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<tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;C</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCCH</td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEI</td>
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<tr>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULCC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDROIT</td>
<td>International Institute for the Unification of Private Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAAWG</td>
<td>Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Description of the Program

The Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP) is a discretionary grants and contributions (G&C) program that funds initiatives for the purpose of assisting the Department of Justice in a number of its priority areas and supporting its goal towards an accessible, efficient, and fair system of justice. The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department on issues related to access to justice, family violence, missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls (MMIWG)/violence against Indigenous women, and the harmonization of private international law. As such, the Program provides funding in support of stimulating knowledge development and dissemination, promoting partnership building and collaboration, and building community capacity.

2. Methodology

In order to address the questions included in the evaluation matrix, the evaluation included the following methodological approaches: document and literature review; key informant interviews; file review; online survey of applicants; and five case studies of funded projects/initiatives.

3. Findings

3.1. Relevance

There is a continued need for the JPIP

The evaluation found a continued need for the types of initiatives funded through the JPIP. All key informants believe the JPIP is still relevant and is needed. Family violence and violence against Indigenous women and girls are ongoing and important issues in Canada that require addressing. Providing financial assistance to Indigenous students in their pursuit of a law career is important in that it contributes towards efforts to reduce the current educational disparities that Indigenous
students experience; it also contributes towards addressing the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

All stakeholders identified a need for continued efforts to build knowledge, awareness, and understanding of justice issues. Such knowledge-building activities are important to assist the public in understanding the justice system and Canadian laws in general, as well to inform both the public as well as justice stakeholders on specific justice-related issues, such as family violence. It is also important to undertake such knowledge-building efforts in a variety of formats in order to ensure accessibility to a wide range of audiences and abilities. Similarly, the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps is critical to inform changes to the justice system and ongoing improvements.

Given the broad objectives of the JPIP, the wide array of initiatives funded and activities undertaken by funded initiatives, the JPIP strives to be responsive to the needs of Canadians. The evaluation found that funded activities have a wide reach with respect to the types of target audiences and beneficiaries, with many targeting Indigenous people, youth, victims of crime, justice stakeholders/professionals, women and girls, and visible minority groups.

**The JPIP aligns with government priorities and federal roles and responsibilities**

The JPIP aligns well with government priorities, contributing to the Department’s strategic outcome of a fair, relevant, and accessible Canadian justice system and in support of the Government of Canada’s priority outcome for a safe and secure Canada. Specific objectives of the JPIP are aligned with government priority areas — such as the *Action Plan to Address Family Violence and Violent Crimes Against Aboriginal Women and Girls* — and departmental policy areas related to family law, human rights law, public law, private international law, and Indigenous justice.

The JPIP aligns with federal roles and responsibilities as articulated by the *Department of Justice Act* and the roles and responsibilities of the Minister. The JPIP and the various initiatives undertaken through JPIP funding are viewed as contributing to the defined roles of the Department, specifically with respect to its role as a policy department.
3.2. Performance — achievement of outcomes

The JPIP contributes to increased capacity of stakeholders for building knowledge, awareness, and understanding

The JPIP is important and often critical to funding recipients to assist with core operations and undertake both ongoing and new activities, and in general to increase their capacity to offer services and activities that contribute to building knowledge, awareness, and understanding of justice issues. The evaluation found that without the JPIP funding, most recipients would not be able to offer the same level of services or would not be able to participate in JPIP-funded activities at all. The JPIP funding also assists recipients with leveraging funds and in-kind resources from other partners; for some, these other funds/resources are contingent on the recipient receiving JPIP funding.

The funding provided through the JPIP increases the capacity of recipient organizations by assisting them in expanding their services and activities, and the number and/or types of clients served; undertaking research and projects for developing tools and resources; providing training, tools, and resources to other organizations that in turn increase the capacity to serve their clients; and developing resources and supports that increase the capacity of the target group to address their justice-related issues.

JPIP recipients develop important partnerships that also contribute to increased capacity, with most recipients having some type of partnership and all being satisfied or very satisfied with their partnerships. While some partners provide cash funds, most provide some type of in-kind resource, primarily in the form of human resources and expertise and advice. In particular, recipients value the partners for the expertise and advice they contribute toward assisting in developing and delivering resources, tools, and programming. As well, partners often come with their own networks and associations that further expand the reach of the initiative.

The JPIP contributes to increased awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system

Most, if not all, of the activities that JPIP recipients undertake can be viewed as knowledge and awareness-building. This includes, for example, such activities as offering workshops, conferences, symposia, and training sessions; conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects; or offering Public Legal Education and Information (PLEI) related services and activities, such as call-in lines, developing and distributing pamphlets and other informational materials, and informational sessions. In addition, a small number of specific recipients take part in the promotion
of increased harmonization of legislation and/or international cooperation on justice issues. Such activities are targeted to the general public, justice stakeholders, specific vulnerable populations, or other organizations.

The evaluation found that JPIP-funded initiatives promote awareness and knowledge of justice-related issues. Recipients report positively on their activities’ contribution to increased knowledge and understanding of justice issues. For example, more than 61% of applicant survey respondents believe their JPIP-funded initiative contributed to each of the JPIP’s four knowledge/awareness-based objectives to a great or very great extent, and more than 79% indicated to at least some extent. As well, based on the file review, most projects report that their funded activities resulted in new information, new skills, or changed awareness.

PLEI organizations, for example, reported receiving positive feedback from clients on the helpfulness of the PLEI activities and services. Financial assistance to Indigenous students assists these students in gaining awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system through their law studies. Projects related to family violence, violence against women, and violence against Indigenous women and girls inform women and girls of their legal rights and how the justice system and other services can assist them. The Uniform Law Conference of Canada’s (ULCC’s) work to unify legislation across Canada increases awareness of the relevant issues across jurisdictions, while the work of the two intergovernmental organizations, the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH) and International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT), assist governments and legislators in gaining a better understanding of cross-border matters, as well as members of the Canadian public and Canadian companies affected by such matters.

**The JPIP assists in promoting Canadian interests internationally**

The promotion of Canadian interests internationally by JPIP recipients is achieved primarily through the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy (ICCLR), the HCCH, and UNIDROIT. The ICCLR participates in numerous international initiatives, including some with the UN, and represents Canada’s interests and imparts a Canadian influence in such initiatives. The Department of Justice is responsible for Canada’s membership in the HCCH and UNIDROIT, and does so through JPIP funds, with this membership providing Canada with the ability to participate in and influence the work of both these organizations. More specifically, Canada contributes expertise in the development of new and the operation of existing instruments, and also participates in governance aspects, thus contributing to the direction of the
organizations. As a result of this involvement and the assessed contribution provided by the JPIP, Canada is considered an influential member of both the HCCH and UNIDROIT.

The work of the ULCC also has an international influence when its work and initiatives, originally developed for a Canadian context, is introduced in international fora. For example, some legislation initially developed for Canada was taken forward to the HCCH and UNIDROIT by Canada and became the basis of international instruments in those organizations. In addition, the ULCC can facilitate the implementation of internationally developed instruments in Canada.

The JPIP contributes to increased access to justice

Stakeholders report that the funded initiatives are providing information, services, and other activities that contribute to the knowledge, understanding, and skills of the public, vulnerable populations, justice stakeholders, and other services providers with respect to the Canadian justice system. This improved knowledge, understanding, and skills in turn lead to increased access to justice. PLEI activities, for example, contributes to a more informed public who are then better able to make the appropriate decisions and take the necessary steps for resolving their legal matter. A more informed justice system is better able to support the public with respect to their justice issues through the appropriate tools, legislation, and decision-making skills. JPIP projects also provide tools and resources to assist vulnerable populations in gaining the knowledge and skills on their rights and how the justice system can assist them in exercising their rights. Initiatives through the ULCC that bring about uniformity in legislation between provinces contribute to improved consistency across the country with respect to how the justice system treats individuals and creates a fairer justice system. And the implementation of instruments developed through international organizations such as the HCCH and UNIDROIT inform justice systems on a global level and provide residents and companies of member states, such as Canada, with increased access to justice on cross-border legal matters.

The evaluation also considered PLEI funding to the territories that is provided through the AJAs Access to Justice Services Agreements (AJAs) with the territories. The PLEI funding provided through these agreements is an important component of access to justice to residents in the territories, as these are usually the only available source of PLEI activities in these locations. Because the PLEI activities are usually delivered out of one main office within each territory that cover a large and remote geographical area, delivery agents make use of a variety of means to make their materials and services accessible to residents. This could be through a toll-free lawline, drop-in services, in-person clinics, printed and online PLEI materials, the use of court workers in communities, and outreach to communities. However, delivery is challenged by the large
geographical areas of the territories populated by small, remote, and poorly serviced communities, with most accessible only by fly-in services and, for some, by boat during small ice-free windows of time. Language and cultural barriers are another main challenge; in addition, accessing materials online is often difficult, as internet services are poor in many communities and the costs of owning a computer and accessing the internet are prohibitive.

**The JPIP contributes to a strengthened Canadian legal framework**

The JPIP contributes to a strengthened legal framework through the positive influence that funded initiatives have on informational, policy, procedural, or legislative changes that provide Canadians with greater access to justice. Each of the various types of JPIP initiatives can be viewed as contributing to this strengthened legal framework in one or more ways. PLEI organizations, for example, help increase the public’s comfort level with and acceptance of the Canadian legal system through a better understanding of how to effectively access the legal system. Through collaboration and communication, the various funded organizations share information with other justice stakeholders, including with the Department of Justice, that help to identify gaps, emerging trends, and unmet needs, and that can assist in informing and influencing programming, policy, and legislation, including greater harmonization of legislation. These actions all lead to a strengthened Canadian legal framework. As well, the work of the ULCC, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT contribute toward harmonized legislation, which further strengthens the legal framework.

**3.3. Performance — demonstration of efficiency and economy**

**Economy**

One aspect of economy, and the extent to which expected outcomes are achieved while using the minimum amount of resources required, is how well actual spending matches budgeted amounts. Any variance between budgeted and actual expenditures for JPIP initiatives over the evaluation period was largely due to $808,330 in underspending for Family Violence and MMIWG contribution projects in 2012–13 at the beginning of the new funding cycle, while awaiting confirmation of program approval.

**Efficiency**

Based on input from funding recipients, JPIP projects appear to be highly successful in achieving their expected outcomes, suggesting that the Program has been able to make efficient and effective
use of the relatively modest amount of available resources to achieve results. This success has been attributed to several factors.

One factor is that funded initiatives are screened and chosen based on their alignment with program priorities and the availability of other resources. Other resources include cash funds but more commonly are in-kind contributions in the form of human resources, expertise, and advice. In particular, the in-kind resources in the form of expertise and knowledge are viewed as making substantial contributions to initiatives that assist them in achieving positive results. The program has also implemented several measures for efficient program management, such as standardized funding applications, a formalized method and set of criteria for reviewing proposals, and regular reporting through a standard reporting template. JPIP applicants were highly satisfied with the application process and funding recipients were highly satisfied with other aspects of program management, such as reporting requirements, timeliness of payments, and the time period of funding awards. Additionally, both applicants and funding recipients were highly satisfied with their interactions with JPIP representatives with respect to their assistance with applications and reporting requirements.

The JPIP also generally meets departmental service standards for acknowledgement, funding decision, and payments, with 80% to 100% of the files sampled meeting the standards for these during most of the years covered by the evaluation. As well, the JPIP has a relatively low ratio of total actual administrative costs (represented as salaries plus O&M) to total actual expenditures (salaries plus O&M plus G&Cs), ranging from 1% to 5% over the evaluation period, which makes it an inexpensive program to administer.
1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). The evaluation was conducted to meet the requirements of the Treasury Board of Canada’s 2009 Policy on Evaluation, which requires departments to evaluate all direct program spending on a five-year cycle.\(^1\) The Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice (the Department) led the evaluation.

1.1. Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the evaluation strategy as described in the JPIP’s Performance Measurement Strategy, which outlines the evaluation issues and questions to address, the data sources, and methods. The evaluation covered fiscal years 2012–13 to 2016–17.\(^2\) The evaluation approach and methodologies supported the assessment of the five following core evaluation issues for relevance and performance as outlined in the 2009 Treasury Board Secretariat Directive on the Evaluation Function.

Relevance:

- Issue 1: Continued need for the Program
- Issue 2: Alignment with government priorities
- Issue 3: Alignment with federal roles and responsibilities

---

\(^1\) The 2009 Policy on Evaluation was rescinded in April 2016 and replaced with the Policy on Results. However, this evaluation was initiated prior to this change; nevertheless, the Policy on Results also outlines requirements for evaluations on a five-year cycle.

\(^2\) While it was recognized that results information would not be available for those JPIP initiatives conducted during 2016–17, including the most recent fiscal year allowed for obtaining input from stakeholders whose projects continued into 2016–17.
Performance:

- Issue 4: Achievement of expected outcomes
- Issue 5: Demonstration of efficiency and economy

The evaluation matrix and its associated questions, indicators, and data sources guided the evaluation; the questions related to the achievement of expected outcomes were defined by the JPIP logic model. The Evaluation Division (ED) led the evaluation, and was assisted by an Evaluation Working Group (EWG). The methodology report was informed by an initial meeting with the ED, as well as a preliminary review of JPIP-related documents and files.

In addition to examining the JPIP, the evaluation also assessed the Public Legal Education and Information (PLEI) component of the Access to Justice Services Agreements (AJAs) between the Government of Canada and the three northern territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut). The AJAs “are the means by which the Government of Canada financially supports the delivery of access to justice services in northern communities, including: legal aid (both criminal and civil), Aboriginal courtwork services and public legal education and information” (Department of Justice, 2016a).
2. PROFILE OF THE JPIP

The JPIP is a discretionary grants and contributions (G&C) program that funds initiatives for the purpose of assisting the Department of Justice in a number of its priority areas and supporting its goal towards an accessible, efficient, and fair system of justice. The JPIP is delivered and managed by the Innovations, Analysis, and Integration Directorate of the Departments’ Programs Branch.

2.1. Overview and Program Objectives

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department on issues related to access to justice, family violence, missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls (MMIWG)/violence against Indigenous women, and the harmonization of private international law. As such, the Program provides funding in support of stimulating knowledge development and dissemination, promoting partnership building and collaboration, and building community capacity (Department of Justice, 2015a).

The specific objectives of the JPIP are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy (ICCLR);
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
• promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;

• reduce the vulnerability of young Indigenous women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Indigenous women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Indigenous women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and

• enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH) and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) (Department of Justice, 2015a).

2.2. Program Components

The JPIP funding to support these objectives is allocated through four sub-activities:

• operational funding in the form of grants that are provided to specific organizations on an annual basis and that include several categories of initiatives as follows:
  – named grants to five selected organizations
  – core funding to 10 provincial PLEI organizations
  – core funding to the ICCLR

• annual educational funding to support Métis and Non-Status Indians in their post-secondary educational pursuits in law studies

• annual funding to meet Canada’s assessed contributions for its memberships in the HCCH and UNIDROIT

• project specific contribution funding to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) conducting activities/initiatives related to the priority areas of the JPIP with respect to access to justice, family violence, and MMIWG/violence against Indigenous women and girls
2.2.1. **Operational Funding**

**Named grants:** Named grant organizations annually receiving JPIP grant funding include the following:

- **Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police**
  - The Law Amendment Committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police consults with other justice stakeholders in the criminal justice fields, and provides advice and input to the Department on matters related to criminal justice policy, legislative initiatives, and possible amendments to the law.

- **Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges**
  - The Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges takes part in a number of activities to ensure a responsive justice system including those related to law reform, judicial independence of the courts, acting as an educational body and disseminator of information for judges across Canada, and providing advice to governments and other bodies with respect to law reform.

- **Canadian Society of Forensic Science**
  - The Canadian Society of Forensic Science maintains professional standards for forensic science and, among other things, serves as an advisory body to the Department on matters related to alcohol and breath analysis, as well as policy related to drugs and driving.

- **National Judicial Institute**
  - The National Judicial Institute develops and delivers educational programs to federal, provincial, and territorial judges focusing on three main areas including substantive law, skills training, and social context issues.

- **Uniform Law Conference of Canada**
  - The Uniform Law Conference of Canada (ULCC) works to harmonize the laws between provinces and territories, as well as with federal law, as relevant; identify where changes are needed in federal criminal legislation and make appropriate recommendations to the federal government; and harmonize Canadian commercial law.
**PLEI organizations:** The JPIP provides core funding annually to 10 PLEI organizations across Canada (one per province). PLEI materials and activities provided by these organizations assist the public in understanding the law, their rights and obligations, the Canadian justice system, and how they might deal with their legal matter.

**ICCLR:** The JPIP also provides core annual funding to the ICCLR, an international organization that “promotes the rule of law, democracy, human rights, and good governance in criminal law and the administration of criminal justice, domestically, regionally and globally” (International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy, n.d.). It does this through research; the development of tools, materials, programs, and policy advice; and through looking for ways of international cooperation in areas of criminal law reform and criminal justice.

### 2.2.2. Educational Funding

Educational funding for the Legal Studies for Aboriginal People (LSAP) is administered through Indspire, an Indigenous-led NGO that delivers bursaries, scholarships, and awards programs to assist Indigenous students in their post-secondary studies. JPIP funding is delivered through the LSAP component of Indspire’s Building Brighter Futures: Bursaries, Scholarships, and Awards program (Indspire, n.d.). Métis and Non-Status Indian students pursuing a law program are eligible for JPIP financial assistance.

### 2.2.3. Funding to the HCCH and UNIDROIT

Canada pays an annual assessed contribution as a component of its membership in both the HCCH and UNIDROIT; JPIP funding provides the annual assessed contribution amounts for both of these organizations. Based out of The Hague, Netherlands, with regional offices in Buenos Aires and Hong Kong, the HCCH is an intergovernmental world organization concerned with the harmonization of private international law. The members of the HCCH work to adopt private international law rules to help resolve situations that may be affected by the differences in legal systems between countries (Hague Conference on Private International Law, n.d.). Based out of Rome, Italy, UNIDROIT is an intergovernmental world organization concerned with “modernising, harmonising and co-ordinating private and in particular commercial law as between States and groups of States” (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, n.d.).

---

3 PLEI funding to the territories is provided through the AJAs.
UNIDROIT works to develop uniform law instruments, principles, and rules to achieve this unification of private law.

2.2.4. Contribution Funding

Contribution funding is provided to NGOs to assist them in delivering initiatives related to family violence and MMIWG/violence against Indigenous women and girls. The funding of initiatives related to family violence is intended to raise public awareness on family violence issues and improve the justice system’s and the public’s response to family violence (Department of Justice, n.d.). The funding of initiatives related to violence against Indigenous women and girls are intended to contribute to reduced victimization of Indigenous women and girls, and to reduce their vulnerability to violence. Initiatives are expected to do so through the provision of tools, resources, and programs that empower Indigenous women and girls and provide them with alternatives to scenarios in which they may be victimized (Department of Justice, 2016b).

2.3. Eligible Activities

The JPIP funding to these organizations supports a variety of eligible activities including research; the development and dissemination of informational materials, models, and tools; pilot projects and demonstrations; conferences, workshops, symposia, and other types of meetings; developing and providing resource tools and supports to victims of violence; empowerment and leadership development; culturally-appropriate healing and support projects; bursaries to Métis and Non-Status Indians; and contribution for membership to the HCCH and UNIDROIT (Department of Justice, 2015a, 2015b).

2.4. Resources

Approximately $3.0 million was allocated to the JPIP annually between 2012–13 and 2016–17, as well as $330,000 annually for the assessed contributions to the HCCH and UNIDROIT (Table 1 and Table 2). Funding to organizations receiving annual funds in the form of operational funds, educational funds, or the assessed contributions to the HCCH and UNIDROIT accounted for 65% of total JPIP funds in 2016–17 ($2.18 million). The distribution between sub-activities was similar for other years of the evaluation period.
The JPIP, as with many programs, experienced reduced funding due to the federal government’s 2012 Economic Action Plan, with the Department reducing JPIP funding by $1 million as part of their Deficit Reduction Action Plan (DRAP) (Department of Justice Canada, 2014, p. 5).

Table 1: Annual allocation of JPIP to recipients, 2012–13 TO 2016–17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-activity and recipient type</th>
<th>Resources allocated annually</th>
<th>2016–17 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Operational funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named grants</td>
<td>$493,345</td>
<td>$493,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEI organizations</td>
<td>$1,030,813</td>
<td>$1,030,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCLR</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educational funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indspire</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initiative funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td>$597,725</td>
<td>$597,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMIWG</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other JPIP activities</td>
<td>$260,218</td>
<td>$260,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JPIP resources</td>
<td>$3,062,101</td>
<td>$3,062,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data provided by program.

