

# National Census of Community Legal Centres

2017 National Report

National Association of Community Legal Centres



**First published in October 2018 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](mailto:naclc@clc.net.au)

Web: [www.naclc.org.au](http://www.naclc.org.au)



© 2018 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: [info@naclc.org.au](mailto:info@naclc.org.au) | phone 02 9264 9595.

## Abbreviations

<b>ATSILS</b>	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service
<b>BBS</b>	Bulletin Board System
<b>CLASS</b>	Community Legal Assistance Services System
<b>CLC</b>	Community Legal Centre
<b>CLE</b>	Community Legal Education
<b>CLSIS</b>	Community Legal Services Information System
<b>CLSP</b>	Community Legal Services Programme
<b>FTE</b>	Full-Time Equivalent
<b>FVPLS</b>	Family Violence Prevention Legal Service
<b>MC</b>	Management Committee
<b>NACLC</b>	National Association of Community Legal Centres
<b>NAS</b>	National Accreditation Scheme
<b>NPA</b>	National Partnership Agreement on Legal Assistance Services 2015-2020
<b>PII</b>	Professional Indemnity Insurance
<b>PLT</b>	Practical Legal Training
<b>RAP</b>	Reconciliation Action Plan
<b>RMG</b>	Risk Management Guide
<b>RRR</b>	Regional, Rural and Remote

## Table of Contents

### 1. Table of Contents

<b>1. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. Funding	9
2.2. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships	9
2.3. Partnerships	10
2.4. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities	11
2.5. Policy advocacy and law reform	11
2.6. Community legal centre profile	12
2.7. Staffing	13
2.8. Turnaways	14
<b>3. NATIONAL DATA</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.1. Funding</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1.1. <i>Funding sources</i>	16
3.1.2. <i>Hours spent on funding-related activities</i>	16
<b>3.2. Turnaways</b>	<b>16</b>
3.2.1. <i>Number of turnaways</i>	17
3.2.2. <i>Appropriate, accessible and affordable referrals for turnaways</i>	17
3.2.3. <i>Collecting turnaway data</i>	17
3.2.4. <i>Methods for recording turnaways</i>	18
3.2.5. <i>Reasons for turnaways</i>	18
<b>3.3. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships</b>	<b>19</b>
3.3.1. <i>Use of volunteers</i>	20
3.3.2. <i>Hours and types of volunteers</i>	20
3.3.3. <i>Type of work undertaken by volunteers</i>	21
3.3.4. <i>Overall centre investment in volunteers</i>	21

3.3.5.	<i>Pro bono partnerships</i>	22
<b>3.4.</b>	<b>Partnerships</b>	<b>24</b>
3.4.1.	<i>Legal services</i>	24
3.4.2.	<i>Community legal education</i>	25
3.4.3.	<i>Policy advocacy and law reform</i>	25
3.4.4.	<i>Partnerships with universities</i>	26
<b>3.5.</b>	<b>Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities</b>	<b>26</b>
3.5.1.	<i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified positions</i>	26
3.5.2.	<i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in centre roles</i>	27
3.5.3.	<i>Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities</i>	27
3.5.4.	<i>Cultural awareness/safety training</i>	28
3.5.5.	<i>Development of Reconciliation Action Plans ('RAPs')</i>	28
<b>3.6.</b>	<b>Policy advocacy and law reform</b>	<b>29</b>
3.6.1.	<i>Engagement in law reform and policy work</i>	29
3.6.2.	<i>Types of law reform and policy work</i>	29
<b>3.7.</b>	<b>Profile of respondents</b>	<b>30</b>
3.7.1.	<i>States and territories</i>	30
3.7.2.	<i>Position of person completing response</i>	30
3.7.3.	<i>Rural, Regional and Remote (RRR) services</i>	31
3.7.4.	<i>Specialist and generalist centres</i>	31
3.7.5.	<i>Specialist programs</i>	31
3.7.6.	<i>Provision of outreach</i>	33
<b>3.8.</b>	<b>Community legal centres' staffing</b>	<b>33</b>
3.8.1.	<i>Number of paid staff</i>	33
3.8.2.	<i>Number of FTE staff</i>	34
3.8.3.	<i>Employment by position</i>	35
<b>APPENDIX A:</b>	<b>CENSUS METHODOLOGY AND QUESTION DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>APPENDIX B:</b>	<b>CENSUS QUESTIONS</b>	<b>40</b>

## 1. Background

### Introduction

Census 2017 marks the fifth 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, policy, advocacy and law reform work, as well as the work 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 2017, 124 community legal centres responded to the Census.

NACLC acknowledges and appreciates centres who took the time to contribute to this important resource. The Census an important information and advocacy tool and it assists centres understanding of their similarities and differences, and the commonalities in their work. It also helps articulate the identity and importance of the role of community legal centres 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 CLCs associations and staff.

In response to feedback from centres, NACLC has continued to work to reduce the length of the survey and ensure it remains focused on data not able to be collected through other mechanisms (such as CLASS).

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

In 2018 and 2019, NACLC is working on mapping and consolidating the data it has available and other means of collecting information about the sector and our clients, as well as NACLC's own priorities and performance.

In 2017, the objectives of the Census were to:

- provide an evidence-base for decision-making and advocacy by NACLC, funded and unfunded state and territory CLC associations, National Networks and individual community legal centres

- continue to build on the longitudinal data set established by previous Census and maintain a national baseline survey framework which can continue to support longitudinal analysis
- support coordinated and efficient state/territory centre data collection and use, particularly through collection of jurisdictional specific data
- increase capacity to track emerging trends and changing sector priorities, and
- inform, support and improve support for and promotion of the sector.

Appendix A sets out the methodology and other information about the development and fielding of the Census questions in 2017.

## 2. Overview of findings

Centres were asked to provide responses to questions based on the 2016/17 financial year, unless stated otherwise. Responses were received from October 2017 to March 2018.

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 number of centres that responded to each particular question in your state/territory (marked as  $n=X$ ). When reading (or quoting) any figures, it is important to note that percentages and numbers only represent those centres that responded to that particular question, from the pool of centres that responded to the Census this year.
- Centres were asked to provide responses to questions based on the 2016/17 financial year, unless asked otherwise. Please refer to the wording of each question to clarify the relevant period asked.
- If you wish to compare the findings with previous years 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, percentages in tables may add up to 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 centres 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.

107 centres reported on their funding sources, with the top 3 sources of funding being:

- Commonwealth government - NPA (76.6% or 82 centres)
- State or territory government (main budget) (74.8% or 80 centres), and
- State or territory government (Public Purpose Fund/Legal Practitioner Interest on Trust Accounts Fund, etc.) (44.9% or 48 centres)

Funding-related activities include reporting, grant applications, advocacy, and fundraising require significant time investment. Limited funding, lack of funding certainty and various reporting requirements directly impacts on and reduces hours available to undertake service delivery.

- 97 centres reported spending an average of **3,857.2 hours per week** in the 2016/17 financial year on funding-related activities.

This demonstrates the ongoing and vital need for long-term, sustainable and predictable funding for the legal assistance sector.

