

National Census of Community Legal Centres

2016 National Report

National Association of Community Legal Centres



First published in August 2017 by:

National Association of Community Legal Centres

ACN: 163 101 737

Tel: 02 9264 9595

Fax: 02 9264 9594

Mail: PO Box A2245 Sydney South NSW 1235 Australia

Email: naclc@clc.net.au

Web: www.naclc.org.au

Twitter: [@NACLCComms](https://twitter.com/NACLCComms)

© 2017 National Association of Community Legal Centres

Publication is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Please attribute to the National Association of Community Legal Centres.

Enquiries should be addressed to: naclc@clc.net.au phone 02 9264 9595.

Abbreviations

ATSILS	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service
BBS	Bulletin Board System
CLASS	Community Legal Assistance Services System
CLC	Community Legal Centre
CLE	Community Legal Education
CLSIS	Community Legal Services Information System
CLSP	Community Legal Services Programme
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
FVPLS	Family Violence Prevention Legal Service
MC	Management Committee
NACLC	National Association of Community Legal Centres
NAS	National Accreditation Scheme
PII	Professional Indemnity Insurance
PLT	Practical Legal Training
RAP	Reconciliation Action Plan
RMG	Risk Management Guide
RRR	Regional, Rural and Remote

Table of Contents

1. Background	6
2. Overview of findings	8
2.1. Funding	9
2.2. Turnaways	10
2.3. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships	11
2.4. Partnerships	12
2.5. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	13
2.6. Engagement with people with disability	14
2.7. Engagement with people from culturally and linguistically diverse background	14
2.8. Policy advocacy and law reform	14
2.9. CLC profile	15
2.10. Staffing	16
3. National data	17
3.1. Funding	17
3.1.1. <i>Funding sources</i>	17
3.1.2. <i>Hours spent on funding-related activities</i>	17
3.1.3. <i>Impact of 2017/18 nationally forecast funding cut</i>	17
3.2. Turnaways	18
3.2.1. <i>Number of turnaways</i>	18
3.2.2. <i>Appropriate, accessible and affordable referrals for turnaways</i>	18
3.2.3. <i>Collecting turnaway data</i>	18
3.2.4. <i>Methods for recording turnaways</i>	19
3.2.5. <i>Reasons for turnaways</i>	19
3.4. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships	21
3.4.1. <i>Use of volunteers</i>	22
3.4.2. <i>Hours and types of volunteers</i>	22
3.4.3. <i>Type of work undertaken by volunteers</i>	23
3.4.4. <i>Overall CLC investment in volunteers</i>	24
3.4.5. <i>Pro bono partnerships</i>	24
3.5. Partnerships	26
3.5.1. <i>Legal services</i>	26
3.5.2. <i>Community legal education</i>	26
3.5.3. <i>Policy advocacy and law reform</i>	27
3.6. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	28
3.6.1. <i>Clients identifying as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</i>	28
3.6.2. <i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified positions</i>	28
3.6.3. <i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in CLC roles</i>	29
3.6.4. <i>Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</i>	29
3.6.5. <i>Cultural awareness/safety training</i>	30
3.6.6. <i>Development of Reconciliation Action Plans ('RAPs')</i>	30
3.7. Engagement with people with disability	31
3.8. Engagement with clients from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds	32
3.9. Policy advocacy and law reform	33

3.9.1.	<i>Engagement in law reform and policy work</i>	33
3.9.2.	<i>Types of law reform and policy work</i>	33
3.9.3.	<i>Recent changes impacting on law reform and policy work</i>	33
3.10.	Profile of respondents	34
3.10.1.	<i>States and territories</i>	34
3.10.2.	<i>Position of person completing response</i>	34
3.10.3.	<i>Centre types</i>	35
3.10.4.	<i>Rural, Regional and Remote (RRR) services</i>	35
3.10.5.	<i>Specialist and generalist centres</i>	35
3.10.6.	<i>Specialist programs</i>	36
3.10.7.	<i>State-wide or national services or programs</i>	37
3.10.8.	<i>Branch offices</i>	37
3.10.9.	<i>Provision of outreach</i>	37
3.11.	CLCs' staffing	38
3.11.1.	<i>Number of paid staff</i>	38
3.11.2.	<i>Number of FTE staff</i>	38
3.11.3.	<i>Employment by position</i>	39

Appendices

Appendix A: Methodology and question development

Appendix B: Census questions

1. Background

Introduction

Census 2016 marks the fourth year since the National Association of Community Legal Centres ('NACLC') commenced running an annual, national survey of the community legal centre ('CLC') sector.

The Census provides a key source of information about the sector and its vital work and is used in informing NACLC's sector sustainability and development work, as well as its policy, advocacy and law reform work, and that of State and Territory CLC Associations. The Census also provides the sector with a strong historical data set that reflects the nature and composition of centres, our clients and our work.

In 2016, 129 CLCs responded to the Census.

NACLC acknowledges and appreciates centres who took the time to contribute to this important resource. Not only is the Census an important information and advocacy tool, it assists CLCs understanding of their similarities and differences, and the commonalities in their work. It also helps articulate the identity and importance of the role of CLCs in the legal assistance sector, their communities and the justice system more broadly.

Census Development and Purpose

As in previous years, the Census has been developed in consultation with the NACLC Board, NACLC Advisory Council members, State and Territory CLC Associations and staff.

In response to feedback from CLCs that the Census had become time consuming and burdensome due to increases in length and complexity over time, in 2016 NACLC reduced the length of the Census by nearly half.

The questions that have remained in the Census largely focus on the identity, work and clients of CLCs, allowing NACLC to continue the important work of 'mapping' trends and changes in the CLC sector and its clients.

Traditional questions relating to sector services and infrastructure were removed with the intention of surveying the sector separately on these matters. Some questions or themes have been removed entirely, while others have been removed with the intention that they will be collected on a less frequent basis – eg. biennially.

In 2016, the objectives of the Census were to:

- provide an evidence-base for decision-making and advocacy by NACLC, funded and unfunded state and territory associations and individual CLCs

- increase and facilitate the opportunity for CLCs to provide feedback and information to NACLC
- establish and maintain a national baseline survey framework which can support longitudinal analysis, but allow flexibility for future amendments
- support coordinated and efficient state/territory CLC data collection and use
- increase capacity to track emerging trends and changing sector priorities, and
- inform, support and improve marketing and promotion for the sector.

Appendix A sets out the methodology and other information about the development and fielding of the Census questions in 2016.

2. Overview of findings

CLCs were asked to provide responses to questions based on the 2015/16 financial year, unless stated otherwise (eg. for the staffing questions). Responses were received from October 2016 to February 2017.

For a more detailed breakdown of survey responses, please refer to the relevant section of the national data provided in Chapter 3.

Notes about using this data:

NACLC has included a list of some key considerations below, in order to assist you with interpreting and using any findings in this report:

- Always refer to the *n*= for the number of CLCs that responded to each particular question in your state/territory. When reading (or quoting) any figures, it is important to note that these percentages and numbers only represent those CLCs that responded to that particular question, from the pool of CLCs that responded to the Census this year.
- CLCs were asked to provide responses to questions based on the 2015/16 financial year, unless asked otherwise (e.g. for staffing questions). Please refer to the wording of each question to clarify the relevant period asked.
- If you wish to compare the findings with previous years state data (where available), NACLC cautions against making any broad statements comparing the findings and saying that an increase or decrease, for example, can be observed. This is because the total number of respondents to the Census differs in each year, and the profile of the centres responding is not identical.
- All percentages have been rounded to one decimal point.
- Due to rounding, total percentages in tables may appear as 99.9% or 100.1%

You may wish to use any or all of the above explanations and qualifications when using any of the data contained in this report in media releases, policy advocacy and law reform work or any other forums.

Where an asterisk (*) has been used, this means CLCs were able to select more than one option from a selection of tick boxes, and many did so.

2.1. Funding

Community legal centres continue to receive funding from a range of sources.

122 CLCs reported on their funding sources, with the top 3 sources of funding being:

- Commonwealth government (82% or 100 CLCs)
- State or territory government (main budget) (76.2% or 93 CLCs), and
- State or territory government (Public Purpose Fund/Legal Practitioner Interest on Trust Accounts Fund) (47.5% or 58 CLCs)

Funding-related activities including reporting, grant applications, advocacy, and fundraising require significant time investment. Increased reporting requirements and the ongoing funding shortfall across CLCs directly impacts on and reduce hours spent undertaking frontline service delivery.

- 118 CLCs reported spending **2,477.5 hours per week** in 2015/16 financial year on funding-related activities.

At the time of the Census, CLCs were expecting a 30% cut to Commonwealth funding nationally. In welcome news, the Commonwealth Government announced a reversal of the expected funding cuts and some State and Territory Governments announced additional funding. However, there is still a critical need for long-term, sustainable and predictable funding for the legal assistance sector.

While the following anticipated impacts related to the expected cut, they also illustrate the impact of underfunding, funding reductions and funding uncertainty on centres.

- 116 CLCs provided examples of the likely effect of the significant Commonwealth Government funding cut to CLCs nationally (forecast from 2017/18), with the main predicted impacts including:
 - increased number of turnaways
 - reduction in services overall, with associated negative outcomes for clients
 - reduction in staff hours and/or redundancies
 - reduction in outreach and closure of branch offices
 - loss of specialist services and programs, and
 - complete closure of some services.