Table 2: Annual allocation to assessed contributions, 2012–13 TO 2016–17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed contribution</th>
<th>Resources allocated annually</th>
<th>2016–17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCCH</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDROIT</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HCCH &amp; UNIDROIT</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data provided by program.
3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology for the evaluation consisted of multiple lines of evidence, including a document/literature review, key informant interviews, a file review, a survey of applicants, and case studies. As noted, the methodology is as outlined in the JPIP Performance Measurement Strategy. The evaluation was guided by an evaluation matrix that addresses questions around relevance and performance, and includes indicators and data sources for each. Performance questions include the consideration of achievement of the outcomes as defined by the JPIP logic model. Appendix A provides the logic model and evaluation matrix.

The evaluation methodologies are described below and data collection instruments are provided in Appendix B. All data collection instruments were developed in consultation with the EWG.

3.1. Document and Literature Review

The document review involved a review of internal documents as well as publicly available documents and included the following:

- terms and conditions for the Program
- templates or examples of recipient project or contribution agreements
- annual reporting by the Program, such as through Departmental Performance Reporting
- other relevant publicly available information such as reports on plans and priorities, Budget Speeches, and Speeches from the Throne
- previous evaluations or sub-studies of funded areas
- annual data on the number of recipients and funding amounts by funding areas
- any other relevant documents identified by the Program or ED
While this task did not include an exhaustive literature review, any recent literature covering access to justice issues relevant to the JPIP that were identified over the course of the evaluation were also reviewed.

3.2. **Key Informant Interviews**

Key informant interviews were conducted to obtain the opinions, perceptions, and experiences of key stakeholders with knowledge of the JPIP. Interviews included Department of Justice Canada staff, partners, and stakeholders.

Information was collected from 21 key informants in total. Input was provided through 18 interviews (two of the interviews involved two participants each) and one written submission, with the breakdown of key informants as follows:

- Department of Justice representatives – five interviewees
- Family Violence Initiative (FVI) recipients – five interviewees
- PLEI core funding recipients – four interviewees
- Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls (VAAWG) fund recipients – three interviewees
- JPIP general funding recipients – two interviewees
- AJA PLEI recipients – two interviewees

The EWG identified potential key informant interview participants. Interviews were conducted using structured interview guides tailored to the specific groups, with questions designed to address the evaluation issues and questions.

The representatives for the AJA PLEI components were asked some basic questions regarding how PLEI services are delivered in the territories, what gaps in services exist, and any challenges in delivering PLEI in the northern territories.

3.3. **File Review**

The file review involved a review of performance information and files for specific funded JPIP recipients. Files were selected to include a sample from each of the recipient groups, including named grants, PLEI organizations, VAAWG initiatives, FVI initiatives, and JPIP general funding.
Given the small number of named grants, it was decided to include all five recipients in the review. Half of the PLEI organizations were included in the review, and the remaining files were chosen from the other initiatives.

A total of 31 JPIP recipient files were reviewed, with the breakdown as follows:

- named grants – five
- PLEI organizations – five
- VAAWG – seven
- FVI – nine
- JPIP general funding – five

The JPIP program randomly selected files to review, according to the number per group outlined above. Recipients that were included in case studies were not included in the file review.

Files were reviewed at Department of Justice program offices and included reviews of data and records maintained for each funding recipient, such as the following:

- recipient applications
- contribution agreements
- recipient reporting
- financial data on reviewed files
- correspondences between the recipient and program staff

Each file was reviewed using a file review template to ensure that all data were reviewed in a consistent fashion and to facilitate analysis and reporting. Two file review templates were developed based on information required in JPIP applications and reporting templates; JPIP uses two reporting templates — one for named grants, and one for all other recipients.

3.4. **Survey of Applicants**

The evaluation included an online survey of project applicants in order to obtain input from a broad range of Program stakeholders and to provide an opportunity to capture applicant input in a manner that can be aggregated and quantified. The survey included both successful and unsuccessful
applicants, and it included some questions applicable to both and some specific to funding recipients and unsuccessful applicants. As well, the survey questionnaire was developed in a manner as to allow some comparisons with the survey results from the previous evaluation.

The Program provided the email addresses of primary contacts for project applicants. Applicants received an email invitation from the ED to explain the survey and encourage their participation. Applicants were emailed a unique link to the survey, with options for completing the survey in either official language. Several rounds of follow-up emails to non-respondents were conducted to encourage participation. A total of 114 applicants were invited to participate in the survey. Forty-six applicants completed the survey, representing a response rate of 40%.

### 3.5. Case Studies

Five case studies of funded projects/initiatives were conducted to provide more in-depth context into how the JPIP contributes to each of the initiatives and results achieved. Case study candidates were identified with the assistance of the ED and included the following recipients:

- the HCCH (receives JPIP general funding)
- UNIDROIT (receives JPIP general funding)
- Indspire (which administers the LSAP Program through JPIP general funding)
- Girls Action Foundation (receives funding through both the FVI and the VAAWG initiative)
- Community Legal Education Association Incorporated (receives JPIP general funding for PLEI)

Each case study involved a review of relevant documents and files for each project/initiative (e.g., applications, contribution agreements, recipient reporting), as well as interviews with several key stakeholders for each of the chosen projects/initiatives. Two interview guides were developed specifically for the case studies: one for PLEI recipients and one for other recipients.

Interviews were conducted with the primary contact for each case study initiative, who were asked to identify other relevant stakeholders to interview, such as partners and/or program participants.
3.6. Limitations

The methodological limitations of the evaluation are listed below, along with the mitigating strategies taken.

**Review of documents and data.** There were limited documents and data available to inform the evaluation beyond program objectives, program terms and conditions, a few previous evaluations, financial data on funding, and project reporting.

**Responses from surveys and interviews with key informants and case study stakeholders.** Surveys and interview findings are potentially affected by self-reported response bias and strategic response bias. Self-reported response bias occurs when individuals are reporting on their own activities and so may want to portray themselves in the best light. Strategic response bias occurs when the participants answer questions with the desire to affect outcomes.

**Small sample size for the survey.** The survey included all organizations that have applied for JPIP funding over the evaluation period, other than the HCCH and UNIDROIT, including successful and unsuccessful applicants. As a smaller program, the JPIP has not had a large number of applicants over the course of the evaluation. The Program did not have up-to-date information for some applicants, primarily unsuccessful applicants. As a result, 114 applicants were asked to respond to the survey and 46 applicants responded, which provides a fairly small sample for reporting results.

**Mitigation strategies.** The main mitigation strategies for the above methodological limitations were to use multiple lines of evidence, make use of both quantitative and qualitative data, and include a range of stakeholder groups for the various lines of evidence. By triangulating the findings from these different sources, the evaluation was able to strengthen its conclusions despite the limitations. The different stakeholder groups included key informant interviews with Department of Justice representatives, as well as with funding recipients from each type of JPIP funding initiative (e.g., named grants, PLEI organizations, FVI, VAAWG, and JPIP general funding); the survey of applicants that included all recipient types except for HCCH and UNIDROIT; the case studies of five funding recipients; and the file review of 31 recipient files.
4. FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the evaluation according to relevance and performance issues.

4.1. Relevance

The core issues with respect to relevance include the following:

- the continued need for the Program
- the alignment of Program objectives with government and departmental priorities
- the roles and responsibilities of the federal government to deliver the Program

4.1.1. Continued need for the JPIP

The evaluation found a continued need for the types of initiatives funded through the JPIP. All key informants believe that the JPIP is still necessary and relevant. The JPIP addresses what are viewed as important ongoing issues — such as family violence and violence against Indigenous women — and can assist in identifying emerging trends and gaps. The JPIP can also be used to address emerging issues. Interviewed recipients were all able to identify objectives of the JPIP that aligned with the objectives of their own projects. The file review confirms these observations, with all projects assessed as aligning with one or more JPIP objectives. Just over half of survey respondents (including approved and unapproved applicants) believe that the JPIP objectives are completely or very much aligned with the justice needs of the general public (52%; n=24) as well as with the justice needs of the legal community in general (54%; n=25), while most others believe they were somewhat aligned (33%, n=15; and 22%, n=10, respectively).

This strong alignment with JPIP objectives indicates project applicants’ perceived need for and desire to take part in initiatives in these areas. As further evidence that stakeholders view the JPIP objectives as important for meeting the needs of Canadians, and also that support is needed to
achieve these objectives, applicant survey respondents reported a high level of need for support to their organization to assist them in working toward achieving JPIP objectives.

In particular, over 80% of respondents identified a moderate to great need for support to help their organization achieve the following JPIP objectives:

- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence (91% great/moderate need)
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence (87% great/moderate need)
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among the public on justice issues (85% great/moderate need)
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system (83% great/moderate need)
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders on justice issues (87% great/moderate need)

As well, over two-thirds of respondents identified a moderate to great need for support to help their organization achieve the following JPIP objective:

- reduce the vulnerability of young Indigenous women to violence through the development of models, programs, tools, and resources to provide alternatives to risky behaviour and to empower Indigenous women (70% great/moderate need)

The continued need for JPIP funding to support initiatives that strive to achieve specific JPIP objectives is discussed below.

**Building knowledge, awareness, and understanding around justice issues.** Key informants spoke widely of the need for building knowledge and awareness of the justice system and justice issues in a wide range of areas. Funded PLEI activities are viewed as needed to help the public understand the law, the Canadian justice system, their rights, and how to deal with their legal matters. PLEI activities are particularly of importance to assist the increasing number of self-represented litigants. Furthermore, PLEI materials need to be provided in a user-friendly manner and in a number of formats to ensure the materials are accessible and understandable to a wide range of audiences. A few key informants observed that PLEI activities contribute to the *Nine-Point Access to Justice Roadmap* outlined by Justice Cromwell in the report on access to civil and family justice. This report, conducted by the Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters,
identifies a serious access to justice issue in Canada due to the civil and family justice system being complex, slow, and expensive. One of the main beginning elements of the roadmap laid out in the report for achieving access to justice is for a front-end set of services that can facilitate early resolution of legal matters to avoid the involvement of the formal justice system (e.g., tribunals and court). The report identifies public legal information and education as one of the foundational components of these early resolution services (Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, 2013).

Key informants spoke of the need to build awareness, knowledge, and understanding for the public as well as for justice stakeholders with respect to specific issues that are addressed through the JPIP, such as family violence, violence against Indigenous women and girls, and the harmonization of laws.

**Identifying emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system.** Key informants spoke of how the funded initiatives can contribute toward identifying emerging trends and gaps, and the importance of this work to inform and improve the justice system. For example, a key role of the ICCLR is to inform and support the federal government in key priority areas with respect to criminal law and to do so in both a national and international context. It does so through the early identification of trends occurring at the national and international level, and supporting policy-oriented research with respect to responding to trends. The work of the ULCC is also viewed as important for identifying and contributing to justice reform to address trends, issues, and gaps in the justice system. One way the ULCC does this is in bringing attention to issues identified by stakeholders working in the justice system, such as judges and other practitioners, or by provinces and territories.

**Participating in efforts to harmonize international private law.** Canada’s participation in efforts to harmonize international private law is viewed as needed to assist Canadian individuals, families, and commercial enterprises in resolving their legal matters that have an international context. Furthermore, harmonization has become increasingly important, given the global nature of commercial entities as well as the rising tendency of Canadians to have personal and business ties to other countries.

**Increasing awareness of and strengthening responses to family violence.** Family violence is a pervasive problem in Canada and globally, as evidenced by a 2014 report by Canada’s Chief Public Health Officer (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2016). According to the report, while acknowledging that complete and reliable statistics on family violence are difficult to obtain, available data indicate the following: on average, 172 family-related homicides are committed in
Canada annually; those at greatest risk of family violence include women, children, Indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, and people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, or questioning; women are more likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse (physical and sexual) and to be killed by an intimate partner; and family violence is often unreported, due to the reluctance of victims to speak out. All key informants spoke of the need to increase awareness of and strengthen the response to family violence, with many interviewed recipients providing examples of how their projects contribute to addressing this need. An example of highlighting this need was provided through case study interviews that revealed relationship violence as an increasing form of violence, while a culture of shame still exists in reporting this violence. Empowering young women to acknowledge relationship violence and seek assistance is viewed as an important unmet need that can be addressed through JPIP funding. Furthermore, a few key informants working in the area of family violence indicated that there is a need for more work to ensure that victims and their families receive equitable and fair access to justice, or that the issue of forced marriages is an emerging issue in Canada requiring further attention with respect to protecting and supporting victims of forced marriages.

**Reducing the vulnerability of young Indigenous women to violence.** A 2009 Statistics Canada study based on General Social Survey data found that Indigenous women self-reported rates of violent victimization three times higher than that of non-Indigenous women (Brennan, 2011). The 2013 study initiated by the Commissioner of the RCMP on MMIWG found that not only are Indigenous women over-represented with respect to missing and murdered women, but that the numbers exceeded previous estimates. The study reported police records of 1,017 homicide victims and 164 missing Indigenous women and girls (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2014). Further evidence of the recognition of the need for initiatives to reduce the vulnerability of Indigenous women to violence is the Parliament-established Special Committee of the House of Commons that conducted hearings regarding MMIWG. The Special Committee’s report *Invisible Women: A Call to Action* looked at the extent of MMIWG in Canada and considered the root causes of violence against Indigenous women (Special Committee on Violence, 2014). Key informants also spoke of the need for programming to assist vulnerable Indigenous women to gain an understanding of how to recognize violence and of the supports available to address the violence.

Promoting the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law. The financial support from the JPIP is viewed as needed to financially assist Indigenous students enrolled in a pre-law or law program and to increase their access to becoming members of the legal profession. In recognition of the need to
address the educational disparities that exist for Indigenous students, the Truth and Reconciliation Call to Action made a series of recommendations around education, including for the development of a joint strategy between the federal government and Indigenous groups “to eliminate educational and employment gaps between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians,” as well as for the “federal government to provide adequate funding to end the backlog of First Nations students seeking a post-secondary education” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). In the December 2015 Speech from the Throne, the Government of Canada committed to work to implement the Truth and Reconciliation’s recommendations and to “work with First Nations so that every First Nations child receives a quality education” (Government of Canada, 2015c).

**Responsiveness of the JPIP to the needs of Canadians**

The JPIP’s scope is necessarily broad given its wide range of objectives. JPIP activities and funding investments include providing funding for the following purposes, and, as was discussed above, stakeholders believe there is a need for this support:

- to promote partnership building and intersectoral collaboration, such as through membership in the HCCH and UNIDROIT
- to stimulate knowledge development and dissemination
- to build community capacity
- to reduce victimization of Indigenous women
- to improve the Justice system’s response to family violence and reduce family violence
- to provide financial support to Indigenous students pursuing a legal studies program.

Similarly, recipients’ area of focus for their JPIP-funded initiative is broad, as revealed through both the file review and the applicant survey (Table 3). The majority of survey respondents (approved applicants) reported that their initiative’s area of focus was related to family violence and access to justice, and a majority of the files reviewed had access to justice as an area of focus. Over 40% of both the survey respondents (approved applicants) and file reviews had an area of focus related to PLEI; over 30% for each had victims of crime as an area of focus and, for files reviewed, family violence.
Table 3: Areas of focus for JPIP-funded initiative – survey of applicants (approved applicants) and file review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of focus</th>
<th>Survey approved applications (n=38)</th>
<th>File review (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of crime</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against Indigenous women and girls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or murdered Indigenous women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International law (justice-related issues in the international fora)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal law reform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents could provide more than one answer; totals may sum to more than 100%. Caution: Small sample size; response from a total of 114 applicants surveyed.

Initiatives funded through the JPIP also take part in a variety of activities to achieve their objectives, as demonstrated in Table 4.

Table 4: JPIP-funded initiatives’ activities – survey of applicants (approved applicants) and file review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities that recipients take part in</th>
<th>Survey approved applications (n=38)</th>
<th>File review (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offering workshops, conferences, symposia</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEI projects</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering training sessions</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote increased harmonization of legislation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote international cooperation on justice issues</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research related to access to justice</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support-type services (counselling, legal advice)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted events to raise awareness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All lines of evidence identified that JPIP initiatives had a wide reach with respect to the types of target audiences and beneficiaries, which included Indigenous women and girls, or Indigenous people in general; women or women and girls; youth, including youth at risk and youth involved in the justice system; seniors; victims of crime; visible minority groups; justice professionals and other professional groups; government; northern and/or remote communities; urban communities; persons with disabilities and/or mental health issues; and the general public, amongst other groups. Table 5 illustrates the findings from the applicant survey and file review.

Table 5: Most commonly identified intended direct beneficiaries or target populations for project(s) – survey of applicants (approved applicants) and file review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most commonly identified direct beneficiaries/target populations*</th>
<th>Survey approved applications (n=38)</th>
<th>File review (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (12 to 18 years old)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of crime</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice-related professionals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-cultural or visible minority groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban communities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote communities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons undergoing separation or divorce</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with mental health issues (including FASD)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth at risk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only direct beneficiary groups identified by 25% or more of survey respondents and/or files reviewed.

Note: Respondents could provide more than one answer; totals may sum to more than 100%. Caution: Small sample size; response from a total of 114 applicants surveyed.
The intended reach of a project is indicated by the numbers and types of activities offered, as well as by who the target audience is. Actual reach is indicated by the numbers of the target population that avail themselves of the offered activities and materials. Participation in JPIP-funded activities and the use of materials offered were primarily available to the evaluation through examples provided by key informants and reviews of project reporting.

Some examples of reach for PLEI activities reported by PLEI organizations as identified through the file review include the following:

- Community Legal Education Ontario reported 754,503 publications ordered, with 1,679 other organizations placing orders; 27 webinars with 607 participants; 833,099 website visits; and five learning sessions with 129 participants in 2013–14.

- The Legal Resource Centre of Alberta reported 55,000 publications distributed to direct service organizations; 15,000 legal information documents distributed or downloaded; 75 workshops across the province; and more than 1,000 referral questions responded to in 2013–14.

- Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan reported 46 publications produced, revised, and printed; 112,615 titles distributed; 35 learning sessions with 668 participants; 629 calls received on the call line; and 280 referrals made in 2012–13.

The case study of the Community Legal Education Association Incorporated revealed detailed information on reach, such as a law phone-in line staffed by full-time lawyers and taking an average of 6,800 calls per year, as well as responding to email queries (1,215 emails in 2015); a lawyer referral program, with 1,262 referrals provided in 2015; an inventory of 120 titles as of 2015 (including their own materials and those from other organizations); 8,500 items distributed per year on average; and approximately 135,000 visitors to the PLEI website over the past three years. The Community Legal Education Association Incorporated also offered community activities, such as various PLEI community events to provide free legal information sessions and community legal intermediary training to provide training on the legal system and various areas of law to other service providers who may interact with individuals in need of legal information.

Examples of reach for other types of JPIP-funded initiatives include the following:

- The *Family Counselling for Families of Missing and Murdered Aboriginal Women* project reported providing services to 366 family members through one-on-one counselling, support groups, and ceremony and other traditional gatherings.
The MissingKids.ca: Abducted and Murdered Children Research Initiative project reported sharing the research conducted with 12 law enforcement agencies, four victim services agencies, five prosecutors, and four psychologists.

The Enhancing Community Capacity to Respond to and Prevent Forced Marriage project reported providing training to 23 service providers and sending copies of a developed legal framework on forced marriage to 15 service provider agencies.

**Needs not being met or emerging needs**

Many key informants also identified areas where justice needs of Canadians are not being sufficiently met, or emerging needs. Examples given for unmet needs include continuing gaps in services and resources for self-represented litigants, or for services for specific types of vulnerable groups (e.g., victims of crime, people new to Canada, low-income people, youth, the growing senior population, people living in remote communities). Others indicated it was not so much that there were specific areas of unmet need, it was more that the JPIP did not have sufficient funds to meet the level of needs. As a result, the program is not always able to fund initiatives of interest for emerging justice issues.

Key informants identified continued needs with respect to PLEI, such as for plain-language materials, the provision of PLEI services and PLEI resources in non-official languages, paralegal assistance in completing forms, and practical and procedural step-by-step guides, with much of this information targeted to assisting self-represented litigants. Identified areas of law need include those related to consumer, debt, accidents, and injuries.

Some key informants provided suggestions on emerging areas of need, which included implementing trauma-informed approaches where service providers are trained to be more aware of the impact of trauma on people; considering the interconnectedness of issues such as drugs, addiction, mental health, violence, and justice, particularly in light of the federal government’s intention to legalize and regulate marijuana; restorative justice in Indigenous communities; human trafficking in the context of domestic violence; general legal education in relation to issues of violence and violence prevention at schools, the workplace, and online (i.e., cyberbullying). A few key informants had differing opinions on whether forced marriage is an area of emerging need.
4.1.2. Alignment with Government Priorities

The JPIP’s alignment with government priorities can be demonstrated through the program’s logic model and the linkages of outcomes to priority outcomes of the Department. From the logic model (see Appendix A), each of the sub-activities, outputs, and immediate and intermediate outcomes are expected to lead to the ultimate outcomes of “increased access to the Canadian justice system” and a “strengthened Canadian legal framework.” These ultimate outcomes contribute to the Department’s strategic outcome of “a fair, relevant, and accessible Canadian justice system,” as defined in the Department’s Program Alignment Architecture (PAA) (Department of Justice Canada, 2016a). As well, JPIP falls under Department Program 1.1: Stewardship of the Canadian Legal Framework, which supports the Government of Canada’s priority outcome for “a safe and secure Canada” (Department of Justice Canada, 2016b).