## 2.2. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships

Volunteers and pro bono partnerships<sup>1</sup> significantly enhance the capacity of community legal centres to provide services for people across Australia.

### Volunteers

Centres across Australia rely on volunteer contributions from law students, law graduates, solicitors, barrister and others to provide legal and related services.

- **94.5% (104 centres from 110 respondents) reported using volunteers.**
- 94 centres provided information about the types of volunteer and 91 centres provided further detail on the number of hours contributed. These centres reported that **6,915 volunteers contributed nearly 15,300 hours of work per week in the 2016/17 financial year.**
- The 3 main categories of volunteer contributions, as reported by these centres, were from:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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'.

- lawyers (3,165 contributed 3,693 hours per week)
- students – undergraduate law (2,144 volunteers contributed 5,430 hours per week),
- law graduates – Practical Legal Training ('PLT') (458 contributed 2,250 hours per week).
- The 3 main types of work undertaken by volunteers,\* as reported by 100 centres, were:
  - involvement in direct legal service delivery (87%),
  - administrative support (72%), and
  - policy advocacy and law reform (e.g. researching or writing submissions) (52%).

Importantly however, engagement of volunteers requires significant training, supervision and support as well as imposing an administrative load on centres. For example:

- 2,489 hours per week were spent responding to volunteers' queries and otherwise supervising volunteers in 2016/17, as reported by 89 centres.
- 14,654.6 hours were spent on developing and providing orientation and induction training to volunteers in the 2016/17 financial year, as reported by 88 centres.
- 21,748 hours were spent on developing and providing training other than orientation/induction training to volunteers in the 2016/17 financial year, as reported by 72 centres.

### **Pro bono partnerships**

- Pro bono partners provide significant contributions to the sector and the communities we work with each year. **65.4%** of centres (70 centres) reported having a pro bono partnership, of the 107 centres that responded to a question about working with pro bono partners.
- **83,252.5 hours of pro bono assistance** were provided to 63 of these centres and their clients over the 2016/17 financial year, including 66,989 hours for direct legal service delivery. A significant proportion of this was through direct service delivery.
- However, given the number of respondents, this is a conservative number that does not reflect the full pro bono contribution to centres across Australia.

It is, however, important to recognise that 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 funding for legal assistance services.

### **2.3. Partnerships**

Community legal centres 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.

- The most common partners in the delivery of legal services were other centres (56.4% or 57 centres from 101 respondents),\*
- 49.5% of respondents partnered with non-legal community organisations and 48.5% partnered with legal pro bono partners. 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 centres when delivering community legal education (68.3% or 69 centres from 101 respondents).\*
- Other centres were also the most common partner in policy, advocacy and law reform projects (57.4% or 58 centres from 101 respondents).\*
- The results also highlighted partnerships with universities across a range of areas. For example 31.7% of centres reported partnering with a university for delivering legal services (32 centres from 101 respondents); 40.6% for delivery of community legal education (41 centres); and 27.7% (28 centres) for policy, advocacy and law reform.

## 2.4. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities

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

- Participating in community events was the main type of community engagement (reported by 77.2% or 71 centres from 92 respondents), followed by community outreach (57.6% or 53 centres) and participation in NAIDOC Week (56.5% or 52 centres).\*
- 17.5% (18 centres from 103 respondents) reported having at least one Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified position.
- 72.8% (75 centres from 103 respondents) report that staff undertake cultural awareness/safety training.
- Of the 102 centres that responded to a question about whether their centre has or is considering developing a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP), 9.8% or 10 centres have already developed and implemented a RAP, and 38.2% or 39 centres are either currently developing or planning for a RAP within the next 12 months.
- 28.4% or 17 of the 102 centres have not yet considered developing a RAP.

## 2.5. Policy advocacy and law reform

Community legal centres 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 centres are restricted from undertaking some of this work with Commonwealth funding under the National Partnership Agreement on Legal Assistance Services, many centres continue to direct non-Commonwealth funding and resources to this important work.

- **77.9% (81 centres from 104 respondents) reported undertaking policy and law reform activities** in the 2016/17 financial year.
- The main 3 forms of policy and law reform activities\*, as reported by 80 centres, were:
  - preparing submissions to inquiries (90% or 72 centres)
  - meeting with MPs and/or their staff (82.5% or 66 centres), and
  - letter writing to MPs (73.8% or 59 centres).

## 2.6. Community legal centre 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.

- 124 centres completed the survey.<sup>2</sup> The state/territory breakdown was:

State/Territory	No. of CLCs	%
Victoria	27	21.8
New South Wales	26	21.0
Queensland	23	18.5
Western Australia	21	16.9
South Australia	9	7.3
Tasmania	7	5.6
Northern Territory	6	4.8
Australian Capital Territory	5	4.0
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

- 43.5% (54 centres) classified themselves as delivering a specialist service, 35.5% (44 centres) as a generalist service with specialist programs and 21% (26 centres) as a generalist service.
- 97 centres reported on the area of work where their centre offers specialist programs, with the top 3 being:

<sup>2</sup> Not all 124 centres 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.

- domestic/family violence (56.7% or 55 centres)
- family law (41.2% or 40 centres)
- tenancy (30.9% or 30 centres)
- 111 centres reported on the particular client groups their specialist programs target, with the top 3 being:
  - people experiencing domestic/family violence (61.3% or 68 centres)
  - Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples (42.3% or 47 centres)
  - women (36% or 40 centres)
- 102 centres reported that they provide services to clients and communities in regional, rural and remote ('RRR') areas
- 82.9% (102 centres from 123 respondents) reported offering legal outreach at a location or locations other than their main or branch offices.

## 2.7. Staffing

Unlike the other Census questions, staffing questions were aimed at capturing staffing at a 'point in time' – that is, at 30 June 2017, rather than for the 2016/17 financial year.

- 108 centres reported employing a total of 1,349 people.
  - 50.5% (681 people) of those people were employed full-time.
  - 44.9% (606 people) of those people were employed part-time.
  - 4.6% (62 people) of those people were employed on a casual basis.
- 107 centres then reported their number of full-time equivalent ('FTEs') staff, with 1,027.6 FTE staff employed by these centres.
- The biggest group of FTE staff were solicitors (46.1% or 482.3 FTE staff), as reported by 106 centres.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This figure includes staff identified as lawyers (37.1% or 387.7 FTE staff) and the 9% of staff (94.7 FTE staff) employed as principal lawyers, including those who manage their CLC, and those who do not manage their CLC.

## 2.8. Turnaways

The Census continues to be an important tool to gather data on the number of turnaways<sup>4</sup> and the reasons why centres are forced to turn away people seeking legal help.