2.2. Turnaways

The Census continues to be an important tool to gather data on the number of turnaways¹ and the reasons why CLCs are forced to turnaway people seeking legal help.

- CLCs were forced to **turnaway over 169,513 people** in the 2015/2016 financial year. 109 CLCs provided the actual number or an estimate of the number of people turned away.
- 32% of people turned away in 2015/16 could not be provided with an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral (as reported by 50 CLCs). This has fundamental implications for people across Australia who are unable to access the legal help they need.
- The majority of respondents (42.2% or 54 CLCs from 128 respondents) reported recording turnaways 'some of the time', with 35.9% or 46 CLCs recording turnaways 'all of the time'. This, along with the number of respondents, means that the turnaway figure included above is a conservative one.
- The most prevalent reasons for turnaways,* as reported by 99 CLCs, were:
 - conflict of interest (79.8% or 79 CLCs)
 - insufficient resources (74.7% or 74 CLCs), and
 - person's legal problem was outside our centre's priority area/client group (74.7% or 74 CLCs).
- The methods used for collecting turnaways, as reported by 96 CLCs were:
 - entering "information referrals" in the Community Legal Services Information System (CLISIS)²,
 - spreadsheets,
 - telephone systems that collect the number of calls that did not get through on advice lines (these are recorded as turnaways), and
 - practice management systems.

As noted above, 74.7% (74 CLCs) reported that people were turned away because their legal problem was outside the centre's priority area/client group.

This could reflect the fact that at least some of the CLCs offered specialist services that have priority areas and clients. It could also, or alternatively mean, that centres have been compelled to make a policy decision to focus on work in a particular priority area or not to do certain types/areas of work due to limited resources.

¹ In the Census, a 'turnaway' was defined as: 'any person your CLC had to send away because you were unable to assist them within the needed timeframe or because of a lack of resources, lack of centre expertise or your centre's eligibility policy'.

² CLSIS is the database system used by the majority of CLCs to record client information and statistics from 2003 to 2016.

2.3. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships

Volunteers and pro bono partnerships³ significantly increase the capacity of CLCs to provide services for people across Australia.

Volunteers

Every year CLCs harness the energy and expertise of thousands of barristers, solicitors, law students and others to provide legal and related services in centres across Australia.

- 93.5% (116 CLCs from 124 respondents) reported utilising the skills and expertise of volunteers.
- 112 CLCs provided detailed information about the types of volunteer and hours contributed. These 112 CLCs reported that 6,773 volunteers contributed a total of 17,098 hours of work per week in the 2015/16 financial year. This means that in 2015/16 **a total of 889,096 work hours were contributed by volunteers in 2015/16.**
- The 3 main categories of volunteer contributions, as reported by these 112 CLCs, were from:
 - students – undergraduate law (2,679 volunteers contributed 7,760 hours per week to CLCs),
 - lawyers (2,452 contributed 2,852 hours per week), and
 - law graduates – Practical Legal Training ('PLT') (549 contributed 3,625 hours).
- The 3 main types of work undertaken by volunteers,* as reported by 113 CLCs, were:
 - involvement in direct legal service delivery (91.2% or 103 CLCs),
 - administrative support (73.5% or 83 CLCs), and
 - policy advocacy and law reform (57.5% or 65 CLCs).

Importantly however, engagement of volunteers requires significant training, supervision and support as well as an administrative load. As a result, with 889,096 hours contributed by volunteers in 2015/16, an average of approximately⁴ **1 staff hour was spent to garner 6.4 quality assured volunteer hours.**

³ In the Census, NACLC defined a volunteer as: 'an individual, who provides skills and experience to a CLC, free of charge.' A pro bono partner was defined as: 'a professional or firm that, as a business, has formally committed to allocating resources and making a contribution to a CLC and/or its clients, free of charge'.

⁴ The word 'approximately' is used because the number of CLCs that responded to each question about hours spent on supervising, inducting, orientating and training volunteers varied.

- 2,177.8 hours were spent per week responding to volunteers' queries and otherwise supervising volunteers in 2015/16, as reported by 105 CLCs. (113,245.6 hours over the 12 month period)
- 14,848.6 hours were spent on developing and providing orientation and induction training to volunteers in the 2015/16 financial year, as reported by 105 CLCs.
- 10,508.5 hours were spent on developing and providing training other than orientation/induction training to volunteers in the 2015/16 financial year, as reported by 98 CLCs.
- Combining the annual figures for induction, supervision and training, employed staff at CLCs spent approximately⁵ 138,602.7 hours supporting the work of volunteers in 2015/16.

Pro bono partnerships

The contribution of pro bono partners to the work of CLCs in assisting clients across Australia every year cannot be underestimated.

- Of the 122 CLCs that responded to a question about working with pro bono partners, 63.1% (77 CLCs) reported having a pro bono partnership.
- **57,848 hours of pro bono assistance** was provided to 70 of these centres and their clients over the 2015/16 financial year, including 46,261 hours from lawyers for direct service delivery to clients. Given the number of respondents, this is likely to be a conservative number that does not reflect the full pro bono contribution to CLCs across Australia.

It is, however, important to recognise the resources required to establish and maintain pro bono relationships can be significant; pro bono support is sometimes not available in particular areas of law or in rural, regional and remote (RRR) areas; and most importantly, cannot be a substitute for government-funded legal assistance services.

2.4. Partnerships

CLCs have a history of working collaboratively with both legal and non-legal service providers, including with other legal assistance services; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community-controlled organisations; the private profession; pro bono partners; community organisations; and Commonwealth, state and local government agencies.

⁵ See above footnote for explanation about the use of the word 'approximately'

- The most common partners in the delivery of legal services were other CLCs (58% or 69 CLCs from 119 respondents),* followed by 47.1% partnering with legal pro bono partners and 47.1% partnered with legal aid commissions. These statistics reflect the strong collaboration centres undertake to ensure clients receive the most appropriate assistance.
- Non-legal community organisations were the primary partners for CLCs when delivering community legal education (73.1% or 87 CLCs from 119 respondents).*
- Other CLCs were also the most common partner in policy, advocacy and law reform projects (58% or 69 CLCs from 119 respondents).*

2.5. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

The Census asked a series of questions about the engagement of CLCs with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities.

- The **average proportion of CLC clients identifying as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person was 15.4%**, while the median⁶ was 5% (across 73 respondents).
- Participating in community events was the main type of community engagement (as reported by 72% or 72 CLCs from 100 respondents).*

Over the past 12 months, one focus of NACLC's work has been on supporting centres to ensure they provide culturally safe and appropriate services,⁷ including through employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

- 18% (22 CLCs from 122 respondents) reported having at least one Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified position.
- 74.6% (90 CLCs from 119 respondents) report that staff undertake cultural awareness/safety training.
- Of the 118 CLCs that responded to a question about whether their CLC has or is considering developing a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP), 5.9% or 7 CLCs have already developed and implemented a RAP, and 43.2% or 51 CLCs are either currently developing or planning for a RAP within the next 12 months.
- 33.9% or 40 of the 118 CLCs have not yet considered developing a RAP.

⁶ The median result falls in the middle of all results when sorted in order of size.

⁷ For example, through introduction of a mandatory cultural safety standard as part of the National Accreditation Scheme; development of resources and guidance for centres; and training and information sessions.

2.6. Engagement with people with disability

Community legal centres across Australia work with and provide vital services to people with disability. Across 67 respondents, the average proportion of CLC clients identifying as persons with disability was 24%, while the median was 19.7%.

2.7. Engagement with people from culturally and linguistically diverse background

Community legal centres across Australia work with and provide vital services to people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds and CALD communities. Across 63 respondents, the average proportion of CLC clients identifying as persons from a culturally and linguistically diverse background was 25.8%, while the median was 18%.

2.8. Policy advocacy and law reform

CLCs have a long and successful history of bringing about systemic change through policy, advocacy and law reform. This work is crucial in identifying and encouraging reform of laws, policies and practices that are not operating effectively or equitably.

Importantly, while CLCs are restricted from undertaking this work with Commonwealth funding under the National Partnership Agreement on Legal Assistance Services, many CLCs continue to direct non-Commonwealth funding and resources to this important work.

- **76.2% (93 CLCs from 122 respondents) reported undertaking policy and law reform activities** in the 2015/16 financial year.
- The main 3 forms of policy and law reform activities*, as reported by 94 CLCs, were:
 - preparing submissions to inquiries (93.6% or 88 CLCs)
 - meeting with MPs and/or their staff (63.8% or 60 CLCs), and
 - letter writing to MPs (60.6% or 57 CLCs).

2.9. CLC profile

To establish some information about respondents, the initial questions in the Census asked for information about the state in which the service operated, type of service, specialist programs offered and service delivery locations, among other factors.