The JPIP’s specific objectives are also aligned with government priorities. The JPIP objective of reducing the vulnerability of young Indigenous women to violence and empowering Indigenous women aligns with the federal government’s priority areas related to MMIWG (Government of Canada, 2015b; Office of the Prime Minister, n.d.).

The Action Plan to Address Family Violence and Violent Crimes Against Aboriginal Women and Girls further articulates the federal government’s priority areas for addressing violence against Indigenous women and girls. The action plan was in response to recommendations made by the Special Committee on Violence Against Indigenous Women. The plan outlines actions that were to be made by the federal government over five years to prevent violence, support victims, and protect Indigenous women and girls. Actions defined in the plan align well with the JPIP objectives related to family violence and reducing the vulnerability of young Indigenous women to violence including:

- engaging partners for a coordinated approach;
- community-led programs for creating safe communities, preventing violence, and breaking intergenerational cycles of violence and abuse; and
- programming and services to support and protect victims of family and other types of violence (Government of Canada, 2014).

The Mandate Letter for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada also outlined the Minister’s areas of responsibility, including “policy in such areas as criminal law, family law, human rights law, public law and private international law, constitutional law and Aboriginal
justice,” most of which align well with the needs targeted by the JPIP (Office of the Prime Minister, n.d.). Key informants who could speak on alignment with government priorities further confirmed this alignment, observing that funded initiatives align with departmental priorities for improving access to justice, enhancing the justice system’s response to family violence, promoting a fair and accessible Canadian justice system, and developing approaches to strengthen the Canadian legal framework. In particular, key informants mentioned that the JPIP aligns well with current governmental priorities with respect to family violence and violence against Indigenous women and girls. As well, given that the Department of Justice has the responsibility of ensuring Canada’s membership in the HCCH and UNIDROIT, the JPIP aligns well with meeting this responsibility.

Key informants also view the JPIP as complementing initiatives taking place in other federal departments/agencies and other jurisdictions. For example the Department of Justice, Status of Women Canada, Public Safety Canada, and Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada all have distinct and complementary roles in the Action Plan to Address Family Violence and Violent Crimes Against Aboriginal Women and Girls. PLEI organizations receiving PLEI funding through the JPIP are organizations designated by their province to provide PLEI services.

4.1.3. Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities

The JPIP appears to align well with federal roles and responsibilities as outlined in legislation and articulated in the Department’s roles and responsibilities with respect to the administration of justice. Section 4 of the Department of Justice Act (R.S.C., 1985) outlines the powers, duties, and functions of the Minister, including to:

“(b) have the superintendence of all matters connected with the administration of justice in Canada, not within the jurisdiction of the governments of the provinces;

(c) generally advise the Crown on all matters of law referred to the Minister by the Crown; and

(d) carry out such other duties as are assigned by the Governor in Council to the Minister” (Government of Canada, n.d.).”

Within these responsibilities, the Department of Justice has three defined roles, all of which are related to the objectives of the JPIP, including acting as “a policy department with broad responsibilities for overseeing all matters relating to the administration of justice that fall within
The JPIP’s overall goal of supporting the policy directions of the Department of Justice directly assists the Department in its role of acting as a policy department. Each of the JPIP’s specific objectives can be viewed as contributing to this overall JPIP goal and, therefore, support the policy directions of the Department. The JPIP objectives related to the identification of justice-related emerging trends, issues, and gaps, and of building knowledge, awareness, and understanding can be viewed as contributing not only the first role, but to all three of the Department’s roles defined above. Furthermore, the funding provided by the JPIP supports the work of various organizations that have the potential to assist the Department in each of the above roles. This includes each of the named grants recipients, the ICCLR, the ULCC, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT. For example, key informants reported that the five organizations receiving named grant funds will advise and inform the Department and other stakeholders on legislative matters. Key informants also observed that the funded initiatives contribute toward the federal government’s ability to fulfill its roles in such areas as promoting access to justice, and in the provision of accessible justice-related information, as well as with assisting the federal government in its shared jurisdiction with provinces/territories for the administration of justice. PLEI organizations that receive funding from both their provincial governments and the JPIP are examples of the latter.

4.2. Performance — Achievement of Immediate Outcomes

4.2.1. Increased Capacity to Build Knowledge, Awareness, and Understanding

Extent that stakeholders can continue ongoing activities

The JPIP is important to recipients to assist them in undertaking the various activities, services, and supports that contribute to building knowledge, awareness, and understanding of justice issues. While JPIP funding may not constitute all or even a majority of some recipients’ resources, key informants reported the funding is still critical to organizations for assisting with such things as core operations, offering programming, expanding their client base, and leveraging resources. For some recipients, however, the JPIP funds are the primary or sole source of cash funds for their initiative, with any partners primarily providing in-kind resources. Most key informants believe JPIP recipients’ services or projects would either have to discontinue or be curtailed without JPIP funding.
This belief was further confirmed by the applicant survey, where almost all (95%; n=36) of the respondents with an approved application indicated that their project would not have been able to proceed without JPIP funding. Similarly, close to three-quarters (72%; n=13) of the respondents with an unapproved application indicated that their project was unable to proceed without JPIP funding. As well, the majority of survey respondents indicated their organization had a great to moderate need for support to help them conduct various JPIP-funded activities, such as the following:

- develop/offer resources, tools, and supports related to family violence (87% great/moderate need)
- offer training sessions (87% great/moderate need)
- conduct pilot, demonstration, and research projects (85% great/moderate need)
- offer workshops, conferences, and symposia (85% great/moderate need)
- conduct PLEI projects (78% great/moderate need)
- offer culturally-appropriate healing and support projects (72% great/moderate need)

And, in particular, almost three-quarters of respondents (72%) indicated they had a great need to assist them in developing and/or offering resources, tools, and supports related to family violence, and close to two-thirds (63%) indicated they had a great need to assist them in conducting pilot, demonstration, and research projects and in conducting PLEI projects.

Some specific examples of how the JPIP allows organizations to continue their ongoing activities include the following:

- A few recipient organizations mentioned the JPIP funding assists their organization in leveraging resources from other funding sources, and that the loss of JPIP funds could jeopardize access to these other funding sources. Funding through the JPIP provides further credibility on the importance of PLEI services to the public. For example, one PLEI organization indicated that the JPIP and another funding source together provide 60% of the organization’s overall resources. While the other funder accounts for the larger share of the 60%, its contribution is contingent on the JPIP also providing funds. JPIP funding assists PLEI organizations with meeting operational expenses, developing PLEI materials, conducting outreach and training activities, and translating materials.
• Funding to the ICCLR supports the operations of the organization that consists of a small contingent of staff, and supports program development and research activities. Research is often conducted by associates of the ICCLR who are recognized as experts in various criminal justice issues, with this work often serving as a catalyst for other initiatives.

• Without the JPIP funding that Indspire receives, financial assistance to Indigenous students pursuing a law program would have to be diverted from other programs and, therefore, would impact students wanting to access those funding programs.

• The HCCH and UNIDROIT rely on member country contributions, including from Canada, for their ongoing operation. Furthermore, Canada is in the top funding category for each organization; contributors to the top funding categories together account for a substantial proportion of overall funds for both organizations. Provision of the assessed contribution — which is provided through the JPIP — is essential for Canada’s continued membership and involvement in each of these organizations, as mentioned by key informants. Canada makes contributions to both of these organizations that are beyond the JPIP funding, which goes toward meeting assessed membership requirements. The Constitutional Administrative and International Law Section of the Department of Justice is responsible for meeting the work requirements of the HCCH and UNIDROIT membership. Canadian delegates represent Canada’s views, contribute to the work of the organizations, and are often requested to assume leadership roles within both organizations.

**Extent that the JPIP contributes to increased capacity**

Separating out the extent that recipients’ capacity has increased due to the JPIP funding from the extent that recipients are able to continue ongoing activities is challenging, particularly as there is no baseline upon which to measure ongoing activities versus increased capacity. Evidence of increased capacity is primarily from recipient specific examples, as provided through key informants, case studies, and the file review. Some of these examples are provided below:

• Projects that aim to reduce the vulnerability of young Indigenous women, and/or young women in general, to prevent them from becoming victims of violence have directly increased capacity to serve this target group. One provided example of such increased capacity includes development of a risk assessment framework tool that could be used by counselling programs to assess risks of forced marriage to help organizations better serve individuals who may be vulnerable to such risks. Another example is a training program to offer to caregivers and professionals who work with Indigenous women and children experiencing violence to assist the service provider better understand why violence exists and to develop culturally-
appropriate healing strategies. From key informant interviews with Department stakeholders, a focus of the program is to fund organizations providing services to victims of family violence and Indigenous women who have experienced violence. The intent is to increase the capacity of these organizations to provide needed services to these victims.

- Some organizations have been able to expand their services and their client base in terms of volumes served, types of services provided, and the intended target group. An example of service expansion is more specialized services to Indigenous women or immigrant women. One example of both expanded services and client base is the Girls Action Foundation’s Building Bridges to Justice project. Through this project, the Foundation expanded its work from a primary focus on prevention and self-esteem-building activities to activities that would assist young women who experienced relationship violence. They also expanded the age group that the activities were targeting to include an older age group than the Foundation usually works with.

- The funding of two victims of domestic violence programs operated by the Victims Services Program of Toronto is viewed as contributing to increased capacity for all service providers that interact with victims of domestic violence, including victims services, police, child protection services, and others. An aspect of the project is to provide victims of domestic violence with an advocate who coordinates a multidisciplinary team of justice and social service providers. The multidisciplinary nature of the services has assisted partner organizations gain a greater understanding of each partner’s services, as well as in identifying gaps and working collaboratively to address them.

- PLEI organizations have been able to provide training to other organizations or service providers, who are then in a better position to provide legal information services to their own clients. As a result, the JPIP funding has assisted not only in increasing the capacity of the PLEI organizations, but also the capacity of these other organizations/service providers.

- Similarly, with respect to increasing capacity to other stakeholders, the tools and resources developed through some projects are useful and have contributed to increased understanding and improved capacity in other organizations for meeting client needs. For example, a risk assessment tool — developed through several JPIP-funded projects on forced marriage — is expected to increase the capacity of service providers to address issues around forced marriages, identifying potential cases of forced marriages, and providing support to victims of forced marriages in a culturally sensitive manner.

- The resources and supports provided through some projects increased the ability and capacity of clientele to address their own justice-related issues.
JPIP funding contributes to Canada’s membership in the HCCH and UNIDROIT, but the Department of Justice as well as other Canadian delegates contribute time and expertise to the work of both organizations. As such, Canada is viewed as playing a leadership role and contributing to the capacity of the organizations through proposing new conventions, facilitating the consensus approach of the HCCH and UNIDROIT, and contributing to the governance aspect of the organizations. Canada also contributes expertise in the development of new conventions and in the operation of existing conventions. Furthermore, as a country with both civil and common law, Canada is in the unique position of being able to provide input into schemes that are workable in both systems.

Key informants also identified that language and other barriers can affect clients’ (or potential clients) abilities to access and make use of needed information and services. Examples were provided of how some funding recipients make efforts to address the language needs of clients, which contributes to capacity for building knowledge and understanding. Such efforts could be in the form of offering PLEI materials in both official languages, or through translating materials into other languages, including Mandarin, Hindi, Spanish, and Arabic. A few key informants who provide services to Indigenous communities reported more material should be produced using Indigenous languages, while also ensuring the material is culturally relevant. However, it was noted that it can be difficult to find translators for some Indigenous languages. Others have used Indigenous interpreters in programming or services.

For those initiatives receiving JPIP funding on an annual basis — such as for core funding or named grants — this ongoing funding provides a certain level of security that assists organizations with planning for both ongoing and new activities. However, organizations receiving short-term funds — such as through special initiatives funding for one year — can find it challenging or not possible to offer the services once JPIP funding has ended. Alternatively, there may be an interruption in services while waiting for program decisions on continued funding, or the organization may not have the capacity to implement or conduct ongoing communications or training on tools and resources developed through the JPIP-funded initiative.

**Contribution of partnerships to capacity**

Partnerships are an important aspect of JPIP-funded initiatives for contributing to capacity; in fact, partnerships are encouraged by the Program and multiple partners are not uncommon. Just over three-quarters (76%, n=29) of the survey respondents with an approved application indicated they had a partner for their JPIP-funded initiative. Almost all (90%, n=28) of the reviewed files identified partners, with the number of partners ranging from one to over 40. Just over one-third
(35%, n=11) of the reviewed projects identified one to five partners, and 29% (n=9) identified 10 to 20 partners.

While somewhere under half of the partners (45%, n=13 of approved applicants responding to the survey; 36%, n=10 of files reviewed) provide cash funds, the majority provide in-kind contributions (79%, n=23 in the survey; 88%, n=23 in the file review). In-kind contributions are primarily in the form of human resources, expertise, and advice.

JPIP recipients have a high level of satisfaction with their partnerships; 76% (n=22) of survey respondents were very satisfied, and 24% (n=7) were satisfied with their partnerships. Partnerships are highly valued not only for the cash resources they provide but also for the expertise and knowledge they contribute to the initiative. Key informants identified that partners often have expertise that assists the initiative in developing and delivering resources, tools, and programming. As well, partners often come with their own networks and associations, which can contribute to increasing the reach of the initiative. Partners will often take tools, resources, and information developed through initiatives, and implement and use them in their own organization, as well as share and endorse them with other organizations. Other identified helpful contributions by partners include volunteering their time toward the initiative, or providing space, supplies, and other infrastructure.

As revealed in interviews, funded initiatives have a wide range of partnerships. Initiatives operating at the community level, for example, will have partnerships and draw on the knowledge and skills of other community organizations or service providers in the areas of justice, social services, health, and education. Participants in the work of the ULCC include representatives of federal, provincial, and territorial governments; the Canadian Bar Association; academic institutions; and others. The ICCLR has partnerships not only with other justice stakeholders within Canada, but also at the international level, such as the United Nations (UN).

For several JPIP-funded initiatives — specifically the intergovernmental organizations HCCH and UNIDROIT — partnerships are critical to the work and ongoing operations of the organizations. The 80 member states of the HCCH and the 63 member states of UNIDROIT fund the organizations, make decisions, contribute to their work, reach agreements on conventions and other instruments, and subsequently adopt conventions for the purpose of harmonizing laws. Canada also makes contributions to the HCCH and UNIDROIT beyond the JPIP funding in the form of expertise and support from the Department of Justice, other federal departments, provinces and territories, and the private sector.
4.3. **Performance — Achievement of Intermediate Outcomes**

4.3.1. **Increased Awareness and Knowledge**

**JPIP-funded activities that contribute toward increased awareness and knowledge**

Most, if not all, of the activities that JPIP recipients initiate can be viewed as knowledge and awareness-building activities. In particular, as demonstrated in Table 4, a majority of recipients take part in activities that are conducted specifically to build awareness, knowledge, and understanding. For example, 61% (n=23) of survey respondents who had approved applications conducted activities such as workshops, conferences, and symposia. Just over half (53%, n= 20) of respondents indicated they took part in PLEI-related projects, and a substantial number were offering training sessions, or conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects.

PLEI organization initiatives focus on assisting the public to better understand the Canadian justice system and the law, and offer a variety of activities in a number of formats to ensure that a wide range of topics are covered in a range of accessible formats. Examples gathered through the evaluation include call-in lines and responding to email queries: PLEI materials distributed online, as well as print forms distributed through the PLEI organization and through other service organizations; legal information sessions and presentations; and training to other organizations to assist them in providing legal information to their clients. The information provided covers a range of areas including criminal, family, and civil law, as well as general information on understanding and navigating the justice system.

Other examples were provided of activities conducted to increase awareness and knowledge in vulnerable populations. Some examples are provided below:

- conferences, webinars, toolkits, and training to increase awareness and discussion around forced marriages
- a workshop guide to help facilitators from community organizations hold discussions with young women on how to respond to relationship violence, what their rights are, and what services and community resources are available to them; the same project provided a website with 21 different online tools to support young women and help them to identify, prevent, and respond to relationship violence
• a project targeting schools and Indigenous communities that utilizes theater to provide information on relevant legal issues, such as cyber bullying, Indigenous law, and restorative justice

• a video on the history of Indigenous issues that included the effects of colonization and the roots of violence

Some activities are intended to contribute to the increased awareness and knowledge of justice system stakeholders such as legislators, judges, the courts, federal and provincial justice departments, and students. A few specific examples include the following:

• The Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges provides educational activities to judges across Canada.

• The ULCC conducts activities to inform the unification and increased consistency of laws across Canada.

• The Canadian Society of Forensic Science conducts tests and research that help to inform stakeholders on medical devices and aspects of impaired driving.

• Some recipients conduct conferences and symposia to encourage discussion on justice-related matters.

• The HCCH and UNIDROIT offer information on their websites and take part in activities such as conferences, seminars, and other knowledge sharing platforms with the purpose of informing stakeholders on the unification of private law. They also provide materials to assist governments and other stakeholders in implementing and using their instruments.

• The bursaries administered by Indspire assist Indigenous students with their law programs. From 2012–13 to 2014–15, 158 Métis and Non-Status Indian students received JPIP funds to contribute toward their education in legal studies, which is an average of 40 students per year. Of these 158 students, 152, or 96%, were Métis.4

The evaluation was not able to obtain any overall estimates or assessments of numbers and types of activities offered. While reporting templates ask recipients to report on the reach of their project, such as the number of participants or number of materials distributed, the information is not collected in a manner that is easily aggregated. Additionally, the file review involved reviewing only a sample of JPIP files. However, a number of specific examples were identified through the

---

4 Data provided by the JPIP.
file review and other lines of evidence, particularly for PLEI activities, and are described at the end of Section 4.1.1 of this report.

**Promotion of awareness and knowledge, and extent of increased knowledge and understanding**

The evaluation considered how the JPIP funded activities promoted awareness and knowledge, and the extent to which they contributed to increased understanding. All lines of evidence for the evaluation indicate that JPIP-funded initiatives do promote and contribute to increased awareness and knowledge of justice-related issues. As was demonstrated in Table 4, the majority of recipient activities involves knowledge-building, such as offering workshops, conferences, and symposia (61% of survey respondents with approved applications; 52% of files reviewed); conducting PLEI projects (53% of survey respondents with approved applications; 39% of files reviewed); offering training sessions (45% of survey respondents with approved applications; 39% of files reviewed); and conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects (40% of survey respondents with approved applications; 16% of files reviewed).

Most survey respondents believe that their JPIP-funded initiative contributes to the JPIP objectives that are related to awareness and knowledge; moreover, the majority believes their JPIP-funded initiative does so to a great or very great extent:

- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders on justice issues (71% great/very great extent; 82% at least some extent)
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system (61% great/very great extent; 90% at least some extent)
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among the public on justice issues (61% great/very great extent; 82% at least some extent)
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence (61% great/very great extent; 79% at least some extent)

Furthermore, from the file review, four of five named grant recipients reported their initiatives resulted in new information, and 77% (n=20) of other projects reviewed reported new skills, new information, and changed awareness.

The previous evaluation of the JPIP, published in 2012, also conducted an applicant survey. The current survey was developed using similar questions in order to facilitate a comparison of results.
Compared to the previous survey, respondents participating in the survey for this evaluation report somewhat more positively on the extent to which their project contributes to the JPIP objective to *build knowledge, awareness, and understanding on justice issues*.

Examples of how JPIP initiatives are viewed as contributing to increased awareness, knowledge, and understanding are provided below:

- PLEI recipients reported that the focus of their organizations’ work is to increase the public awareness and knowledge of justice issues. Recipients reported that their PLEI materials and activities have resulted in a more informed public with a greater knowledge of the law and legal processes. Recipients also reported positive feedback from clients on the helpfulness of their PLEI activities and also that there has been an increasing demand for PLEI resources and services. Furthermore, the training activities delivered to other service providers increases their level of knowledge and understanding which, in turn, assists these organizations in providing services and helping to inform their own clients.

- PLEI organizations also noted that, through their work, they are able to track the issues and informational needs of their clients, and that these data can be used to inform other stakeholders of emerging trends and unmet needs.

- Educational funding provided through JPIP is viewed by Indspire as contributing to increased awareness and understanding of justice issues by assisting Indigenous students to pursue law studies. As well, this awareness and understanding is further increased if students pursue legal careers upon graduation and pass on this knowledge and awareness to their clients.