- **Only 62 centres responded to this question, however together they turned away over 112,700 people** in the 2016/2017 financial year.
- On average, a quarter (25.8%) of people turned away in 2016/17 could not be provided with an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral (as reported by 64 centres). This has fundamental implications for people across Australia who are unable to access the legal help they need.
- Centres most commonly reported recording turnaways ‘some of the time’ (48.4% or 59 centres from 122 respondents), with 31.1% or 38 centres recording turnaways ‘all of the time’.
- Importantly, a relatively low number of centres responded to this question which means this turnaway figure is extremely conservative and doesn’t reflect the full number of turnaways from centres in the 2016/17 financial year.
- The most prevalent reasons for turnaways,\* as reported by 112 centres, were:
  - conflict of interest; insufficient resources (both reasons reported by 71.4% or 80 centres), followed by
  - the person’s legal problem was outside the centre’s priority area/client group (reported by 70.5% or 79 centres)<sup>5</sup>.
- The methods used for collecting turnaways, as reported by 91 centres were:
  - recording “referrals” in the Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS)<sup>6</sup>,
  - recording “informations” in CLASS
  - recording “information referrals” in the Community Legal Services Information System (CLSIS),
  - spreadsheets,
  - telephone systems that collect the number of calls that did not get through on advice lines (these are recorded as turnaways), and

---

<sup>4</sup> In the Census, a ‘turnaway’ was defined as: ‘any person your centre 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’.

<sup>5</sup> This includes, for example, those centres offering specialist services that have priority areas of law and/or client groups. It could also indicate some centres have made a policy decision to focus work on a particular priority area or not do certain types/areas of work, including due to limited resources.

<sup>6</sup> Community Legal Assistance Service System (CLASS) was rolled out to the majority of centres in February-March 2017. CLASS is designed to support legal practice management in CLCs (and FVPLS) and fulfil reporting requirements under the NPA and some other funding agreements. From 2003-2017, centres used the CLSIS database to record client information and statistics, and report to funders.

- other practice management systems.

### 3. National data

#### 3.1. Funding

##### 3.1.1. Funding sources

In 2017, centres were asked to report upon their funding sources.

**Table 1: Funding sources, multiple answers possible (n=107)**

Funding Sources	No. of CLCs	%
Commonwealth Government (NPA)	82	76.6
State or Territory Government (Main Budget)	80	74.8
State or Territory Government (Public Purpose Fund/Legal Practitioner Interest on Trust Accounts Fund etc)	48	44.9
Fundraising and sponsorship	38	35.5
Philanthropic	30	28.0
Commonwealth Government (non-NPA)	28	26.2
Total number of responding CLCs(n)	107	

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

##### 3.1.2. Hours spent on funding-related activities

97 centres reported spending 3,857.2 hours per week in 2016/17 financial year on funding-related activities (e.g. reporting, grant applications, lobbying and fundraising).

#### 3.2. Turnaways

For the purposes of the 2016 Census, a 'turnaway' by a community legal centre was defined as:

*any person your centre 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

Only 62 centres provided the actual number or an estimate of the number of people turned away in the 2016/17 financial year. The total number of people turned away from these 62 centres in 2016/17 was 112,735 people.

**Table 2: Turnaways (n=62)**

Number of turnaways	No. of CLCs	%
1-499	24	38.7
500-999	19	30.6
1000-1999	8	12.9
2000-4999	6	9.7
5000 and more	5	8.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100</b>

**Question:** Please give the actual number or an estimate of the number of people your centre turned away in the 2016/17 financial year.

### 3.2.2. Appropriate, accessible and affordable referrals for turnaways

64 centres responded to the question, 'of your total turnaways in the 2016/17 financial year, to what proportion (per cent) could you give an appropriate, accessible and affordable referral?' The average was 74.2%, and the median was 80%.

### 3.2.3. Collecting turnaway data

Of the 122 centres that responded to a question about whether they recorded turnaways, most centres (48.4% or 59 centres) recorded turnaways 'some of the time'.

**Table 3: Recording of turnaways (n=122)**

Recording 'turnaways'	No. of CLCs	%
Yes – some of the time	59	48.4
Yes – all the time	38	31.1
No – never	25	20.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>

**Question:** Did your CLC record 'turnaways' in the 2016/17 financial year?

### 3.2.4. Methods for recording turnaways

91 centres that record turnaways described how they record turnaways.

Methods were:

- entering “information referrals” in the Community Legal Services Information System (CLSIS)<sup>7</sup>,
- recording “informations” in the Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS),
- recording “referrals” in CLASS,
- telephone systems that collect the number of calls that did not get through on advice lines (these are recorded as turnaways),
- spreadsheets, and
- other practice management systems.

Note, the Community Legal Service Information System (‘CLSIS’) database – used for data collection by centres in the Community Legal Services Programme from 2003 to early 2017 – did not have capacity to specifically record turnaways. The new Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS) database provides improved data collection, however NACLC will be working with the sector to consider ways to appropriately and accurately measure turnaways..

### 3.2.5. Reasons for turnaways

Community legal centres were asked to identify the reasons why they turned away clients in 2016/17 by selecting all relevant grounds from a list. 112 centres gave reasons for turnaways \*.

The most prevalent reasons were:

- conflict of interest, or the centre having insufficient resources at the time (71.4% or 80 centres for both reasons),
- the person’s legal problem was outside the centre’s priority area/client group (70.5% or 79 centres).
- unable to assist in the timeframe the client needed (67.9 % or 76 centres)

**Table 4: Reasons for turnaways, multiple answers possible (n=112)**

Reasons for turnaways	No. of CLCs	%
<b>Conflict of interest</b>	80	71.4
<b>Our centre had insufficient resources at the time</b>	80	71.4
<b>Person’s legal problem was outside our centre’s priority area/client group</b>	79	70.5
<b>Unable to assist in the timeframe the client needed</b>	76	67.9

<sup>7</sup> CLSIS is the database system used by the majority of centres to record client information and statistics from 2003 to early 2017. CLASS is the new system that was rolled out in February-March 2017.

<b>Our centre didn't possess the relevant expertise</b>	74	66.1
<b>Person outside the catchment area</b>	56	50.0
<b>Person was already being assisted by a private lawyer and could continue to afford this</b>	44	39.3
<b>Person was already being relevantly assisted by another legal assistance provider (e.g., Legal Aid, FVPLS, ATSILS)</b>	41	36.6
<b>Other (please specify)</b>	13	11.6
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>112</b>	

**Question:** What were the reasons your centre turned people away in 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

### 3.3. Volunteers and pro bono partnerships

Volunteers and pro bono partnerships<sup>8</sup> significantly increase the capacity of community legal centres to provide services. Every year centres 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 community legal centre, free of charge.*

A volunteer relationship is between the individual lawyer/law student (for example) and the centre 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 Management Committee/Board members undertook other volunteer work, external from their governance responsibilities, for the centre (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 centre and/or its clients, free of charge.*

---

<sup>8</sup> 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'.

A pro bono relationship is between a business and a centre. 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.

### 3.3.1. Use of volunteers

Of the 110 centres who responded to a question about volunteers, 94.5% (104 centres) indicated that volunteers were used in the 2016/17 financial year.

### 3.3.2. Hours and types of volunteers

Of the 110 centres who responded to the initial question about volunteers, 94 centres then provided information about the categories of volunteers who worked at their centre, and 91 centres provided further detail on the number of hours provided by volunteers in 2016/17.

94 centres reported that 6,915 volunteers contributed and 91 centres recorded a total of 15,291.7 hours of work per week in 2016/17.