- 129 CLCs completed the survey.⁸ The state/territory breakdown was:
 - 25.6% (33 CLCs) from New South Wales
 - 23.3% (30 CLCs) from Victoria
 - 21.7% (28 CLCs) from Queensland
 - 14.7% (19 CLCs) from Western Australia
 - 4.7% (6 CLCs) from Tasmania
 - 4.7% (6 CLCs) from South Australia
 - 3.1% (4 CLCs) from Northern Territory, and
 - 2.3% (3 CLCs) from Australian Capital Territory.
- 96.1% (124 respondents) identified as CLCs, 3.1% (4 respondents) as FVPLS and 0.8% (1 respondent) as ATSILS.
- 42.6% (55 CLCs) classified themselves as delivering a specialist service, 38.8% (50 CLCs) as a generalist service with specialist programs and 18.6% (24 CLCs) as a generalist service.
- 105 CLCs reported on the client groups or area where their CLC offers specialist programs, with the top 3 being:
 - domestic/family violence (43.8% or 46 CLCs)
 - Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander peoples (38.1% or 40 CLCs)
 - family law (38.1% or 40 CLCs)
- 83% (107 CLCs from 129 respondents) reported that they provide services to clients and communities in regional, rural and remote ('RRR') areas.
- 48.4% (62 CLCs from 128 respondents) reported that their CLC was a state-wide or national service, or offered state-wide or national programs.
- 46.5% of CLCs (60 CLCs of the 129 Census respondents) reported having one or more branch office.
- 79.1% (102 CLCs from 129 respondents) reported offering legal outreach at a location or locations other than their main or branch offices.

⁸ Not all 129 CLCs responded to every single question. The number of responses to each question has generally been included in the summary. If you wish to confirm the n=, please refer to the relevant section in the report below.

2.10. Staffing

Unlike the other Census questions, staffing questions were aimed at capturing staffing at a 'point in time' – that is, at the time when the CLC completed the Census, rather than for the 2015/16 financial year.

- 120 CLCs reported employing a total of 1,693 people.
 - 48.9% (828 people) of those people were employed full-time.
 - 42.9% (727 people) of those people were employed part-time.
 - 8.1% (138 people) of those people were employed on a casual basis.
- 119 CLCs then reported their number of full-time equivalent ('FTEs') staff, with 1,279 FTE staff employed by these CLCs.
- The biggest group of FTE staff were lawyers (42.1% or 605.9 FTE staff), as reported by 125 CLCs.⁹

⁹ This figure includes staff identified as lawyers (32.9% or 474 FTE staff) and the 9.2% of staff (131.9 FTE staff) employed as principal lawyers, including those who manage their CLC, and those who do not manage their CLC.

3. National data

3.1. Funding

3.1.1. Funding sources

In 2016, CLCs were asked to report upon their funding sources.

Table 1: Funding sources, multiple answers possible (n=122)

Funding Sources	Number of CLCs	Percentage %
Commonwealth Government	100	82.0
State or Territory Government (Main Budget)	93	76.2
State or Territory Government (Public Purpose Fund etc)	58	47.5
Fundraising and sponsorship	40	32.8
Philanthropic	29	23.8
Number of responding CLCs	122	

Question: From which of the following sources did your CLC receive funding? (Tick all that apply)

3.1.2. Hours spent on funding-related activities

118 CLCs reported spending 2,477.4 hours per week in 2015/16 financial year on funding-related activities (e.g. reporting, grant applications, lobbying and fundraising).

3.1.3. Impact of 2017/18 nationally forecast funding cut

116 CLCs provided examples of the likely effect of the significant Commonwealth Government funding cut to CLCs nationally (forecast from 2017/18), with the main predicted impacts including:

- reduction in staff hours of both legal and non-legal staff
- reduction in services overall, with associated negative outcomes for clients
- reduction in outreach specifically
- loss of specialist services and programs
- closure of branch offices
- staff redundancies, including the loss of specialist positions – e.g., positions for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander staff
- increased number of turnaways, and
- complete closure of some services.

3.2. Turnaways

For the purposes of the 2016 Census, a ‘turnaway’ by a CLC was defined as:

any person your CLC had to send away because you were unable to assist them within the needed timeframe or because of a lack of resources, lack of centre expertise, conflict of interest or your centre’s eligibility policy.

3.2.1. Number of turnaways

109 CLCs provided the actual number or an estimate of the number of people turned away in the 2015/16 financial year. The total number of people turned away from these 109 CLCs in 2015/16 was 169,513 people.

Table 2: Turnaways (n=109)

Number of turnaways	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
1-499	55	50.5
500-999	20	18.3
1000-1999	14	12.8
2000-4999	13	11.9
5000 and more	7	6.4
Total	109	100.0

Question: *Please give the actual number or an estimate of the number of clients who received legal advice, casework and information services from your centre in the 2015/16 financial year?*

3.2.2. Appropriate, accessible and affordable referrals for turnaways

50 CLCs responded to the question, ‘of your total turnaways in the 2015/16 financial year, to what proportion (per cent) could you give an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral?’ The average was 68%, and the median was 80%.

3.2.3. Collecting turnaway data

Of the 128 CLCs that responded to a question about whether they recorded turnaways, the majority (42.2% or 54 CLCs) recorded turnaways ‘some of the time’.

Table 3: Recording of turnaways (n=128)

Recording 'turnaways'	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
Yes – some of the time	54	42.2
Yes – all the time	46	35.9
No – never	28	21.9
Total	128	100.0

Question: Did your CLC record 'turnaways' in the 2015/16 financial year?

3.2.4. Methods for recording turnaways

96 CLCs that record turnaways described how they record turnaways.

Methods were:

- entering “information referrals” in the Community Legal Services Information System (CLSIS)¹⁰,
- spreadsheets,
- telephone systems that collect the number of calls that did not get through on advice lines (these are recorded as turnaways), and
- practice management systems.

Note, the Community Legal Service Information System ('CLSIS') database – used for data collection by CLCs in the Community Legal Services Programme from 2003 to 2017 – did not have capacity to specifically record turnaways. The new Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS) database will provide improved data collection which will enhance statistical analysis.

3.2.5. Reasons for turnaways

CLCs were asked to identify the reasons why they turned away clients in 2015/16 by selecting all relevant grounds from a list. 99 CLCs gave reasons for turnaways*.

The top 3 most prevalent reasons (in order) were:

1. conflict of interest (79.8% or 79 CLCs)
2. our centre had insufficient resources at the time (74.7% or 74 CLCs), and
3. person's legal problem was outside our centre's priority area/client group (74.7% or 74 CLCs).

¹⁰ CLSIS is the database system used by the majority of CLCs to record client information and statistics from 2003 to 2016.

Table 4: Reasons for turnaways, multiple answers possible (n=99)

Reasons for turnaways	No. of CLCs	%
Conflict of interest	79	79.8
Person's legal problem was outside our centre's priority area	74	74.7
Our centre had insufficient resources at the time	74	74.7
Unable to assist in the timeframe the client needed	68	68.7
Our centre didn't possess the relevant expertise	67	67.7
Person outside the catchment area	54	54.5
Person was already being relevantly assisted by another legal assistance provider	48	48.5
Person was already being assisted by a private lawyer and could continue to afford this	41	41.4
Other (please specify)	14	14.1
No of responding CLCs	99	

Question: *What were the reasons your centre turned clients away in 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).*

3.4. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships

Volunteers and pro bono partnerships¹¹ significantly increase the capacity of CLCs to provide services. Every year CLCs harness the energy and expertise of thousands of barristers, solicitors, law students and others to provide legal and related services in centres across Australia.

NACLC believes that an important distinction exists between volunteers and pro bono workers. In the Census, a ‘volunteer’ was defined as:

an individual who provides skills and experience to a CLC, free of charge.

A volunteer relationship is between the individual lawyer/law student (for example) and the CLC and its clients. Respondents were asked not to include Management Committee/Board members as volunteers, when those members were fulfilling their usual governance duties. However, if MC/Board members undertook other volunteer work, external from their governance responsibilities, for the CLC (or its clients) in that year, respondents were asked to report these contributions.

A ‘pro bono partner’ was defined in the Census as:

a professional or firm that, as a business, has formally committed to allocating resources and making a contribution to a CLC and/or its clients, free of charge.

A pro bono relationship is between a business and a CLC. Pro bono contributions usually occur in an organised way that may be formalised in an agreement. There is often (but not always) a benefit to the law firm as a business.

¹¹ In the Census, NACLC defined a volunteer as: ‘an individual, who provides skills and experience to a CLC, free of charge.’ A pro bono partner was defined as: ‘a professional or firm that, as a business, has formally committed to allocating resources and making a contribution to a CLC and/or its clients, free of charge’.

3.4.1. Use of volunteers

Of the 124 CLCs who responded to a question about volunteers, 93.5% (116 CLCs) indicated that volunteers were used in the 2015/16 financial year.

3.4.2. Hours and types of volunteers

Of the 124 CLCs who responded to the initial question about volunteers, 112 CLCs then provided detailed information about the types and numbers of volunteers they had at their centre in 2015/16.

112 CLCs reported that 6,773 volunteers contributed a total of 17,098 hours of work per week in 2015/16. Multiplying this figure by 52 weeks suggests that volunteers contributed 889,096 hours to those 112 CLCs in 2015/16.

Table 5: Types of volunteers, numbers and hours worked (n=112)

Volunteer Position	Number of CLCs with vol type	Maximum per CLC	TOTAL number of vols	Average Vols per CLC with vol type	Total Sector Hours per week
Lawyers	87	240	2452	28.2	2852
Migration Agents	6	32	52	8.7	82
CLE/Community Development Workers	10	5	18	1.8	328
Students					
- Undergrad Law	93	150	2679	28.8	7760
Students					
-Undergrad Social Work	16	6	39	2.4	196
Law Graduate – PLT	66	100	549	8.3	3625
Counsellors - Financial	2	2	3	1.5	18
Counsellors					
- Family Violence	1	1	1	1.0	14
Administrative Assistants	37	40	243	6.6	1594
Finance Officer/ Bookkeepers	6	5	10	1.7	34
Fundraisers	7	30	46	6.6	38
Other Volunteers	38	115	681	17.9	557
TOTAL			6773		17098

Question: Please provide the total number of volunteers at your centre in the 2015/16 financial year in each of the following categories; and Please calculate or make your best estimate as to the total number of hours provided by each category of volunteer PER WEEK at your centre in 2015/16 financial year.