- Projects related to family violence, violence against women, and violence against Indigenous women and girls are viewed as informing families, women, and girls as well as other stakeholders that may interact with victims of such violence on aspects of domestic violence, relationship violence, and other forms of violence. Women and girls are informed of their rights with respect to violence, and how the justice system and other services can assist them.

- Projects related to forced marriages help to raise awareness of the issue of forced marriages, to give a greater understanding on how forced marriages intersect with the justice system, and the types of culturally-appropriate supports needed that are related to forced marriages.

- A symposium attended by mental health and justice stakeholders shared information between stakeholders and worked to develop practical solutions, strategies, and best practice recommendations to assist frontline justice stakeholders when dealing with mental health issues in the context of the criminal justice system.
• The NJI and the Canadian Association of Provincial Judges both provide educational programs for judges. In addition, the latter also serves as a disseminator of information to judges and provides advice and information to governments.

• Research and consultations undertaken by the HCCH and UNIDROIT assist member countries in gaining awareness and understanding of the cross-border justice issues and the importance of developing and adopting uniform private law to resolve associated legal issues.

• The ULCC work to unify legislation across Canada increases awareness of the relevant issues across jurisdictions. For example, one specific legislation facilitated by the work of the ULCC, the Uniform Missing Persons Act, allows for the sharing of missing persons information by police and law enforcement authorities in different jurisdictions, which helps to inform missing persons investigations.

The communication of project results and successes to other relevant stakeholders is an important aspect of increasing knowledge and awareness. Based on the file review, funding recipients are making efforts to share their project results, with 73% (n=19) of reviewed projects reporting that they communicated their results. As shown in Table 6, meetings, conferences, websites, and workshops are popular methods of informing other stakeholders of project results.

**Table 6: How project results were communicated – file review (n=19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of communication</th>
<th>Number of projects*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providing agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not applicable to named grants.

*This does not include named grants recipients; the named grants reporting template does not require reporting on the communication of results.*
4.3.2. Promotion of Canadian Legal Interests Internationally

JPIP-funded involvement in international fora is primarily through the ICCLR, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT. As mentioned, one aspect of the ICCLR’s work is with respect to international cooperation in areas of criminal law reform and criminal justice. Both the HCCH and UNIDROIT are intergovernmental organizations involved in some aspect of developing tools to harmonize international private law. The work of the ULCC can also have an influence beyond Canada when its work and initiatives originally developed for a Canadian context are introduced in international fora, such as through the HCCH. The ULCC can also facilitate the implementation of internationally developed instruments in Canada. In that respect, the ULCC, and Canada’s involvement in the HCCH and UNIDROIT work in a complementary fashion.

The ICCLR participates in numerous international initiatives, including some with the UN. For example, the ICCLR is one of 18 global institutes that are part of the UN’s Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, which involves conferences, information sharing, and collaborations. As part of that, the ICCLR participates in the UN’s major congress on crime prevention and criminal justice, which occurs every five years. The Centre will also be working on behalf of the Government of Canada and the UN to organize a meeting of experts on using restorative justice principles in criminal matters, which includes developing background information. Other examples of international initiatives that the ICCLR has participated in include collaboration with the Thailand Institute of Justice on a reference tool related to justice indicators and criminal justice reform, and participation in a pan-African consultation on HIV/AIDS in prisons.

Through such participation, the ICCLR is able to represent Canada’s interests at the UN and to other international bodies and other countries, and influence work being done at the international level. While the JPIP funding contributes to the operational aspects of the ICCLR, this support makes it possible for the organization to participate internationally and to attract skilled and experienced associates who take part in national and international efforts on behalf of the ICCLR. Several examples where the ICCLR has influenced international work include a UN model strategy for the protection of all forms of violence against children, the aforementioned reference tool on justice indicators and criminal justice reform that has been distributed worldwide, and a tool that is currently in development for the UN, related to anti-corruption for law enforcement officials. The ICCLR has also supported Canada in introducing principles on the use of restorative justice in criminal matters at the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.
With respect to the HCCH and UNIDROIT, Canada’s assessed contribution for its membership in these organizations is provided through the JPIP. However, as described earlier, Canada makes other contributions to these organizations beyond JPIP funding. The Department of Justice’s CAILS is responsible for meeting the federal government’s work requirements as part of their membership; Canadian delegates and representatives participate directly in this work.

Canada is considered an influential member of both the HCCH and UNIDROIT. Canada contributes expertise to the development of new and the operation of existing conventions, and also participates in governance aspects, thus contributing to the direction of the organizations. For example, a Canadian representative was elected as a member of the Governing Council of UNIDROIT in six consecutive elections from 1984 to 2013. As further illustration of how Canada has influenced international work, Canada will also propose new conventions. For example, Canada is credited with making the initial proposal for the work that led to the HCCH Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. In some cases, Canadian legal policy has been able to affect the development of the HCCH and UNIDROIT conventions, resulting in uniformity and predictability between international instruments and existing Canadian legal policies. As noted by key informants, one example of an HCCH convention originating from Canada is the Convention of 29 May 1993 on the Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption. An example for UNIDROIT is the 2001 Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment. Out of that convention came a 2001 Aircraft Protocol that assists international financiers of equipment to recover funds in the event of a loan default. A more recent example is a current first preliminary draft of a fourth Protocol to the Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters Specific to Agricultural, Construction and Mining Equipment.

The work of the ULCC also has an international influence. The UNIDROIT convention on mobile equipment, for example, began with the ULCC’s work on personal property security legislation, which was taken forward by Canada and introduced internationally through UNIDROIT. Another example is the ULCC’s work on civil protection orders which Canada brought forward to the HCCH Conference, and where work is now currently being conducted on cross-border civil protection orders at the international level.

While most of these examples of instruments that Canada influenced occurred outside of the evaluation period, they serve to demonstrate how the assessed contributions provided through the JPIP — along with the work conducted by Canadian representatives — can be viewed together as contributing to the promotion of Canadian legal interests internationally. As well, it would be expected that the ongoing work of Canadian delegates in both of these organizations would involve
the promotion of Canadian legal interests through participating in the development of new instruments and the operation of existing instruments.

4.4. Performance — Achievement of Ultimate Outcomes

4.4.1. Increased Access to Justice

Prior to making any assessments on the extent to which the JPIP has contributed to increased access to justice, it is useful to first consider what “access to justice” means. The Canadian Forum on Civil Justice states that “access to justice refers broadly to the access that citizens have to dispute resolution tools of justice including but not limited to courts. Effective access to justice does not only refer to reductions in costs, access to lawyers and access to courts; but rather, it is a broad term that refers more generally to the efficaciousness of a justice system in meeting the dispute resolution needs of its citizens” (Canadian Forum on Civil Justice, n.d.). In that sense, one measure of the efficaciousness of Canada’s justice system in the context of the stated objectives of the JPIP is the extent to which information is available about the Canadian justice system. A more informed public is better able to make the appropriate decisions and take the necessary steps for resolving their legal matter, and a more informed justice system is better able to support the public with respect to their justice issues through the appropriate tools, legislation, and decision-making skills.

Concrete measures on how the JPIP directly affects access to justice are not available. As well, some key informants observed that assessing the impact of the funded initiatives on access to justice is difficult, or could be assessed through the information and supports generated. Stakeholders believe that the JPIP-funded initiatives contribute to informing about aspects of the justice system or providing supports to victims and vulnerable populations, thereby contributing to access to justice. Most key informants provided examples of how specific initiatives achieved their objectives, thereby contributing to access to justice. As well, from the applicant survey, almost all approved applicants (95%; n=36) noted that their completed JPIP project(s) were able to almost or fully achieve their objectives, with two-thirds (66%; n=25) of respondents indicating that their project(s) fully achieved their objectives.

PLEI activities, for example, inform the public on a wide range of law and justice issues including criminal, family, and civil law. Key informants believe that providing PLEI materials, tools, and resources assists the public in becoming more informed on justice issues, and their legal matter, and that this assists them in achieving access to justice. In particular, this information is important
for newcomers to Canada, who are unfamiliar with the Canadian legal system, and to those individuals who plan or need to self-represent on a litigation matter. The survey found that 70% (n=19) of applicants who reported an awareness of PLEI activities believe that the general public finds PLEI materials and activities useful for addressing their legal needs and concerns to either a great or very great extent; 16% (n=4) indicated the public finds this information useful to some extent. PLEI organizations also work to consult and collaborate with government and other justice service providers to inform them of access to justice issues experienced by their clients and to provide a community perspective on such issues.

Projects that provide tools and resources to address the needs of women experiencing family or relationship violence and Indigenous women and girls vulnerable to violence help these women and girls gain increased knowledge of their rights and how the justice system can assist them, thereby increasing their access to justice.

The work of the ULCC assists in the development of uniform legislation between provinces and territories, which creates increased consistency in how individuals are treated between jurisdictions. More consistency creates a fairer justice system, thereby contributing to increased access to justice.

The conventions and tools developed through the HCCH and UNIDROIT contribute toward informing not only the Canadian justice system but also the justice system on a global level. The application of the conventions and tools developed through these organizations provides residents and companies of member states, including Canada, with increased access to justice in matters with a cross-border legal component. The HCCH, for example, has developed several conventions that assist parents and their children obtain access to justice, such as the Child Abduction Convention. Under this convention, if a child is removed to another country, such as through parental abduction, jurisdiction is provided to the courts of the child’s habitual residence. If that were Canada, the child would be returned to Canada for the Canadian courts to determine what should happen to the child. Several of the HCCH’s conventions work in a complementary fashion. For example, in the case of a parental abduction to another country, the determination of who holds the authority to take protection measures for the child can be achieved through the Child Protection Convention. An example for UNIDROIT is the aforementioned 2001 Aircraft Protocol that facilitates Canadian airlines in arranging foreign financing for aircraft acquisition by providing these foreign investors with protection in the event of a loan default. Another convention that is considered important to many Canadians with ties to other countries is the Convention on International Wills that ensures wills made in one country are recognized in countries party to the convention.
While data are not available to assess if a more equitable representation of Indigenous people in the legal profession exists due to the JPIP, 158 students received funding from 2012–13 to 2015–16 to assist them in their pursuit of an education in law. No data are available on whether these students would or would not have been able to pursue their education in the absence of JPIP funding. From the Indspire case study, the overall body of students who receive funding from the Building Brighter Futures: Bursaries, Scholarships and Awards program (of which the JPIP-funded LSAP Program is a component) has a 93% graduation rate and an 82% employment rate. These figures suggest that JPIP funding is assisting in contributing toward a more equitable representation of Indigenous people in the legal profession, although no statement can be made on the extent to which this is occurring.

PLEI activities offered through the AJA

The evaluation also considered PLEI funding to the territories that is provided through the AJAs with the territories. The PLEI funding provided through these agreements is an important component of access to justice to residents in the territories, as these are usually the only available source of PLEI activities in these locations. Below is a summary of how these PLEI activities have contributed to increased information about the Canadian justice system and, therefore, increased access to justice in the territories.

- **PLEI services and activities delivered.** Examples of how PLEI is provided in the territories include a toll-free lawline, a main office in one of the territory’s larger communities where drop-in services are available, in-person clinics and outreach through visits to communities, the provision of PLEI materials, and, in some cases, duty counsel services for family and child protection related law matters. Clinics or presentations outside the main office centre are primarily by request from communities, or where court workers have been able to identify a need or interest in a community on a specific topic. Outreach or requests for information are often in the areas of child protection, family law, housing, income support, powers of attorney matters, and wills. While some PLEI is provided for criminal matters, much of this type of information and assistance is available through criminal lawyers. Court workers are considered valuable components to the delivery of PLEI. The territories are very large sparsely populated areas with remote and isolated communities. Court workers live in the communities and have established relationships with community residents. Court workers can assist residents with accessing PLEI materials, informing PLEI staff of justice needs of the communities, and providing interpreter services.
• **Challenges in delivering PLEI services and gaps in services.** The large geographical area of the territories populated by small, remote, and poorly serviced communities is one of the main challenges in delivering PLEI services in the territories. The distance to communities that mainly have to be accessed by air transportation makes it difficult and costly to provide in-person services. While one service mentioned striving to ensure a visit to each community to become acquainted with the communities, visits for specific services are largely through community request. For example, elders or community leaders will request a workshop or presentation on an area of law for which there is a perceived need. Alternatively, as mentioned, court workers will identify the interest or need in a community and inform PLEI staff.

Language and cultural barriers are another main challenge. In-person sessions that give communities an opportunity to become acquainted with the PLEI staff are considered helpful for overcoming cultural barriers and assisting residents to increase their comfort level to request information. As well, court workers are considered important for assisting in bridging the cultural gap and providing interpreter services. However, there are limited numbers of court workers available, with each worker having responsibility for a region of the territory. While one key informant noted that some effort has been made to provide materials in Indigenous languages, their territory has many official languages. Furthermore, internet services are poor in many of these communities, and the costs of owning a computer and accessing the internet are prohibitive; as a result, many residents cannot access forms and information online. In addition, many of the communities have no courthouse and few other support services that could provide materials.

Challenges to residents in accessing justice are that there is a lack of lawyers and particularly a lack of lawyers available to take on family and civil law matters. As a result, many individuals must self-represent in such matters, making assistance from PLEI services critical.

### 4.4.2. Strengthened Canadian Legal Framework

The JPIP contributes to a strengthened legal framework through the positive influence that funded initiatives have on informational, policy, procedural, or legislative changes that provide Canadians with greater access to justice. Each of the various types of JPIP initiatives can be viewed as contributing to this strengthened legal framework in one or more ways. This could be through providing information and supports to clients that inform them of their rights and gain a greater comfort level with the legal framework. Through collaborations and communications, the various funded initiatives share information with other justice stakeholders, including with the Department
of Justice, that help to identify gaps, emerging trends, and unmet needs, and that can assist in informing and influencing programming, policy, and legislation, including the greater harmonization of legislation. These actions all lead to a strengthened Canadian legal framework.

Key informants provided several examples of how JPIP-funded projects have contributed to the legal framework:

- Reports on results of funded initiatives related to violence against Indigenous women and girls are shared within the Department and help to identify issues and underlying factors affecting vulnerable populations, such as Indigenous women and girls, women experiencing family violence, or women new to Canada; this information contributes to planning and informs policy.

- PLEI organizations assist the public to gain a better understanding of the legal system and of how to access the legal system more effectively. PLEI key informants believe that this increases the public’s acceptance and confidence in the country’s legal system. PLEI organizations also participate in consultations with other justice stakeholders on issues related to access to justice that are intended to lead to changes that will strengthen the legal framework at both the provincial and federal level.

- Several of the funding recipients observed that their organizations have, at the request of the federal government, provided input in the area of marijuana legislation development and regulations for Canada.

- The ICCLR has conducted considerable work in the area of restorative justice, beginning with organizing the first national conference in Canada on restorative justice in 1998. Much of this work has informed policy and practices.

- The Law Amendments Committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police provides advice and guidance to the federal government on a number of matters of relevance and priority. Such information is used by government to inform policy, legislation, and regulations that affect access to justice.

- The recommendations stemming from the project on Addressing Forced Marriages in Canadian Context addressed changes that required the legal framework to be more supportive to victims of forced marriages, particularly with respect to criminal, civil, and immigration legislation.
The work of the ULCC, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT contribute toward harmonized legislation, which further strengthens the legal framework. The work of the ULCC assists in the development of uniform legislation between provinces and territories, which creates increased consistency regarding how individuals are treated between jurisdictions. For example, the *Uniform Child Status Act* provides basic rules for determining the parentage of children, and which encompasses assisted reproduction. From key informant interviews, Parliament requested that the ULCC work toward uniform legislation on this matter that was not within federal legislative authority, and a number of jurisdictions have adopted the legislation.

The work of both the HCCH and UNIDROIT focuses on the development of conventions and instruments for the unification and harmonization of international private law. Such harmonization enhances the ability of Canadians and Canadian companies affected by cross-border legal matters to achieve access to justice. Furthermore, for both the HCCH and UNIDROIT, Canada has been able to propose and affect development of new international instruments that align well with existing Canadian policy. The HCCH has adopted 38 conventions; Canada is party to four, including the following:

- Convention of 15 November 1965 on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters
- Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction
- Convention of 1 July 1985 on the Law Applicable to Trusts and on their Recognition
- Convention of 29 May 1993 on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption

UNIDROIT has conducted close to 70 studies and projects, which have resulted in a series of international instruments, including 13 international conventions and model laws. UNIDROIT instruments that are viewed as benefitting from Canada’s involvement include the following:

- 1973 Convention Providing a Uniform Law on the Form of an International Will
- 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects

---

6 https://www.hcch.net/en/states/hcch-members/details1/?sid=28
• 2007 Luxembourg Rail Protocol
• 2009 Space Protocol
• 2009 Geneva Convention on Intermediated Securities
• a first preliminary draft of a fourth Protocol to the Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters Specific to Agricultural, Construction and Mining Equipment.

When the subject matter of the international instruments falls under provincial authority, the ULCC assists in the adoption and implementation of international instruments in Canada by working towards the adoption of uniform legislation at the provincial level.

4.4.3. Contributing/Constraining Factors to Achieving Outcomes and Unexpected Outcomes

All lines of evidence used for the evaluation show that partnerships and collaborations are viewed as one of the main contributing factors to the success of JPIP-funded initiatives. Key informants mentioned the value of having partnerships and relationships with other organizations, in that these provide access to expertise and other in-kind resources, as well as avenues for networking, disseminating and sharing information, and expanding the reach of the initiative in terms of accessing clients and other relevant stakeholders. Other identified success factors at the initiative level include the following:

• the program is able to build on and draw from existing resources rather than having to duplicate efforts
• having dedicated volunteers and staff members to draw on
• implementing strategic planning for the initiative.

Several program-level attributes were also considered to facilitate the achievement of outcomes, including the following:

• careful assessment of project applications using a defined set of criteria to ensure organizations have the capacity, expertise, and partnerships to undertake the initiative
• making use of longer term funding periods, such as through grant funding; this creates more certainty for organizations and allows for more effective planning
• requiring a reasonable amount of regular reporting for recipients that provides a framework for accountability but does not place undue reporting burdens on the recipients

Any of the identified constraints to achieving outcomes were mainly related to resources. The $1 million reduction of JPIP funding, due to the 2012 DRAP measures, required a reduced scope for the program, as well as a reduction in the number of projects that can be funded. As a result, the Program may not be able to address some emerging priorities. Long-term recipient organizations also observed that their funding levels have not changed for many years, despite increasing demands for service or a greater demand than they had anticipated. Results of the survey of applicants indicates that 63% of respondents with an approved application were satisfied or very satisfied with the amount awarded, 8% were neither satisfied nor unsatisfied and 24% were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied.

The evaluation revealed few unexpected outcomes other than several identified by a few funded recipient key informants, such as a higher than expected level of demand for the funded initiative’s services or outputs, or that the initiative was able to tap into unexpected resources or networks. No unexpected outcomes were reported for the JPIP itself.

4.5. Performance — Efficiency and Economy

The Treasury Board Secretariat’s 2009 Policy on Evaluation defines economy as minimizing the use of resources, which is achieved when the “cost of resources used approximates the minimum amount of resources needed to achieve expected outcomes” (Treasury Board Secretariat, 2009). The Policy defines efficiency as the use of resources such that the same level of input produces more output or the same level of output is produced by fewer inputs. Efficiency and economy are considered below using available financial information for the JPIP, as well as survey and qualitative data collected through the evaluation process.

4.5.1. Economy

One aspect of economy, and the extent to which expected outcomes are achieved while using the minimum amount of resources required, is how well actual spending matches budgeted amounts. Table 7 shows the annual 2012–13 to 2016–17 budgeted and actual expenditures for JPIP grants

---

7 As mentioned previously, the 2009 Policy on Evaluation was rescinded in April 2016 and replaced with the Policy on Results. However, this evaluation was initiated prior to this change.
and contributions by categories (excluding the assessed contributions to HCCH and UNIDROIT), as well as the overall variance between budgeted and actual expenditures per fiscal year. The largest variance ($808,330) was for Family Violence and MMIWG contribution projects in 2012–13, which was the beginning of a new five-year program cycle. The program had placed a hold on approving new contribution projects while awaiting confirmation that the program would be continued pending the findings of the previous evaluation. According to program staff, unspent JPIP funds in 2013–14 were due to the limited number and quality of proposals and to the timeliness of approvals. Unspent funds in 2014–15 and 2016–17 were largely due to a lengthy approval process for Family Violence projects, which have apparently improved since then.

Lapsed JPIP amounts in subsequent years, as well as some allocated JPIP funds, were shifted to budgets for HCCH and UNIDROIT, which exceed the allocated amounts ($330,000 per year, see Table 2 in each year of the evaluation. These shifts were to account for conversion rates from the Euro to Canadian dollars, as well as a one-time requirement paid in 2013–14 to contribute toward Canada’s share of the HCCH staff pension costs. Budgeted and actual expenditures were very similar each fiscal year for HCCH and UNIDROIT (Table 8). Overall variances between budgeted and actual expenditures over the evaluation period amounted to $1,121,773 for JPIP and $3,550 for HCCH and UNIDROIT, with the former largely due to the $808,330 for family violence and MMIWG projects in 2012–13, as discussed above.