**Table 5: Types of volunteers, numbers and hours worked (n=91-94)**

Position	No. of CLCs with volunteer type	Maximum per CLC	TOTAL no. of vols	Average Vols per CLCs with volunteer type	Total Sector Hours per week
Lawyers	70	1000	3165	45.2	3692.9
Migration Agents	11	36	105	9.5	98.0
Community Legal Education/Community Development Workers	4	1	4	1.0	25.0
Students – Undergrad Law	82	191	2144	26.1	5429.9
Students – Undergrad Social Work	20	8	53	2.7	282.5
Law Graduate – Practical Legal Training (PLT)	59	96	458	7.8	2250.0
Counsellors – Financial	2	2	3	1.5	15.2
Counsellors – Family Violence	0	0	0	0.0	14.0
Administrative Assistants	33	47	203	6.2	414.0
Finance Officers/Bookkeepers	4	5	9	2.3	36.0
Fundraisers	7	10	16	2.3	45.0
Communications/Media	13	5	19	1.5	64.3
Other Volunteers <sup>1</sup>	26	230	736	28.3	2925.0
<b>Total volunteers and hours</b>			<b>6915</b>		<b>15291.7</b>

**Notes: 1 Other volunteers included: board and management committee members and volunteers with other specialist skills.**

**For consistency with previous years, the findings in this table are based on two groups of CLCs: those that answered Q25 on the number of volunteers (n=94) and those that answered Q26 on the number of hours worked by volunteers (n=91).**

**Question:** Please provide the total number of volunteers at your centre in the 2016/17 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 2016/17 financial year.

### 3.3.3. Type of work undertaken by volunteers

The main activity undertaken by volunteers at centres was involvement in direct legal service delivery (87% from 100 respondents).

**Table 6: Work undertaken by centre volunteers, multiple answers possible (n=100)**

Volunteer work	No. of CLCs	%
Involvement in direct legal service delivery	87	87.0
Administrative support	72	72.0
Policy advocacy and law reform (eg., researching or writing submissions)	52	52.0
Community legal education/community development	41	41.0
Involvement in other direct service delivery (eg. social work, court support or financial counselling)	27	27.0
Other (please specify)	23	23.0
Communications/Media	21	21.0
Fundraising or sponsorship activities	19	19.0
Accounting/bookkeeping	8	8.0
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Question:** What type of work was undertaken by your CLC volunteers in the 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

### 3.3.4. Overall centre investment in volunteers

To find out more about support of and investment in centre volunteers in the 2016/17 financial year, respondents were asked to provide hours that employed community legal centre staff spent supervising, inducting and training volunteers.

**Table 7: Hours centres spent supervising, inducting and training volunteers (n=72-89)**

Volunteer supervision/training	Hrs per week supervising volunteers	Hrs in FY developing and inducting volunteers	Hrs in FY providing other training to volunteers
Number of Responding CLCs	89	88	72
Mean	28.0	166.5	302.1
Median	15.0	57.5	37.5
Minimum	0.2	1.0	1.0
Maximum	200.0	2016.0	9990.0
<b>Total Sector Hours</b>	<b>2489.0</b>	<b>14654.6</b>	<b>21748.0</b>

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

### 3.3.5. Pro bono partnerships

Centres 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 2016/17 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 centre and/or its clients, free of charge.*

Of the 102 centres that answered this question, 65.4% (70 centres) reported that their centre had a pro bono partnership with a business.

63 centres provided a breakdown of the hours contributed by pro bono partnerships, adding to a total of 83,252.5 hours of assistance to these 63 centres over the 2016/17 financial year. The majority of hours contributed by pro bono partners were to provide direct legal service delivery.

**Table 8: Number of hours contributed by pro bono partners (n=63)**

Activity - pro bono	Number of CLCs	% of responding CLCs	Maximum hours per CLC	Total Hours to CLC Sector
<b>Involvement in direct legal service delivery</b>	45	71.4	36403	66989

Provision of advice by specialist lawyers in a particular area of expertise for use in client matters	31	49.2	8700	10358.5
Provision of advice or assistance to the centre	38	60.3	320	1817
Policy advocacy and law reform (e.g., researching or writing submissions)	12	19.0	600	1480
Governance/management	7	11.1	680	793
Fundraising or sponsorship	10	15.9	200	502
Publications (eg., design and printing)	14	22.2	150	442
Administrative support	7	11.1	150	290
Community legal education	15	23.8	30	243
Legal practice management	6	9.5	100	167
Marketing	3	4.8	80	96
Accounting/bookkeeping	3	4.8	40	75
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>63</b>		<b>Total hours: 83252.5</b>	

**Question:** *Please estimate the total number of hours that pro bono partnerships contributed to your centre in each of the following areas in the 2016/17 financial year.*

### 3.4. Partnerships

Centres 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 2017 Census, 101 centres 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 2016/17 financial year.

#### 3.4.1. Legal services

The 101 respondents reported that their most common partners when delivering legal services were other community legal centres (56.4% or 57 centres), non-legal community organisations (49.5% or 50 centres) and legal pro bono partners (48.5% or 49 centres).

**Table 9: Partners for legal services, multiple answers possible (n=101)**

Partnership	No. of CLCs	%
Community legal centres	57	56.4
Community organisation - non-legal	50	49.5
Pro bono partners - legal	49	48.5
Legal Aid	43	42.6
University	32	31.7
Aboriginal community controlled organisation	20	19.8
State government agency (NOT Legal Aid)	16	15.8
FVPLS	15	14.9
ATSILS	15	14.9
Community organisation - legal	15	14.9
Commonwealth government agency	12	11.9
Local government agency	10	9.9
Pro bono partners - non-legal	4	4.0
Total number of responding CLCs(n)	101	
<b>Note: For consistency with previous years, the findings are based on the number of CLCs that provided at least one response to Q38, This may result in one centre's multiple partnerships being reflected in these numbers.</b>		

**Question:** Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering legal services in the 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).



### 3.4.2. Community legal education

For the 101 respondents, non-legal community organisations were the primary partners for centres when delivering community legal education (68.3% or 69 CLCs).

**Table 10: Partners for community legal education, multiple answers possible (n=101)**

Partnership	No. of CLCs	%
Community organisation - non-legal	69	68.3
Community legal centres	53	52.5
Legal Aid	44	43.6
University	41	40.6
State government agency (not Legal Aid)	28	27.7
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander community controlled organisation	28	27.7
Pro bono partners - legal	19	18.8
Local government agency	18	17.8
Community organisation - legal	12	11.9
Commonwealth government agency	11	10.9
FVPLS	10	9.9
ATSILS	10	9.9
Pro bono partners - non-legal	6	5.9
Total number of responding CLCs(n)	101	
Note: For consistency with previous years, the findings are based on the number of CLCs that provided at least one response to Q38, This may result in one centre's multiple partnerships being reflected in these numbers.		

**Question:** Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering community legal education in the 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

### 3.4.3. Policy advocacy and law reform

For the 101 respondents, other centre were the most common partner in policy advocacy and law reform projects (57.4% or 58 centres).