3.4.3. Type of work undertaken by volunteers

The main activity undertaken by volunteers at CLCs was involvement in direct legal service delivery (91.2% or 103 CLCs from 113 respondents).

Table 6: Work undertaken by CLC volunteers, multiple answers possible (n=113)

Type of volunteer work	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
Involvement in direct legal service delivery	103	91.2
Administrative support	83	73.5
Policy advocacy and law reform	65	57.5
Community legal education/community development	59	52.2
Involvement in other direct service delivery	28	24.8
Other (please specify)	19	16.8
Fundraising or sponsorship activities	16	14.2
Accounting/bookkeeping	8	7.1
Number of responding CLCs	113	

Question: What type of work was undertaken by your CLC volunteers in the 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

3.4.4. Overall CLC investment in volunteers

To find out more about support of and investment in CLC volunteers in the 2015/16 financial year, respondents were asked to provide hours that employed CLC staff spent supervising, inducting and training volunteers.

Combining the annual figures for induction, supervision and training, employed staff at 105 CLCs spent approximately¹² 138,602.7 hours supporting the work of volunteers in 2015/16. Considering the 889,096 total hours contributed by volunteers in 2015/16, an average of approximately¹³ 1 staff hour was spent to garner 6.4 quality assured volunteer hours.

Table 7: Hours CLCs spent supervising, inducting and training volunteers (n=105)

Volunteers	Hours per week supervising volunteers	Hours in 2015/16 developing and inducting volunteers	Hours in 2015/16 providing other training to volunteers
Number of Responding CLCs	105	105	98
Mean	24.0	24.0	31.0
Median	12.0	50.0	24.5
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	183.0	1092.0	1520.0
Total Sector Hours	2177.8	14848.6	10508.5

Question: Please estimate the total number of hours employed staff spent at your CLC supervising, supporting and training volunteers – both legal and non-legal volunteers

3.4.5. Pro bono partnerships

CLCs were asked to quantify the number of hours contributed by pro bono partners to their centre in a number of different business areas over the 2015/16 financial year. A 'pro bono partner' was defined in the Census as:

a professional or firm that, as a business, has formally committed to allocating resources and making a contribution to a CLC and/or its clients, free of charge.

Of the 122 centres that answered this question, 63.1% (77 CLCs) reported that their CLC had a pro bono partnership with a business.

70 of the 77 CLCs provided a breakdown of the hours. These partnerships contributed 57,848 hours of assistance to these 70 CLCs over the 2015/16 financial

¹² The word 'approximately' is used because the number of CLCs that responded to each question about hours spent on supervising, inducting, orientating and training volunteers varied.

¹³ See above footnote for explanation about the use of the word 'approximately'.

year. The majority of hours were contributed by pro bono lawyers providing direct service delivery to clients.

Table 8: Number of hours contributed by pro bono partnerships (n=70)

Activity	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%) of responding CLCs	Max hours per CLC	Total Hours to CLC Sector
Involvement in direct service delivery	54	77.1	20000	46261
Provision of advice or assistance to centre	52	74.3	300	2787
Provision of advice by specialist lawyers	38	54.3	1040	4951
Policy advocacy and law reform	18	25.7	600	1440
Community Legal Education	16	22.9	100	451
Legal Practice Management	9	12.9	120	471
Accounting/Bookkeeping	0	0.0	0	0
Administrative Support	7	10.0	100	256
Governance/Management	11	15.7	150	406
Publications (e.g. design & printing)	20	28.6	80	511
Marketing	6	8.6	20	58
Fundraising or sponsorship	13	18.6	60	256
Total hours				57,848

Question: Please estimate the total number of hours that pro bono partnerships contributed to your centre in each of the following areas in the 2015/16 financial year

3.5. Partnerships

CLCs have a history of working collaboratively with both legal and non-legal service providers, including with other legal assistance services; the private profession; pro bono partners; community organisations; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community-controlled organisations; and Commonwealth, state and local governments and agencies.

In the 2016 Census, 122 CLCs selected from a list the organisations and agencies with which they had partnered to deliver legal services, community legal education, and/or policy advocacy and law reform in the 2015/16 financial year.

3.5.1. Legal services

The 122 respondents reported that their most common partners when delivering legal services were other CLCs (58% or 69 CLCs), Legal Aid (47.1% or 56 CLCs) and pro bono partners – legal (47.1% or 56 CLCs).

Table 9: Partners for legal services, multiple answers possible (n=119)

Partnership	Number of CLCs	%
CLCs	69	58.0
Legal Aid	56	47.1
Pro Bono Partners - legal	56	47.1
Community Organisation - Non-legal	55	46.2
University	45	37.8
Aboriginal Controlled Organisation	32	26.9
ATSILS	20	16.8
State Govt Agency	19	16.0
Community Organisation - Legal	18	15.1
FVPLS	17	14.3
Local Govt Agency	17	14.3
Commonwealth Govt Agency	15	12.6
Pro Bono Partners - non-legal	12	10.1
Number of responding CLCs	119	

Question: Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering legal services in the 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

3.5.2. Community legal education

For the 119 respondents, community organisations – non-legal were the primary partners for CLCs when delivering community legal education (73.1% or 87 CLCs).

Table 10: Partners for community legal education, multiple answers possible (n=119)

Partnership	Number of CLCs	Percentage %
Community Organisation - Non-legal	87	73.1
CLCs	67	56.3
University	49	41.2
Legal Aid	46	38.7
State Govt Agency	38	31.9
Aboriginal Controlled Organisation	37	31.1
Pro Bono Partners - legal	33	27.7
Local Govt Agency	28	23.5
Community Organisation - Legal	27	22.7
FVPLS	19	16.0
Commonwealth Govt Agency	19	16.0
ATSILS	13	10.9
Pro Bono Partners - non-legal	11	9.2
Number of responding CLCs	119	

Question: Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering community legal education in the 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

3.5.3. Policy advocacy and law reform

For the 119 respondents, other CLCs were the most common partner in policy advocacy and law reform projects (58% or 69 CLCs).

Table 11: Partners for policy advocacy/law reform, multiple answers possible (n=119)

Partnership	No. of CLCs	%
CLCs	69	58.0
Community Organisation - Non-legal	51	42.9
University	31	26.1
State Govt Agency	22	18.5
Aboriginal Controlled Organisation	22	18.5
Pro Bono Partners - legal	21	17.6
Legal Aid	19	16.0
Commonwealth Govt Agency	18	15.1
Community Organisation - Legal	18	15.1
ATSILS	15	12.6
FVPLS	14	11.8
Local Govt Agency	14	11.8
Pro Bono Partners - non-legal	6	5.0
Number of responding CLCs	119	

Question: Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering policy advocacy and law reform in the 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

3.6. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

The Census asked a series of questions about the engagement of CLCs with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities.

3.6.1. Clients identifying as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

Centres were again asked to indicate the proportion of their clients, as a percentage of their total number of clients in the 2015/16 financial year, who identified as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Among the 73 CLCs that answered this question, the average proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients was 15.4%, and the median¹⁴ result was 5%.

The higher average figure in comparison to the median figure mirrors is inflated by 6 CLCs that reported Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples constituted 86% or more of their client base.

Both the average and median percentages of clients identifying as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander remains above the percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the total Australian population (2.8%).¹⁵

3.6.2. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified positions

Of the 122 centres that responded to a question about having an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified staff position, 18% (22 CLCs) indicated that they have at least 1 identified position that can only be filled by an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person. Three centres (2.5%) reported that they planned to introduce such a position within the next 12 months.

Considerable variation exists amongst the states and territories, with NSW again having the highest number of identified positions (14 CLCs). This may reflect the fact that the peak representative body, CLCNSW, is funded to run the state-wide Aboriginal Legal Access Program, which aims to increase access to justice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

¹⁴ The median result falls in the middle of all results when sorted in order of size

¹⁵ Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Population and Housing – Cat No 2001.0* (2016) retrieved from ABS webpage:

http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/036?opendocument

Table 12: CLCs with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified position (n=122)

Identified position	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
Yes	22	18.0
No	97	79.5
Not yet, but planning for such a position within the next 12 months	3	2.5
Total	122	100.0

Question: Does your CLC currently have an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified position? An identified position in this case is a position that can ONLY be filled by an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person.

3.6.3. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in CLC roles

CLCs were asked about the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in CLC roles.

Table 13: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in CLC roles (n=100)

CLC roles held by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Number of CLCs reporting	Average per CLC reporting	Total in CLC Sector
Employed Staff	35	4.0	140
Advisory Council/Working Group	35	1.9	67
Management Committee/Board Member	25	2.2	54
Volunteer	17	3.0	51
Total responding CLCs	100		

Question: Based on your knowledge, how many people currently at your CLC identify as an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person, in each of the following roles?

3.6.4. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

CLCs were asked to nominate the engagement their CLC has with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, aside from providing direct client services. 100 CLCs responded, with participating in community events being the number one activity (as reported by 72% of respondents or 72 CLCs).