Table 7: JPIP budgeted and actual expenditures, 2012–13 to 2016–17 (in $000)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIP general</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named grants²</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIP</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEI²</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence – PLEI²</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMIWG</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCLR²</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contributions</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
<td>$2,161</td>
<td>$2,906</td>
<td>$2,858</td>
<td>$2,936</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
<td>$2,799</td>
<td>$2,611</td>
<td>$2,791</td>
<td>$2,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8: Assessed contributions budgeted and actual expenditures, 2012–13 to 2016–17 (in $000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCCH</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDROIT</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$489</td>
<td>$489</td>
<td>$477</td>
<td>$474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data provided by program.

Note: Main estimates provide $250,000 for HCCH and $80,000 for UNIDROIT. Additional funds to cover the yearly assessment are taken from JPIP resources.

### 4.5.2. Efficiency

#### Results achievement

One indicator for efficient resource utilization is the extent to which the resources support the achievement of results which, for JPIP projects, is the extent to which project objectives are being achieved and target audiences are being reached. Almost all survey respondents (95%, n=36) who had an approved JPIP initiative indicated their project had either fully achieved or achieved almost all their objectives, or were expected to do so on completion. As well, most (84%, n=32) respondents reported they were able to reach their intended target audience to a great or very great extent. Furthermore, almost all (84%, n=26) projects reviewed for the file review reported achieving some category of results (e.g., new information or skills, increased awareness, best practices), although there was no measure available on the extent to which they achieved their expected results.

#### Leveraging resources

This reported level of achievement, coupled with the relatively modest amount of funding available to allocate to a wide range of topics and objectives, suggests that JPIP funding has been able to make effective use of the available resources to achieve results. Some key informants
attribute this success to the initiatives’ ability to draw on other sources of cash and in-kind funding that augment and build on the funds available through the JPIP. In particular, as noted previously, the in-kind resources in the form of expertise and knowledge are viewed as making substantial contributions to initiatives that assist them in achieving positive results. Some key informants commented specifically on the JPIP initiatives’ ability to make significant accomplishments with a relatively small amount of funding, due to their ability to leverage funding and in-kind contributions from other sources. Key informants noted that the JPIP funding adds credibility to the initiative and assists in leveraging other resources. For example, one PLEI organization estimated that they are able to leverage $1.56 in cash funds for every JPIP dollar, and observed that some of these funds are contingent on receiving JPIP funding. A few department key informants indicated that, while JPIP funding represents a relatively small amount of federal money, it is used to bolster or add to the budgets and activities of well-placed and carefully screened initiatives that align with the priorities of the program. As mentioned previously, under half of the partners involved in funded projects provide cash funds (45%, n=13 of approved applicants responding to the survey; and 36%, n=10 of files reviewed), but the majority also provide in-kind contributions (79%, n=23 in the survey; 88%, n=23 in the file review). In-kind contributions are primarily in the form of human resources, expertise, and advice.

Program management

Several measures have been put in place for the efficient management of the JPIP, some of which have been discussed in previous sections. Most key informants had positive comments about the application process and believed the process has improved over the past several years. Department stakeholders view the use of standardized funding applications, along with a formalized method and set of criteria for reviewing proposals (that includes using application reviewers who have content experience), as an effective and efficient approach for allocating available JPIP funds. Recipient key informants reported that the funding application was user-friendly, straightforward, “very manageable,” and asked good questions. They also appreciated that applications could be tailored to address the specific program objective that the project is intending to address. Survey respondents, including applicants with approved and/or unapproved applications, also showed a high level of satisfaction with the application process, with close to three-quarters and more being satisfied or very satisfied with most elements of the application process, as follows:

- ease of the application process (80% satisfied/very satisfied)
- type of information required in the application form (78% satisfied/very satisfied)
- clarity of the application process (76% satisfied/very satisfied)
• timeliness of responses to their queries or communications with Justice Canada (72% satisfied/very satisfied)

• appropriateness of selection criteria (72% satisfied/very satisfied)

Several recipient key informants commented on the responsiveness of JPIP program staff, for example, in addressing questions. They also appreciated that they were able to deal with the same program staff person on an ongoing basis. Moreover, 72% of survey respondents were also satisfied or very satisfied with the ease of interaction with JPIP representatives.

A few key informants believe the application process is still too cumbersome or that there is still a level of uncertainty within the current process. For example, delays in the application process leave organizations uncertain about whether their projects will go forward; alternatively, if their project is approved, they are uncertain when the funding will be released. This situation makes it difficult for organizations to plan for staffing needs, and it can leave non-profit organizations — which operate with little surplus — cash strapped. From the survey of applicants, the timeliness of receiving approval decisions is the element of applications that had the lowest proportion of applicants who were satisfied/very satisfied, although this still represented 65% of respondents. Meanwhile, 26% indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, or that they were dissatisfied/very dissatisfied.

The evaluation found a high level of satisfaction also exists with the management of JPIP projects, which can be viewed as another indicator of efficient and effective management. From the survey of applicants, most respondents with an approved application were satisfied with various elements of program management related to reporting requirements and funding period and/or payments, as follows:

• timeliness of payments (90% satisfied/very satisfied)

• funding reporting requirements (87% satisfied/very satisfied)

• assistance received from JPIP representatives for meeting reporting requirements (84% satisfied/very satisfied)

• time period of funding awarded (79% satisfied/very satisfied)

Looking at the performance against departmental service standards with respect to applications and payments of funds, the JPIP showed a high level of meeting departmental service standards, with 80% to 100% of files sampled meeting the standard from 2011-12 to 2015-16 for each of the
standards related to acknowledgement, funding decision, and payments (Table 9). One exception is that only 67% of the files sampled met the payment standard in 2014–15.

Table 9: JPIP performance against departmental service standards for G&C, by type of service standard 2011–12 to 2015–16

| Fiscal year | Acknowledgement | | Funding decision | | Payment* |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|              | Files meeting standard | % meeting standard | Files meeting standard | % meeting standard | Files meeting standard | % meeting standard |
| 2011–12     | 41 (of 50) | 82% | 43 (of 50) | 86% | n/a | n/a |
| 2012–13     | 57 (of 63) | 90% | 53 (of 63) | 84% | 13 (of 13) | 100% |
| 2013–14     | 30 (of 36) | 83% | 29 (of 36) | 81% | 4 (of 4) | 100% |
| 2014–15     | 29 (of 35) | 83% | 28 (of 35) | 80% | 10 (of 15) | 67% |
| 2015–16     | 35 (of 37) | 95% | 33 (of 37) | 89% | 9 (of 10) | 90% |

Source: Data provided by program.

*Based on a random sample of payments (numbers in brackets for the payment column refer to number sampled) n/a – not available.

A few recipient organizations commented that the reporting process has improved over the last several years. The program uses standard project summary reporting templates, with one template for named grants and one for other recipient types. The file review also considered the extent that recipient reporting reflects the requirements of the reporting templates. Consistent means of reporting contributes to a more efficient and consistent process for assessing reports for the achievement of results. Almost all (n=27; 87%) of the funding recipients followed the JPIP reporting templates with the exception of named grant projects; while most recipients of named grants did submit final reports, they were very brief and did not include the required information to address the questions in the template. As a result, the information collected on named grants is very limited. Other funding recipient types provided very detailed summary reports that followed the JPIP template. Although the template appeared to evolve over the course of the evaluation period, the information gathered was very similar.

Key informants identified several practices that they believed contributed to more efficient and effective reporting, including providing recipients with reminders when reporting is due, reducing

---

8 The standard for acknowledgement is that written acknowledgement is sent to the applicant within seven calendar days of receiving the application; the standard for funding decisions is that a decision is made within 120 calendar days of the date that a completed funding application has been received; the standard for payments is that a payment is processed within 28 calendar days that the requirements in the contribution letter or the grant letter have completed.
the number of required reports (a few recipient organizations reported that they were only required to report annually), and having the ability to use reporting that had already been prepared for other funding sources. A few other key informants reported challenges with the reporting process, such as having insufficient time to submit reports, and not being granted an extension to provide additional time.

With respect to program management, another aspect of efficiency is the proportion of actual total expenditures that are comprised of administrative costs, where administrative costs consist of salaries and operations and maintenance (O&M) expenditures. Table 10 shows actual expenditures for salaries, O&M, and grants and contributions (G&C), as well as the proportion of total expenditures represented by administrative costs (salaries plus O&M). JPIP administrative expenditures are low relative to total expenditures, ranging from 1% to 5% over the evaluation period, with the increase mainly being due to an annual increase in salary expenditures. JPIP staff resources are required for developing application and reporting templates, accepting and screening applications, making funding decisions, dispersing funds, monitoring recipients’ adherence to their reporting requirements, reviewing reports, and interacting with applicants and funding recipients, among other JPIP program management responsibilities. Key informants were not able to identify more cost-effective approaches to achieving the program objectives.

Table 10: Percent of total JPIP actual expenditures as administrative costs, 2012–13 to 2016–17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$26,803</td>
<td>$51,209</td>
<td>$68,657</td>
<td>$126,249</td>
<td>$167,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,384</td>
<td>$4,846</td>
<td>$2,223</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;C</td>
<td>$2,582,998</td>
<td>$3,782,400</td>
<td>$3,336,776</td>
<td>$3,099,795</td>
<td>$3,244,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>$2,609,801</td>
<td>$3,836,993</td>
<td>$3,410,279</td>
<td>$3,228,267</td>
<td>$3,413,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin= salaries + O&amp;M</td>
<td>$26,803</td>
<td>$54,593</td>
<td>$73,503</td>
<td>$128,472</td>
<td>$169,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Administrative costs (5/4)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data provided by program.
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Relevance

Continued need for the JPIP

The evaluation found a continued need for the types of initiatives funded through the JPIP. All key informants believe the JPIP is still relevant and is needed. Family violence and violence against Indigenous women and girls are ongoing and important issues in Canada that require addressing. Providing financial assistance to Indigenous students in their pursuit of a law career is important in that it contributes towards efforts to reduce the current educational disparities that Indigenous students experience; it also contributes towards addressing the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

All stakeholders identified a need for continued efforts to build knowledge, awareness, and understanding of justice issues. Such knowledge-building activities are important to assist the public in understanding the justice system and Canadian laws in general, as well to inform both the public as well as justice stakeholders on specific justice-related issues, such as family violence. It is also important to undertake such knowledge-building efforts in a variety of formats in order to ensure accessibility to a wide range of audiences and abilities. Similarly, the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps is critical to inform changes to the justice system and ongoing improvements.

Given the broad objectives of the JPIP, the wide array of initiatives funded and activities undertaken by funded initiatives, the JPIP strives to be responsive to the needs of Canadians. As well, the evaluation found that funded activities have a wide reach with respect to the types of target audiences and beneficiaries, with many targeting Indigenous people, youth, victims of crime, justice stakeholders/professionals, women and girls, and visible minority groups.

Alignment of the JPIP with government priorities and federal roles and responsibilities

The JPIP aligns well with government priorities, contributing to the Department’s strategic outcome of a fair, relevant, and accessible Canadian justice system and in support of the
Government of Canada’s priority outcome for a safe and secure Canada. Specific objectives of the JPIP are aligned with government priority areas — such as the *Action Plan to Address Family Violence and Violent Crimes Against Aboriginal Women and Girls* — and departmental policy areas related to family law, human rights law, public law, private international law, and Indigenous justice.

The JPIP aligns with federal roles and responsibilities as articulated by the *Department of Justice Act* and the roles and responsibilities of the Minister. The JPIP and the various initiatives undertaken through JPIP funding are viewed as contributing to the defined roles of the Department, specifically with respect to its role as a policy department.

5.2. **Performance — Achievement of Outcomes**

**Increased capacity of stakeholders for building knowledge, awareness, and understanding**

The JPIP is important and often critical to funding recipients to assist with core operations and undertake both ongoing and new activities, and in general to increase their capacity to offer services and activities that contribute to building knowledge, awareness, and understanding of justice issues. The evaluation found that without the JPIP funding, most recipients would not be able to offer the same level of services or would not be able to participate in JPIP-funded activities at all. The JPIP funding also assists recipients with leveraging funds and in-kind resources from other partners; for some, these other funds/resources are contingent on the recipient receiving JPIP funding.

The funding provided through the JPIP increases the capacity of recipient organizations by assisting them in expanding their services and activities, and the number and/or types of clients served; undertaking research and projects for developing tools and resources; providing training, tools, and resources to other organizations that in turn increase the capacity to serve their clients; and developing resources and supports that increase the capacity of the target group to address their justice-related issues.

JPIP recipients develop important partnerships that also contribute to increased capacity, with most recipients having some type of partnership and all being satisfied or very satisfied with their partnerships. While some partners provide cash funds, most provide some type of in-kind resource, primarily in the form of human resources and expertise and advice. In particular, recipients value the partners for the expertise and advice they contribute toward assisting in developing and
delivering resources, tools, and programming. As well, partners often come with their own networks and associations that further expand the reach of the initiative.

**Increased awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system**

Most, if not all, of the activities that JPIP recipients undertake can be viewed as knowledge and awareness-building. This includes, for example, such activities as offering workshops, conferences, symposia, and training sessions; conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects; or offering PLEI-related services and activities, such as call-in lines, developing and distributing pamphlets and other informational materials, and informational sessions. As well, a small number of specific recipients take part in the promotion of increased harmonization of legislation and/or international cooperation on justice issues. Such activities are targeted to the general public, justice stakeholders, specific vulnerable populations, or other organizations.

The evaluation found that JPIP-funded initiatives promote awareness and knowledge of justice-related issues. However, recipients report positively on their activities’ contribution to increased knowledge and understanding of justice issues. For example, 61% and more of applicant survey respondents believe their JPIP-funded initiative contributed to each of the JPIP’s four knowledge/awareness-based objectives to a great or very great extent, and 79% and more indicated to at least some extent. As well, based on the file review, most projects report that their funded activities resulted in new information, new skills, or changed awareness.

PLEI organizations, for example, reported receiving positive feedback from clients on the helpfulness of the PLEI activities and services. Financial assistance to Indigenous students assists these students in gaining awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system through their law studies. Projects related to family violence, violence against women, and violence against Indigenous women and girls inform women and girls of their legal rights and how the justice system and other services can assist them. The ULCC’s work to unify legislation across Canada increases awareness of the relevant issues across jurisdictions, while the work of the two intergovernmental organizations, the HCCH and UNIDROIT, assist governments and legislators in gaining a better understanding of cross-border matters, as well as members of the Canadian public and Canadian companies affected by such matters.

**Promoting Canadian interests internationally**

The promotion of Canadian interests internationally by JPIP recipients is achieved primarily through the ICCLR, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT. The ICCLR participates in numerous
international initiatives, including some with the UN, and represents Canada’s interests and imparts a Canadian influence in such initiatives. The Department of Justice is responsible for Canada’s membership in the HCCH and UNIDROIT, and does so through JPIP funds, with this membership providing Canada with the ability to participate in and influence the work of both these organizations. More specifically, Canada contributes expertise in the development of new and the operation of existing instruments, and also participates in governance aspects, thus contributing to the direction of the organizations. As a result of this involvement and the assessed contribution provided by the JPIP, Canada is considered an influential member of both the HCCH and UNIDROIT.

The work of the ULCC also has an international influence when its work and initiatives, originally developed for a Canadian context, is introduced in international fora. For example, some legislation initially developed for Canada was taken forward to the HCCH and UNIDROIT by Canada and became the basis of international instruments in those organizations. In addition, the ULCC can facilitate the implementation of internationally developed instruments in Canada.

**Increased access to justice**

Stakeholders report that the funded initiatives are providing information, services, and other activities that contribute to the knowledge, understanding, and skills of the public, vulnerable populations, justice stakeholders, and other services providers with respect to the Canadian justice system. This improved knowledge, understanding, and skills in turn lead to increased access to justice. PLEI activities, for example, contributes to a more informed public who are then better able to make the appropriate decisions and take the necessary steps for resolving their legal matter. A more informed justice system is better able to support the public with respect to their justice issues through the appropriate tools, legislation, and decision-making skills. JPIP projects also provide tools and resources to assist vulnerable populations in gaining the knowledge and skills on their rights and how the justice system can assist them in exercising their rights. Initiatives through the ULCC that bring about uniformity in legislation between provinces contribute to improved consistency across the country with respect to how the justice system treats individuals and creates a fairer justice system. And the implementation of instruments developed through international organizations such as the HCCH and UNIDROIT inform justice systems on a global level and provide residents and companies of member states, such as Canada, with increased access to justice on cross-border legal matters.

The evaluation also considered PLEI funding to the territories that is provided through the AJAs with the territories. The PLEI funding provided through these agreements is an important
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component of access to justice to residents in the territories, as these are usually the only available source of PLEI activities in these locations. Because the PLEI activities are usually delivered out of one main office within each territory that cover a large and remote geographical area, delivery agents make use of a variety of means to make their materials and services accessible to residents. This could be through a toll-free lawline, drop-in services, in-person clinics, printed and online PLEI materials, the use of court workers in communities, and outreach to communities. However, delivery is challenged by the large geographical areas of the territories populated by small, remote, and poorly serviced communities, with most accessible only by fly-in services and, for some, by boat during small ice-free windows of time. Language and cultural barriers are another main challenge; in addition, accessing materials online is often difficult, as internet services are poor in many communities and the costs of owning a computer and accessing the internet are prohibitive.

**Strengthened Canadian legal framework**

The JPIP contributes to a strengthened legal framework through the positive influence that funded initiatives have on informational, policy, procedural, or legislative changes that provide Canadians with greater access to justice. Each of the various types of JPIP initiatives can be viewed as contributing to this strengthened legal framework in one or more ways. PLEI organizations, for example, help increase the public’s comfort level with and acceptance of the Canadian legal system through a better understanding of how to effectively access the legal system. Through collaboration and communication, the various funded organizations share information with other justice stakeholders, including with the Department of Justice, that help to identify gaps, emerging trends, and unmet needs, and that can assist in informing and influencing programming, policy, and legislation, including greater harmonization of legislation. These actions all lead to a strengthened Canadian legal framework. As well, the work of the ULCC, the HCCH, and UNIDROIT contribute toward harmonized legislation, which further strengthens the legal framework.

5.3. **Performance — Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy**

**Economy**

One aspect of economy, and the extent to which expected outcomes are achieved while using the minimum amount of resources required, is how well actual spending matches budgeted amounts. Any variance between budgeted and actual expenditures for JPIP initiatives over the evaluation period was largely due to $808,330 in underspending for Family Violence and MMIWG
contribution projects in 2012–13 at the beginning of the new funding cycle, while awaiting confirmation of program approval.

**Efficiency**

Based on input from funding recipients, JPIP projects appear to be highly successful in achieving their expected outcomes, suggesting that the Program has been able to make efficient and effective use of the relatively modest amount of available resources to achieve results. This success has been attributed to several factors.

One factor is that funded initiatives are screened and chosen based on their alignment with program priorities and the availability of other resources. Other resources include cash funds but more commonly are in-kind contributions in the form of human resources, expertise, and advice. In particular, the in-kind resources in the form of expertise and knowledge are viewed as making substantial contributions to initiatives that assist them in achieving positive results. As well, the program has implemented several measures for efficient program management, such as standardized funding applications, a formalized method and set of criteria for reviewing proposals, and regular reporting through a standard reporting template. JPIP applicants were highly satisfied with the application process and funding recipients were highly satisfied with other aspects of program management, such as reporting requirements, timeliness of payments, and the time period of funding awards. Additionally, both applicants and funding recipients were highly satisfied with their interactions with JPIP representatives with respect to their assistance with applications and reporting requirements.

The JPIP also generally meets departmental service standards for acknowledgement, funding decision, and payments, with 80% to 100% of the files sampled meeting the standards for these during most of the years covered by the evaluation. One exception was for payments made in 2014–15, where only 67% of the files sampled met the standard that year. As well, the JPIP has a relatively low ratio of total actual administrative costs (represented as salaries plus O&M) to total actual expenditures (salaries plus O&M plus G&Cs), ranging from 1% to 5% over the evaluation period, which makes it an inexpensive program to administer.
6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Issue 1: Further Streamline Program Objectives

The 2011 evaluation of the JPIP recommended streamlining the objectives of the Program to focus on its primary goals. JPIP objectives were indeed revised to better reflect the intended outcomes of the Program and government priorities, and their number was reduced from ten to eight. Although most of the objectives now align with the Program’s primary goals, some are still specifically linked to the agencies or organizations receiving funding. The Program would benefit from objectives that are more clearly defined and aligned with intended outcomes in that it would help ensure that it continues to be flexible and able to fund a broad range of initiatives.

Recommendation 1: Further streamline objectives and clarify expected outcomes.