**Table 11: Partners for policy advocacy/law reform, multiple answers possible (n=101)**

Partnership	No. of CLCs	%
Community legal centres	58	57.4
Community organisation - non-legal	39	38.6
University	28	27.7

Legal Aid Commission	20	19.8
State government agency (not Legal Aid)	19	18.8
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander community controlled organisation	12	11.9
Pro bono partners - legal	12	11.9
ATSILS	11	10.9
Local government agency	11	10.9
Community organisation - legal	10	9.9
Commonwealth government agency	9	8.9
FVPLS	8	7.9
Pro bono partners - non-legal	2	2.0
Total number of responding CLCs(n)	101	
Note: For consistency with previous years, the findings are based on the number of centres that provided at least one response to Q38, This may result in one centre's multiple partnerships being reflected in these numbers.		

**Question:** Which of the following organisations or agencies did your CLC partner with in delivering policy advocacy and law reform in the 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

#### 3.4.4. Partnerships with universities

In addition to the partnerships highlighted above in relation to delivery of legal services, community legal education and policy, advocacy and law reform, 27.5% (28 centres) reported they had partnered with a university for a research project or other substantive grant-based work during 2016/17.

### 3.5. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities

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

#### 3.5.1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified positions

Of the 103 centres that responded to a question about having an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified staff position, 17.5% (18 centres) indicated that they have at least one identified position that can only be filled by an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander person. Six centres (5.8%) reported that they planned to introduce such a position within the next 12 months.

**Table 12: Community legal centres with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified position (n=103)**

Identified position	No. of CLCs	%
Yes	18	17.5
No	79	76.7
Not yet, but planning for such a position within the next 12 months	6	5.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

**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.

### 3.5.2. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in centre roles

Community legal centres were asked about the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in centre roles.

**Table 13: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in community legal centre roles (n=95)**

Role	Number of CLCs reporting	Average per CLC reporting	Total in CLC Sector
Employed Staff	29	2.4	69
Volunteer	15	1.7	25
Management Committee/Board Member	24	1.9	46
Advisory Council/Working Group	8	5.6	45
<b>Total Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people employed</b>			<b>185</b>
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>95</b>		

**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?

### 3.5.3. Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities

Community legal centres were asked to nominate the engagement their centre has with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities, aside from providing direct client services. 92 centres responded, with participating in community events being the number one activity (as reported by 77.2% of respondents or 71 centres).

**Table 14: Engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (n=92)**

Engagement	No. of CLCs	%
Participating in community events	71	77.2
Community outreach	53	57.6
Participating in NAIDOC Week	52	56.5
Participating in Reconciliation Week	36	39.1
Management Committee/Board member	24	26.1
Other (please specify)	24	26.1
Advisory Council/Working Group	15	16.3
Total number of responding CLCs(n)	92	

**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 centres that selected 'Other' engagement (26.1% or 24 centres), 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.

#### **3.5.4. Cultural awareness/safety training**

Of the 103 centres that responded to a question about cultural awareness/safety training, 72.8% (75 centres) reported that their staff undertake this training.

#### **3.5.5. Development of Reconciliation Action Plans ('RAPs')**

Of the 102 centres that responded to a question about whether their centre has or is considering developing a RAP, 9.8% or 10 centres have already developed and implemented a RAP, and 38.2% or 39 centres are either currently developing or planning for a RAP within the next 12 months.

28.4% or 29 of the 102 centres have not yet considered developing a RAP.

**Table 15: Development of Reconciliation Action Plans (n=102)**

Reconciliation Action Plan	No. of CLCs	%
Not yet considered developed a RAP	29	28.4
Planning for a RAP within the next 12 months	21	20.6
Currently developing a RAP	18	17.6
Other (please specify)	17	16.7
Developed and implemented a RAP	10	9.8
Considered a RAP and decided against developing one	7	6.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100</b>

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

### 3.6. Policy advocacy and law reform

#### 3.6.1. Engagement in law reform and policy work

Of the 104 respondents, the majority (77.9% or 81 centres) indicated that they undertook policy advocacy and law reform activities in the 2016/17 financial year.

#### 3.6.2. Types of law reform and policy work

Of these 104 centres, 80 responded to a further question asking them to select the activities undertaken. The main activity reported was preparing submissions to inquiries and reviews (90% or 72 centres).

**Table 16: Policy advocacy and law reform undertaken by CLC, multiple answers possible (n=80)**

Types of policy and law reform	No. of CLCs	%
Preparing submissions to inquiries and reviews	72	90.0
Meetings with MPs and/or their staff	66	82.5
Letter writing to MPs	59	73.8
Advocating via social media	52	65.0
Consulting with and appearing before inquiries and reviews	39	48.8
Advocating via other media	37	46.3
Running a coordinated, branded campaign (e.g., Do Not Knock campaign)	12	15.0
Other (please specify)	7	8.8
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>80</b>	

**Question:** What sort of policy and law reform work did your CLC undertake in the 2016/17 financial year? (Tick all that apply).

### 3.7. 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.

#### 3.7.1. States and territories

**Table 17: State and territory breakdown (n=124)**

State/Territory	No. of CLCs	%
Victoria	27	21.8
New South Wales	26	21.0
Queensland	23	18.5
Western Australia	21	16.9
South Australia	9	7.3
Tasmania	7	5.6
Northern Territory	6	4.8
Australian Capital Territory	5	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

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

#### 3.7.2. Position of person completing response

The majority of surveys were completed by centre managers across a range of position titles, with Principal Solicitor also acting as manager being the most commonly reported position (20.2% of survey respondents).<sup>9</sup>

**Table 18: Position of respondent (n=124)**

Position Title	No. of CLCs	%
Manager, including Chief Executive Officer, Coordinator or other title	62	50.0
Principal Solicitor as CLCmanager	26	21.0
Principal Solicitor non-CLC manager	18	14.5
Administrator, including operations	8	6.5
Management Committee/Board Member	2	1.6
Other (please specify)	8	6.5

<sup>9</sup> Most of the “Other” positions comprised of managerial roles (11 respondents) senior lawyer roles (4 respondents), and junior or assistant roles (3 respondents).

Total	124	100
-------	-----	-----

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

### 3.7.3. Rural, Regional and Remote (RRR) services

Respondents were asked if they regarded their centre as servicing a RRR location. A total of 102 respondents reported providing services to clients and communities in RRR areas. The majority of those (63.7% or 65 centres) are located in an urban area but also service RRR areas, while 36.3% (37 centres) are located in a RRR area.

### 3.7.4. Specialist and generalist centres

Centres were also asked to nominate which type or types of service their centre delivered. Of the 124 respondents, most centres offered specialist services, either as part of or an adjunct to, a generalist service (35.5% or 44 centres) or as a stand-alone specialist only service (43.5% or 54 centres).