Table 14: Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (n=100)

Type of engagement	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
Participating in community events	72	72.0
Participating in NAIDOC Week	63	63.0
Community outreach	58	58.0
Participating in Reconciliation Week	38	38.0
Advisory Council/Working Group	28	28.0
Other (please specify)	28	28.0

Management Committee/Board member	24	24.0
Number of responding CLCs	100	

Question: *Aside from direct client services, what engagement does your CLC have with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples? (Tick all that apply).*

From those CLCs that selected 'Other' engagement (28% or 28 CLCs), the responses varied and included:

- formal and informal partnerships and collaborations with key Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and organisations
- input in policy and advocacy programs and activities
- regular community legal education, and
- participating in networks, conferences and forums.

3.6.5. Cultural awareness/safety training

Of the 119 CLCs that responded to a question about cultural awareness/safety training, 75.6% (90 CLCs) reported that their staff undertake this training.

3.6.6. Development of Reconciliation Action Plans ('RAPs')

Of the 118 CLCs that responded to a question about whether their CLC has or is considering developing a RAP, 5.9% or 7 CLCs have already developed and implemented a RAP, and 43.2% or 51 CLCs are either currently developing or planning for a RAP within the next 12 months.

33.9% or 40 of the 118 CLCs have not yet considered developing a RAP.

Table 15: Development of Reconciliation Action Plans (n=118)

Action	Number of CLCs	Percentage (%)
Not yet considered developed a RAP	40	33.9
Planning for a RAP within the next 12 months	29	24.6
Currently developing a RAP	22	18.6
Other (please specify)	12	10.2
Considered a RAP and decided against developing one	8	6.8
Developed and implemented a RAP	7	5.9
Total	118	100.0

Question: *We are interested in hearing about whether your CLC has, or is considering developing, a Reconciliation Action Plan ('RAP').*

3.7. Engagement with people with disability

CLCs were asked to indicate the percentage of their total number of clients in the 2015/16 financial year, who identified as a person with disability. For the 67 respondents, the average proportion of clients with disability was 24%. The median showed that 19.7% of clients identified as people with disability.

It is important to note that this figure is likely to be conservative, as it reflects those people who identify or report as a person with disability, and does not necessarily represent the proportion of clients with a disability, given that clients might not self-identify or disclose their disability (particularly psychosocial disability), and given differing definitions of disability.¹⁶

¹⁶ Definitions of disability may impact on data collection and disclosure from clients. For example, the Productivity Commission notes that some intellectual disabilities might not be adequately captured by the Australian Bureau of Statistics definition. See Productivity Commission of Australia, *Disability Care and Support*, Volume 1 (2011), <<http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/disability-support/report/disability-support-volume1.pdf>>, 94-95.

3.8. Engagement with clients from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds

CLCs were asked to indicate the percentage of their total number of clients in the 2015/16 financial year, who identified as from a culturally and linguistically diverse background. For the 63 respondents, the average proportion of CLC clients who identified as being from a culturally and linguistically diverse background was 25.8%, while the median was 18%.

3.9. Policy advocacy and law reform

3.9.1. Engagement in law reform and policy work

Of the 122 respondents, the majority (76.2% or 93 CLCs) indicated that they undertook policy advocacy and law reform activities in the 2015/16 financial year.

3.9.2. Types of law reform and policy work

Of these 122 CLCs, 94 responded to a further question asking them to select the activities undertaken. The main activity reported was preparing submissions to inquiries and reviews (93.6% or 88 CLCs).

Table 16: Policy advocacy and law reform undertaken by CLC, multiple answers possible (n=94)

Action	Number of CLCs	%
Preparing submissions to inquiries and reviews	88	93.6
Meetings with MPs and/or their staff	60	63.8
Letter writing to MPs	57	60.6
Advocating via social media	57	60.6
Advocating via other media	55	58.5
Consulting with and appearing before inquiries and reviews	53	56.4
Running a coordinated, branded campaign	18	19.1
Other (please specify)	12	12.8
Number of responding CLCs	94	

Question: What sort of policy and law reform work did your CLC undertake in the 2015/16 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

3.9.3. Recent changes impacting on law reform and policy work

CLCs were asked to provide an example of how a number of factors (including Commonwealth Government funding restrictions) may affect policy advocacy and law reform work. 58 CLCs responded, with some of the key affects including:

- commonwealth funding is not used to undertake this work
- increased reliance on other funding sources and volunteer assistance to fund this work
- increased cautiousness in undertaking this work
- reduction in this work given increased time spent on funding-related activities
- changes in nature of law reform and policy advocacy work, and
- increased reliance on peak bodies and Networks to undertake this work.

3.10. Profile of respondents

To establish some information about respondents, the initial questions in the Census asked for information about the state in which the service operated, type of service, specialist programs offered and service delivery locations, among other factors.

3.10.1. States and territories

Table 17: State and territory breakdown (n=129)

STATE / TERRITORY	No. of CLCs that responded	Percentage (%) of National total
New South Wales	33	25.6
Victoria	30	23.3
Queensland	28	21.7
Western Australia	19	14.7
Tasmania	6	4.7
South Australia	6	4.7
Northern Territory	4	3.1
Australian Capital Territory	3	2.3
Total	129	100.0

Question: *In which state/territory are you located?*

3.10.2. Position of person completing response

The majority of surveys (64.1% or 82 CLCs) were completed by CLC managers across a range of position titles other than lawyer. Principal Lawyer (20.3% or 26 CLCs) was the single main position title held by the 128 respondents who answered this question.

Table 18: Position of respondent (n=128)

POSITION TITLE	No. of CLCs	%
Principal Lawyer	26	20.3
Manager	23	18.0
Chief Executive Officer	21	16.4
Executive Officer	14	10.9
Coordinator	13	10.2
Director	11	8.6
Administrator	9	7.0
Operations	5	3.9
Principal Lawyer/Manager	3	2.3
Management Committee/Board Members	2	1.6
Other (please specify)	1	0.8
Total	128	100.0

Question: *What is your position title at the CLC?*

3.10.3. Centre types

Respondents were asked which of 3 centre types best described their organisation. Most of the respondents identified as a CLC (96.1% or 124 CLCs).¹⁷

Table 19: Centre type (n=129)

Organisation Type	No. of CLCs	%
CLC – Community Legal Centre	124	96.1
FVPLS – Family Violence Prevention Legal Service	4	3.1
ATSILS – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service	1	0.8
Total	129	100.0

Question: Which of the following best describes your organisation?

3.10.4. Rural, Regional and Remote (RRR) services

Respondents were asked if they regarded their CLC as servicing a RRR location. Of the 129 respondents, the majority (83% or 107 CLCs) self-identified as providing services to clients and communities in RRR areas.

The above figures reflect the number of CLCs *servicing* RRR areas, as opposed to being *located* in RRR areas. For example, state-wide specialist services exist that are based in urban areas, but provide outreach services to RRR areas.

3.10.5. Specialist and generalist centres

Centres were also asked to nominate which type or types of service their centre delivered. Of the 129 respondents, most centres offered specialist services, either as part of or an adjunct to, a generalist service (38.8% or 50 CLCs) or as a stand-alone specialist only service (42.6% or 55 CLCs).

Table 20: Type of service (n=129)

Type of Service	No. of CLCs	%
Specialist	55	42.6
Generalist	24	18.6
Generalist with specialist program(s)	50	38.8
Total	129	100.0

Question: Which of the following best describes the type of service your centre delivers?

¹⁷ As stated previously, for ease of reference, this report uses the term 'CLC' or 'centre' for all these member services, unless otherwise stated.

3.10.6. Specialist programs

105 CLCs nominated the specialist programs offered by their CLC. Even those nominating that they were a generalist CLC in the above question, then indicated that they still have specialist expertise in a particular area(s) or with a particular client group(s). The top 3 specialist areas or client groups were:

1. domestic/family violence (43.8% or 46 CLCs)
2. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (38.1% or 40 CLCs), and
3. family law (38.1% or 40 CLCs).

The text of this question made it clear to respondents that centres could nominate more than one type of specialist service offered, and a number did so.

Table 21: Types of specialist programs, multiple answers possible (n=105)

Client groups/specialist programs	No. of CLCs	%
Domestic/family violence	46	43.8
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	40	38.1
Family law	40	38.1
People from culturally and/or linguistically diverse (CALD)	33	31.4
Women	32	30.5
Tenancy	31	29.5
People with disability	29	27.6
Consumer, credit and debt	25	23.8
People in prison	22	21.0
Discrimination	21	20.0
Youth	21	20.0
Employment	20	19.0
Care and protection	19	18.1
Homelessness	19	18.1
Other (please specify)	19	18.1
Health justice partnership	18	17.1
Welfare rights	16	15.2
Older people	15	14.3
Immigration/refugee law	13	12.4
LGBTIQ communities	13	12.4
Financial counselling	11	10.5
Mental health law	9	8.6
Self-represented litigants	9	8.6
Alternative dispute resolution	8	7.6
Police accountability	7	6.7
Environmental	5	4.8
Animal welfare	3	2.9
Arts	3	2.9
Total number of responding CLCs (n)	105	

Question: In which of the following areas or to which client groups do you provide specialist programs? (Tick all that apply).

3.10.7. State-wide or national services or programs

Respondents were asked if their CLC was a state-wide or national service, or offered state-wide or national programs. Of the 128 respondents 48.4% or 62 CLCs reported that their CLC was a state-wide or national service, or offered state-wide/national programs.

3.10.8. Branch offices

Centres deliver legal assistance in a variety of locations (eg. main office, branch office, outreach location). 60 CLCs (46.5% of the 129 CLCs completing the Census) reported that they have at least one branch office.