Management Response: Agree. The objectives of the Program will be reviewed and further streamlined by eliminating those objectives specifically linked to organizations receiving funding. The revised objectives will be aligned with government priorities. The expected outcomes of the Program will also be reviewed in light of the new objectives.

Issue 2: Performance Measurement

The evaluation noted several limitations related to the consistency and quality of performance data, particularly with regard to named grant recipients. In order to better assess the achievements of named grant initiatives, more complete performance data should be collected.

Another limitation with regard to performance measurement identified during the evaluation, is the frequency in which performance data is collected and reported. Although the Program collects annual performance information, this information is not analyzed and used to report on the achievement of Program results. The Program could strengthen performance measurement by starting to monitor and report annually on key indicators that measure the performance of the Program. Being able to regularly report on aggregate key performance data is particularly relevant in light of the Treasury Board Secretariat 2016 Policy on Results that no longer requires grant and
contribution programs that have five-year average actual expenditures of $5 million or less to be evaluated every five years.

**Recommendation 2:** Strengthen performance measurement to ensure that data is regularly available and addresses the intended outcomes of the Program by:

1. Encouraging named grant organizations to report annually on their performance using a consistent approach determined by the Program;

2. Revising reporting templates to collect some performance and results data in a manner more conducive to aggregation (for example, on the reach of initiatives) in order to facilitate performance reporting; and

3. Monitoring and reporting regularly on aggregate key performance data.

**Management Response:** Agree. Program managers will be reminded of the importance of ensuring that funding recipients provide useful performance data to the Department. Staff in the Directorate will be engaged in the development of new reporting tools. In addition, staff will be responsible for ensuring that information provided by recipients meets performance measurement needs in order to facilitate regular reporting on performance.
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Appendix A:
JPIP logic model and evaluation matrix
Justice Partnership and Innovation Program Logic Model

**Justice Partnership and Innovation Program**

**ACTIVITIES**
- Operational Funding
- Educational Funding
- International Funding
- Knowledge and Expertise Exchange Funding

**(Sub-)ACTIVITIES**

**OUTPUTS**

**IMMEDIATE OUTCOME**
- Increased capacity to build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues

**INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES**
- Canadians have an increased awareness and knowledge of the justice system including their rights and obligations
- Promotion of Canadian legal interests internationally

**ULTIMATE OUTCOMES**
- Increased access to the Canadian justice system
- Strengthened Canadian legal framework

**DEPARTMENTAL STRATEGIC OUTCOME**
- A fair, relevant and accessible Canadian justice system
## JPIP Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Issue</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Evaluation Indicators</th>
<th>Potential Data Sources/Analysis</th>
<th>Responsibility for Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Continued Need for the JPIP</td>
<td>1.1 To what extent is there a continuing need for the JPIP?</td>
<td>1.1.1 Alignment of the needs targeted by the JPIP and the justice needs of Canadians and needs identified by funding applicants/recipients</td>
<td>• Document/Literature review&lt;br&gt; • Key informant interviews&lt;br&gt; • Applicant survey&lt;br&gt; • Case studies&lt;br&gt; • File review</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 To what extent are the activities of the JPIP responsive to the needs of Canadians?</td>
<td>1.2.1 Scope and reach of JPIP activities and funding investments</td>
<td>• Document review&lt;br&gt; • Applicant survey&lt;br&gt; • Case studies&lt;br&gt; • File review</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Number/type/nature of funded activities under the JPIP</td>
<td>• Document review&lt;br&gt; • Applicant survey&lt;br&gt; • Case studies&lt;br&gt; • File review</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alignment with Government Priorities</td>
<td>2.1 Is the JPIP aligned with the priorities of the Department and the Government?</td>
<td>2.1.1 Alignment of the needs targeted by the JPIP with federal government and Justice priorities</td>
<td>• Document/Literature review&lt;br&gt; • Key informant interviews</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>3.1 To what extent do the activities of the JPIP align with federal roles and responsibilities?</td>
<td>3.1.1 Alignment of the JPIP with the Government of Canada’s roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Document/Literature review (Justice Constitutional/ statutory authorities RPP, PAA)&lt;br&gt; • Key informant interviews</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement of Expected Outcomes</td>
<td>4.1 To what extent has the JPIP increased the capacity of stakeholders to build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues?</td>
<td>4.1.1 Number and nature of partnerships</td>
<td>• Document review&lt;br&gt; • Key informant interviews&lt;br&gt; • Applicant survey&lt;br&gt; • Case studies&lt;br&gt; • File review</td>
<td>Justice ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issue</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Evaluation Indicators</td>
<td>Potential Data Sources/Analysis</td>
<td>Responsibility for Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Extent to which stakeholders are able to continue to maintain their ongoing activities in support of departmental priorities</td>
<td>• Document review • Key informant interviews • Applicant survey • Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Extent to which capacity has increased as a result of JPIP funding</td>
<td>Document review Key informant interviews Applicant survey Case studies File review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4 Nature and extent of federal contribution to issues at the international level</td>
<td>Document review Key informant interviews Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.5 Level of satisfaction with partnerships</td>
<td>Document review Key informant interviews Applicant survey Case studies File review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.6 Efforts to address barriers to obtaining needed information (i.e. language)</td>
<td>Key informant interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>To what extent has the JPIP increased awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Number of Métis and Non-Status Indians that have received financial assistance to pursue their studies in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Document review • Key informant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Extent to which public legal education and information organizations assisted through funding promoted awareness and knowledge of the Canadian justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Document review • Key informant interviews • Applicant survey • Case studies • File review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Extent to which Justice partners’ knowledge and understanding has increased through funded meetings, conferences, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Document review • Key informant interviews • Applicant survey • Case studies • File review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issue</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                  | 4.2.4               | Number, type and nature of public legal education and information resources and tools developed, distributed | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Applicant survey  
Case studies  
File review | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.2.5               | Type and number of activities that build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Applicant survey  
Case studies  
File review | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.3                 | To what extent has the JPIP helped promote Canadian legal interests internationally |                |
|                  | 4.3.1               | Nature and extent of involvement in international fora | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Case studies | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.3.2               | Examples where Canada has influenced international work | Key informant interviews  
Case studies | Justice ED |

**Ultimate Outcomes**

|                  | 4.4                 | To what extent has the JPIP contributed to increased access to justice? |                |
|                  | 4.4.1               | Extent to which information is available to inform about the Canadian justice system | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Applicant survey  
Case studies  
File review | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.4.2               | Extent to which there is a more equitable representation of Aboriginal people in the legal profession | Document review  
Key informant interviews | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.5                 | To what extent has the JPIP contributed to a strengthened Canadian legal framework? |                |
|                  | 4.5.1               | Evidence of changes to harmonize legislation | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Case studies | Justice ED |
|                  | 4.5.2               | Ways in which the JPIP funding recipients have contributed to the legal framework (e.g. ICCLR assistance in responding to domestic issues) | Document review  
Key informant interviews  
Case studies | Justice ED |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Issue</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Evaluation Indicators</th>
<th>Potential Data Sources/Analysis</th>
<th>Responsibility for Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>What factors are contributing to, or constraining the achievement of expected outcomes?</td>
<td>4.6.1 Constraints on the ability to achieve outcomes</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, Applicant survey, Case studies, File review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6.2 Factors supporting the achievement of outcomes</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, Applicant survey, Case studies, File review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Have there been any unexpected outcomes?</td>
<td>4.7.1 Identification of unexpected outcomes</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy | 5.1 To what extent is the JPIP resource utilization efficient?  
|                  |                     | 5.1.1 Extent to which the resources support the achievement of results | Key informant interviews, Applicant survey, Case studies | Justice ED |
|                  |                     | 5.2 What measures are in place to manage the JPIP efficiently and economically?  
|                  |                     | 5.2.1 Measures in place to manage the JPIP efficiently | Key informant interviews |  |
|                  |                     | 5.2.2 Measures in place to manage the JPIP economically | Key informant interviews |  |
|                  | 5.3 Have the 2011 JPIP summative evaluation recommendations been implemented? | 5.3.1 Extent to which the recommendations have been implemented | Key informant interviews |  |
Appendix B:
Data collection instruments
Key informant interview guides
Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program

Key informant interview guide for the
Department of Justice Canada representatives

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to assist the Department in achieving government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focuses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation. A component of the evaluation involves interviews with stakeholders who have knowledge of the JPIP. The interview will be conducted by telephone and will be audio recorded with your permission. The information we gather from the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. We recognize that representatives may have familiarity mainly with specific areas and/or objectives of JPIP funding. If some questions are not applicable to your area of knowledge, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

Prior to the interview, please review the JPIP objectives provided on the last page.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your involvement with the JPIP, and how long you have been involved with the Program.

Relevance

2. Given the JPIP objectives (provided on the last page), to what extent do you see that the JPIP is still needed? Can you speak to the relevance of the JPIP’s objectives for meeting the justice needs of Canadians? (Probe: Do the objectives align with the justice needs of Canadians? Are there any particular areas of justice needs not being met? Are there specific groups that have greater needs? Are there emerging trends or changing needs?) (1.1.1)
3. Please explain how the JPIP aligns with or does not align with Government of Canada priorities, and specifically with Department of Justice priorities. What, if any, changes have been made to the Program to reflect changing government or departmental priorities? (2.1.1)

4. Does the funding provided by the JPIP complement initiatives funded by other federal departments or by other jurisdictions? Is there overlap with any other initiatives? (2.1.1, 5.1.1)

5. What federal roles and responsibilities does the JPIP address and how? Please give specific examples if you are able to (e.g., legislative authorities). (3.1.1)

Performance – achievement of outcomes

6. To what extent has the JPIP enabled recipients to take part in their funded initiatives/ activities? How has the funding helped recipients in building capacity in the funded areas? Please give specific examples, as you are able, at both a Canadian and international level. (Probe: Would recipients be able to continue with their funded activities without JPIP support?) (4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4)

7. Can you comment on partnerships that have been formed as a result of the JPIP? How have these partnerships contributed to increased awareness, knowledge, and understanding of the justice system? Are partners satisfied with their partnerships? (4.1.1, 4.1.7)

8. (For stakeholders familiar with PLEI activities) Please describe some of the PLEI activities undertaken by funded recipients. (4.1.8, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)

   a. Who are the target audiences? How successful are these activities in reaching these audiences? (Probe: What, if any, barriers exist and how were they addressed?)

   b. To what extent have these activities contributed to increased awareness and understanding of justice issues? Has this understanding changed over the past five years or so?

   c. Have they contributed to increased access to justice? If so, how? Has this changed over the past five years or so?

   d. Is there a sufficient level of this type of information available? Why or why not?

   e. Are there any barriers to accessing this information (e.g., language issues), and if so, how are these addressed?
9. (For stakeholders familiar with educational funding to support Métis and non-status Indians in pursuing studies in law) Can you comment on the number of Métis and non-status Indians that have received financial assistance through the JPIP for pursuing their studies in law? (4.2.2, 4.4.2)

a. Are all eligible students accessing the JPIP? What, if any, barriers exist in accessing these funds?

b. What difference does the JPIP funding make to these students?

c. To what extent is the JPIP funding contributing to more equitable representation of Indigenous peoples in the legal profession?

10. (For stakeholders familiar with named grants) For those named grant recipients you are familiar with, please describe some of the activities undertaken and how they contribute to the JPIP objectives (see last page). How have these activities contributed to each of the below? Please give specific examples as you are able. (4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)

a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audience or in general. Has this changed over the past five years or so?

b. Increased access to justice. Has this changed over the past five years or so?

11. (For stakeholders familiar with other types of funded projects other than those operating at the international level) For those projects you are familiar with, please describe some of the activities undertaken, their target audience, and how they contribute to the JPIP objectives (see last page). How have these activities contributed to each of the aspects below? Please give specific examples as you are able to. (4.1.8, 4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)

a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audience or in general. Has this changed over the past five years or so?

b. Increased access to justice. Has this changed over the past five years or so?

c. Are there any barriers to the target audience in accessing the funded activities (e.g., language issues or other challenges), and if so, how are these addressed?
12. (For stakeholders familiar with funded initiatives that operate at the international level) Are you able to comment on the JPIP’s involvement at the international level? Which JPIP-funded initiatives are you familiar with? How has this involvement contributed to each of the following? Please give specific examples as you are able to. (4.1.4, 4.3.1, 4.3.2)

   a. promoting Canadian legal interests internationally
   b. contributing to Canada’s influence at the international level
   c. contributing to unification of rules
   d. promoting international cooperation with respect to access to justice

13. Please describe, as you are able, how you see JPIP-funded initiatives contributing towards strengthening the Canadian legal framework? Towards a more harmonized legislation? Please give specific examples as you are able, both in terms of funded recipients and how their activities make such contributions. (4.5.1, 4.5.2)

14. Are you aware of any of the JPIP-funded activities that have helped to inform policy at the federal level? At other jurisdictional levels, including internationally? If yes, can you give specific examples and the applicable policy or policies? (4.5.2)

15. Are you aware of any other contributions besides those we have already discussed that funded projects have made towards increasing awareness, knowledge, and access to justice? This could be through development of informational materials; new strategies, models or tools; research; conferences; supports for victims of crime, etc. If so, please describe these and the contributions they have made. (4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)

16. Can you comment on specific success factors that have assisted the JPIP in achieving its objectives? On specific constraints for achieving objectives? (4.6.1, 4.6.2)

   a. Have there been any unexpected outcomes from the JPIP, either positive or negative? (4.7.1)

**Performance – economy and efficiency**

17. Given the level of annual funding to JPIP recipients, do you believe that the benefits accruing to Canada and the Canadian public are reasonable? Please explain. (5.1.1)
18. Can you comment on the extent that funds are leveraged from other sources as a result of the funding from the JPIP? Would this other funding have occurred without the JPIP? (5.1.1)

19. Are you satisfied with the application and recipient monitoring process? Do any challenges exist with either the application or reporting process? Do you have any suggestions for making either of these processes more efficient and/or effective? (5.2.1, 5.2.2)

20. Are the Department of Justice’s staffing resources for the JPIP sufficient to manage applications and provide oversight to funded recipients? Please explain any challenges that exist. (5.2.1, 5.2.2)

21. Are you aware of alternative ways to achieve some or all of the objectives of the JPIP more cost-effectively? If yes, please describe them. (5.1.1)

22. The previous evaluation of the JPIP made the two recommendations below. Can you comment on to what extent each of these has been implemented? (5.3.1)

   a. Streamline the objectives to focus on the primary goals of the Program.
   
   b. Strengthen performance measurement by requiring funded organizations to collect some data from beneficiaries as a part of the funding agreement.

23. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the JPIP?

   Thank-you for your participation.
JPIP objectives

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, access to justice, and the harmonization of private international law. The specific objectives are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
- reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit).
Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program

Key informant interview guide for recipients receiving funding for PLEI activities

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to assist the Department in achieving government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focuses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation. A component of the evaluation involves interviews with stakeholders, including funding recipients, who have knowledge of the JPIP. This interview will be conducted by telephone and will be audio recorded with your permission. The information we gather from the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. If you are unable to answer any questions, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

Prior to the interview, please review the JPIP objectives provided on the last page.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your organization’s involvement with the JPIP, and how long you have been involved with the Program.

Relevance

2. Can you speak to the need for PLEI in Canada in general and in your jurisdiction specifically? What are the areas of need? Are there specific groups that have greater or specific needs? Are there any emerging or changing needs? (1.1.1)

3. Given the JPIP objectives (provided on the last page), to what extent do you see that the JPIP is still needed in general? How about specifically for your organization? Can you speak to the relevance of the JPIP’s objectives for meeting Canadians’ justice needs? (1.1.1) (Probe: Do the objectives align with the justice needs of Canadians? Are there any particular justice needs not being met? Are there specific groups that have greater needs? Are there any other emerging trends or changing needs not identified in #2 above?)
Performance – achievement of outcomes

4. To what extent has the JPIP enabled organizations such as yours to take part in their PLEI activities? How has the funding helped your organization in building capacity for providing PLEI services? Please give specific examples as you are able. (*Probe: Would your organization be able to continue with their PLEI activities without JPIP support?*) (4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4)

5. Please describe some of the PLEI activities your organization undertakes and the objectives for these activities. (4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5)
   a. What are some of the informational materials and tools you have developed or are able to provide through the JPIP funding?
   b. In your opinion, is there a sufficient level of this type of information available in your jurisdiction? Why or why not?

6. Who are the target audiences for your PLEI activities? How satisfied are you at your organization’s ability to reach these audiences? (4.1.8, 4.2.4)
   a. What steps does your organization take to try to reach this audience?
   b. What, if any, barriers or challenges exist in reaching this audience and how are they addressed?
   c. What, if any, steps are taken for reaching those members of the target audience with specific language needs?

7. In your opinion, to what extent have these activities contributed to each of the below? (4.2.2, 4.4.1)
   a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audience. Has this changed over the past five years or so?
   b. Increased access to justice. If so, how? And has this changed over the past five years or so?

8. Has your organization formed any partnerships with respect to your PLEI services? If yes, could you describe the partnerships and what they contribute to your PLEI activities? (4.1.1)
9. *(If have partnerships)* Are you satisfied with your partnerships and how they have helped you with your PLEI activities? Why or why not? (4.1.7)

   a. Have they assisted your organization with increasing awareness, knowledge, and understanding of the justice system? Please explain.

10. Are you able to comment on the extent to which JPIP-funded initiatives have contributed towards strengthening the Canadian legal framework? Towards a more harmonized legislation? Please give specific examples as you are able, both in terms of funded recipients and the contributions they make. (4.5.1, 4.5.2)

11. Are you able to comment on whether any of the JPIP-funded activities have helped to inform policy at the federal level? At other jurisdictional levels, including internationally? If yes, can you give specific examples? (4.5.2)

12. Are you aware of any specific success factors that have assisted the JPIP in achieving its objectives? On specific constraints for achieving objectives? (4.6.1, 4.6.2)

   a. Have there been any unexpected outcomes from the JPIP, either positive or negative? (4.7.1)

**Performance – economy and efficiency**

13. Given the level of annual funding to JPIP recipients, such as your organization and in general, do you believe that the benefits accruing to Canada and the Canadian public are reasonable? Please explain. (5.1.1)

14. Is your organization able to leverage funding from other sources as a result of the funding from the JPIP? If yes, please describe the funding (including the source) and what it has meant to your PLEI activities? Would this other funding have occurred without the JPIP? (5.1.1)

15. Are you satisfied with the JPIP application and reporting process? Do any challenges exist for your organization with either the application or reporting process? Do you have any suggestions for making either of these processes more efficient and/or effective? (5.2.1, 5.2.2)

16. In your opinion, are the Department of Justice’s staffing resources for the JPIP sufficient to manage applications and provide any needed input or assistance to funded recipients? Please explain. (5.2.1, 5.2.2)
17. Are you aware of alternative ways to achieve some or all of the objectives of the JPIP more cost-effectively? If yes, please describe them. (5.1.1)

18. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the JPIP?

Thank-you for your participation.
JPIP objectives

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, access to justice, and the harmonization of private international law. The specific objectives are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
- reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit).
**Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program**

**Key informant interview guide for JPIP funding recipients**  
(other than PLEI recipients)

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to assist the Department in achieving government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focuses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation. A component of the evaluation involves interviews with stakeholders, including funding recipients, who have knowledge of the JPIP. The interview will be conducted by telephone and will be audio recorded with your permission. The information we gather from the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. If you are unable to answer any questions, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

**Prior to the interview, please review the JPIP objectives provided on the last page.**

**Introduction**

1. Please briefly describe your organization’s involvement with the JPIP, and how long you have been involved with the Program.

**Relevance**

2. Looking at the JPIP objectives listed on the last page, which of these objectives would best apply to the activities your organization undertakes with JPIP funding? What are Canadians’ justice needs related to these activities? Are there any emerging or changing needs?

3. Given the JPIP objectives, can you speak to their relevance for meeting Canadians’ justice needs? To what extent do you see that the JPIP is still needed in general? How about specifically for your organization? (Probe: Do the objectives align with Canadians’ justice needs? Are there any particular areas of justice needs not being met? Are there specific groups
that have greater needs? Are there any other emerging trends or changing needs not identified in #2 above?) (1.1.1)

Performance – achievement of outcomes

4. To what extent has the JPIP enabled recipients, such as your organization, to take part in their funded initiatives/activities? How has the funding helped your organization in building capacity in your funded area? Please give specific examples as you are able, at both a Canadian and international level, if applicable. (Probe: Would your organization be able to continue with the funded activities without JPIP support?) (4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4)

5. Please briefly describe the activities your organization undertakes through JPIP funding. (4.2.5, 4.4.1)
   a. Are there any specific informational materials, strategies, models, research, or supports you have either developed or are able to make available through the JPIP funding?
   b. In your opinion, is there a sufficient level of these types of activities taking place in Canada in general? In your jurisdiction? Why or why not?