**Table 20: Type of service (n=124)**

Type of Service	No. of CLCs	%
<b>Specialist</b>	54	43.5
<b>Generalist with specialist program(s)</b>	44	35.5
<b>Generalist</b>	26	21.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

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

### 3.7.5. Specialist programs

97 centres provided details of specialist programs offered by their community legal centre in particular areas of law. The top 3 specialist areas were:

1. domestic/family violence (56.7% or 55 centres)
2. family law (41.2% or 40 centres)
3. tenancy (30.9% or 30 centres)

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.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Many CLCs also specified other areas or specific client groups, with the most commonly reported being elder abuse, disability related issues, child support and planning law.

**Table 21: Types of specialist programs, multiple answers possible (n=97)**

Specialist programs	No. of CLCs	%
Domestic/family violence	55	56.7
Other (please specify)	41	42.3
Family law	40	41.2
Tenancy	30	30.9
Discrimination	27	27.8
Employment	23	23.7
Health justice partnership	22	22.7
Care and protection	21	21.6
Consumer, credit and debt	21	21.6
Welfare rights	18	18.6
Alternative dispute resolution	15	15.5
Immigration/refugee law	12	12.4
Mental health law	11	11.3
Police accountability	10	10.3
Financial	9	9.3
Environment	7	7.2
Animal Welfare	3	3.1
Arts	1	1.0
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>97</b>	

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

In addition, centres were also asked to which targeted clients groups their centre offers specialist programs. A majority (61.3%) of the 111 responding centres mentioned people experiencing domestic/family violence, with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and women being the next most commonly reported client groups (42.3% and 36% respectively).

Client groups	No. of CLCs	%
People experiencing domestic/family violence	68	61.3
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples	47	42.3
Women	40	36.0
People experiencing homelessness and those at risk of homelessness	33	29.7
People from culturally and/or linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds and/or community	33	29.7
Young people	27	24.3



People with disability	26	23.4
Older people	23	20.7
Self-represented litigants	20	18.0
Social security recipients	19	17.1
People in prison	18	16.2
Other (please specify)	15	13.5
Refugees	13	11.7
LGBTIQ communities	13	11.7
Boarders & Lodgers	4	3.6
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>111</b>	

### 3.7.6. Provision of outreach

123 centres responded to a question about the provision of outreach legal services, with 82.9% (102 centres) reporting that their centre provided legal outreach at a location other than their main or branch offices.

## 3.8. Community legal centres' staffing

Staffing-related questions were aimed at capturing staffing at a 'point in time' – that is, at 30 June 2017, rather than for the 2016/17 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'.

### 3.8.1. Number of paid staff

Community legal centres 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 centre completed the Census.

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

108 centres reported employing a total of 1,349 people. 50.5% (681 people) of those were employed full-time. Part-time staff comprised 44.9% of people employed (606 people) and only 4.6% (62 people) were employed as casuals.

The average total number of paid staff at each centre was between 12 and 13 people. This average is inflated by the participation of some relatively large centres.

**Table 23: Number of permanent full-time, part-time and casual staff (n=108)**

Staff employment	No. of staff	Average employed per CLC	Median employed per CLC	% of CLC workforce
Permanent full-time	561	5.2	4.0	41.6
Permanent part-time	459	4.3	3.0	34.0
Fixed-term full-time	120	1.1	0.0	8.9
Fixed-term part-time	147	1.4	0.0	10.9
Casual	62	0.6	0.0	4.6
<b>Total employees</b>	<b>1349</b>	<b>12.5</b>		
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>108</b>			
<b>Notes:</b> The average is the 'mean' average: the total number of staff divided by the number of responding CLCs. The median is the midpoint of the distribution. Thus a median of '0' indicates that at least 50% of the responding CLCs had no staff of this type.				

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

### 3.8.2. Number of FTE staff

107 centres reported employing a total of 1,027.6 full-time equivalent (FTE staff). Of these, the majority (66.5% or 681 FTEs) were employed full-time. Part-time FTE staff comprised 31.5% (323.9 FTEs) and 2.2% (22.8 FTEs) were employed as casuals.

The average total number of FTE staff at each centre was 9.6. This average is inflated by some relatively large centres.

**Table 24: Number of FTE paid full-time, part-time and casual staff (n=107)**

Staff employment - FTE	No. of FTE	Average FTE per CLC	Median FTE per CLC	% of centre workforce
FTE Permanent full-time	561.0	5.2	4.0	54.6
FTE Permanent part-time	255.8	2.4	1.6	24.9
FTE Fixed-term full-time	120.0	1.1	0.0	11.7
FTE Fixed-term part-time	68.1	0.6	0.0	6.6
FTE Casual	22.8	0.2	0.0	2.2
<b>Total FTE</b>	<b>1027.6</b>	<b>9.6</b>		
<b>Total number of responding CLCs(n)</b>	<b>107</b>			

**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.

### 3.8.3. Employment by position

106 centres responded to a question asking them to report the number of FTE staff they employed against a number of position types. In total, 1,046.2 FTE staff were employed by the sector at 30 June 2017.

The majority of paid FTE staff were solicitors (46.1% or 482.3 FTE staff). This figure includes staff identified as lawyers (37.1% or 387.7 FTE staff) and the 9% of staff (94.7 FTE staff) employed as principal solicitors, including those who manage their centre, and those who are not employed as managers.

30 centres reported employing 'Other paid staff' representing 4.8% of total FTEs of the workforce. The most commonly reported other position types include Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander officer/coordinator, disability advocates, project manager/coordinator and mediators, amongst others.

**Table 25: FTE staff by position (n=106)**

Position	Number of CLCs employing	Total FTE employed in sector	Average FTE per all CLCs	Average FTE per CLCs employing	% of total CLCs workforce
<b>Solicitor</b>	88	387.7	3.66	4.41	37.1
<b>Administration Assistant</b>	52	62.0	0.59	1.19	5.9
<b>Other Paid Staff</b>	30	54.0	0.51	1.80	5.2
<b>Principal Solicitor who doesn't manage CLC</b>	49	50.6	0.48	1.03	4.8
<b>Administrator</b>	41	50.3	0.47	1.23	4.8
<b>Principal Solicitor who manages CLC</b>	49	44.1	0.42	0.90	4.2
<b>Receptionist</b>	32	34.7	0.33	1.09	3.3
<b>Manager</b>	27	34.2	0.32	1.27	3.3
<b>Tenants' Advocate/worker</b>	17	32.4	0.31	1.91	3.1
<b>Paralegal</b>	30	30.3	0.29	1.01	2.9
<b>Finance Officer/Bookkeeper</b>	46	30.2	0.29	0.66	2.9

Community Legal Education/Community Development Worker	31	29.5	0.28	0.95	2.8
Domestic & Family Violence Support	12	27.1	0.26	2.26	2.6
Director	19	26.1	0.25	1.37	2.5
CEO	25	23.8	0.22	0.95	2.3
Coordinator	21	21.5	0.20	1.02	2.1
Social Worker/other counsellor	14	20.3	0.19	1.45	1.9
Financial Counsellor	6	18.3	0.17	3.05	1.7
Policy Officer/Researcher	7	16.4	0.15	2.34	1.6
Operations	12	14.3	0.13	1.19	1.4
Communications/Media Officer	18	13.2	0.12	0.73	1.3
Executive Officer	13	12.0	0.11	0.92	1.1
Court Support/Advocate	6	5.0	0.05	0.83	0.5
Fundraiser	8	4.8	0.05	0.60	0.5
Migration Agent	4	3.6	0.03	0.90	0.3
<b>Total Sector FTE</b>		<b>1046.2</b>	<b>9.87</b>		
<b>Total number of responding CLCs (n)</b>	<b>106</b>				

**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 2017, 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 community legal centres. These members include community legal centres, Family Violence Prevention Legal Services and 1 Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Legal Service.

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

### **Communications**

Communications about the survey were circulated through the NACLC website, newsletters and Twitter account. Follow-up emails and phone calls were made by NACLC up to March 2018. 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 2017. 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 centres 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. Centres 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 October 2017 to March 2018.

## Data cleaning and analysis

Data cleaning was undertaken in Excel on data exported from SurveyMonkey. The following changes were made to the dataset:

- Where multiple responses from the same centre were received only one response was retained. Where appropriate responses were merged into one record
- Formatting changes to facilitate analysis, for instance turning 'nil' into '0'.
- To reconcile inconsistent responses, for instance where a response said no information was recorded on turnaways but a valid response was provided on reasons for turnaways, then the latter was retained.

Data analysis was undertaken using SPSS Statistics software. Additional corrections were made for the purpose of reporting the analysis, including:

- Where different information was provided in questions that were eliciting the same information, such as 'number of full time staff' and 'FTE full time', the information was reported from one question only.
- Extreme outliers were removed where the information provided was not considered to be plausible, such as the number of hours worked by volunteers per week exceeding the available hours for the number of volunteers.

Reported analysis is on the basis of centres providing a response to a question. However, a small number of questions did not include all possible options for response, such as a 'not applicable' or 'none' option.

## Changes to the Census questions and impact

In response to feedback from centres that the Census had become time consuming and burdensome, due to increases in length and complexity over time, NACLC built on changes to the Census made in 2016 namely reducing the number of questions by half.

The questions largely focus on the identity and work of centres, allowing NACLC to build upon the baseline data collected in previous years.

Traditional questions relating to sector services, infrastructure and clients were not included with the intention of surveying the sector separately on these matters or collecting the data through other methods, for example CLASS.

The majority of respondents (72%) completed the survey within 60 minutes, and 32% completed within 30 minutes.

The responses from centres about the Census itself varied, with a number of centres commenting positively on the decreased length and ease of the Census and 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 2017 Census in order to inform the development of future sector 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 2017**

### **WELCOME TO THE NACLC CENSUS 2017!**

Welcome to the NACLC Census 2017 – 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.

Your responses to Census 2016 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.

**FINAL CLOSING DATE: Friday, 15 December 2017 5pm AEDT.**

**\*Complete the Census by the above closing date and go in the draw to win a free registration to the 2018 National CLCs Conference!\***

**PLEASE NOTE:** In response to feedback received, this year we have made it possible to save a partially completed survey and return to it at a later time. This is why you will receive the questionnaire directly from SurveyMonkey rather than NACLC.

### **Need Help?**

Also new to 2017 is the Census Calculator Tool – an excel spreadsheet NACLC has created to assist centres calculate staff numbers, FTEs etc. It is attached in the Census information email with instructions. If you have questions about the tool, please contact Charlotte on 02 9264 9595 or [charlotte\\_maung@clc.net.au](mailto:charlotte_maung@clc.net.au).

### **About the Census questions**

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

- turnaways
- staffing
- funding
- 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
- Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS), and
- policy advocacy and law reform work.

The questions relate to the **2016/17** financial year. Most questions are optional, except for those marked

with an asterisk (\*).

### **What's changed in Census 2017?**

The responses to the survey **can now be saved** to be continued later. Responses are **saved** on clicking **Next** on each **page** of the survey. Once you submit the **completed** survey changes can not be made.

For the first time, some Census data will be collected from CLASS.

Staffing calculations have changed from **current point in time**, to levels at **30 June 2017**. These figures can then also be used when required for insurance purposes.

### **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.

NACLC may seek 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 Charlotte Maung on 02 9264 9595 or [charlotte\\_maung@clc.net.au](mailto:charlotte_maung@clc.net.au)



## NACLC Census 2017

### 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. Do you give permission for your response to this questionnaire to be provided to your state/territory association? (Note: If you do not answer yes to this question only your de-identified data will be included in the information provided to the state/territory association)**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**4. What is your name?**

**5. What is your position title at the CLC?**

- ☐ Chief Executive Officer
- ☐ Executive Officer
- ☐ Director
- ☐ Manager
- ☐ Operations
- ☐ Coordinator
- ☐ Principal Solicitor as CLC manager
- ☐ Principal Solicitor non-CLC manager
- ☐ Administrator
- ☐ Management Committee/Board Members
- ☐ Other (please specify)

**6. What is your contact email address?**



## NACLC Census 2017

### PROFILE

**7. 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

**8. Do you provide legal outreach (e.g: advice, casework, legal information) at a location other than at your main or branch office(s))?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

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

- ☐ Specialist
- ☐ Generalist
- ☐ Generalist with specialist program(s)

## NACLC Census 2017

### PROFILE

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

- ☐ Alternative dispute resolution
- ☐ Animal welfare
- ☐ Arts
- ☐ Care and protection
- ☐ Consumer, credit and debt
- ☐ Discrimination
- ☐ Domestic/family violence
- ☐ Employment
- ☐ Environment
- ☐ Family law
- ☐ Financial
- ☐ Health justice partnership
- ☐ Immigration/refugee law
- ☐ Police accountability
- ☐ Mental health law
- ☐ Tenancy
- ☐ Welfare rights
- ☐ Other (please specify)

## NACLC Census 2017

### PROFILE

#### 11. Do you provide specialist programs targeting particular client groups? (Tick all that apply).

- ☐ Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples
- ☐ People experiencing domestic/family violence
- ☐ Boarders & Lodgers
- ☐ People experiencing homelessness and those at risk of homelessness
- ☐ Refugees
- ☐ LGBTIQ communities
- ☐ Older people
- ☐ People from culturally and/or linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds and/or community
- ☐ People in prison
- ☐ People with disability
- ☐ Self-represented litigants
- ☐ Social security recipients
- ☐ Women
- ☐ Young people
- ☐ Other (please specify)



## **NACLC Census 2017**

### **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.

#### **12. Did your CLC record 'turnaways' in the 2016/17 financial year?**

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



## NACLC Census 2017

### TURNAWAYS

**13. If your CLC recorded turnaways in the 2016/17 financial year, please tell us in a few lines how your CLC recorded turnaways? Tick all that apply.**

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

**14. What were the reasons your centre turned people away in the 2016/17 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)

**15. Please give the actual number of an estimate of the number of people your centre turned away in the 2016/17 financial year?**

**16. Of your total turnaways in the 2016/17 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 2017

### 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.

**It is recommended that you use the Census Calculator Tool to assist you to calculate answers for this section.**

In 2017 a Census Calculator Tool has been provided to assist you to calculate and keep a record of staff positions, FTEs, volunteers, and hours staff spent supervising volunteers and engaging in fundraising activities.

The tool is an excel spreadsheet with formulas designed to provide totals once your staff data is entered. You will not be asked to provide NACLC with a copy of the spreadsheet; the tool is for your own use only, and it is strongly recommended that you save a copy of the completed spreadsheet for your Centre's future reference.

**NB: When answering, please respond with staff positions as at 30 June 2017 (not current time). Please take into account all staff employed and any position for which you were actively recruiting at 30 June 2017.**

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

**17. First, we would like to know how many of your paid staff (or positions under active recruitment) at 30 June 2017 are employed permanent, fixed-term, full-time, 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.**

**Fixed-term full-time – On contract of fixed duration, 35 hours per week or more; with access to entitlements such as paid annual leave, sick leave and public holidays.**

**Fixed-term part-time – On contract of fixed duration, 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 IN THE PAY WEEK COVERING at or for your centre.**

**Using the definitions above, how many of your paid staff were employed at 30 June 2017**

Permanent full-time

Permanent part-time

Fixed-term full-time

Fixed-term part-time

Casual

**18. 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 employed at 30 June 2017.**

FTE Permanent full-time

FTE Permanent part-time

FTE Fixed-term full-time

FTE Fixed-term part-time

FTE Casual



## NACLC Census 2017

### 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.

**It is recommended that you use the Census Calculator Tool to assist you to calculate your FTE staff.**

The tool is an excel spreadsheet with formulas designed to provide totals once your staff data is entered.

**Alternatively, 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.

**19. 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.**

CEO	<input type="text"/>
Director	<input type="text"/>
Executive Officer	<input type="text"/>
Coordinator	<input type="text"/>
Manager	<input type="text"/>
Operations	<input type="text"/>

Administrator	
Administration Assistant	
Receptionist	
Finance Officer/Bookkeeper	
Principal Solicitor who manages CLC	
Principal Solicitor who doesn't manage CLC	
Solicitor	
Paralegal	
Tenants' Advocate/worker	
Community Legal Education/Community Development Worker	
Policy Officer/Researcher	
Social Worker/other counsellor	
Domestic & Family Violence Support	
Financial Counsellor	
Migration Agent	
Fundraiser	
Communications/Media Officer	
Court Support/Advocate	
Other Paid Staff	

**20. 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 2017

### FUNDING

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

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

**22. Please list your sources of non-NPA Commonwealth funding. (This will assist NACLC with advocacy in relation to Commonwealth funding sources outside of the NPA.)**

**23. Please estimate the total number of hours PER WEEK in the 2016/17 financial year that your CLC spent on funding-related activities (e.g., reporting, applying for grants, lobbying, fundraising).**

**Note: Census Calculator Tool can be used to assist providing the staff hours for this question. Please remember to add any Board or other volunteer or contract hours to your estimate.**



## NACLC Census 2017

### 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. Please **do not** include Pro Bono secondment in the volunteer section as this is to be included in the Pro Bono section.

#### 24. Did your centre use volunteers in any capacity in the 2016/17 financial year?

☐ Yes

☐ No



## NACLC Census 2017

### VOLUNTEERS

**25. Please provide the total number of volunteers at your centre in the 2016/17 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"/>
Communications/Media	<input type="text"/>
Other Volunteers	<input type="text"/>

**26. 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 2016/17 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

Migration Agents

Community Legal  
Education/Community  
Development Workers

Students – Undergrad  
Law

Students – Undergrad  
Social Work

Law Graduate  
– Practical Legal  
Training (PLT)

Counsellors – Financial

Counsellors – Family  
Violence

Administrative  
Assistants

Finance  
Officers/Bookkeepers

Fundraisers

Communications/Media

Other Volunteers

**27. 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.**

**28. What type of work was undertaken by your CLC volunteers in the 2016/17 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
- ☐ Communications/Media
- ☐ Fundraising or sponsorship activities
- ☐ Other (please specify)

**29. 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. NOTE: Census Calculator Tool can be used to assist in answering this question. Please estimate the total number of hours:**

PER WEEK in the  
2016/17 financial year  
that employed staff  
spent responding to  
volunteers' queries,  
checking volunteers'  
advices, and otherwise  
supervising volunteers'  
work.

over the ENTIRE  
2016/17 financial year  
that employed staff  
spent on developing  
and providing  
orientation/induction  
and other training to  
volunteers.

over the ENTIRE  
2016/17 financial year  
that employed staff  
spent on developing  
and providing  
training **other than** at  
orientation/induction to  
volunteers.



## **NACLC Census 2017**

### **PRO BONO PARTNERSHIPS**

NACLC is interested in information about your pro bono partnerships in the 2016/17 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.

**30. Did your centre have a pro bono partnership with a business in the 2016/17 financial year?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## **NACLC Census 2017**

### **PRO BONO PARTNERSHIPS**

**31. What type of work was undertaken by or with the assistance of your pro bono partners in the 2016/17 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

**32. Please estimate the total number of hours that pro bono partnerships contributed to your centre in each of the following areas in the 2016/17 financial year:**

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



## NACLC Census 2017

### 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.

**33. 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

**34. 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"/>

**35. Aside from direct client services, what engagement does your CLC have with Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities? 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)

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**37. 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 2017**

### **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.

**38. 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 2016/17 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"/>

**39. NACLC is considering a National Research Agenda to facilitate research collaboration between CLCs and universities/academics. In 2016/17 did your CLC partner with a university for a research project or other substantive grant-based work?**

**Note: Please exclude clinical education programs.**

☐ Yes

☐ No

**40. if YES, please specify the name of the academic and/or university and the name of the project:**



## **NACLC Census 2017**

### **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 2016/17 financial year?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## **NACLC Census 2017**

### **POLICY ADVOCACY AND LAW REFORM**

**42. What sort of policy and law reform work did your CLC undertake in the 2016/17 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 2017

### CLASS

The Community Legal Assistance Services System (CLASS) database provides a contemporary cloud based platform that more effectively supports legal practice management in CLCs and FVPLS as well as fulfill reporting requirements under the NPA.

NACLC is committed to ensuring that CLASS continues to meet as many of the business requirements of the sector as possible. Your views on the usability and functionality of CLASS are extremely valuable to us. We therefore ask that you answer the following questions to provide a baseline against which we can measure progress in the ongoing development and continuous improvement of the system.

**45. What is your Centre's overall satisfaction with CLASS right now? (Scale of 1 - 5, 1 being very unsatisfied through to 5 being very satisfied)**

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5

**46. What do you think your Centre's satisfaction level will be once customisable reports will be available in CLASS? (Scale of 1 - 5, 1 being very unsatisfied through to 5 being very satisfied)**

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5

**47. What are the three main changes or additions that could be made to CLASS to make it more functional/useful for your Centre?**



## NACLC Census 2017

### 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 2017. 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 John Macmillan at the NACLC office on [john\\_macmillan@clc.net.au](mailto:john_macmillan@clc.net.au) or 02 9264 9595.

#### 48. 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

#### 49. 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.*