Table 22: Number of branch offices

Number of Branch Offices	No. of CLCs	Percentage (%)
1	41	31.8
2	9	7.0
3	4	3.1
4	1	0.8
5+	5	3.9
Total	60	46.5

Question: *If you have a branch office(s), please tell us how many?*

3.10.9. Provision of outreach

129 CLCs responded to a question about the provision of outreach legal services, with 79.1% (102 CLCs) reporting that their centre provided legal outreach at a location other than their main or branch offices.

3.11. CLCs' staffing

Staffing-related questions were aimed at capturing staffing at a 'point in time' – that is, at the time when the CLC completed the Census, rather than for the 2015/16 financial year. Respondents were asked to take into account all paid staff at their centre and any position for which they were actively recruiting at that 'point in time'.

3.11.1. Number of paid staff

CLCs were asked how many of their paid staff were employed:

- permanent full-time (35 hours a week or more)
- permanent part-time (less than 35 hours a week), or
- on a casual basis in the week that the CLC completed the Census.

The focus in this question was on the number of people employed, not full-time equivalents ('FTEs').

120 centres reported employing a total of 1,693 people, with 48.9% (828 people) of those employed full-time. Part-time staff comprised 42.9% of people employed by respondents (727 people) and only 8.1% (138 people) were employed as casuals.

The average total number of paid staff at each CLC was between 14 and 15 people. This average is inflated by the participation of some relatively large CLCs.

Table 23: Number of permanent full-time, part-time and casual staff (n=133)

Staff employment	Number of staff	Average per CLC	Percentage (%) of CLC workforce
Permanent full-time	828	6.9	48.9
Permanent part-time	727	6.1	42.9
Casual	138	1.1	8.1
Total	1693	14.1	99.9

Question: Using the definitions above, how many of your current paid staff are employed permanent full-time, permanent part-time or casual.

3.11.2. Number of FTE staff

119 centres reported employing a total of 1,279 full-time equivalent (FTE staff). Of these, the majority (64.4% or 824 FTEs) were employed full-time. Part-time FTE staff comprised 32.9% (421 FTEs) and 2.6% (5 FTEs) were employed as casuals.

The average total number of FTE staff at each CLC was 10.7. This average is inflated by some relatively large CLCs.

Table 24: Number of FTE paid full-time, part-time and casual staff (n=119)

Staff employment	Number of staff	Average per CLC	Percentage (%) of CLC workforce
FTE Permanent full-time	824	6.9	64.4
FTE Permanent part-time	421	3.5	32.9
FTE Casual	33	0.3	2.6
Total	1279	10.7	99.9

Question: Now that you've told us how many paid staff are working full-time, part-time and casual, we would like to ask how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) you employ.

3.11.3. Employment by position

125 CLCs responded to a question asking them to report the number of FTE staff they employed against a number of position types. In total, 1,439.4 FTE staff were employed at the time the Census was completed by the sector.

The majority of paid FTE staff were lawyers (42.1% or 605.9 FTE staff). This figure includes staff identified as lawyers (32.9% or 474 FTE staff) and the 9.2% of staff (131.9 FTE staff) employed as principal lawyers, including those who manage their CLC, and those who are not employed as managers.

56 CLCs reported employing 'Other paid staff' representing 9.3% of total FTEs of the workforce. Of these the most commonly reported other position type was tenancy worker followed by communications workers.

Table 25: FTE staff by position (n=125)

Position	Number of CLCs employing	Total FTE employed in sector	Average FTE per all CLCs	Average FTE per CLCs employing	Percentage (%) of total CLC workforce
Lawyer	109	474.0	3.79	4.35	32.9
Administration Assistant	71	106.3	0.85	1.50	7.4
Principal Lawyer who manages CLC	67	64.4	0.51	0.96	4.5
Finance Officer / Bookkeeper	66	45.7	0.37	0.69	3.2
Principal Lawyer who doesn't manage CLC	63	67.5	0.54	1.07	4.7
Manager	48	58.5	0.47	1.22	4.1
CLE/Community development worker	48	72.3	0.58	1.51	5.0
Administrator	47	46.3	0.37	0.98	3.2
Executive Officer	46	46.4	0.37	1.01	3.2
Receptionist	41	46.4	0.37	1.13	3.2
Paralegal	38	93.7	0.75	2.47	6.5
Coordinator	35	56.9	0.45	1.62	3.9
Policy Officer/Researcher	17	23.7	0.19	1.39	1.6
Social worker/ other counsellor	15	20.6	0.16	1.37	1.4
Fundraiser	12	10.5	0.08	0.87	0.7
Financial Counsellor	10	26.8	0.21	2.68	1.9
Migration Agent	7	24.7	0.20	3.53	1.7
Court Advocate	4	20.4	0.16	5.10	1.4
Social Enterprise Worker	1	1.0	0.01	1.00	0.1
Other paid staff	56	133.6	1.07	2.39	9.3
Total Sector FTE		1439.4			

Question: For each of the following position descriptions, please tell us the number of FTE staff your centre employs. How many paid FTE staff do you employ in each of the following position descriptions? Please enter a '0' if you do not employ anyone in that position.

Appendix A:

Census methodology and question development

Questions

In 2016, the Census comprised nationally focussed questions only

In developing the questions, NACLC consulted with the NACLC Advisory Council and Board, state and territory associations and NACLC staff.

A full list of the questions is available at Appendix B.

Population group

The population group surveyed comprised members of the state and territory associations of CLCs. These members include CLCs, FVPLS and 1 ATSILS.

Only 1 response was required per CLC. NACLC sought responses from CLC personnel in management or Principal Solicitor positions, as it was predicted that these positions would have the most comprehensive knowledge about the CLC, and be best placed to answer the vast bulk, if not all, of the Census questions.

Communications

Marketing for the survey was provided via the NACLC website, newsletters and Twitter account. Follow-up emails and phone calls were made by NACLC throughout January and February 2017. Some state and territory associations also promoted the Census through their newsletters, websites and via the telephone.

Data governance standards

The data governance standards from the previous three Census surveys were retained in 2016. The objective of these standards was to protect the integrity of the data and ensure the statistical results distributed remain consistent.

The standards explained access and ownership of the raw data and online survey program, as well as set out the parameters of confidentiality offered to respondents. It was agreed that all data provided by CLCs would be de-identified, except for case studies where approval to use the material had been sought and given.

Distribution

The Census was primarily delivered as a mixed mode survey on SurveyMonkey, with the primary mode being a web-based survey. CLCs were also provided with a PDF version of the survey, which they could complete and scan and post back to NACLC for data entry. The survey was open from November 2016 to February 2017.

Data cleansing

In a few instances, multiple responses from the same CLC were received. In these cases, the response that contained the most completed questions was retained in the sample. Where a CLC had completed the survey more than once, but answered a different group of questions at each attempt, the data was merged into one complete response. All data was cleansed in SPSS Statistics, a statistical analysis program, for data cleaning and analysis, after being extracted from SurveyMonkey.

Changes to the Census questions and impact

In response to feedback from CLCs that the Census had become time consuming and burdensome, due to increases in length and complexity over time, in 2016 NACLC reduced the length of the Census by nearly half.

The questions that have remained in the Census largely focus on the identity, work and clients of CLCs, allowing NACLC to build upon the baseline data collected in the 2013, 2014 and 2015 Census collections.

Traditional questions relating to sector services and infrastructure were removed with the intention of surveying the sector separately on these matters. Some questions or themes were removed entirely, while others were removed with the intention that they will be collected on a less frequent basis (for example, biennially) based on an analysis of how much the data has changed across the previous census collections.

The majority of respondents (78.3% or 94 CLCs) completed the survey within 60 minutes, and 30% (36 CLCs) completed within 30 minutes.

The responses from CLCs about the Census itself varied, with a number of CLCs commenting positively on the decreased length and ease of the Census compared to 2015, and others requesting the ability to save and return to the online survey. Other feedback included difficulty in making estimates, and the need for improved definitions, particularly in regard to turnaways.

NACLC is currently reviewing all feedback from the 2016 Census, in order to inform the development of future surveys.

As in previous years, the Census is a 'living' project, and NACLC welcomes feedback at any time, to inform the development of the Census project.

Appendix B: Census questions



NACLC Census 2016

WELCOME TO THE NACLC CENSUS 2016!

Welcome to the NACLC Census 2016 – an important tool for gathering data that is critical to informing the sector sustainability and policy and advocacy work of NACLC and the CLC state/territory associations.

In response to feedback from the CLCs that the Census had become unduly burdensome due to increases in length and complexity over time, **NACLC has reduced the length of the Census by nearly half.**

Your responses to Census 2015 informed NACLC's work in a range of areas, including most notably as part of the Fund Equal Justice campaign, Federal Budget submissions and submissions to other inquiries and reviews.

CLOSING DATE: Friday, 18 November 2016 5pm AEDT.

***** Complete the Census by the above closing date and go in the draw to win a free registration to the 2017 National CLCs Conference! *****

PLEASE NOTE: Due to the way the survey tool operates, you will need to complete the survey in the **one sitting**. We hope that the shorter format will make this easier to manage than in previous years. It may be helpful to read the questions in advance, think about your responses or consult with others in your CLC before completing the questionnaire. We encourage you to [download this PDF version for printing](#). Please then enter your response electronically or scan and [email a copy to NACLC](#).