6. Who are the target audiences for your funded activities? How satisfied are you by your organization’s ability to reach these audiences? (4.1.8, 4.2.5)
   a. What steps does your organization take to try to reach these audiences?
   b. What, if any, barriers or challenges are there in reaching these audiences and how are they addressed?
   c. What, if any, steps are taken for reaching those members of the target audiences with specific language needs?

7. In your opinion, to what extent have these activities contributed to each of the below? (4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)
   a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audiences or in general? Has this changed over the past five years or so?
   b. Increased access to justice? Has this changed over the past five years or so?
8. Has your organization formed any partnerships with respect to your funded activities? If yes, could you describe the partnerships and what they contribute to your JPIP-funded activities? (4.1.1)

9. (If they have partnerships) Are you satisfied with your partnerships and how they have helped you with your funded activities? Why or why not? (4.1.7)

   a. Have they assisted your organization with increasing awareness, knowledge, and understanding of the justice system? Please explain.

10. (For recipients with funded initiatives that operate at the international level) Please describe your funded initiative’s activities and involvement at the international level. How has this involvement contributed to each of the following? Please give specific examples as you are able. (4.1.4, 4.3.1, 4.3.2)

    a. promoting Canadian legal interests internationally
    b. contributing to Canada’s influence at the international level
    c. contributing to unification of rules
    d. promoting international cooperation with respect to access to justice

11. If applicable, please describe your funded activities that you believe contribute towards strengthening the Canadian legal framework? Towards a more harmonized legislation? Please give specific examples as you are able, both in terms of the activities and the contributions they make. (4.5.1, 4.5.2)

12. Are you aware of any of how your organization’s JPIP-funded activities have helped to inform policy at the federal level? At other jurisdictional levels, including internationally? If yes, can you give specific examples? Are you aware of any other JPIP-funded activities that make such contributions? If so, could you give specific examples? (4.5.2)

13. Are you aware of any specific success factors that have assisted the JPIP in achieving its objectives? Or specific constraints for achieving objectives? (4.6.1, 4.6.2)

14. Have there been any unexpected outcomes from the JPIP, either positive or negative? (4.7.1)
Performance – economy and efficiency

15. Given the level of annual funding to JPIP recipients, such as to your organization and in general, do you believe that the benefits accruing to Canada and the Canadian public are reasonable? Please explain. (5.1.1)

16. Is your organization able to leverage funding from other sources as a result of the funding from the JPIP? If yes, please describe the funding (including the source) and what it has meant to your funded activities. Would this other funding have occurred without the JPIP? (5.1.1)

17. Are you satisfied with the JPIP application and reporting process? Do any challenges exist for your organization with either the application or reporting process? Do you have any suggestions for making either of these processes more efficient and/or effective? (5.2.1, 5.2.2)

18. In your opinion, are the Department of Justice staffing resources for the JPIP sufficient to manage applications and provide any needed input or assistance to funded recipients? Please explain. (5.2.1, 5.2.2)

19. Are you aware of alternative ways to achieve some or all of the objectives of the JPIP more cost-effectively? If yes, please describe. (5.1.1)

20. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the JPIP?

Thank-you for your participation.
JPIP objectives

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, access to justice, and the harmonization of private international law. The specific objectives are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
- reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit).
Evaluating the PLEI component of the Access to Justice Agreements
Key informant interview guide for AJA PLEI recipients

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP). This program aims to assist the Department in achieving government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation.

The evaluation also covers the PLEI component of the Access to Justice Agreements (AJA). As such, the evaluation involves interviews with several representatives of Canada’s territories who can speak to the PLEI activities offered. This interview will be conducted by telephone and will be audio recorded with your permission. The information we gather from the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada.

1. Please briefly describe your position and your role in delivering PLEI services and activities in your territory.

2. Please describe what types of PLEI services and activities are delivered in your territory.

3. How are these PLEI services delivered (e.g., who delivers them; how are materials distributed)?

4. Are there any gaps in services or any PLEI needs not being met? If yes, what are these gaps or unmet needs? What steps are taken to overcome these gaps/unmet needs?

5. What delivery challenges exist in the territories with respect to PLEI? Again, what steps are taken to overcome these challenges?

6. How have your PLEI services contributed to increased awareness and understanding of justice issues in your territory?

7. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your territory’s PLEI services?

Thank-you for your participation.
Case study guides
**Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program**

*Case study interview guide (PLEI recipients)*

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to help the Department achieve government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focuses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation.

Case studies of several funded projects/initiatives comprise a component of the evaluation. Case studies will involve a review of documents and several interviews with recipients and other relevant stakeholders. The interviews will be conducted by telephone and will be audio-recorded with your permission. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. If you are unable to answer any questions, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

*prior to the interview, please review the JPIP objectives provided on the last page.*

1. Please briefly describe your organization and how its activities and objectives relate to the JPIP objectives.
   
a. How long has your organization received JPIP funding for PLEI activities?

2. Can you speak to the need for PLEI in Canada in general and in your jurisdiction specifically? What are the areas of need? Are there specific groups that have greater or specific needs? Are there any emerging or changing needs? *(1.1.1)*
3. To what extent has the JPIP enabled your organization to take part in their PLEI activities? (4.1.2, 4.1.3)

   a. How has the funding helped your organization in building capacity for providing PLEI services? Please give specific examples as you are able.

   b. Would your organization be able to continue with their PLEI activities without JPIP support? (Probes: Would the activities have been offered/conducted at all? Offered in a different manner or scale?)

4. Please describe some of the PLEI activities your organization undertakes and the objectives for these activities. (1.2.2, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)

5. What are some of the informational materials and tools you have developed or are able to provide through the JPIP funding?

6. In your opinion, is there a sufficient level of this type of information available in your jurisdiction? Why or why not?

7. Who are the target audiences for your PLEI activities? How satisfied are you with your organization’s ability to reach these audiences? (1.2.1, 4.1.8)

   a. What steps does your organization take to try to reach this audience?

   b. What, if any, barriers or challenges exist in reaching this audience and how are they addressed?

   c. What, if any, steps are taken for reaching those members of the target audience with specific language needs?

8. Looking at the JPIP objectives, which of these objectives would best apply to the PLEI activities your organization undertakes? Can you describe how your funded activities have been able to contribute to those objectives? (4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)
9. In general, to what extent have these activities contributed to? (4.2.2, 4.4.1)
   a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audience or in general? Has this changed over the past five years or so?
   b. Increased access to justice? Has this changed over the past five years or so?

10. Has your organization formed any partnerships with respect to your PLEI activities? If yes, please describe these partnerships and what they contribute to this project (e.g., direct funding, in-kind funding and if so, what kind)? (4.1.1, 4.1.7, 5.1.1)
    a. What have your partnerships meant to your organization in terms of achieving your PLEI objectives?
    b. Were these partnerships formed because of your involvement with this JPIP project? (Probe: would they have happened without the JPIP funding?)
    c. How satisfied is your organization with these partnerships? Why or why not?

11. Does your organization receive funding from any other sources for this project other than what you might have described above under question 10? If yes please describe these other source of funding. (5.1.1)

12. Did the JPIP funding assist your organization in leveraging other sources of funds either from partners or other sources reported in the previous question? Would this funding have occurred without the JPIP funding? (5.1.1)
    a. Relative to other sources of funding (all other sources, including those from partners), what proportion of the funding for this project is from JPIP funding?

13. Are you aware of any other PLEI initiatives or activities similar to those undertaken by your organization being conducted in your jurisdiction? If yes, who funds these activities (e.g., other federal departments, other governments, or non-governmental organizations)? Are there any measures your organization takes to avoid duplication with other initiatives? (5.1.1)
14. Can you comment on specific success factors that have assisted your organization in achieving its PLEI objectives? On specific constraints for achieving objectives? (4.6.1, 4.6.2)

   a. Have there been any unexpected outcomes, either positive or negative, from the JPIP funding? (4.7.1)

15. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your JPIP-funded project/initiative or about the JPIP in general?

   Thank-you for your participation.
**JPIP objectives**

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, access to justice, and the harmonization of private international law. The specific objectives are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
- reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit).
Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program

Case study interview guide (other than PLEI recipients)

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to help the Department achieve government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focusses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation.

Case studies of several funded projects/initiatives comprise a component of the evaluation. Case studies will involve a review of documents and several interviews with recipients and other relevant stakeholders. The interviews will be conducted by telephone and will be audio-recorded with your permission. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. If you are unable to answer any questions, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

Prior to the interview, please review the JPIP objectives provided on the last page.

1. Please briefly describe your organization and how its activities and objectives relate to the JPIP objectives.

2. Please briefly describe the JPIP-funded project/initiative we are discussing today. (1.2.2)
   a. How long has your organization received funding for this project?

3. What needs related to access to justice is this project/initiative intended to meet? In your view, are there any emerging or changing needs in this area? If yes, how is this project/initiative able to respond to these emerging or changing needs? (1.1.1, 1.2.1)
4. To what extent has the JPIP funding enabled your organization to take part in the funded initiatives/activities? (4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4)
   a. How has the funding helped your organization in building capacity in the area funded through this project? Please give specific examples as you are able, at both a Canadian and international level, if applicable.
   b. Would your organization be able to continue with the funded activities without JPIP support? (Probes: Would the activities have been offered/conducted at all? Offered in a different manner or scale?)

5. Please give examples of the activities your organization undertakes through this JPIP funded project/initiative. (1.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)
   a. Are there any specific informational materials, strategies, models, research, or supports you have either developed or are able to make available through the JPIP funding?
   b. In your opinion, is there a sufficient level of these types of activities taking place in Canada in general? In your jurisdiction? Why or why not?

6. Who are the target audiences for this JPIP funded project/initiative? How satisfied are you with your organization’s ability to reach these audiences? (1.2.1, 4.1.8)
   a. What steps does your organization take to try to reach this audience?
   b. What, if any, barriers or challenges are there in reaching this audience and how are they addressed?
   c. What, if any, steps are taken for reaching those members of the target audience with specific language needs?

7. Looking at the JPIP objectives, which of these objectives would best apply to this project? Can you describe how your funded project/initiative has been able to contribute toward those objectives? (4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.4.1)
8. In general, to what extent have the activities funded through this JPIP project contributed to:
   (4.2.3, 4.4.1)
   a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues for your target audience or in general? Has this changed over the past five years or so?
   b. Increased access to justice? Has this changed over the past five years or so?

9. Has your organization formed any partnerships for delivering these activities? If yes, please describe these partnerships and what they contribute to this project (e.g., direct funding, in-kind funding and if so, what kind)? (4.1.1, 4.1.7, 5.1.1)
   a. What have your partnerships meant to your organization in terms of achieving the objectives of this funded project/initiative?
   b. Were these partnerships formed because of your involvement with this JPIP project? *(Probe: would they have happened without the JPIP funding?)*
   c. How satisfied is your organization with these partnerships? Why or why not?

10. Does your organization receive funding from any other sources for this project other than what you might have described above under question 12? If yes, please describe these other sources of funding. (5.1.1)

11. Did the JPIP funding assist your organization in leveraging other sources of funds either from partners or other sources reported in the previous question? Would this funding have occurred without the JPIP funding? (5.1.1)
   a. Relative to other sources of funding (all other sources, including those from partners), what proportion of the funding for this project is from JPIP funding?

12. Are you aware of any other initiatives or activities similar to those funded by this JPIP project being conducted elsewhere? If yes, who funds these activities (e.g., other federal departments, other governments, or non-governmental organizations)? Are there any measures your organization takes to avoid duplication with other initiatives? (5.1.1)
13. Can you comment on specific success factors that have assisted your JPIP-funded project/initiative in achieving its objectives? On specific constraints for achieving objectives? (4.6.1, 4.6.2)

a. Have there been any unexpected outcomes, either positive or negative, from this JPIP-funded project/initiative? (4.7.1)

14. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your JPIP-funded project/initiative or about the JPIP in general?

Thank-you for your participation.
JPIP objectives

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support the policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, missing and murdered Aboriginal women, access to justice, and the harmonization of private international law. The specific objectives are to:

- promote the equitable representation of Métis and Non-Status Indians in the legal system by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public concerning justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing, and other emerging justice issues, including justice-related issues in the international fora;
- provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
- strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
- promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
- reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behaviour; and
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives by participating in the work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (Unidroit).
Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program

Case study interview guide for partners of JPIP recipients

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”). This program aims to help the Department achieve government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. The evaluation covers a four-year period (2012–13 to 2015–16) and focuses on the Program’s relevance and performance.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation.

Case studies of several funded projects/initiatives comprise a component of the evaluation. Case studies will involve a review of documents and several interviews with the project recipients as well as with partners that they have worked with on some of the activities that are funded through the JPIP. The interviews will be conducted by telephone and will be audio-recorded with your permission. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. If you are unable to answer any questions, please let the interviewer know and they will skip to the next question.

1. Please briefly describe your organization and the work it does.

2. (Interviewer: name the organization receiving the JPIP funding and the funded initiative that you would like to discuss with the participant) Can you briefly describe how you are involved with this organization and this JPIP-funded initiative?

3. What does your organization contribute to this initiative? (Probes: cash funding, in-kind resources and what kind?)

   a. How important to this initiative is your partnership with the organization we are talking about today?

4. What are some of the activities related to this initiative that your organization is involved in? What needs is this project intended to meet?
5. Who are the target audiences/beneficiaries for this initiative? How do they benefit from the initiative? How satisfied are you with the extent this audience has been reached? What challenges are there, if any, in reaching this audience?

6. In general, to what extent would you say the activities conducted through this initiative have contributed to:

   a. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues? Please give examples if possible.

   b. Increased access to justice? Please give examples if possible.

7. Can you comment on specific success factors that have assisted this initiative in achieving its objectives? On any specific constraints for achieving objectives?

8. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about this initiative or your partnership with the organization we are discussing today?

   Thank-you for your participation.
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Case study questions for international organizations

The Department of Justice Canada (the Department) is conducting an evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP). This program aims to help the Department achieve government priorities in the areas of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information (PLEI), and missing and murdered Aboriginal women/violence against Aboriginal women and girls. Two areas that are funded through the JPIP are Canada’s assessed contributions to the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.

PRA Inc., an independent research company, has been contracted to support the evaluation.

Case studies of several funded projects/initiatives comprise a component of the evaluation, including case studies of the two internationally funded organizations. Case studies will involve a review of documents and several interviews with recipients and other relevant stakeholders. The questions below can be responded to in writing or, if preferred, a telephone interview can be arranged with a PRA researcher. Interview notes will not be shared outside of PRA Inc. and the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice Canada. Please indicate if you are unable to answer any of the questions.

1. Please briefly describe how Canada’s membership is important to your organization?

2. How does Canada’s financial contribution assist your organization in conducting its work and achieving its objectives?

3. Who do you see as the main beneficiaries of the work your organization conducts? How do they benefit from the organization’s work?
4. Can you comment on and give examples of how the work of your organization contributes to each of the following:

   a. Unification of rules?

   b. Increased awareness and understanding of justice issues?

   c. Increased access to justice?

   d. Promoting international cooperation with respect to access to justice?

5. Are you able to comment on how Canada’s membership in your organization facilitates the promotion of Canadian legal interests internationally? How does this contribute to Canada’s influence at the international level?

6. Are there any other comments you would like to make about Canada’s membership in the organization that have not already been covered?

   Thank-you for your participation.
File review templates
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File Review Template – Named Grants Recipients
The file review data will be entered into an excel spreadsheet.

**Background**

1. Name of organization/recipient; funding amount; file number

2. Follows JPIP report template
   - Yes
   - No

3. Year or years of funding (evaluation years only)
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - 2016-17
   - Not clear

4. Information contained in recipient’s file (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Application
   - Funding agreement
   - Activity/summary reports
   - Organization or initiatives annual report
   - Budgets/financial reporting
   - Correspondences between JPIP program and recipient
   - Work plans
   - Other (Specify) _____

5. Years of summary reports available – indicate if based on only a partial year
   - None
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - Unclear – dates not attached to all reports

**Use the most recent summary report to complete remaining questions**

6. Summary/annual report year that the remaining template questions are drawn from:
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - Unclear – date not attached to report used

7. Type of organization
   - Non-profit organization
   - Provincial or territorial government
   - Municipal government
   - Canadian educational institution/board of education
   - International organization
   - Band, tribal council, self-governing First Nation and Inuit
   - Other (Specify) _____
   - Not identifiable

8. Grants or contribution funded
   - Grants
What happened?

9. Activities supported by JPIP funding – check identified activities below (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY). Also briefly summarize giving specific examples (e.g. type of conference, types of public legal education and information project, etc.).

☐ Offering workshops, conferences, symposiums
☐ Offering training sessions
☐ Conducting pilot, demonstration or research projects
☐ Public legal education and information projects
☐ Activities to promote international cooperation with respect to justice issues
☐ Activities to promote increased harmonization of legislation
☐ Research related to access to justice
☐ Other (Specify) ______
☐ Not clear
☐ Not provided (IF NOT PROVIDED SKIP TO Q11)

10. Based on activities reported above what were the main areas of focus? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Family violence
☐ Missing or murdered Indigenous women
☐ Violence against Indigenous women and girls
☐ Victims of crime
☐ International law (justice-related issues in the international fora)
☐ Access to justice
☐ Public legal education and information
☐ Criminal law reform
☐ Justice policy
☐ Other (Specify) ______
☐ Not clear

11. Which of the JPIP objectives do the funded activities appear to be related to (assessed by reviewer based on information in file) (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ promote the equitable representation in the legal system of Métis and Non-Status Indians by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
☐ promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
☐ build knowledge, awareness and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public on justice issues and other emerging justice issues;
☐ provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
☐ strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
☐ promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
☐ reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behavior
☐ Not clear
### What happened? (CONTINUED)

12. Results achieved – check identified results achieved below (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY). Also briefly summarize verbally giving specific examples. Briefly summarize results achieved with examples.

- □ New skills
- □ New information
- □ Increased awareness
- □ Development or identification of best practices
- □ Identification of emerging issues or trends
- □ Identification of gaps
- □ Implementation of best practices
- □ Response to emerging issues or trends
- □ Response to gaps
- □ Not provided
- □ Not clear
- □ Not provided

13. Who accessed services?

- □ Judiciary
- □ Law enforcement officers/officials
- □ Corrections staff/officials
- □ Department of Justice officials (federal/provincial/territorial)
- □ Other government representatives (federal/provincial/territorial)
- □ Crown prosecutors/other lawyers
- □ International agencies
- □ International governments
- □ Academics
- □ Other professional groups (Specify) _____
- □ Other justice related professionals
- □ Victims of crime
- □ Official language minority communities
- □ General public
- □ Other (Specify) _____
- □ Not clear
- □ Not provided

14. Why they accessed the services?

(DESCRIBE BRIEFLY)

- □ Not clear
- □ Not provided

### Target population

15. Target population (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- □ Judiciary
- □ Law enforcement officers/officials
- □ Corrections staff/officials
- □ Department of Justice officials (federal/provincial/territorial)
- □ Other government representatives (federal/provincial/territorial)
- □ Crown prosecutors/other lawyers
- □ International agencies
- □ International governments
- □ Academics
- □ Other professional groups (Specify) _____
- □ Other justice related professionals
- □ Victims of crime
- □ Official language minority communities
- □ General public
- □ Other (Specify) _____
- □ Not clear
- □ Not provided
### Partnerships

16. Received funding from other sources
   - Yes
   - No (SKIP TO Q18)
   - Not indicated (SKIP TO Q18)

17. If yes, number of partners listed
   - One
   - Two
   - Three
   - Other (Specify) __________

18. If yes, did partners offer the below:
   - **Cash:**
     - Yes
     - No
     - Not Clear
   - **Knowledge or expertise:**
     - Yes
     - No
     - Not Clear
   - **Materials or space:**
     - Yes
     - No
     - Not Clear
   - **Other (specify)** __________

19. If yes, types of partners listed
   (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Canadian federal justice related government department
   - Canadian provincial/territorial justice related government department
   - Canadian academic institution
   - Canadian justice-related agency/organization
   - International government
   - International academic institution
   - International justice-related agency/organization
   - Other (Specify) __________
   - Not provided

### Lessons learned

20. Anything they would do differently? (DESCRIBE BRIEFLY)
   - Not provided
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File Review Template – All Recipients Except Named Grants

The file review data will be entered into an excel spreadsheet.