About the Census questions

The Census will take around 30 minutes to complete, and will include questions about your CLC's:

- turnaways
- staffing
- funding, including the impact of any funding cuts
- volunteers and pro bono partnerships
- engagement with Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples, people with disability and people from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds and/or community
- partnerships, and
- policy advocacy and law reform work.

The majority of questions relate to the 2015/16 financial year (except for staffing).

Most questions are optional, except for those marked with an asterisk (*).

What's changed in Census 2016?

The questions that have remained in the Census allow NACLCL to continue the important work of 'mapping' trends and changes in the CLC sector and its clients. Some questions or themes have been removed entirely, while others have been removed with the intention that they will be collected on a less frequent basis – eg. biennially.

Confidentiality

Statistical data will only be published in de-identified, aggregated form.

Some case studies and/or open text comments may also be included in published documents or media statements from time to time. While every effort will be made to ensure the confidentiality of this information, your attention is drawn to the potential for case studies and/or open text comments to include identifying factors.

If you are concerned about the potential for this identification, please ensure your case studies and/or open text comments do not include any identifying information or feel free to skip any such questions.

NACLCL may seek your permission to publish case studies and/or open text comments provided that include identifying information or to work with you to redraft this information in a non-identifying way.

Who should complete the Census?

Only 1 response is required per CLC, and this should be completed by a CEO, Principal Solicitor or other nominated person.

Questions

Please contact Chantel (Tues-Fri) via chantel_cotterell@clc.net.au or 02 9264 9595.



NACLC Census 2016

PROFILE

We would like to start by asking you some "profile" questions about your CLC and some contact details for you in case we need to clarify anything.

*** 1. What is the name of your CLC?**

*** 2. In which State/Territory are you located?***

- Australian Capital Territory
- New South Wales
- Victoria
- Northern Territory
- Queensland
- Tasmania
- Western Australia
- South Australia

3. What is your name?

4. What is your position title at the CLC?

- Chief Executive Officer
- Executive Officer
- Manager
- Coordinator
- Principal Lawyer
- Administrator
- Management Committee/Board Members
- Other (please specify)

5. What is your contact email address?

NACLC Census 2016

PROFILE

6. Is your CLC a state-wide/national service, or does it offer state-wide/national programs?

- Yes
 No

*** 7. Which of the following best describes your organisation?**

- CLC – Community Legal Centre
 FVPLS – Family Violence Prevention Legal Service
 ATSILS – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service

8. We are interesting in knowing about the rural, regional or remote status of CLCs. Is your CLC:

- located in a RRR area
 located in an urban area, but servicing a RRR area

9. Which of the following best describes the type of service your centre delivers?

- Specialist
 Generalist
 Generalist with specialist program(s)

10. In which of the following areas or to which client groups do you provide specialist programs? (Tick all that apply).

- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples
- Alternative dispute resolution
- Animal welfare
- Arts
- Care and protection
- Consumer, credit and debt
- Discrimination
- Domestic/family violence
- Employment
- Environmental
- Family law
- Financial counselling
- Health justice partnership
- Homelessness
- Immigration/refugee law
- LGBTIQ communities
- Older people
- People from culturally and/or linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds and/or community
- People in prison
- People with disability
- Police accountability
- Mental health law
- Self-represented litigants
- Tenancy
- Welfare rights
- Women
- Youth
- Other (please specify)



NACLC Census 2016

PROFILE

11. If you have a branch office(s), please tell us how many?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

12. Do you provide legal outreach (eg., advice, casework, legal information) at a location other than at your main or branch office(s)?

- Yes
- No

NACLC Census 2016

TURNAWAYS

CLCs have told us that they regularly 'turnaway' some people because they were unable to assist them. We also understand that some people who are turned away cannot be provided with an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral by the CLC.

NACLC defines a 'turnaway' as any person your CLC had to send away because you were unable to assist them within the needed timeframe or because of a lack of resources, lack of centre expertise, conflict of interest or your centre's eligibility policy.

13. Did your CLC record 'turnaways' in the 2015/16 financial year?

- Yes – all the time
- Yes – some of the time
- No – never

NACLC Census 2016

TURNAWAYS

14. If your CLC recorded turnaways in the 2015/16 financial year, please tell us in a few lines how your CLC recorded turnaways? Tick all that apply.

- In CLSIS as "information referrals"
- Telephone systems that record the number of calls that went unanswered
- Spreadsheets
- Other (please specify)

15. What were the reasons your centre turned people away in the 2015/16 financial year? Tick all that apply.

- Our centre didn't possess the relevant expertise
- Person's legal problem was outside our centre's priority area/client group
- Person outside the catchment area
- Conflict of interest
- Our centre had insufficient resources at the time
- Unable to assist in the timeframe the client needed
- Person was already being relevantly assisted by another legal assistance provider (e.g., Legal Aid, FVPLS, ATSILS)
- Person was already being assisted by a private lawyer and could continue to afford this
- Other (please specify)

16. Please give the actual number or an estimate of the number of people your centre turned away in the 2015/16 financial year?

Number of people

17. Of your total turnaways in the 2015/16 financial year, to what proportion (percent) could you give an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral?

Percentage (%) of
turnaways you could
give an appropriate,
accessible and
affordable referral



NACLC Census 2016

STAFFING

Understanding CLC staffing profiles assists NACLC to understand the sector and informs its work on behalf of the sector, for example in engaging in reviews and inquiries relating to legal assistance and access to justice.

As this data is used for different purposes, we have to ask you some questions that may seem unnecessary or repetitive, but they are actually very important and inform NACLC's work.

NB: When answering, please take into account all of your current paid staff and any position for which you are currently actively recruiting. This is at the time of you completing this survey, NOT for the 2015/16 financial year.

NB: Please enter a '0' if you have no staff for any category, rather than leaving the answer empty.

18. First, we would like to know how many of your current paid staff (or positions under active recruitment) are employed permanent full-time, permanent part-time and casual.

- **Permanent full-time – 35 hours per week or more; with access to entitlements such as paid annual leave, sick leave and public holidays.**
- **Permanent part-time – Less than 35 hours per week; with access to entitlements such as paid annual leave, sick leave and public holidays.**
- **Casual – casuals do not receive paid annual leave, sick leave and usually work on an irregular basis. In order to collect consistent meaningful data on casuals, we only want to know about casuals that worked THIS WEEK at or for your centre.**

Using the definitions above, how many of your paid staff are employed:

Permanent full-time	<input type="text"/>
Permanent part-time	<input type="text"/>
Casual	<input type="text"/>

19. Now that you've told us how many paid staff are working full-time, part-time and casual, we would like to ask how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) you employ.

FTE Permanent full-time

FTE Permanent part-time

FTE Casual



NACLC Census 2016

STAFFING

In order to inform NACLC's submissions to legal assistance reviews and other advocacy, it would help us to know the full-time equivalent (FTE) for the positions listed below.

A brief guide to working out the number of FTE staff:

If your centre employs three lawyers and your normal working week is 35 hours, then:

Lawyer 1 working 2 days (or 14 hours per week) is an FTE = 0.4

Lawyer 2 working 5 days (or 35 hours per week) is an FTE = 1.0

The number of FTE lawyers employed by the centre is in this case: FTE = 1.4

You would enter the number 1.4 (FTE) for the position type Lawyer below, even though you actually employ two lawyers.

If you have an employee who works in more than one of the positions listed, please allocate their hours across the relevant positions.

20. For each of the following position descriptions, please tell us the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff your centre employs. If you need assistance with calculating the FTE, please see the brief guide above.

How many paid staff do you employ in each of the following position descriptions? Please enter a '0' if you do not employ anyone in that position.

Principal Lawyer who manages CLC	<input type="text"/>
Principal Lawyer who doesn't manage CLC	<input type="text"/>
Administrator	<input type="text"/>
Executive Officer	<input type="text"/>
Administration Assistant	<input type="text"/>
Manager	<input type="text"/>
Coordinator	<input type="text"/>
Lawyer	<input type="text"/>
Receptionist	<input type="text"/>
Finance Officer/Bookkeeper	<input type="text"/>
Community Legal Education/Community Development Worker	<input type="text"/>
Policy Officer/Researcher	<input type="text"/>
Paralegal	<input type="text"/>
Social Worker/other counsellor	<input type="text"/>
Financial Counsellor	<input type="text"/>
Migration Agent	<input type="text"/>
Fundraiser	<input type="text"/>
Social Enterprise Worker	<input type="text"/>
Court Advocate	<input type="text"/>
Other Paid Staff	<input type="text"/>

21. If you entered a number value for 'Other Paid Staff' in the previous question, please tell us the types of positions that you were reporting for under under this category.



NACLC Census 2016

FUNDING

22. From which of the following sources did your CLC receive funding? Please tick all that apply.

- Commonwealth Government
- State or Territory Government (Main Budget)
- State or Territory Government (Public Purpose Fund/Legal Practitioner Interest on Trust Accounts Fund)
- Philanthropic
- Fundraising and sponsorship

23. There will be a significant Commonwealth Government funding cut to CLCs nationally forecast from 1 July 2017. Please give an example of the likely affect of any such cut on the work of your CLC. (For example, reduction in services, cessation of a program(s), impact on outreach services).

24. Please estimate the total number of hours PER WEEK in the 2015/16 financial year that your CLC spent on funding-related activities (e.g., reporting, applying for grants, lobbying, fundraising).

NACLC Census 2016

VOLUNTEERS

The ability of CLCs to attract and use volunteers is vital to the work of CLCs and differentiates CLCs from other legal service providers.

A 'volunteer' is classified as an individual who provides skills and experience to a CLC, free of charge. For this Census, please do not include as volunteers Management Committee ('MC')/Board members when they are fulfilling their usual governance duties – you can, however, add any contributions your MC/Board members made to the CLC in addition to these duties.

25. Did your centre use volunteers in any capacity in the 2015/16 financial year?

- Yes
- No



NACLC Census 2016

VOLUNTEERS

26. Please provide the total number of volunteers at your centre in the 2015/16 financial year in each of the following categories:

Lawyers	<input type="text"/>
Migration Agents	<input type="text"/>
Community Legal Education/Community Development Workers	<input type="text"/>
Students – Undergrad Law	<input type="text"/>
Students – Undergrad Social Work	<input type="text"/>
Law Graduate – Practical Legal Training (PLT)	<input type="text"/>
Counsellors – Financial	<input type="text"/>
Counsellors – Family Violence	<input type="text"/>
Administrative Assistants	<input type="text"/>
Finance Officers/Bookkeepers	<input type="text"/>
Fundraisers	<input type="text"/>
Other Volunteers	<input type="text"/>

27. Please calculate or make your best estimate as to the total number of hours provided by each category of volunteer PER WEEK at your centre in 2015/16 financial year. For example, if your centre has 4 lawyers who each volunteer 4 hours, this would be a weekly total of 16 hours for the category 'lawyers'.

Lawyers	<input type="text"/>
Migration Agents	<input type="text"/>
Community Legal Education/Community Development Workers	<input type="text"/>
Students – Undergrad Law	<input type="text"/>
Students – Undergrad Social Work	<input type="text"/>
Law Graduate – Practical Legal Training (PLT)	<input type="text"/>
Counsellors – Financial	<input type="text"/>
Counsellors – Family Violence	<input type="text"/>
Administrative Assistants	<input type="text"/>
Finance Officers/Bookkeepers	<input type="text"/>
Fundraisers	<input type="text"/>
Other Volunteers	<input type="text"/>

28. If you entered a number value for 'Other Volunteers' in the previous questions, please tell us the types of positions that you were reporting for under under this category.

29. What type of work was undertaken by your CLC volunteers in the 2015/16 financial year?

Tick all that apply.

- Involvement in direct legal service delivery
- Involvement in other direct service delivery (eg., social work, court support or financial counselling)
- Policy advocacy and law reform (eg., researching or writing submissions)
- Community legal education/community development
- Administrative support
- Accounting/bookkeeping
- Fundraising or sponsorship activities
- Other (please specify)

30. NACLC is interested in hearing about the hours employed staff spent at your CLC spent on supervising, supporting and training volunteers - both legal and non-legal volunteers. Please estimate the total number of hours:

PER WEEK in the
2015/16 financial year
that employed staff
spent responding to
volunteers' queries,
checking volunteers'
advices, and otherwise
supervising volunteers'
work.

over the ENTIRE
2015/16 financial year
that employed staff
spent on developing
and providing
orientation/induction
and other training to
volunteers.

over the ENTIRE
2015/16 financial year
that employed staff
spent on developing
and providing
training **other than** at
orientation/induction to
volunteers.



NACLC Census 2016

PRO BONO PARTNERSHIPS

NACLC is interested in information about your pro bono partnerships in the 2015/16 financial year.

A 'pro bono partner' is defined as a professional or firm that, as a business, has formally committed to allocating resources and making a contribution to a CLC and/or its clients, free of charge. In this case, the relationship is essentially between a business and a CLC. Pro bono contributions usually occur in an organised way that may be formalised in an agreement.

31. Did your centre have a pro bono partnership with a business in the 2015/16 financial year?

- Yes
- No

NACLC Census 2016

PRO BONO PARTNERSHIPS

32. What type of work was undertaken by or with the assistance of your pro bono partners in the 2015/16 financial year? Please tick all that apply.

- Involvement in direct legal service delivery
- Provision of advice or assistance to the centre
- Provision of advice by specialist lawyers in a particular area of expertise for use in client matters
- Policy advocacy and law reform (e.g., researching or writing submissions)
- Community legal education/community development
- Legal practice management
- Accounting/bookkeeping
- Administrative support
- Governance/management
- Publications (e.g., design and printing)
- Marketing
- Fundraising or sponsorship

33. Please estimate the total number of hours that pro bono partnerships contributed to your centre in each of the following areas in the 2015/16 financial year:

Involvement in direct legal service delivery

Provision of advice or assistance to the centre

Provision of advice by specialist lawyers in a particular area of expertise for use in client matters

Policy advocacy and law reform (e.g., researching or writing submissions)

Community legal education

Legal practice management

Accounting/bookkeeping

Administrative support

Governance/management

Publications (eg., design and printing)

Marketing

Fundraising or sponsorship



NACLC Census 2016

ENGAGEMENT WITH SPECIFIC PRIORITY CLIENTS

In order to assist NACLC in advocating for the clients of CLCs, NACLC is seeking data about the percentages (%) of clients your CLC provided with legal assistance from specific priority clients. NACLC understands that in some cases clients may identify as belonging to more than one of these priority client groups.

34. According to CLSIS or other client records/database, in the 2015/16 financial year, what percentage (%) of your clients identified as a:

Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person	<input type="text"/>
Person with disability	<input type="text"/>
Person from a culturally and/or linguistically diverse background and/or community	<input type="text"/>



NACLC Census 2016

ENGAGEMENT WITH ABORIGINAL AND/OR TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER PEOPLES

NACLC is committed to engaging with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities, and being guided by the vision of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in working to achieve access to justice.

35. Does your CLC currently have an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander identified position? An identified position in this case is a position that can ONLY be filled by an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person.

- Yes
- No
- Not yet, but planning for such a position within the next 12 months

36. Based on your knowledge, how many people currently at your CLC identify as an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person (whether employed in an identified position or not)? Please enter the number of people in the following roles:

Employed staff	<input type="text"/>
Volunteer	<input type="text"/>
Management Committee/Board member	<input type="text"/>
Advisory Council/Working Group	<input type="text"/>

37. Aside from direct client services, what engagement does your CLC have with Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples? Tick all that apply.

- Community outreach
- Participating in NAIDOC Week
- Participating in Reconciliation Week
- Participating in community events
- Advisory Council/Working Group
- Management Committee/Board member
- Other (please specify)

38. Do staff at your CLC undertake cultural awareness/safety training?

- Yes
- No

39. We are interested in hearing about whether your CLC has, or is considering developing, a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP). Has/is your CLC:

- Developed and implemented a RAP
- Currently developing a RAP
- Planning for a RAP within the next 12 months
- Considered a RAP and decided against developing one
- Not yet considered developed a RAP
- Other (please specify)



NACLC Census 2016

PARTNERSHIPS

NACLC knows that CLCs develop beneficial partnerships with community organisations, government agencies and each other to deliver holistic services to clients and communities. We are interested in hearing about those partnerships.

We define a 'partnership' as any service that your CLC may deliver in collaboration with another service, whether or not a formal agreement is in place.

40. Which of the following organisations did your CLC partner with in delivering legal services, community legal education, and/or policy advocacy and law reform in the 2015/16 financial year? Tick all that apply.

	Legal services	Community legal education	Policy, advocacy and law reform
CLCs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FVPLS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ATSILS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal Aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commonwealth government agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State government agency (NOT Legal Aid)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local government agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community organisation - legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community organisation - non-legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aboriginal community controlled organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pro bono partners - legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pro bono partners - non-legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NACLC Census 2016

POLICY ADVOCACY AND LAW REFORM

NACLC is interested in hearing about your CLC's policy advocacy and law reform work.

41. Did your CLC undertake policy advocacy and law reform activities in the 2015/16 financial year?

- Yes
- No

NACLC Census 2016

POLICY ADVOCACY AND LAW REFORM

42. What sort of policy and law reform work did your CLC undertake in the 2015/16 financial year? Tick all that apply.

- Preparing submissions to inquiries and reviews
- Letter writing to MPs
- Consulting with and appearing before inquiries and reviews
- Meetings with MPs and/or their staff
- Advocating via social media
- Advocating via other media
- Running a coordinated, branded campaign (eg., Do Not Knock campaign)
- Other (please specify)

43. Do you have a case study/example of effective policy advocacy or law reform activity undertaken by your CLC? Please share in a few sentences.

44. There are a number of factors in recent years (including Commonwealth Government funding restrictions) that may affect the law reform and policy work of CLCs. Has your CLC's policy advocacy and law reform work been affected? If so, please provide an example.



NACLC Census 2016

YOUR EXPERIENCE OF THE CENSUS

As we see want to continue to improve the Census for CLCs, we encourage you to provide your feedback below.

NACLC has sought to reduce the length and complexity of the Census in 2016. NACLC is particularly interested in hearing from your CLC on whether this aim has been realised or not, and why.

If you prefer to talk over the phone, please contact Chantel (Tues-Fri) at the NACLC office on [email](#) or 02 9264 9595.

45. How long did it take you to complete this Census?

- 30 minutes or less
- 31 to 60 minutes
- 61 to 90 minutes
- 91 to 120 minutes
- 121 minutes or more

46. Do you have any comments or suggestions you wish to make about the Census?

NACLC acknowledges the traditional owners of the lands across Australia and particularly acknowledges the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation, traditional owners of the land on which the NACLC office is situated. We pay deep respect to Elders past and present.