Background

1. Name of organization/recipient, budget, fund, project title, file number

2. Follows JPIP report template
   - Yes
   - No

3. Year or years of funding (evaluation years only)
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - 2016-17
   - Not clear

4. Information contained in recipient’s file (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Application
   - Contribution agreement
   - Activity/summary reports
   - Budgets/financial reporting
   - Correspondences between JPIP program and recipient
   - Work plans
   - Other (Specify) _____

   Questions 5 to 7 from application;

5. Program which they applied for (first page of application). Complete for multiple years if applied for different programs in different years and indicate the years.
   - Not given

6. Funding program priorities that relate to their project (Question 2.5 of application).
   - promote the equitable representation in the legal system of Métis and Non-Status Indians by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law;
   - promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
   - build knowledge, awareness and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public on justice issues and other emerging justice issues;
   - provide operational funding to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy;
   - strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence;
   - promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence;
   - reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models and programs to empower Aboriginal women, and the development of resources and tools to provide Aboriginal women with alternatives to risky behavior
   - Not given

7. Briefly describe how their project is to address the priority (Question 2.5 of application)
   - Not given

8. Years of summary reports available – indicate if based on only a partial year
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - Unclear – dates not attached to all reports
Use the most recent summary report to complete remaining questions

9. Summary/annual report year that the remaining template questions are drawn from:
   - 2012-13
   - 2013-14
   - 2014-15
   - 2015-16
   - Unclear – date not attached to report used

10. Type of organization
    - Non-profit organization
    - Provincial or territorial government
    - Municipal government
    - Canadian educational institution/board of education
    - International organization
    - Band, tribal council, self-governing First Nation and Inuit
    - Other (Specify) _____
    - Not identifiable

11. Grants or contribution funded
    - Grants
    - Contribution

12. Type of project (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    - Public Legal Education and Information
    - Information sharing (conference/workshop/training/other)
    - Training and Education
    - System Development
    - Research
    - Linguistic/Legal Tools
    - Other (Specify) _____
    - Not provided

13. Objectives given:
    - Yes (summarize briefly) _____
    - No

14. If objectives given above, based on objectives what were the main areas of focus? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    - Family violence
    - Missing or murdered Indigenous women
    - Violence against Indigenous women and girls
    - Victims of crime
    - International law (justice-related issues in the international fora)
    - Access to justice
    - Public legal education and information
    - Criminal law reform
    - Justice policy
    - Other (Specify) _____
    - Not clear

15. Do the project objectives appear to align with the funding program priorities related to their project? (Compare answers to Q1 and Q14 to Q6)
    - Yes
    - No
    - Not clear

16. Gives extent objectives achieved
    - Yes – if yes, what extent achieved?
      
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Activities conducted (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (reviewer assess based on descriptions in reporting and application)
    - Offering workshops, conferences, symposiums
    - Offering training sessions
    - Conducting pilot, demonstration or research projects
    - Public legal education and information projects
    - Activities to promote international cooperation with respect to justice issues
    - Activities to promote increased harmonization of legislation
    - Research related to access to justice
    - Other (Specify) _____
    - Not clear
**Target population**

18. Target population (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- [ ] Children (0 to 12 years old)
- [ ] Youth (12 to 18 years old)
- [ ] Indigenous peoples
- [ ] Northern communities
- [ ] Remote communities
- [ ] Urban communities
- [ ] Ethno-cultural or visible minority groups
- [ ] Official language minority communities
- [ ] Homeless persons
- [ ] Persons with disabilities
- [ ] Persons with mental health issues (including FASD)
- [ ] Persons with addictions issues
- [ ] Persons undergoing separation or divorce
- [ ] Youth at risk
- [ ] Youth involved in the justice system
- [ ] Victims of crime
- [ ] Justice related professionals
- [ ] Other professional groups
- [ ] Governments (provincial/territorial)
- [ ] Seniors
- [ ] Other (Specify) ______
- [ ] Not provided

19. Reach - number of participants, numbers served, numbers of materials distributed, etc.

- [ ] Not provided

**Results**

20. Results achieved (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   a. Reports new skills, information, changed awareness
      - [ ] Yes (summarize briefly) ______
      - [ ] No
   b. Reports that identified best practices or potential responses to priority/emerging justice
      - [ ] Yes (summarize briefly) ______
      - [ ] No
   c. Reports that participants find that progress made developing best practices or responses to emerging justice issues
      - [ ] Yes (summarize briefly) ______
      - [ ] No

21. Reports unanticipated results
   - [ ] Yes (summarize briefly) ______
   - [ ] No

22. Reports positive response from target population on quality and utility of activities
   - [ ] Yes (Specify)
   - [ ] No

23. Reports that target audience reported increased knowledge/understanding of the relevant justice issue
   - [ ] Yes (Specify)
   - [ ] No

24. Reports on how project affected community's capacity to respond to he needs identified in the project
   - [ ] Yes (Specify)
   - [ ] No

25. Reports on how project affected Official Minority Communities
   - [ ] Yes (Specify)
   - [ ] No
### Partnerships

26. Number of partners
- [ ] None indicated (SKIP TO Q29)
- [ ] One
- [ ] Two
- [ ] Three
- [ ] Other (Specify) __________

27. If partners indicated, types of partners (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- [ ] Aboriginal/tribal organization/agency
- [ ] Victims of crime services
- [ ] Seniors services/organization
- [ ] Child welfare agency/organization
- [ ] Mental health organization/service/professionals
- [ ] Canadian justice/law enforcement/corrections officials/departments
- [ ] Other federal/provincial/territorial/municipal government officials/departments
- [ ] Canadian academic institution
- [ ] International government
- [ ] International academic institution
- [ ] Other international agency/organization
- [ ] Other (Specify) __________
- [ ] Not provided

28. What partners offered to project (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- [ ] Cash ▼
- [ ] Total amount from all partners $ __________

In-kind funding, in the form of:
- [ ] Knowledge, expertise, or skills
- [ ] Materials or space
- [ ] Other (Specify) __________
- [ ] Not provided/not clear

29. Description of partnership arrangement (check both if they indicated short-term for some partners and ongoing for others)
- [ ] Short-term
- [ ] Ongoing (have worked with them before)

30. Any potential partners suggested by their Department of Justice contact
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not identified

31. If yes, did they follow up on suggestion
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not identified

32. Would they do anything differently for partnerships?
- [ ] Yes (Specify) __________
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not identified

### Lessons learned

33. Reports on what worked well
- [ ] Yes (Specify) __________
- [ ] No

34. Reports on what did not work so well
- [ ] Yes (Specify) __________
- [ ] No

35. Reports on changes identified to build on lessons learned
- [ ] Yes (Specify) __________
- [ ] No
Communication of results

36. Are project results communicated
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not indicated

37. If yes, how are results communicated (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   □ Local media
   □ National media
   □ Conferences
   □ Workshops
   □ Meetings
   □ Reports
   □ Web site
   □ Newsletters
   □ Other (Specify) ______
   □ Not provided

38. Next steps identified
   □ Yes (Specify) ______
   □ No
Applicant survey
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Applicant Survey Questionnaire

Welcome to the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP or “the Program”) applicant survey. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Participation in the survey is voluntary. You may leave the survey at any time and come back later to complete the questions. If you do leave the survey prior to completion, we ask that you wait approximately 15 minutes to re-enter it, in order to give the survey a chance to refresh. The survey will be online until INSERT DATE.

About your organization

Please tell us a bit about your organization

1. Which of the following best describes your organization?
   - [ ] Non-profit organization
   - [ ] Provincial or territorial government
   - [ ] Municipal government
   - [ ] Canadian educational institution/board of education
   - [ ] International organization
   - [ ] Band, tribal council, self-governing First Nation, or Inuit
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

2. Which of the following areas does your organization conduct work in? (Check all that apply)
   - [ ] Family violence
   - [ ] Missing or murdered Indigenous women
   - [ ] Violence against Indigenous women and girls
   - [ ] Victims of crime
   - [ ] International law (justice-related issues in the international fora)
   - [ ] Access to justice
   - [ ] Public legal education and information
   - [ ] Criminal law reform
   - [ ] Justice policy
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

3. How did you first learn about the JPIP program?
   - [ ] Department of Justice Canada website
   - [ ] Department of Justice Canada – Other method (please specify)
   - [ ] From other organizations in your field
   - [ ] From organizations outside your field
   - [ ] Other (please specify)
   - [ ] Don’t know
4. How familiar are you with the JPIP? (4.1.3)
   - Very familiar
   - Somewhat familiar
   - Slightly familiar
   - Not at all familiar [SKIP TO Q6]

5. In general, how aware of the JPIP do you believe other organizations that may potentially be eligible for JPIP funding are? (4.1.3)
   - Very familiar
   - Somewhat familiar
   - Slightly familiar
   - Not at all familiar
   - Don’t know

6. Below lists some of the JPIP objectives. Please indicate for each the extent your organization needs or would benefit from support to help you in achieving these objectives. (4.1.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JPIP objectives</th>
<th>Extent your organization requires/could benefit from support to assist you in achieving the JPIP objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. promote the equitable representation in the legal system of Métis and Non-Status Indians by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders on justice issues</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among the public on justice issues</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models, programs, tools, and resources to provide alternatives to risky behaviour and to empower Aboriginal women</td>
<td>□ Great need □ Moderate need □ Slight need □ Not needed □ Don’t know or not applicable to your organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. To what extent would you say your organization needs or would benefit from support to help you in conducting the following activities for contributing towards JPIP objectives? (4.1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JPIP funded activities</th>
<th>Extent to which your organization requires/could benefit from support to help you in conducting the following activities</th>
<th>Don't know or not applicable to your organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offer workshops, conferences, symposiums</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offer training sessions</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pilot, demonstration, and research projects</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Public legal education and information projects</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Develop/off resources, tools, and supports related to family violence?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Culturally appropriate healing and support projects</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In your opinion, how well are the JPIP objectives and activities aligned with the justice needs of the general public? Would you say they are… (1.1.1)
   □ Completely aligned
   □ Very much aligned
   □ Somewhat aligned
   □ Slightly aligned
   □ Not at all aligned
   □ Don’t know

9. In your opinion, how well are the JPIP objectives and activities aligned with the justice needs of the legal community in general? Would you say they are… (1.1.1)
   □ Completely aligned
   □ Very much aligned
   □ Somewhat aligned
   □ Slightly aligned
   □ Not at all aligned
   □ Don’t know
About your JPIP project applications

(For successful and unsuccessful applicants)

10. Since April 1, 2012 how many times have you or your organization applied to the JPIP? Please indicate the total number of times, even if the applications have been for the same project. (1.2.2)
   - Once
   - Twice
   - Three times
   - Four times
   - Other (please specify)

11. If more than once, have these all been for the same project or for different projects? (1.2.2)
   - All the same
   - All different
   - Some the same and some different
   - Don’t know

12. Of the total times you’ve applied to the JPIP for funding since April 1, 2012, how many times were you successful and your application approved by the JPIP? Were all, some, or no applications approved? (1.2.1)
   - All were approved
   - Some were approved and some were not
     - How many were approved? ____
     - How many were not approved? ____
   - None were approved
   - Don’t know

   (CONTINUE WITH ALL RESPONDENTS BUT ADD THE FOLLOWING FOR THOSE THAT SAID SOME WERE APPROVED AND SOME WERE NOT) Most of the remaining questions are regarding your applications that were approved. Please respond with these projects in mind. We ask you a few questions at the end about your applications that were not approved.

13. (Successful applicants) What was the area of focus of the project or projects for which received JPIP funding? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   (Unsuccessful applicants) What was the area of focus of the project or projects for which you applied to the JPIP for funding? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (1.2.1)
   - Family violence
   - Missing or murdered Indigenous women
   - Violence against Indigenous women and girls
   - Victims of crime
   - International law (justice-related issues in the international for a)
   - Access to justice
   - Public legal education and information
   - Criminal law reform
   - Justice policy
   - Other (please specify)
14. (Successful applicants) What type of activities did you take part in through JPIP funding? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (1.2.2/4.2.4/4.2.5)

(Unsuccessful applicants) What type of activities did you plan to take part in through JPIP funding? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Offering workshops, conferences, symposiums
- Offering training sessions
- Conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects
- Public legal education and information projects
- Activities to promote international cooperation with respect to justice issues
- Activities to promote increased harmonization of legislation
- Research related to access to justice
- Other (Please specify)

15. Who were the intended direct beneficiaries or target population for this project or projects? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (1.2.1)

- Children (0 to 12 years old)
- Youth (12 to 18 years old)
- Indigenous peoples
- Northern communities
- Remote communities
- Urban communities
- Ethno-cultural or visible minority groups
- Official language minority communities
- Homeless persons
- Persons with disabilities
- Persons with mental health issues (including FASD)
- Persons with addictions issues
- Persons undergoing separation or divorce
- Youth at risk
- Youth involved in the justice system
- Victims of crime
- Justice-related professionals
- Other professional groups
- Governments (provincial/territorial)
- Seniors
- Other (please specify)

16. Besides your own organization, did you have any other partners for this project or projects? (4.1.1)

- Yes
- No SKIP TO Q20 IF SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT; Q21 IF UNSUCCESSFUL
- Don’t know SKIP TO Q20 IF SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT; Q21 IF UNSUCCESSFUL
17. If yes, what were these partners to contribute to the project or projects? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (4.1.1)
   - Cash funding
   - In-kind contribution (please specify)__________________________
   - Other (please specify)_______________________________________
   - Don't know

   UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS SKIP TO Q21; SUCCESSFUL AND THOSE WHO WERE BOTH SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL CONTINUE

18. Overall, how satisfied are you with the partnerships you have or had for your JPIP project or projects? (4.1.7)
   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied
   - Don’t know

19. Could you please explain why you were [ENTER RESPONSE FROM PREVIOUS QUESTION] with the partnerships you had for your JPIP funded project or projects? (4.1.7)

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   Don’t know

20. (Successful applicants) Would this project have been able to proceed without the JPIP funding? (4.1.3)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

   [SKIP TO Q24]

21. (Unsuccessful applicants) Was this project able to proceed without the JPIP funding? (4.1.3)
   - Yes, the project was able to proceed but with changes necessary due to not receiving JPIP funding (e.g., change in scope, need to find other partners)
   - Yes, the project was able to proceed with no changes necessary due to not receiving JPIP funding [SKIP TO Q23]
   - No [SKIP TO Q23]
   - Don’t know [SKIP TO Q23]

22. Please explain:
   a. What changes were necessary in order for the project to proceed?
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________

   b. How did this affect the success of the project (e.g., achievement of objectives)?
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
23. Were any of your funding sources for this project (e.g., cash or in-kind resources from partners or other funders) dependent on receiving the JPIP funding and unavailable due to not receiving JPIP funding?

☐ Yes (please explain) ____________________________
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

24. Do you plan to re-apply to the JPIP in the future? (1.1.1/5.1.1)

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

25. If no, why not?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(IF THEY INDICATED NONE IN Q12, GO TO Q33)

Results of funded projects

[For successful applicants only]

The following section concerns the results of your JPIP-funded project(s) or activities.

26. Is/are your JPIP-funded project, or projects, completed or still ongoing?

☐ All completed
☐ Some completed and some ongoing
☐ All ongoing
☐ Don’t know

27. To what extent was/were your completed JPIP project(s) able to achieve its/their objectives, or to what extent do you expect your ongoing JPIP project(s) to achieve its/their objectives? (4.2 to 4.5 depending on project)

☐ Fully achieved
☐ Almost all achieved
☐ Some achieved
☐ A few achieved
☐ None achieved [SKIP TO Q0]
☐ Don’t know [SKIP TO Q0]

28. [If it achieved at least a few objectives] Please describe the factors and best practices that have assisted your project with those objectives that have been achieved/that you expect to achieve. (4.6.2)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
29. Please describe the challenges, if any, encountered and how these affected the achievement of the project objectives. (4.6.1)

30. To what extent would you say that your JPIP-funded project or projects contributed to each of the following JPIP objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JPIP objectives</th>
<th>Extent your JPIP funded project achieved JPIP objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. promote the equitable representation in the legal system of Métis and Non-Status Indians by encouraging them to pursue their studies in law (4.2.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues, and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system (4.4.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among justice stakeholders on justice issues (4.2.3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. build knowledge, awareness, and understanding among the public on justice issues (4.2.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. strengthen the justice system’s response to family violence (4.4.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence (4.4.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. reduce the vulnerability of young Aboriginal women to violence through the development of models, programs, tools, and resources to provide alternatives to risky behaviour and to empower Aboriginal women (4.4.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. To what extent do you believe you were able to reach the intended target audience for this JPIP-funded project? (1.2.1)

☐ To a very great extent
☐ To a great extent
☐ To some extent
☐ To little extent
☐ Not at all
☐ Don’t know
☐ Not applicable to your project
32. Could you please describe how the beneficiaries/target population of your JPIP-funded activities benefited from the project activities? (4.2 to 4.5 depending on project)

[Insert response here]

☐ Don’t know

Public legal education and information

33. Are you familiar with public legal education and information, or PLEI, materials and activities?

☐ Yes

☐ No [SKIP TO Q36]

34. If yes, to what extent would you say the general public finds PLEI materials/activities useful in addressing their legal needs and concerns? (4.2.2)

☐ To a very great extent

☐ To a great extent

☐ To some extent

☐ To a little extent

☐ Not at all

☐ Don’t know [SKIP TO Q36]

35. Please explain why you believe the general public finds PLEI materials useful [INSERT RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]. (4.2.2)

[Insert response here]
Satisfaction with the JPIP application process

For successful and unsuccessful applicants

The next few questions ask about the JPIP application process.

36. How satisfied are you with each of the following with respect to the application process? (5.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the JPIP application process</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the ease of the application process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the clarity of the application process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the type of information required in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the application form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the ease of interactions between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicants and JPIP representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. the timeliness of responses to your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queries or communications with Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. the appropriateness of selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. the timeliness of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the status of your application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(approval decisions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other aspects of JPIP application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Do you have any suggestions for improving the application process? (5.1.1)

☐ No suggestions

[IF ANSWERED NONE IN Q12 GO TO Q48]
38. [For successful applicants only — those who answered “All” or “Some” in Q12] How satisfied is your organization with each of the following for your successful applications? (5.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the JPIP funding, project management, and reporting process</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the amounts awarded</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the time period of funding awarded</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the timeliness of payments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the funding reporting requirements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. the assistance received from JPIP representatives for meeting reporting requirements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other aspects of JPIP funding, project management or reporting (please specify)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Do you have any suggestions for improving the JPIP management and reporting process? (5.1.1)

Q40 TO Q0 are for respondents that said some applications were accepted and some were not in Q12; all others SKIP TO Q48

The remaining questions ask about the projects where your JPIP application was not approved.

40. What was the area of focus of the project or projects for which you applied to the JPIP for funding but were not approved? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (1.2.1)

- ☐ Family violence
- ☐ Missing or murdered Indigenous women
- ☐ Violence against Indigenous women and girls
- ☐ Victims of crime
- ☐ International law (justice-related issues in the international fora)
- ☐ Access to justice
- ☐ Public legal education and information
- ☐ Criminal law reform
- ☐ Justice policy
- ☐ Other (please specify)
41. What type of activities did you plan to take part in through JPIP funding? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Offering workshops, conferences, symposiums
   - Offering training sessions
   - Conducting pilot, demonstration, or research projects
   - Public legal education and information projects
   - Activities to promote international cooperation with respect to justice issues
   - Activities to promote increased harmonization of legislation
   - Research related to access to justice
   - Other (Please specify)

42. Who were the intended direct beneficiaries or target population for this project or projects? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (1.2.1)
   - Children (0 to 12 years old)
   - Youth (12 to 18 years old)
   - Indigenous peoples
   - Northern communities
   - Remote communities
   - Urban communities
   - Ethno-cultural or visible minority groups
   - Official language minority communities
   - Homeless persons
   - Persons with disabilities
   - Persons with mental health issues (including FASD)
   - Persons with addictions issues
   - Persons undergoing separation or divorce
   - Youth at risk
   - Youth involved in the justice system
   - Victims of crime
   - Justice-related professionals
   - Other professional groups
   - Governments (provincial/territorial)
   - Seniors
   - Other (please specify)

43. Besides your own organization, did you have any other partners for this project or projects? (4.1.1)
   - Yes
   - No [SKIP TO Q45]
   - Don’t know [SKIP TO Q45]

44. If yes, what were these partners to contribute to the project or projects? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) (4.1.1)
   - Cash funding
   - In-kind contribution (please specify)
   - Other (please specify)
   - Don’t know
45. Was this project able to proceed without the JPIP funding? (4.1.3)
   □ Yes, the project was able to proceed but with changes necessary due to not receiving JPIP funding (e.g., change in scope, need to find other partners)
   □ Yes, the project was able to proceed with no changes necessary due to not receiving JPIP funding [SKIP TO Q47]
   □ No [SKIP TO Q47]
   □ Don’t know [SKIP TO Q47]

46. Please explain:
   a. What changes were necessary in order for the project to proceed?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

   b. How did this affect the success of the project (e.g., achievement of objectives)?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

47. Were any of your funding sources for this project (e.g., cash or in-kind resources from partners or other funders) dependent on receiving the JPIP funding and unavailable due to not receiving JPIP funding?
   □ Yes (please explain)________________________________________
   □ No
   □ Don’t know

   (All respondents)

48. Do you have any other comments you would like to share about the JPIP program?
   □ Yes (please specify)________________________________________
   □ No

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey