Legal Data in Saskatchewan and Implications for a Justice Data Commons:
Results from an Environmental Scan and Key Informant Interviews

Lisa Jewell & Bryce Stoliker

In Collaboration with:

Brea Lowenberger & Heather Heavin

Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies

University of Saskatchewan

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

March 31, 2023

Legal Data in Saskatchewan and Implications for a Justice Data Commons: Results from an Environmental Scan and Key Informant Interviews

Prepared by:

Lisa Jewell & Bryce Stoliker – Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies, University of Saskatchewan

In collaboration with:

Brea Lowenberger – Centre for Research, Evaluation, and Action Towards Equal (CREATE) Justice, University of Saskatchewan

Heather Heavin – College of Law, University of Saskatchewan

Submitted: March 31, 2023

Funding and Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

The Centre for Research, Evaluation, and Action Towards Equal Justice (CREATE Justice) is working with stakeholders such as the Law Society of Saskatchewan to improve access to justice initiatives in Canada—particularly, in the province of Saskatchewan. In this effort, it is recognized that there is a need to develop and enhance the evidentiary base for access to justice issues, especially concerning civil and family law (McCashin et al., 2018). It is also recognized that current practices for collecting and analyzing justice data may be insufficient (Canadian Bar Association, 2013; McCashin et al., 2018). To that end, the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies (CFBSJS) in collaboration with CREATE Justice is undertaking a research project to develop a more cohesive picture of access to justice issues relating primarily to civil and family law in Saskatchewan.

The main objective of this research project is to compile foundational data concerning the legal needs of Saskatchewan residents. The current report presents the results from the first component of this study: **a scan of existing justice data being collected by legal and non-legal organizations in Saskatchewan** to determine the usability of that data to identify gaps in the justice system, inform service delivery, improve access to justice, and establish a data commons. Results from the second component of this study – **legal needs surveys of current legal and social service providers, as well as practicing lawyers**, to identify legal needs/gaps that exist within Saskatchewan– are available in a separate report (see Stoliker et al., 2023).

Study Purpose and Research Questions

The **purpose of the current study** was to conduct a scan of justice-related data being collected by legal organizations (i.e., those that provide legal services) and non-legal organizations (i.e., those who may serve clients with legal needs and who may be collecting relevant legal data) in Saskatchewan, particularly in the domains of civil and family law, to better understand the nature of the data being collected, the accessibility of that data for data sharing purposes, and how amenable agencies in Saskatchewan are to establishing a justice data commons in the province. To that end, **three overarching research questions** guided the study:

1) What types of justice-related data related to civil and family law are being collected by legal (and non-legal) organizations in Saskatchewan?

2) To what extent are agencies in Saskatchewan practicing within the domains of civil and family law able to share data with external parties? What factors may facilitate or hinder data sharing?

3) What is the perceived need for a justice data commons in Saskatchewan? What are the perceived benefits and challenges associated with establishing a justice data commons?

Method

A multi-method approach was employed to achieve the study's objectives. First, an **environmental scan** was conducted by reviewing annual reports from 2020-21 for 24

government, legal not-for-profit, and other community agencies to determine the type of data collected by these organizations. Data from the environmental scan was analyzed using two lenses: (1) a content analysis of the type of data contained within the reports; and (2) the fit of the collected data within the Access to Justice (A2J) Measurement Framework developed by A2JBC (2019). The A2J Measurement Framework is a justice metrics framework that can be used to monitor and evaluate improvements in access to justice with respect to three elements: 1) Improving Population Access to Justice; 2) Improving User Experience of Access to Justice; and 3) Improving Costs.

Second, **key informant interviews** were conducted with 14 representatives from 8 agencies in Saskatchewan with a vested interested in access to justice in the areas of civil and family law to obtain a more in-depth understanding of data collection practices within the province. Three 'clusters' of agencies were considered for inclusion in the key informant interviews: 1) agencies that <u>do</u> currently report data publicly; 2) agencies that <u>do not</u> currently report data publicly; and 3) agencies with current and/or past experience with establishing data portals/warehouses. All interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board

Environmental Scan

Lens One: Data Categories Reported by Agencies

The analysis of the 24 annual reports revealed that agencies collected data that falls within eight categories (see Table E1).

E1: Categories of Data Reported in Annual Reports

Type of Data	Key Findings
Referrals, inquiries, claims, complaints, and appeals received	• The majority of organizations (n=16) reported data related to the initial points of contact with, or services requested from, their agency. They typically reported on the volume and nature of these contacts. • The specifics of the data reported varied according to the mandate and nature of the organization (i.e., an initial contact could refer to the receipt of a referral, inquiry, application, claim, complaint, or appeal).
Files opened, services delivered, and file closures	• Most organizations (n=16) reported data related to the volume and type of files opened or services delivered (including, in some cases, the specific area of law to which a file pertains). • Many agencies (n=13) reported on the volume of files concluded (or the volume of final decisions issued) with most (n=11) offering data on the nature of the outcomes achieved (or final decision rendered). In some cases, this included documenting the dollar amount of penalties, revenue, or orders secured.

	• Only two organizations provided data related to the volume of services denied, with one organization denoting the volume of services denied due to capacity.
Duration of services provided	• Just under half (*n*=10) provided data related to the length of time between commencing and concluding their legal matter. • Seven organizations reported on the number of files in progress or in queue at the end of the fiscal-year. • Only one organization reported on the number of hearings conducted and the point in the legal process at which outcomes were achieved. • Five organizations published data related to the length of time required to respond to an inquiry or application.
Client demographics	• Three organizations reported on the number of clients served, as well as clients' demographic characteristics. • Among these organizations, the variables that were most frequently reported were gender, age, and ethnicity (especially in relation to being Indigenous).
Quality of service measures	• Four organizations provided data that spoke to the quality of services provided to clients.
Employee, student, and volunteer data	• Five organizations published data that related to some aspect of their workforce (e.g., number of employees and volunteers, level of employee engagement, employee professional development), with very few organizations reporting the same metrics.
Financial-related data	• Five agencies reported some type of financial-related data with the data reported being unique to each agency.
Population-level data	• Three agencies included data that related to access to justice at the population level. For instance, Legal Aid Saskatchewan reported on the percentage of criminal files with Legal Aid representation while the Saskatchewan Police Commission reported on police to population ratios in the province.

Lens 2: Applying the A2J Measurement Framework

The A2J Measurement Framework is comprised of three elements (i.e., Improving Population Access to Justice, Improving User Experience of Access to Justice, and Improving Costs) each of which can be further divided into several dimensions and components. The extent to which each element, dimension, and component were reflected in the data published in the annual reports was considered in the analysis.

Improving Population Access to Justice

Improving Population Access to Justice considers whether the justice system has the necessary institutions, knowledge, resources, and services needed to help individuals manage, avoid, and/or resolve everyday legal problems (A2JBC, 2019). The first dimension, **Prevalence of Legal Needs/Problems**, is comprised of three components. With respect to the first component, **Prevalence of Legal Problems in the Population**, 15 agencies included data about the extent to which a given population is experiencing legal problems and the nature of those problems. Most commonly, agencies reported on data related to the number and type of legal problems that clients accessing their services had. No agencies tracked information about whether clients had more than one legal problem.

Only two agencies reported on data that spoke directly to **Unaddressed Legal Needs in the Population.** CLASSIC reported on the percentage of applications denied due to capacity, while Pro Bono Law indicated the number of clients serviced by panel programs who were unmatched (and matched) to services. No agencies directly reported on data that measured **Public Legal Awareness**, which includes the public's level of awareness and understanding of their rights, entitlements, and obligations under the law. However, two agencies reported data that may indirectly speak to public legal awareness, such as the number of newspaper contributions made (CLASSIC) and number of times individuals accessed or requested legal information (PLEA).

The second dimension, **Response to Legal Needs**, considers the extent to which legal needs of the population are being met. In general, the agencies did not report on data related to **People's Choice of Path to Justice** (i.e., the decisions that individuals make about how to address their legal problems). The agencies provided statistics regarding the number of individuals who accessed their (legal) services, but not what proportion of the broader population these individuals represented (with the exception of Legal Aid who indicated the percentage of criminal files in Saskatchewan with Legal Aid representation). With respect to **Legal Information and Education Needs**, one organization (Financial and Consumer Affairs) reported on data related to the understandability, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of the legal information they shared, while a second organization (PLEA) reported on the volume, type, and helpfulness of the legal information they disseminated. **Legal Advice Needs** was also not well represented in the annual reports. Two organizations (Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner, CLASSIC) provided information on the number of people who were able to obtain legal advice but did not report data related to the larger issue of how many people overall needed legal advice (and whether they were able to access it). The **Need for Legal Representation and Other Legal Assistance** was reflected to some extent in three annual reports. Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and Pro Bono Law provided data on the number of clients for whom they provided legal representation or other forms of legal assistance; however, no data was reported on the effectiveness of the services provided. No agencies reported on the **Need for Consensual Dispute Resolution Process.**

The third dimension, **Fair and Equitable Access to Justice**, considers a variety of aspects associated with accessing the justice system. With respect to the **Accessibility of the Justice System**, the majority of agencies (*n*=14) provided data on the number of people who used their services (e.g., the number and type of files opened; complaints or appeals made) which, when

taken together, provides insight into the number of individuals who were able to access legal services and the types of problems for which services were sought. Only four organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law, and Saskatchewan Advocate for Child and Youth [SACY]) specifically reported on the demographic characteristics of the clients they served. All four indicated the percentage of clients who were Indigenous, while only CLASSIC provided the percentage of clients who were immigrants or refugees. None of the agencies reported data on people experiencing mental illness. Additional data is needed to fully understand the extent to which these specific demographic groups, as well as the broader population, are able to afford, understand, access, use, and navigate the justice system and receive meaningful legal assistance.

Financial Access to the Justice System is another component within this dimension and is focused on understanding the proportion of the population that cannot access a particular path to justice due to their financial situation. Legal Aid Saskatchewan provided the percentage of all criminal files in Saskatchewan with Legal Aid representation, as well as the number of applications received and number of files opened; however, the reported data did not indicate the proportion of applicants who qualified for, received, or self-selected out of services. The Automobile Inquiry Appeal Commission was the only other agency that published data related to financial access to justice and included the number of fee waivers provided. No data was identified that examined public perceptions of the fairness of eligibility criteria used to determine access to legal services. The final component within this dimension is **Timeliness of Access to the Justice System** – twelve agencies published data related to the length of time it took for a file or case to be resolved.

The fourth dimension, **Social and Economic Impact of Access to Justice,** is comprised of seven components. Several of these components were not reflected in the data published in the annual reports reviewed. Specifically, no agencies reported data that pertained to **Social Policy Objectives** (i.e., the extent to which social policy objectives can be linked to changes in a population's level of access to justice), **Public Confidence in the Justice System** (i.e., how changes in a population's level of access to justice affects public confidence in the justice system), and **Social and Economic Costs and Benefits to Access to Justice** (i.e., the extent to which changes in a population's level of access to justice affects their social and economic development, promotes inclusive growth, and results in social and economic benefits).

In addition, none of the agencies directly reported on **Public Confidence in Social Institutions** (i.e., how a population's level of access to justice affects their trust and confidence in social institutions), but many organizations (n=7) fielded complaints about various social institutions from which the number of individuals who may lack trust and confidence in these institutions may be gleaned. Similarly, the annual reports reviewed did not include data on how changes in a population's level of access to justice contributes to the **Protection of People's Rights;** however, some agencies (e.g., Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, CLASSIC, Office of the Treaty Commissioner, SACY) did report data related to this component, largely due to the nature and mandates of those organizations. With respect to the measurement of **Gender Equality**, three organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and Pro Bono Law) reported on gender as a demographic characteristic of their clients, but it would not be possible to extrapolate this data into an understanding of whether greater gender equality and meaningful

improvements in the daily lives of women have occurred. Likewise, with respect to **Justice of Indigenous Persons**, four organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law, SACY) reported on ethnicity as a demographic characteristic, but not on changes in Indigenous peoples' level of access to justice and any resulting changes in their lives.

Improving User Experiences of Access to Justice

The second element of the A2J Measurement Framework focuses on various aspects of the user experience of accessing justice and is comprised of five dimensions and related components (A2JBC, 2019). The first dimension considers **Experiences of Obstacles to Access to Justice**. Overall, the annual reports did not include data related to this dimension. For instance, no agencies published data related to **Obstacles to Access** encountered by clients, such as the distance to services, accessing technology, language barriers, and the affordability of legal services. They also did not report on the **Affordability of Services** with the exception of the Automobile Injury Appeal Commission which indicated the number of fee waivers offered. There was also no published data on **Delays in Accessing Justice Services and their Impact,** including the extent to which individuals are appropriately *referred* to access to justice mechanisms in a timely manner (only data pertaining to accepting referrals was provided by some agencies). Financial and Consumer Affairs, Legal Aid Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan Municipal Board did report on performance measures related to processing time for approving, responding to, and completing applications, respectively; however, the impact of these processing times on clients is not known. The final component, **Eligibility Criteria** (i.e., consequences of any criteria utilized to determine whether individuals are eligible to receive legal services) was better represented in the annual reports. Six agencies reported on data that broadly assesses the consequences of criteria utilized to determine whether individuals are eligible to receive legal services, such as performance measures on the clarity of criteria for approving applications and renewals (Financial and Consumer Affairs), processing times for received applications (Saskatchewan Municipal Board), and number of appeals (Workers Compensation Board) and applications (CLASSIC) denied. However, no agencies reported on data related to the fairness of the application or eligibility determination process.

The second dimension, **Quality of User Experience of the Justice System**, considers whether individuals seeking legal information can obtain meaningful, credible, and trustworthy information that is relevant to their jurisdiction that allows them to determine whether they have a legal problem and offers direction on how to potentially address or resolve their legal problem(s). Two agencies provided data that related to the **Quality of Legal Information and Education** resources offered. Financial and Consumer Affairs included performance measures assessing the degree to which compliance requirements and regulatory changes were clear to the user, while PLEA documented the percentage of individuals who rated the information on their website to be helpful. However, no agencies reported data on **Trust and Confidence in Legal Information** (i.e., trustworthiness of legal information) or **User Empowerment** (i.e., the extent to which users of legal information and education are empowered to manage and resolve their legal needs and problems). With respect to the **Quality of Referral Services**, two agencies (CLASSIC and PLEA) tracked the number of referrals for their programs, while the Workers Compensation Board reported the outcomes of its referrals, which provides some insight into the appropriateness of the referrals received. Similarly, two agencies (CLASSIC and Pro Bono Law)

reported data related to the **Quality of Legal Advice** received, although the data pertained more to whether people with a legal problem could access free or inexpensive advice rather than the quality (e.g., trustworthiness and usefulness) of the legal advice. In addition, two agencies (Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee, Saskatchewan Municipal Board) published data on the **Quality of Legal Assistance and Representation** provided (e.g., percentage of files that had average to excellent service, percentage of stakeholders who were satisfied or unsatisfied with their services). No agencies reported on data related to the **Experience of Self-Represented Litigants** or the **Quality of Consensual Dispute Resolution Processes.**

In the third dimension, the **Effectiveness of the Justice System in Addressing User Legal Problems** is considered. Few components within this dimension were reflected in the annual reports. With respect to the **Effective Resolution of Legal Problems**, many organizations (*n*=13) reported the number of files that were concluded or resolved, as well as the outcomes of those files (e.g., the nature of the final decision). However, this data does not necessarily indicate whether the resolution of those files was effective or satisfactory. In addition, two agencies (CLASSIC and Pro Bono Law) reported data that relates to the **Limits to the Assistance Received** (i.e., the degree to which limitations in the scope, coverage, and quality of legal services prevented individuals' legal needs from being fully met). Specifically, CLASSIC indicated the number applications denied due to capacity, while Pro Bono Law stated the number clients who were matched and unmatched within their panel program. Data was not reported in relation to the remaining components of: **Mitigated Impact of Legal Problems** (i.e., the extent to which the impact of the legal problems experienced by justice system users was mitigated); **Prevention of Legal Problems** (i.e., the extent to which access to justice services helped prevent the emergence of legal problems); **Prevention of Conflict** (i.e., the extent to which conflicts were prevented, mitigated, resolved, or kept from escalating further); and **Unmet Legal Needs and Their Consequences** (i.e., the extent to which individuals' legal problems are unidentified and legal needs are unmet, as well as the personal consequences of these unmet legal needs).

Similarly, the components of the fourth dimension, **Appropriateness of the Justice Process,** were not reflected in the data published in the annual reports. Specifically, there were no data related to the: **Fairness, Equity, and Impartiality of the Process** (i.e., the extent to which justice system users perceive the justice process as being fair, equitable, and impartial); **Cultural Appropriateness** (i.e., the cultural appropriateness of the justice services delivered); and **Voice and Participation (**i.e., the extent to which individuals are able to meaningfully participate and be heard in a court of law, tribunal, or other proceedings to resolve their legal problems).

Finally, the fifth dimension, **Justice Outcomes for the User**, only had two components reflected in the annual reports. Many agencies (*n*=15) reported on the **Outcomes of the Justice Process** by specifying the number of files or cases that were concluded, as well as the way in which the files were concluded (e.g., the nature of the final decision). In addition, two agencies provided data on **Compliance with Court Orders, Judgements, and Mediated Agreements.** Specifically, Financial and Consumer Affairs stated the number of enforcement actions taken, while the Office of Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner reported on the percentage of files in compliance with recommendations. Otherwise, the agencies did not report any data related to the remaining four components: **User Satisfaction with the Outcomes of the Justice Process; Post-Resolution Support** (i.e., the extent to which individuals are supported

following the resolution of their legal problems); **User Enhanced Legal Awareness** (i.e., whether, as a result of accessing a particular path to justice, justice service users have greater awareness of the law and of their rights, entitlement, and responsibilities.); and **Enhanced Legal Capability** (i.e., the degree to which individuals' experiences with accessing justice services has empowered and enabled them to manage their legal needs beyond their initial legal problem).

Improving Costs

The third, and final, element of the A2J Measurement Framework focuses on **Improving Costs** and is comprised of three dimensions: **Per-Capita Costs of Services** (i.e., per-capita costs of delivering access to justice services); **Per-User Costs of Services** (i.e., costs of delivering access to justice services in accordance with the number of users of these services); and **Other Costs** (i.e., the social and economic costs associated with unresolved legal problems or the impact of unresolved legal problems on costs borne by other sectors). Only one agency (CLASSIC) included any data related to improving costs in their annual report – they provided an estimate of the costs of services obtained/retained for their clients.

Conclusion

Implications of the Environmental Scan for a Justice Data Commons

Given that one of the driving impetuses behind this study is to work towards establishing a justice data commons, our environmental scan has suggested that data related to the volume and types of initial contacts to an organization (e.g., request for services), the volume and types of services delivered, the volume of files concluded and the outcomes of the files, and the length of time between commencing and resolving a legal matter may be the best types of data to initially focus on for inclusion in the data commons. We make this recommendation on the basis that these data were collected by the majority of agencies and, therefore, constitute a viable starting point for building a centralized data management system of relevance to many agencies. Specifically, it will be important to focus on common data elements during the initial start-up of the data commons to increase the likelihood that agencies will perceive themselves as having something to contribute to the initiative, thereby increasing their likelihood of participation, especially if the data being sought will not require much effort for them to collect beyond their current data collection practices. Once agencies have experience with participating in, and contributing to, the data commons, it can be expanded to include data that is not collected as often (including supporting agencies in expanding their data collection practices).

Importantly, the pooling of data commonly collected by organizations in Saskatchewan will allow A2J stakeholders within the province to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the family and civil law landscape than can be obtained by independently reviewing data from individual organizations. In fact, organizations may hold different, yet complementary, data that, when combined together, allows for a greater amount of insight on how well access to justice is being achieved and any gaps that may exist. Moreover, as organizations move toward collecting and reporting data in similar ways and using shared metrics (such as those detailed in the A2J Measurement Framework), there will be a greater level of confidence in that data, including that participating organizations are measuring similar concepts or phenomena. In turn, using this

shared data may lead to: (a) better, more informed decisions to increase access to justice, potentially resulting in more coordinated responses across involved funders and agencies; and (b) decisions having more widespread support due to the collective nature of the data on which they are based.

Conclusions about the Access to Justice Measurement Framework

Overall, the A2J Measurement Framework was a useful analytic lens in our study and has the potential to be a useful tool for guiding the development of a justice data commons. The current study revealed that not all data reported annually by the organizations fit perfectly within the measurement framework and there are many aspects of the measurement framework for which data does not currently exist in Saskatchewan (at least not in the published annual reports); however, the A2J Measurement Framework provided a helpful rubric for understanding the scope of justice data available in the province in reference to a much larger possible range of justice metrics (as identified by the framework).

With respect to building a justice data commons, adopting the A2J Measurement Framework may create efficiencies in moving forward with a data commons as it provides a readymade starting point for identifying common measurement priorities. For instance, the framework could be used to facilitate discussions among justice stakeholders about the types of data that are most important to include in the data commons, including data elements that are most readily available and those for which there are existing gaps. Relatedly, it can be used to establish a strategy for the types of data that will be added to the data commons over time and guide organizations in how to expand and refine their performance measures in a coordinated way, particularly in areas that are under-measured as a whole. In addition, the framework could be used as an organizational tool to structure the various types of data to be included in the data commons to ensure that it includes data that measures both outputs (e.g., data reflecting the volume and types of services utilized) and outcomes (e.g., data that can be used to determine if meaningful change in access to justice has occurred). Indeed, Lowenberger and colleagues (2021) have previously underscored the benefits of adopting of the A2J Measurement Framework, many of which are directly relevant to creating a justice data commons, including that it can facilitate a shared understanding of the types of data that should be collected and the meaning behind various data elements among justice stakeholders; provide a common language for discussing various dimensions of access to justice, including desired goals and outcomes; lead to improved comparability between jurisdictions, projects, and organizations; and support the coordination of programs, projects, and collaborations within and between various jurisdictions.

Thus, given: (a) the ability of the A2J Measurement Framework to provide detailed and comprehensive direction on the types of metrics that should be collected to measure improvements in access to justice, including the achievement of key objectives and outcomes over time; and (b) the traction that the A2J Measurement Framework has had in Saskatchewan (e.g., through the 2018 Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution) and in Canada more broadly (e.g., it has been endorsed by 50 organizations in British Columbia and utilized by the Social Security Tribunal of Canada), we recommend the A2J Measurement Framework as a suitable, appropriate, and helpful framework for guiding the collection of justice data through a data commons in Saskatchewan.

Key Informant Interviews

The key informant interviews broadly explored three domains: a) data collection practices, including the usage of data, type of data collected, and the mode and frequency of data collection; b) data sharing practices, including existing policies and facilitators and barriers associated with sharing data with external parties; and c) perceptions of establishing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan, including possible benefits, barriers, and facilitators associated with such an initiative. The key findings are as follows.

Data Collection Practices

Data Utilization

All agencies (both government and not-for-profit) used data in similar ways: 1) to enhance service delivery; 2) justify funding; and 3) complete reporting. With respect to **enhancing service delivery**, the agencies used their data to identify gaps and trends over time to develop new resources, programs, and policies to meet emergent needs. Some organizations also used the data collected to directly and immediately inform the provision of legal services to their clients.

In terms of **justifying funding**, most organizations (both government and not-for-profit) relied upon data to justify the need for funding (including the maintenance of specific programs/units and staff positions) and to determine the levels of funding required to meet the demand for legal services.

For **reporting**, most of the agencies reported to the federal and/or provincial governments, largely with respect to funding that had been received. Some were also required to report back to the general public (e.g., through annual reports, provincial audit processes). Two agencies participated in surveys coordinated by the federal government to create national databases related to family and civil courts (i.e., Survey of Family Courts, Survey of Maintenance Enforcement, Civil Court Survey).

Types of Data Collected

There were similarities in the types of data collected across the organizations (and with respect to the data elements identified through the environmental scan). Several agencies collected data related to **inquiries made to their agency**, including the volume, modality (e.g., phone, email), and reasons for the contact. In addition, two agencies collected data on the number of applications received, with one recording the number of applications denied. Most agencies also collected data on **volume and types of services provided**, including the volume of files opened and closed, the volume of service users, the types of services provided, and the area of law required or type of legal need to be addressed. Some agencies also collected data on the number of individuals who registered and attended various program offerings, the number of referrals that agencies provided to service users to access other services, and legal proceedings. Further, several organizations collected data on the **demographic characteristics** of their clientele, including financial status, martial status, dependents, geographic location, whether domestic violence as experienced, gender, ethnicity, and whether someone was incarcerated. A handful of

agencies collected data related to the **quality of services provided**, such as the length of time to open a file, the usefulness of legal information provided, and satisfaction with the legal service received. In addition, some data was collected on **employees' workload** (e.g., time spent on file) and **volunteers** affiliated with a given organization (e.g., number of volunteers, area of specialization).

Frequency and Modality of Data Collection

Most agencies tracked data on an **ongoing basis** (e.g., during each contact with clients) and compiled that data monthly, quarterly, or annually, depending on their organizational needs. Approximately half of the agencies recorded their data in an **Excel spreadsheet**, while the other half used a **case management or client management database**. One agency largely collected data manually (e.g., using paper-based forms).

Data Sharing Practices

Data Sharing Policies

All government-affiliated agencies are required to abide by **Privacy and Access legislation** (e.g., Freedom of Information and Protection [FOIP]) with respect to collecting and using personal information. Some interviewees indicated that **sharing aggregate-level data** was not subjected to the same level of scrutiny and was within the control of individual departments to share. Only one of the not-for-profit legal organizations indicated that they had a privacy policy; the other two not-for-profit legal organizations did not have formal data collection or sharing policies and considered their approach to data collection and sharing to be a **practice and procedure**.

All agencies, with the exception of one not-for-profit legal organization, had past experiences with sharing data. The agencies **most commonly shared data** with other government departments, the Judiciary, parent agencies (e.g., national umbrella organizations overseeing provincial chapters), and external partners working on similar initiatives. Decisions to share data were typically made on a **case-by-case basis** and, in most cases, organizations only shared aggregate data due to the sensitive nature of the data they held. Two organizations utilized **data sharing agreements or Memorandum of Understandings** to share data, whereas others did not draw upon such formal processes (largely due to the aggregate and anonymized nature of the data being shared).

Facilitators and Barriers to Data Sharing

Having **trust** in the data recipient emerged as the most important factor influencing an organization's willingness to share data. This included having a long-term relationship with the data recipient and a mutual understanding of how the data will be used. Another facilitator of data sharing, especially from the perspective of not-for-profit organizations, was providing the agencies with the **monetary resources** needed to provide the data requested, as these agencies had limited resources to draw upon to fill data requests.

With respect to barriers to data sharing, interviewees noted that there may be some hesitancy within their organizations to share **data that may be misunderstood or that could jeopardize their funding** if it was misinterpreted politically or in the media. Thus, organizations may only be willing to share a subset of their data that highlights their areas of strength. Another recurrent theme across the interviews related to having **minimal resources to pull, clean, and verify data** for sharing purposes. All organizations (government and not-for-profit) indicated that they had limited resources for engaging in research-related activities and had to prioritize these requests alongside their other responsibilities. Hesitancy also was expressed about **sharing data that had not been verified or which may be of low quality**. In addition, many interviewees indicated that there was **limited technological experience** within their organizations to share data, depending on the format requested. The notion of having the "**social license**" to share the data also arose in two interviews. Within this context, organizations noted that even if they have the legal right to share data, they would want to ensure that doing so would not affect their clients' trust in their organization.

Establishing a Data Commons

All of the interviewees **expressed interest** in the notion of a provincial justice data commons, with some organizations indicating that they would be **willing and ready to participate** and others **requiring more information** about the intended purpose of the data commons. All provided the caveat that any potential involvement would be influenced by **the time and resources required to participate** in such an initiative.

Some of the **perceived benefits** of a data commons included: a) being able to **more readily identify and address gaps** with respect to access to justice and the provision of legal services in the province; b) **enhanced data collection practices** within their own organization, both in terms of how and what data is collected; and c) **learning about best practices** with respect to addressing clients' legal needs.

The greatest **perceived barrier** to participating in a data commons was **limited resources** within each agency, including limited capacity (in terms of time and expertise) to pull data, clean and verify that data to ensure it is accurate and up-to-date, and share data in whatever format is needed. Another major barrier identified was **finding funding** for the data commons, with some agencies expressing that the same funding sources relied upon by not-for-profit organizations to provide legal services should not be utilized for a data commons.

Necessary Supports and Resources

To establish a data commons, interviewees emphasized the need for **dedicated human and financial resources**, with most suggesting that a **full-time team** would be required. Within this team, it was recognized that **many types of expertise** would be required, including legal and privacy, technical, operational, user experience, and organization and systems. It was also identified that it will be necessary for the data commons to have a **clear purpose** to ensure it has a solid foundation, as well as to facilitate agencies' involvement in it. Interviewees expressed that there needs to be a mutual understanding across partners about **the type of data that will be included** in the data commons, **how the data commons will be used**, and **by whom.**

Interviewees also indicated that **clear definitions of family and civil law** will need to be developed for the purposes of this particular initiative, as well as for any variables of interest that will be included in the data commons. Some of the key **data elements of interest for inclusion** in the data commons related to the unmet legal needs of clients, clustering of legal needs, ineligibility for legal services, geographic differences, people who experience poverty and injustice, and long-term outcomes of individuals navigating the justice system.

Finally, it will be necessary to determine the **level of data** that will be targeted by the data commons (i.e., **aggregate data vs. microdata with personal identifiers**). A platform designed to accommodate personally identifiable data will require a much more sophisticated platform than a platform designed to house aggregate data due to the higher level of security needed to protect personal information. It will also require a much more complex legal and privacy framework to allow for the sharing of data. The **need and comfort level** of participating agencies may also influence the type of data included in the data commons.

Conclusion

An important contribution of the current study is that it provides baseline information about organizations' interest and ability to participate in a data commons within the Saskatchewan context. Findings pertaining to agencies' data collection and data sharing practices indicated that they are: a) actively collecting data; and b) already engaged in some data sharing practices, particularly around the sharing of aggregate data. Further, there seems to be some interest in, and support for, participating in a justice data commons; however, two factors will ultimately dictate agencies' level of interest in being involved: a) the purpose of the data commons, including the benefit of being involved for the agencies and/or the broader community being served; and b) the resources (time, capacity, expertise) available to support their involvement in the data commons. Trust in the organization spearheading the data commons will also play a significant role in garnering support for, and involvement in, the initiative.

Recommendations for Establishing a Data Commons

The current study provides insight into the unique contextual factors and concerns that will need to be taken into consideration if steps are taken to develop a data commons in Saskatchewan. The identified factors relate primarily to what is required to ensure buy-in and engagement in the data commons; however, the technical aspects of creating a data commons will also need to be considered. In moving forward with establishing a data commons, the following suggestions and recommendations are offered for consideration.

1. Determine the **purpose** of the data commons and ensure it is grounded in a **strong measurement framework**, such as the A2J Measurement Framework (A2JBC, 2019).
   - Ensuring transparency about the purpose of the data commons may help organizations decide whether to be involved in it.

   - Being clear about the purpose of the data commons may help with eliciting public approval for the data commons and ensure it has the "social licence" to exist.

2. Determine who the **primary audience(s)** are for: a) contributing to the data commons; and b) analyzing and using the data in the commons.
   - The data commons should be developed with the experiences of all users in mind.

3. When seeking funding for the data commons, ensure that **resources** are sought to directly support participating agencies' involvement in the data commons to support their ability to pull, clean, and verify data to contribute to the data commons.
   - Agencies are also concerned about their data being understood correctly; thus, it will be necessary to consider how data can be shared in a way that it will not be misunderstood or misinterpreted.

   - Funding sources sought to establish the data commons should not take away funding opportunities that not-for-profit legal organizations need to fund their services.

4. Establish a **dedicated, full-time team** for developing the data commons with expertise in the following areas:
   - Privacy and access legislation.
   - Technical knowledge of how to access and compile data from multiple data sources.
   - Operational knowledge of the data (including what variables mean, how and when it is collected, and any limitations)
   - User experience with respect to using the data commons for analysis.
   - Organizational and systems experts to engage partners and maintain support and resources for the initiative.

5. Determine the **level of data** that will be targeted by the data commons: aggregate data or microdata that includes personal identifiers. Consider whether to build the data commons using a **phased approach**, focusing first on aggregate data and then moving towards a platform that can accommodate personal data.
   - Focusing on aggregate data may be easier as many organizations are already actively sharing this type of data and a less secure (and, therefore, less costly) platform is needed to house this type of data.

   - Focusing on microdata with personal identifiers will allow for more sophisticated analyses to be completed and may allow data commons users to achieve the type of results in which they are most interested (e.g., long-term outcomes of clients); however, a more secure (and costly) platform would be required to house this type of data due to the security and privacy concerns associated with sharing personal information.

6. Consider initially focusing on **common types of data** (as informed by the environmental scan and key informant interviews) to increase organizations' comfort with, and capacity to, participate in the data commons.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The Centre for Research, Evaluation, and Action Towards Equal Justice (CREATE Justice) is working with stakeholders such as the Law Society of Saskatchewan to improve access to justice initiatives in Canada—particularly, in the province of Saskatchewan. In this effort, it is recognized that there is a need to develop and enhance the evidentiary base for access to justice issues, especially concerning civil and family law (McCashin et al., 2018). It is also recognized that current practices for collecting and analyzing justice data may be insufficient (Canadian Bar Association, 2013; McCashin et al., 2018). Indeed, the Canadian Bar Association (2013) has signified the limited ability to provide answers to even the most basic inquiries concerning access to justice, which is the result of fragmented data practices in Canada at the national, provincial, and territorial levels. To that end, the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies (CFBSJS) in collaboration with CREATE Justice is undertaking a research project to develop a more cohesive picture of access to justice issues relating primarily to civil and family law in Saskatchewan.

The main objective of this research project is to compile foundational data concerning the legal needs of Saskatchewan residents. There are two main outputs associated with the project:

1) A scan of existing justice data being collected by legal and non-legal organizations in Saskatchewan to determine the usability of that data to identify gaps in the justice system, inform service delivery, improve access to justice, and establish a data commons.

2) Legal needs surveys of current legal and social service providers, as well as practicing lawyers, to identify legal needs/gaps that exist within the Saskatchewan justice system.

The current report presents the results from the first component of this study: a scan of existing justice data in Saskatchewan. First, the results of an environmental scan examining the specific data elements known to be collected by government, not-for-profit, and other legal organizations in the province based on published annual reports are presented. Second, the results from interviews with key informants from legal organizations in Saskatchewan who practice in the areas of family and civil law are presented to provide a more in-depth understanding of the types of legal data available in the province, opportunities for sharing the data that does exist, and perceptions regarding the need for a data commons to allow for centralized access to legal data in Saskatchewan. Results from the Saskatchewan legal needs survey are presented in a separate report (see Stoliker et al., 2023).

2. Literature Review

While a large, and growing, body of evidence suggests there is a major access to justice problem in many countries, there are still many gaps in our knowledge about this justice issue—especially with respect to those who are impacted and the particular problems they encounter in accessing justice. Arguably, a major factor contributing to these gaps in knowledge relates to insufficient

policies and practices concerning justice data collection, management, analysis, and sharing. Stakeholders have hinted at the fragmented nature of justice data collection practices and evidence-based decision making in Canada's justice system, noting there is "a long way to go in terms of what information is collected, how it is collected and how open it is" (Canadian Bar Association, 2013, p. 51). Indeed, it is generally unclear what justice stakeholders are collecting data and to what extent; the type of data being collected (e.g., basic demographic information, access to justice indicators); how information is used; and, whether data are accessible to researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.

Ultimately, high-quality justice data collection, management, analysis, and sharing would improve access to justice through better informed policies and practices surrounding service delivery and, consequently, would improve peoples' ability to effectively resolve their justice-related problems. An added challenge, however, is the fact that many people neither seek formal legal support to manage their everyday legal problems nor seek resolution through the formal justice system (World Justice Project, 2019a; for a Canada-specific perspective, see also Farrow et al., 2016). This necessitates the compilation of data from a variety of sources, ranging from courts and government agencies to legal and non-legal service providers in the community. In line with this notion, each justice stakeholder has different policies and practices with respect to collecting, managing, and sharing data. These policies and practices may determine what justice data is collected, the format in which it is collected and stored, as well as the rules and regulations concerning access by external parties (e.g., researchers, practitioners, policymakers, the public, etc.). Each agency may therefore hold data which provide somewhat differing lenses on the justice-related problems in a community. Unfortunately, individualized policies and practices contribute to justice data silos. To the extent that this is the case, one could only expect a fragmented picture of the legal needs and access to justice issues within a particular community.

Many organizations in Canada do, in fact, collect useful data related to access to justice; however, there is a lack of consistency in approach and methodology (Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, 2019a). There has therefore been growing interest in improving data collection and management practices within Canada's justice sector, as it is recognized that current approaches are not meeting the information needs of justice stakeholders (McCashin et al., 2018). This has significant implications, as well-informed policy decisions and effective programming depend upon the availability and quality of data. With that said, there is a need for coordinated efforts at the national, provincial and territorial levels to gather better justice information, especially within the context of increasing demand, increasing costs, and stretched fiscal realities of the justice system (Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, 2013; Canadian Bar Association, 2013). One potential solution to the data problem is developing a **justice data commons**—a centralized system for data collection, management, and sharing. Specifically, a justice data commons would serve as a secure repository for integrating and linking data and information collected by varying agencies (e.g., courts, government agencies, legal and non-legal service providers, etc.) and, therefore, would help remove data silos and provide a rich source of information to empirically assess access to justice initiatives. Taken together, a justice data commons allows for centralized access to, and analysis of, various justice data which would provide a more complete picture of justice-related problems and legal needs within communities.

2.1. Developing a Justice Data Commons

A sizable amount of information is produced and/or collected by various justice stakeholders—including courts, government agencies and law enforcement, legal and non-legal service providers, universities, among others—which would enable valuable research and development on access to justice issues; however, this information has largely been left untapped. This is attributable to the general lack of open access to legal data, as well as the fact that information collected by justice stakeholders may not be readily available as a result of challenges related to cost, usability, proprietary factors, or concerns regarding data privacy and security (Hagan et al., 2019a). Therefore, justice data has largely been inaccessible. A justice data commons could resolve the data issue and help meet critical goals of the access to justice community, enabling higher quality research that could better inform access to justice interventions to close the justice gap (Hagan et al., 2019a). Specifically, it would act as a centralized data management system to allow for the compilation and curation of justice information,[1] and would operate through an interrelationship between: (1) service providers (i.e., those who manage the commons); (2) contributors (i.e., those who provide data to the commons); and (3) users (i.e., those who access the data commons to advance knowledge, policy, programming; Hagan et al., 2019a).

As Hagan and colleagues (2019b) point out, there are several potential models for managing and sharing justice-related data, such as: (1) informal data sharing; (2) a data cloud; and (3) a data commons. While not a permanent solution, an **informal data sharing** setup may act as a first step toward establishing a data commons and would require the least effort to launch. As the name suggests, this model would allow a network of interested justice stakeholders to informally share the public legal datasets they have gathered. However, there would need to be a legal infrastructure in place to mitigate risk in an informal sharing arrangement (see Hagan et al., 2019b). The key difference between informal data sharing and a **data cloud** is that the latter would be centralized and formalized, as well as the fact that data clouds are capable of advanced computing power and supporting big data (Hagan et al., 2019b). An example of a data cloud is the inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan, which provides researchers access to rich data resources.[2] Individual researchers or organizations can deposit relevant data to the ICPSR website, where other researchers and organizations can then discover the data and use it for analyses. It is important to note, however, that managing large data repositories such as the ICPSR is resource intensive (Hagan et al., 2019b). Finally, a **data commons** operates as a data ecosystem, allowing researchers and organizations to house and share their data; providing access to various public and private datasets; and, are oftentimes equipped with built-in tools to perform analyses on data within the commons (Hagan et al., 2019b). An example of a Canadian data commons is the Federated Research Data Repository (FRDR), which was developed to address gaps in Canada's research infrastructure by providing a single platform through which research data can be deposited, curated, and discovered.[3]

---

[1] While a data commons provides an effective method for compiling and sharing important justice information, Hagan and colleagues (2019a) stress that these systems require robust policies and procedures for data security, access, and usage.

[2] For more information on the ICPSR, see https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/

[3] For more information on the FRDR, see https://www.frdr-dfdr.ca/repo/?locale=en

4

While a data commons could promote research and enhance access to justice initiatives, Hagan et al. (2019c) highlight several important factors to consider in order to ensure a properly functioning data commons. Specifically, this will require data sharing agreements with data contributors; a sustainability plan that addresses how the commons will be financed and supported each year; appropriate legal and technical infrastructure; strategies to populate the commons; interoperability with other data commons to accelerate research; and modelling and building intelligent systems. Generating a formal data sharing structure also requires multi-stakeholder participation, including service providers, data contributors, and data users (Hagan et al., 2019c). Foremost, service providers must attract data contributors and data users. On the one hand, service providers need to work with data contributors to identify data that could aid in the research and development of access to justice initiatives. With that said, there are logistical factors to consider with regard to data sharing, including protection of personal information; format of data storage (e.g., paper vs. digital records); and costs associated with obtaining and cleaning the data to integrate. On the other hand, service providers need to work with data users to identify how legal data are being used, the types of data that are desired, and how a data commons could assist in data needs. It will also be important to establish a working group to discuss opportunities, challenges, and requirements around creating and maintaining the data commons. Relatedly, the working group will need to include individuals who are capable of setting up the server and software needed for the technical infrastructure, along with individuals who can establish legal policies and procedures (e.g., data use and sharing agreements, privacy policies, governance structure, etc.).

When it comes to improving data collection and management practices in the justice sector, comparisons are often made with initiatives in the health sector. For instance, the **Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI)** is an independent, not-for-profit organization which acts as a centralized body for (securely) collecting, managing, and sharing information provided by health systems across Canadian provinces and territories.[4] Primarily funded through the federal government and provincial/territorial ministries of health,[5] CIHI was developed as a comprehensive and integrated national health information system with the primary goal of improving access to high-quality data for the purpose of advancing knowledge on, and enhancing strategies to address, issues pertaining to the health of Canadians. CIHI (2020) has demonstrated considerable success in filling data gaps and responding to the data and analytical needs of stakeholders in various health domains; thus, the health sector can be an inspiration for the justice sector.

Nevertheless, the justice sector has been making positive strides as initiatives are underway to develop and maintain a justice-specific data commons. Particularly, in the United States, Georgetown University Law Center is leading a project aimed at building the **Civil Justice Data Commons (CJDC)** which will serve as a secure platform for managing and sharing civil legal data gathered from various sources (e.g., courts, legal service providers, and other civil law

---

[4] For general review, see CIHI's website (https://www.cihi.ca/en) and the latest annual report (Canadian Institute for Health Information, 2020).
[5] CIHI's total annual source of revenue averages $107.8 million between 2016-2017 and 2019-2020, which pays for its ongoing programs of work related to its core functions and priority initiatives. The total operating expenses for the 2020 fiscal year was $115.2 million. For further information on funding and expenses, see Canadian Institute for Health Information (2020).

institutions).[6] The primary goal of the CJDC is to close the information gap in the civil justice system by linking data across civil legal institutions. Similar to CIHI, the CJDC will allow researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to access high-quality justice information to advance knowledge on, and enhance strategies to address, civil justice issues. Relatedly, researchers at the University of Sussex recently completed the 'Justice System Data' project which assessed approaches adopted by three common law countries[7] with respect to collecting, managing, and sharing information generated by justice and court processes (Townend & Wiener, 2021). The purpose of this project was not to inform the development of a data commons per se; rather, the goal was to elucidate what works well, and what does not, and how countries can learn from one another concerning justice system data collection and management.[8] In Canada, the topic of developing a justice data commons has been discussed in several provinces, including Saskatchewan and British Columbia. In fact, the concept of a justice data commons was the subject of a Justice Metrics Colloquium hosted by the University of Victoria's Access to Justice Centre of Excellence in 2020.[9] It is apparent that data management and sharing policies and practices are improving in several sectors, including the justice system. However, there is much work to be done. Further investment in this area could help advance access to justice initiatives and lead to better legal service delivery (Hagan et al., 2019c).

2.2. Conducting a Legal Data Scan

Prior to developing a justice data commons, it is necessary to conduct an environmental scan of existing data sources to: (1) identify what type of justice data are currently being collected by various agencies—especially whether legal needs and/or access to justice indicators are captured; (2) elucidate what policies and practices exist concerning data collection, storage, and sharing; and (3) determine the usability of data with regard to empirically assessing justice system processes and access to justice initiatives. Without knowing what data exists, the format in which it exists, the processes for acquiring the data, and whether it is usable, it would be difficult to build an effective and efficient justice data commons.

While most agencies have data collection policies and practices in place, it is not entirely clear what state these data are in (McCashin et al., 2018). For instance, whether or not data are sufficiently detailed and useful for assessing access to justice initiatives. The format in which data are stored may also present a challenge (e.g., paper versus digital files), as well as the processes required for sharing data with external parties. Data may also be 'messy' or collected strictly for administrative purposes and, therefore, may not be readily accessible for meaningful analysis. A **data scan** provides the opportunity to gather a better understanding of the availability and quality of justice data, as well as whether the data can be integrated into a justice data commons. It also provides the opportunity to identify whether and how current data collection policies and practices can be improved to ensure high-quality justice data (e.g., setting standards for data storage, capturing certain access to justice measures).

---

[6] For more information on the Civil Justice Data Commons project led by Georgetown University Law Center, see https://www.georgetowntech.org/civil-justice-data-commons

[7] The three countries included Australia, Canada, and Ireland (Townend & Wiener, 2021).

[8] The focus of this project was primarily on formal justice system processes.

[9] For further information, see https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5532e526e4b097f30807e54d/t/5ef4067dafc 08b727c334378/1593050753689/Data+Colloquium+2020+-+Final+Report.pdf

On the basis of findings from a legal data scan, recommendations can be made about:
- The type of justice data that should be captured and the level of detail
- Strategies for collecting, storing, and cleaning data
- Processes for accessing and sharing data
- Data sources that should be pursued for analysis
- Infrastructure and processes required to create a justice data commons

Although efforts to establish and maintain a justice data commons in Canada have been scarce, CREATE Justice and the College of Law at the University of Saskatchewan have set the groundwork for this initiative in Saskatchewan through an investigation of data collection and management practices among (civil) justice sector organizations (CREATE Justice, 2019a). This study was grounded in the premise that there is limited understanding of what justice data are being collected in Saskatchewan, especially concerning the civil justice sector (as opposed to the criminal justice, corrections, and policing sectors), and that data-informed decision-making should guide decisions about resource allocation and justice system improvements. Specifically, the research team conducted an online survey involving justice sector organizations in Saskatchewan ($N = 19$) to elucidate what information is being collected; the purposes for which data are being collected; whether information is shared between organizations; and gaps in data collection experienced in the justice sector. Table 2 provides a summary of the type of information collected by the justice sector organizations.[10] While this study provided a glimpse into the nature of data collected by justice sector organizations in Saskatchewan, further research is needed to identify the necessary steps for developing a justice data commons (or, more broadly, a data sharing arrangement); to assess readiness for a justice data commons in the province; and to explore the availability of data.

Table 2: Data Collection by Justice Sector Organizations in Saskatchewan ($N = 19$)

Data Type	Data Collection Practices
Demographic	• Several organizations collected data on geographic location, employment status, gender, number of children, age, receipt of government assistance, and marital status. • Few organizations collected data on ethnicity, housing status, level of education, or sexual orientation.
Service Users	• Several organizations collected data on the volume of new and recurring users.
Nature of Legal Issues	• Many organizations collected data on areas of law, types of applications/processes, and nature of issues within areas of law.
Services Requested, Delivered, and Denied	• Several organizations collected data on volume of services requested (overall and by type), volume of services delivered (overall and by type), and types of services requested and delivered.

---

[10] For detailed discussion of findings, see CREATE Justice (2019a).

Data Type	Data Collection Practices
	• Few organizations collected data on services denied (overall and by type).
Referrals	• Few organizations collected data on referral information (but were most likely to collect data on the volume of referrals).
Co-Occurring Services	• Few organizations collected data on co-occurring services (but were most likely to collect data on whether users sought or received legal advice prior to, or during, service).
Process and Outcomes	• Several organizations collected data on the duration of services delivered, types of outcomes achieved by users, the point at which outcomes are achieved by users, and the duration between commencing and resolving the legal matter.
Employee/Service Provider	• Several organizations collected data on the location of service delivery, number of employees engaged in service delivery, and category of employees engaged in service delivery.
Legal Representation	• Several organizations collected data on whether users were represented by legal counsel, as well as points in the process when legal representation is engaged. • Few organizations collected data pertaining to why legal counsel ceases to be involved.
Adjournments	• Few organizations collected data on adjournments (but were most likely to collect data on reasons for adjournments or number of adjournments per matter).
User Feedback	• Few organizations collected data on user feedback (but were most likely to collect data on user satisfaction or whether users felt legal information was accessible and accurate).
Co-Occurring Issues	• Few organizations collected data on co-occurring user issues (e.g., relationship breakdown alongside physical illness or loss of employment, income, or housing), but were most likely to collect data on whether users experienced a breakdown of relationships.

3. Current Study: Scan of Legal Data in Saskatchewan

3.1. Study Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of the current study was to conduct a scan of justice-related data being collected by legal and non-legal organizations[11] in Saskatchewan, particularly in the domains of civil and family law, to better understand the nature of the data being collected, the accessibility of that data for data sharing purposes, and how amenable agencies in Saskatchewan are to establishing a justice data commons in the province. Ultimately, the purpose of the data scan is to gain insight into the accessibility and usability of the data collected for identifying gaps in the justice system, informing service delivery, improving access to justice, and establishing a data commons. To that end, three overarching research questions guided the study:

1) What types of justice-related data related to civil and family law are being collected by legal (and non-legal) organizations in Saskatchewan?

2) To what extent are agencies in Saskatchewan practicing within the domains of civil and family law able to share data with external parties? What factors may facilitate or hinder data sharing?

3) What is the perceived need for a justice data commons in Saskatchewan? What are the perceived benefits and challenges associated with establishing a justice data commons?

3.2. Method

A multi-method approach was employed to achieve the study's objectives. First, an environmental scan was conducted by examining annual reports from relevant government, legal not-for-profit, and other community agencies. Following this scan, key informant interviews were conducted with representatives from agencies in Saskatchewan with a vested interest in access to justice in the areas of civil and family law to obtain a more in-depth understanding of data collection practices within the province. Both the environmental scan and key informant interviews were utilized to determine the types of justice-related data being collected within the province (i.e., in response to the first research question), whereas the second and third research questions (related to data sharing and establishing a data commons, respectively) were primarily answered through the key informant interviews. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board (see Appendix A).

---

[11] For the purposes of this study, legal organizations were defined as those that provide legal services in the areas of family and civil law. Non-legal organizations were defined as those that do not provide legal services to clients, but who may serve clients with legal needs in the area of family/civil law and who may be collecting relevant legal data.

3.2.1. Environmental Scan

Sample

Annual reports from 2020-21 for Saskatchewan organizations that publish data related to civil and family law were reviewed to determine the type of data collected by these organizations. A dataset previously compiled for CREATE Justice in June 2020 that had identified 37 entities (e.g., branches, commissions, boards, and committees) associated with the Government of Saskatchewan that offer services within the domains of civil and family law was used as the sampling frame for government organizations to be included in the environmental scan (see Appendix B). An Internet search was performed in relation to each entity and a 2020-21 annual report was found for 18 organizations (see Table 3). All other agencies were excluded from the environmental scan. In addition, consultation with key stakeholders (including from CREATE Justice and the Law Society of Saskatchewan) regarding legal not-for-profit organizations and other organizations[12] that may collect family and/or civil legal data led to an additional six agencies being included in the environmental scan (see Table 3)[13]. In total, 24 agencies were included in the environmental scan. It should be noted that this component of the environmental scan was limited to provincial agencies and did not include federal agencies or those whose scope extended outside of Saskatchewan.

Table 3: Agencies Included in the Environmental Scan of 2020-21 Annual Reports

Agency Type	Agency Name
Provincial Government-Affiliated Organizations (*n* = 18)	Automobile Injury Appeal Commission
	Employment Standards Division
	Financial and Consumer Affairs
	Legal Aid Saskatchewan
	Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee
	Office of Residential Tenancies
	Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner
	Ombudsman Saskatchewan
	Provincial Mediation Board
	Public and Private Rights Board
	Public Disclosure Committee
	Saskatchewan Housing Corporation
	Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission
	Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board
	Saskatchewan Municipal Board
	Saskatchewan Police Commission

[12] Two of the "other organizations" (i.e., College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth) were included in the environmental scan as they were known to handle legal issues, while the third (Office of the Treaty Commissioner) was selected for its potential to report data of relevance to family and civil law, especially as it pertains to access to justice for Indigenous peoples.

[13] In addition to the six agencies included, there was also interest in including the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations (FSIN), Métis-Nation Saskatchewan; and Sexual Assault Services of Saskatchewan; however, 2020-21 annual reports that contained justice-related data were not found for these organizations.

Agency Type	Agency Name
	Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission
	Workers Compensation Board
Not-for-Profit Legal Organizations (*n* = 3)	Community Legal Assistance Services for Saskatoon Inner City Inc (CLASSIC)
	Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan
	Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan (PLEA)
Other Relevant Organizations (*n* = 3)	College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan
	Office of the Treaty Commissioner
	Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth

Procedure

A data collection template was used to gather information for the environmental scan, wherein the following information was gathered from each annual report:
- Organization name and website
- Data source (e.g., year and weblink to annual report)
- Years for which annual reports are available
- Data categories reported
- Data elements collected within each data category
- Years of data available in the data source

The data collection template is presented in Appendix C. Data collection for the environmental scan was completed by the first author (LJ).

Data Analysis

Once all annual reports were reviewed, a content analysis was conducted to determine the types of data commonly collected by the organizations. Content analysis is an approach for systematically coding text into categories and identifying themes and patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Thematic categories may be inductive (i.e., emergent based on the data collected) or deductive (i.e., determined by previous research or theory). Content analysis is particularly useful for concept development and for identifying supporting/non-supporting evidence of a guiding theory or lens.

Accordingly, the number of agencies that collected data that fell within various categories of data were determined. Some of the categories were emergent from the sample, whereas others were determined a priori based on previous work in this area conducted by CREATE Justice (2019a) where it was determined that common data types tracked by agencies included:
- Demographic
- Service Users
- Nature of Legal Issues
- Services Requested, Delivered, and Denied
- Referrals
- Co-occurring Services

- Process and Outcomes
- Employee / Service Provider
- Legal Representation
- Adjournments
- User Feedback
- Co-Occurring Issues

In addition, the Triple Aim approach to measuring access to justice,[14] which is a justice metrics framework that can be used to assess the functions and outputs of access to justice initiatives, was used as another data analytic lens (Access to Justice British Columbia [A2JBC], 2019). We adopted the use of this framework after it was workshopped by Saskatchewan stakeholders at the 2018 Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution. Additionally, the 'Triple Aim' approach has been adopted by A2JBC and utilized federally by the Social Security Tribunal of Canada.

According to the Access to Justice (A2J) Measurement Framework developed by A2JBC (2019), there are three key elements, or aims (i.e., the 'Triple Aim'), pertaining to the measurement of access to justice initiatives: (1) **improved population access to justice**; (2) **improved user experience of access to justice**; and (3) **improved costs**. Each of these elements (or aims) consist of varying dimensions under which several justice indicators (i.e., measurable concepts) can be adopted or developed. Table 4 summarizes the 'Triple Aim' access to justice measurement framework, outlining each element and the associated dimensions and components.

Table 4: **Overview of the 'Triple Aim' Access to Justice Measurement Framework**

Element	Dimensions	Components
Improved Population Access to Justice	Prevalence of legal needs/problems	Prevalence of legal problems in the population
		Prevalence of unaddressed legal needs in the population
		Public legal awareness
	Response to legal needs	People's choice of path to justice
		Legal information and education needs
		Legal advice needs
		Need for legal representation and other legal assistance
		Need for consensual dispute resolution process
	Fair and equitable access to justice	Accessibility of justice system, including geographic access and accessibility for Indigenous peoples, people with mental illness, and immigrants and refugees
		Financial access to justice system
		Timeliness of access to justice system
	Social and economic impact of access to justice	Social policy objectives
		Protection of people's rights
		Public confidence in the justice system
		Public confidence in social institutions
		Gender equality

---

[14] Inspired by the Triple Aim approach originally developed in the health sector (Access to Justice British Columbia, 2019).

Element	Dimensions	Components
		Justice for Indigenous peoples
		Social and economic costs and benefits of access to justice
Improved User Experience of Access to Justice	User experience of obstacles to access to justice	Obstacles to access (distances, technology, affordability)
		Eligibility to services
		Affordability of services
		Delays in accessing justice services and their impact
	Quality of user experience of the justice system	Quality of legal information and education
		Trust and confidence in legal information
		User empowerment
		Quality of referral services
		Quality of legal advice
		Quality of legal assistance and representation
		Experience of self-represented litigants
		Quality of consensual dispute resolution processes
	Effectiveness of justice system in addressing user legal problems	Effective resolution of legal problems
		Mitigated impact of legal problems
		Prevention of legal problems
		Prevention of conflicts
		Unmet legal need and their consequences
		Limits to the assistance received
	Appropriateness of the justice process	Fairness, equity, and impartiality of the process
		Cultural appropriateness
		Voice and participation
	Justice outcomes for the users	Outcomes of the justice process
		User satisfaction with the outcomes of the justice process
		Compliance with court orders, judgements, and mediated agreements
		Post-resolution support
		User enhanced legal awareness
		Enhanced legal capability
Improved Costs	Per-capita costs of services	Per-capita costs of services
		Impact of new initiatives on per-capita costs
	Per-user costs of services	Per-user costs by type of services
		Impact of new initiatives on per-user costs
	Other costs	Social and economic costs of unresolved legal problems
		Impact of unresolved problems on costs in other sectors

Source: Access to Justice British Columbia (2019)

3.2.2. Key Informant Interviews

Sample

Key informant interviews were conducted to obtain more in-depth information about data collection and data sharing practices by key organizations in Saskatchewan that have a vested interest in access to justice and, therefore, are mostly likely to be involved in a justice data commons at the 'ground level.' Three 'clusters' of agencies were considered for inclusion in the key informant interviews: 1) agencies that <u>do</u> currently report data publicly and have a vested interested in Access to Justice; 2) agencies that <u>do not</u> currently report data publicly and have a vested interested in Access to Justice; and 3) agencies with current and/or past experience with establishing data portals/warehouses. Agencies for the first two clusters were identified by reflecting upon the Environmental Scan and flagging those agencies collecting highly relevant data and those who likely collect highly relevant data but who do not publish annual reports. Agencies for the third cluster were identified through the professional networks of CREATE Justice and their knowledge of other agencies involved in data commons initiatives.

Accordingly, representatives from 9 agencies were invited to participate in key informant interviews and 8 agencies accepted this invitation. The number of participants who participated in each interview ranged from one to three participants, with a total of 14 individuals participating in interviews (see Table 5).

Table 5: Key Informant Interview Participants

Organization Type	Agencies (n)	Participants (n)
Provincial Government-Affiliated Organizations	4	10
Not-for-Profit Legal Organizations	3	3
Data Commons Subject Matter Expert (SME; Dr. Charles Plante)	1	1

Procedures

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants over Zoom. Interviews ranged in length from 30 to 80 minutes and were conducted by the lead author (LJ). The second author (BS) attended two interviews to assist with notetaking. Verbal informed consent was obtained prior to beginning the interviews (see Appendix D for the consent form). With permission, all interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Most participants wished to review their transcript and were given a two-week period to do so. If the research team did not hear back from participants after the two-week period, data analysis proceeded with using the transcripts 'as is.'

Two interview guides were developed to facilitate the interviews (see Appendix E). The first was used with participants from agencies with a vested interest in access to justice and broadly examined their data collection practices, experiences with data sharing, and perceptions of a justice data commons. Specifically, the following topics were explored in the interviews:
- Data collection processes, including the type, format, and frequency of data collection
- Use of data by the organization

- Nature of any formal data collection, analysis, or sharing policies
- Organization's ability to share data, including involvement in past data sharing activities and factors that may facilitate or hinder data sharing
- Perceptions of developing a justice data commons, including potential benefits, barriers, challenges, and data that would be of most use
- Level of readiness for participation in a data commons, including any supports and resources that would be needed to facilitate any potential involvement

The second interview guide was tailored for participants from agencies involved in data commons initiatives such as a data portal or warehouse. This interview guide explored topics related to the:

- Purpose of the data portal/warehouse initiative
- Stakeholders involved in the initiative
- Governance structure of the initiative
- Steps taken to establish the initiative
- Technical aspects of the data portal/warehouse
- Positive or negative impacts of the data portal/warehouse

Data Analysis

All data collected through the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which involves the systematic identification and categorization of recurring themes found in text (Boyatzis, 1998). Once all interviews were conducted and all transcripts were verified, analysis of the data commenced. First, the transcripts were reviewed and the data were assessed to develop a coding scheme for the purposes of classifying and organizing themes based on similarities emerging from the content of participants' responses. Data were then systematically analyzed, coding excerpts from participants' responses according to the corresponding theme(s). Once the initial coding of the data was completed, the analysis was reviewed to further confirm and organize the coding scheme and major themes. The major themes, and key excerpts illustrating those themes, were then extracted from the analysis and presented in the Results sections of this report. The analysis was completed in a Microsoft Word document by the lead author (LJ).

3.3. Limitations

3.3.1. Environmental Scan

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. With respect to the environmental scan, one limitation is that only agencies with a publicly available annual report published on the Internet were included in the scan. The agencies that were excluded from the scan are likely collecting some form of data that could not be captured via the study's methodology. Second, annual reports tend to be a 'snapshot' of the data collected by a given agency and do not necessarily reflect the full scope of data collected by that organization. Thus, the results of the current study likely do not reflect the full range of data collected by the included agencies. Third, due to financial and time restrictions, only a subset of community organizations that collected data related to family and civil law could be included in the

environmental scan. Additional agencies could be considered in future studies. Similarly, due to financial and time restrictions, the organizations' audited financial statements were not included in the environmental scan which may have limited the amount of financial or cost-related data included in scan. Fourth, the way in which the data included in this report was categorized and understood with respect to the Access to Justice Measurement Framework reflects a single interpretation of the data. There are other ways in which the data may be categorized and some data elements may be interpreted as belonging to one or more elements of the measurement framework. Despite these limitations, it important to note that a key strength of using annual reports as the study's data source is that any data elements reported can be examined and discussed in detail without concerns related to the confidentiality of the organization as the information is publicly available.

3.3.2. Key Informant Interviews

A handful of limitations are also important to note with respect to the key informant interviews. Due to the small sample size and the need to protect participants' confidentiality, detailed information about each organization's identity, as well as their data collection and data sharing processes, cannot be included in the current report. Therefore, the results from this component of the study are aggregated to a much stronger degree than those from the environmental scan. In addition, we had hoped to interview representatives from more than one agency who had prior experience with data commons initiatives; however, only one subject matter expert (SME) responded to our invitation.

4. Environmental Scan

As introduced in Section 3.2.1 (Data Analysis), two lenses were used to analyze the data captured by the annual reports included in the environmental scan. The first lens focused on understanding the categories of data reported by the agencies, which consisted of utilizing a combination of inductive categories identified through our review of the annual reports, as well as a priori categories derived from CREATE Justice's (2019a) survey assessing data collected by justice agencies in Saskatchewan. A second lens consisted of applying the Access to Justice (A2J) Measurement Framework (Access to Justice British Columbia, 2019) to the data included in the annual reports to determine the extent to which reporting practices fell in line with those recommended by the A2J Measurement Framework.

4.1. Lens One: Data Categories Reported by Agencies

4.1.1. Referrals, Inquiries, Applications, Claims, Complaints, and Appeals Received

The first category of data that was considered when reviewing the annual reports related to the initial contact individuals may have with the agencies. Depending on the nature of agency, some organizations reported on referrals, whereas others reported on received inquiries, applications, claims, complaints, or requests for appeals. Regardless, all of these data categories reflect an initial point of contact with, and request for services from, the agency. Accordingly, 16 of 24 agencies (67%) reported the volume of the initial contacts received (i.e., number of referrals [$n=2$], inquiries [$n=8$], applications [$n=5$], claims [$n=1$], complaints [$n=6$][15], or requests for appeals [$n=4$]). In addition, most of these agencies ($n=11$) specified the type of referrals, applications, inquiries, claims complaints, or requests for appeals received (see Table 6).

Some agencies also provided additional information about the nature of the inquiries received (see Table 7). Four agencies provided data on the mode of the initial contact (e.g., whether the contact was made by phone, email, or website), while four agencies more broadly reported on their level of social media engagement (e.g., number of Facebook or Twitter followers, number of website views). Notably, one of these agencies (i.e., CLASSIC) also included their number of social media posts and news article contributions. Finally, two organizations (i.e., Ombudsman Saskatchewan and the Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner) indicated the number of inquiries received that were within and outside of their jurisdictions.

---

[15] The "Applications" category reflects applications to receive services from a given organization. The "Complaints" category reflects requests made to an organization to investigate a perceived wrongdoing in an area where the organization has been vested with independent oversight. For example, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission is responsible for investigating complaints where individuals believe their human rights have been violated (e.g., loss of employment due to their age, gender, or sexual orientation). The complaints category does not refer to complaints made about an organization to that organization.

Table 6: Referrals, Inquiries, Applications, Complaints, and Appeals Received by Agency*

Agency	# of Referrals Received	Type of Referrals Received	# of Inquiries Received	Type of Inquiry Received	# of Applications Received	Type of Applications Received	# of Claims Received	Type of Claims Received	# of Complaints Received	Type of Complaints Received	# of Appeals Received	Type of Appeals Received
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission												
Employment Standards Division												
Financial and Consumer Affairs			X		X	X			X	X		
Legal Aid Saskatchewan					X							
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee												
Office of Residential Tenancies			X		X	X						
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner												
Ombudsman Saskatchewan									X	X		
Provincial Mediation Board			X									
Public and Private Rights Board							X	X				
Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner			X						X			
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation												
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission			X						X	X		
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board					X	X					X	X
Saskatchewan Municipal Board											X	X
Saskatchewan Police Commission											X	
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission				X					X	X		
Workers Compensation Board			X								X	X
CLASSIC	X				X							
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan												
PLEA	X		X									
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan			X	X					X			

Agency	# of Referrals Received	Type of Referrals Received	# of Inquiries Received	Type of Inquiry Received	# of Applications Received	Type of Applications Received	# of Claims Received	Type of Claims Received	# of Complaints Received	Type of Complaints Received	# of Appeals Received	Type of Appeals Received
Office of the Treaty Commissioner												
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth				X								

*Note: The data included in this table cannot be aggregated further due to inconsistent language used by organizations to describe the various inquiries received.

Table 7: Mode of Contact, Social Media Engagement, and Jurisdictional Boundaries by Agency

Agency	Mode of Contact (By Media Type)	Social Media Engagement	Inquiries Within Jurisdiction	Inquiries Outside of Jurisdiction
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission				
Employment Standards Division				
Financial and Consumer Affairs		X		
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X			
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee				
Office of Residential Tenancies	X			
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner				
Ombudsman Saskatchewan			X	X
Provincial Mediation Board	X			
Public and Private Rights Board				
Public Disclosure Committee			X	X
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation				
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission		X		
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board				
Saskatchewan Municipal Board				
Saskatchewan Police Commission				
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission				
Workers Compensation Board				
CLASSIC		X		
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan				
PLEA		X		
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X			
Office of the Treaty Commissioner				
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth				

4.1.2. Files Opened, Services Delivered, and File Closures

The second category of variables analyzed broadly considered the services delivered by the agencies, including the volume and nature of any files opened and closed. In contrast to the previous section which examined initial contacts to the organization, the data captured in this section reflects active work that was taken on and/or concluded by the agencies (see Table 8).

One of the most commonly reported statistics across the annual reports was the volumes of files opened (may it be an application, claim, complaint, appeal, court case, or other type of file) with 17 agencies (71%) providing this type of data. With the exception of one agency, all organizations that provided data on the volume of files opened also provided some data regarding the type of file opened or the nature of the service delivered (including, in some cases, the specific area of law to which the file pertains). One organization (Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth [SACY]) did not provide information on their file volume but did provide a breakdown of the most common issues experienced that fiscal year. Further, several agencies (n=6) provided data on the geographic location where their services were delivered and/or the types of communities to which their work pertains.

Only two agencies reported on any services they denied. Specifically, the Workers Compensation Board reported on the number of appeals denied, while CLASSIC reported on the number of applications denied. Notably, CLASSIC also included the number of applications denied due to capacity, which is one of few data elements contained within the annual reports that speak directly to unmet legal needs within the province.

Approximately half of the organizations (n=13; 54%) reported on the number of files concluded (or the number of final decisions issued within that fiscal year), with most of these organizations (n=11) also providing some data on the nature of the outcomes achieved (or the final decision issued). To illustrate, the Saskatchewan Labour Board presented the number of decisions rendered final and interim and, for decisions rendered final, provided detailed information about the outcomes of each case (e.g., date last heard, day concluded, total days to decision, decisions/order, number of reasons). Similarly, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan also provided a detailed breakdown of the number of file determinations by outcome (i.e., founded, unfounded, partially founded, not determination, still in review, known complications, system error, resolved without physician, and resolved without committee). In addition, several agencies (n=5; 21%) reported the dollar amount of any penalties, revenue, or orders secured through the resolution of the file. For instance, Legal Aid Saskatchewan reported the amount of child and spousal orders secured.

Finally, three agencies (CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan, and PLEA) more broadly reported information about the services they delivered. For instance, PLEA reported the number of publications distributed, while both CLASSIC and Pro Bono Law indicated the number of programs they offered (e.g., Pro Bono Law indicated the number of legal clinics held). CLASSIC also provided data on the number of clients served by their community support program which offers wrap-around and referral support services for clients' non-legal concerns. It is the only agency that provided data on clients' non-legal concerns.

Table 8: Files Opened, Services Delivered, and Files Concluded by Agency

Agency	# of Files Opened	Types of Files Opened / Services Delivered	# of Services Denied	# of Files Closed / Final Decisions Issued	Types of File Outcomes / Final Decisions Issued	Amount ($) of Penalties / Revenue / Orders Secured	Geographic Location Where Services Offered
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission	X	X		X			
Employment Standards Division	X			X	X	X	
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X	X					
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X	X		X	X	X	X
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	X	X					
Office of Residential Tenancies						X	
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner	X	X		X	X		
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X	X		X	X		X
Provincial Mediation Board	X	X				X	
Public and Private Rights Board	X	X		X	X		
Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner							X
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation							
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	X	X		X			
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	X	X		X	X		
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X	X		X	X	X	X
Saskatchewan Police Commission				X	X		
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	X	X		X	X		X
Workers Compensation Board	X	X	X	X	X		
CLASSIC	X	X	X				X
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan	X	X					
PLEA							
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X	X		X	X		
Office of the Treaty Commissioner							
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth		X					

4.1.3. Duration of Services Provided

Another common category of data captured by the annual reports related to the duration of services provided. Within this category, one of the data elements most frequently reported by agencies pertained to the length of time between commencing and resolving legal matters, with 10 agencies (42%) providing such a metric (see Table 9). Six of these agencies provided the average number of days or years it took to close a file. For instance, the Automobile Injury Appeal Commission reported on the average number of years from file opening to written decision. In addition, six agencies (n=6), including two who reported on the (average) number of days required to close a file, reported the degree to which performance benchmarks were achieved with respect to targeted timeframes for concluding files. For example, the Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee measured the percentage of files that were closed within three years of being opened (which was their pre-identified benchmark for service).

One organization (i.e., the Automobile Injury Appeal Commission) also reported on the point in time at which files were closed (i.e., it specified the number of files that were closed prior to hearing, as well as those that concluded following hearings). Further, the Automobile Injury Appeal Commission, along with the Worker's Compensation Board, both published the number of hearings held. In addition, seven organizations (29%) indicated the number of files that were in progress or in queue at the end of their fiscal year. For example, the Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission reported the number of complaint files pending.

In addition to reporting on the time required to conclude an open file, Legal Aid Saskatchewan reported on performance metrics related to the time it took to: (a) respond to an inquiry (i.e., percentage of calls answered within 2.5 minutes); and (b) see clients for full-service representation (i.e., percentage seen within three weeks). Somewhat more commonly, organizations (n=4) reported on the length of time until a response was provided to an application. For instance, the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner included a performance metric related to the percentage of applications that received a response within 20 days.

Table 9: Duration of Services Provided by Agency

Agency	Time between Commencing & Concluding Legal Matter	Point in Process Outcomes are Achieved	# of Hearings	# of Files in Progress or in Queue	Length of Time in Response to Inquiry	Length of Time until Response to Application	Length of Time Until Clients Connected to Service
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission	X	X	X	X			
Employment Standards Division							
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X						
Legal Aid Saskatchewan					X	X	X
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	X						
Office of Residential Tenancies							
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner	X					X	
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X						
Provincial Mediation Board				X			
Public and Private Rights Board				X			
Public Disclosure Committee							
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation							
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission							
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	X						
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X			X		X	
Saskatchewan Police Commission							
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	X			X			
Workers Compensation Board	X		X	X			
CLASSIC							
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan							
PLEA							
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X			X			
Office of the Treaty Commissioner							
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth							

4.1.4. Client Demographics

Four organizations (17%) provided statistics in their annual reports related to the demographic characteristics of clients served (see Table 11). Notably, the organizations that provided this type of data (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan, SACY) served populations that have limited financial resources and may use this information to provide insight into the clientele who are being served by their organizations. Regardless, all of the organizations reported the number of clients served (or, in the case of the SACY, the number of deaths and critical incidents recorded), as well as breakdowns of their clients' ethnicity (with a focus on the number and percentage of clients who were Indigenous). Three of the agencies (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan) also reported their clients' gender. Further, Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and SACY provided some statistics about clients' age, while Legal Aid Saskatchewan and Pro Bono Law both reported on clients' number of dependents. Notably, CLASSIC was the only agency to include the percentage of clients who were immigrants or refugees, while Pro Bono Law was the only agency to include data on clients' employment status, mean monthly income, and sexual orientation.

Table 11: Client Demographics Reported by Agency

Agency	# of Clients	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Immigrant / Refugee	Marital Status	Dependents	Employment Status	Income	Sexual Orientation
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission										
Employment Standards Division										
Financial and Consumer Affairs										
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X	X	X	X		X	X			
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee										
Office of Residential Tenancies										
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner										
Ombudsman Saskatchewan										
Provincial Mediation Board										
Public and Private Rights Board										
Public Disclosure Committee										
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation										
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission										
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board										
Saskatchewan Municipal Board										
Saskatchewan Police Commission										
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission										
Workers Compensation Board										
CLASSIC	X	X	X	X	X					
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan	X	X		X			X	X	X	X
PLEA										
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan										
Office of the Treaty Commissioner										
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth	X		X	X						

4.1.5. Quality of Service Measures

Four agencies included data in their annual reports that spoke to the quality of the service provided to clients and clients' satisfaction with the services received (see Table 12). The Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee included the most data elements in this regard and reported on performance metrics such as the percentage of files where supervisory reviews shows quality service to clients and the percentage of beneficiaries who received average, above average, or excellent service from the Estate Unit. Further, the Saskatchewan Municipal Board reported on stakeholder satisfaction (presumably with the Board), while PLEA reported on percentage of clients who rated the information on their website to be helpful. The Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner provided statistics related to their organization's ability to manage their increasing caseloads and the percentage of reports in compliance with recommendations. Similarly, the Saskatchewan Police Commission recorded the number of audits or reviews completed and/or in progress.

Beyond the quality of service provided to clients, Financial and Consumer Affairs tracked the degree to which its policies and practices were clearly described. In particular, it included performance metrics related to the degree to which its assessment criteria for approving applications/renewals were clear (as perceived by clients), compliance requirements were clearly described, and clients were kept well informed of regulatory changes and other information needed to conduct business.

Table 12: Quality of Service Measures by Agency

Agency	Quality Service Provided to Clients	Clear Policies and Practices	Audits and Reviews Conducted
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission			
Employment Standards Division			
Financial and Consumer Affairs		X	
Legal Aid Saskatchewan			
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	X		
Office of Residential Tenancies			
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner	X		X
Ombudsman Saskatchewan			
Provincial Mediation Board			
Public and Private Rights Board			
Public Disclosure Committee			
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation			
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission			
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board			
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X		
Saskatchewan Police Commission			X
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission			
Workers Compensation Board			
CLASSIC			
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan			
PLEA	X		
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan			
Office of the Treaty Commissioner			
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth			

4.1.6. Employee, Student, and Volunteer Data

Five agencies included data related to their workforce in their annual reports (see Table 13). Three agencies (Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and PLEA) reported the number of employees at their organization, two agencies (CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law) reported the number of volunteers affiliated with their organization, and one agency (CLASSIC) reported the number of students trained by their organization. In addition, two organizations (Legal Aid Saskatchewan, Financial and Consumer Affairs) included data in their annual reports that spoke to the learning and training opportunities undertaken by their employees. For instance, Legal Aid provided the average number of hours staff spent on professional development. Further, these two organizations were the only agencies that included performance measures related to the level of employee engagement within their organizations. Finally, Legal Aid was the only organization that reported the location of their employees, the types of employees (e.g., lawyers, support staff) in place, the demographic profile of their staff, staff's workload, and the average number of sick days used by staff.

Table 13: Employee, Student, and Volunteer Data by Agency

Agency	# of Employees	# of Volunteers	# of Students	Level of Employee Engagement	Employee Learning and Training	Demographic Profile of Staff	Employee Position Profile	Location of Employees	Workload of Staff	Sick Days Used
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission										
Employment Standards Division										
Financial and Consumer Affairs				X	X					
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee										
Office of Residential Tenancies										
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner										
Ombudsman Saskatchewan										
Provincial Mediation Board										
Public and Private Rights Board										
Public Disclosure Committee										
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation										
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission										
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board										
Saskatchewan Municipal Board										
Saskatchewan Police Commission										

Agency	# of Employees	# of Volunteers	# of Students	Level of Employee Engagement	Employee Learning and Training	Demographic Profile of Staff	Employee Position Profile	Location of Employees	Workload of Staff	Sick Days Used
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission										
Workers Compensation Board										
CLASSIC	X	X	X							
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan		X								
PLEA	X									
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan										
Office of the Treaty Commissioner										
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth										

4.1.7. Financial-Related Data

Six agencies reported data in their annual reports that related to financial aspects of the services provided[16]; however, the data reported is unique to each organization. As a result, broader themes cannot be derived for this category. For instance, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation had the most financial-related data elements in their annual report and included the dollar amount of allocations to its various programs (e.g., rental development, home repairs, housing support for the North), as well as several data points related to its expenditures and revenues. The Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee also reported several financial-related data elements, including the number of days it took to process invoices and expenses, the number of payments processed by electronic funds transfer (EFT), and a performance measure related to the difference between the rate of return on invested clients' assets and their policy benchmark. Financial and Consumer Affairs reported on a performance measure related to the degree to which there was variance from the operational budget, while the Saskatchewan Municipal Board reported the dollar amount of cancellations and write-offs related to the Board of Revenue Commissioners activity. CLASSIC provided the dollar amount of the cost of legal services obtained or retained for clients, as well as the dollar amount associated with their fundraising efforts for that fiscal year. Finally, PLEA included statistics related to the percentage of their grants that came from each of their funding sources (see Table 14).

---

[16] The review of annual reports did not include a review of each agency's audited financial statements. Thus, the financial data included in this section reflects data published by agencies related to their delivery of services.

Table 14: Financial-Related Data by Agency

Agency	Variance from Operational Budget	# of Days to Process Invoices and Expenses	# of Payments Processed by EFT	Difference Between Rate of Return and Policy Benchmark	Cancellations / Write-offs ($)	Cost of Services Obtained / Retained	Fundraising ($)	Grants Received	Allocations to Programs ($)	Expenditures ($)
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission										
Employment Standards Division										
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X									
Legal Aid Saskatchewan										
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee		X	X	X						
Office of Residential Tenancies										
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner										
Ombudsman Saskatchewan										
Provincial Mediation Board										
Public and Private Rights Board										
Public Disclosure Committee										
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation								X	X	X
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission										
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board										
Saskatchewan Municipal Board					X					
Saskatchewan Police Commission										
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission										

Agency	Variance from Operational Budget	# of Days to Process Invoices and Expenses	# of Payments Processed by EFT	Difference Between Rate of Return and Policy Benchmark	Cancellations / Write-offs ($)	Cost of Services Obtained / Retained	Fundraising ($)	Grants Received	Allocations to Programs ($)	Expenditures ($)
Workers Compensation Board										
CLASSIC						X	X			
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan										
PLEA								X		
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan										
Office of the Treaty Commissioner										
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth										

4.1.8. Population-Level Data

Three organizations reported data that directly speaks to access to justice and/or legal needs at a population level (see Table 15). Similar to the Financial-Related Data section, the population-level data identified through the environmental scan was unique to each organization that reported it and, as a result, broader themes could not be derived for this type of data.

Among the three agencies identified, the Saskatchewan Police Commission presented the most population-level data. It provided data on the number of sworn officers (authorized and actual) associated with municipal and First Nations police services in the province of Saskatchewan, as well as the police to population ratio. It also listed all cities, towns, and villages policed by municipal and First Nations police services throughout Saskatchewan, as well as the number of firearms discharged and number of conducted energy weapons used by municipal and First Nations police services. Legal Aid Saskatchewan reported on the percentage of all criminal files in Saskatchewan with Legal Aid representation. Finally, CLASSIC indicated the types of systemic barriers addressed (which is qualitatively useful for understanding the types of systemic barriers of concern in Saskatchewan).

Table 15: Population-Level Data by Agency

Agency	% of Criminal Files with Legal Aid Representation	Systemic Barriers/ Issues Addressed	Municipal / First Nations Police Services by Location	# of Police Personnel / Police to Population Ratio	Firearms Discharged / Conducted Energy Weapons Used by Police
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission					
Employment Standards Division					
Financial and Consumer Affairs					
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X				
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee					
Office of Residential Tenancies					
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner					
Ombudsman Saskatchewan					
Provincial Mediation Board					
Public and Private Rights Board					
Public Disclosure Committee					
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation					
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission					
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board					
Saskatchewan Municipal Board					
Saskatchewan Police Commission			X	X	X
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission					
Workers Compensation Board					
CLASSIC		X			
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan					
PLEA					
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan					
Office of the Treaty Commissioner					
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth					

4.2. Lens Two: Applying the Access to Justice Measurement Framework

This analytic component of the environmental scan focused on assessing the degree to which the various data elements included in the annual reports mapped onto the A2J Measurement Framework (A2JBC, 2019). The analysis is organized according to the three major elements of the measurement framework (i.e., Improving Population Access to Justice, Improving User Experience of Access to Justice, and Improving Costs) and considers each dimension and related components that fall within these three major elements.

4.2.1. Improving Population Access to Justice

The first element of the A2J Measurement Framework, Improving Population Access to Justice, considers whether the justice system has the necessary institutions, knowledge, resources, and services needed to help individuals manage, avoid, and/or resolve everyday legal problems, particularly those in the family and civil domains (A2JBC, 2019). It consists of four dimensions: 1) prevalence of legal needs/problems; 2) response to legal needs; 3) fair and equitable access to justice; and 4) social and economic impact of access to justice.

Prevalence of Legal Problems

The prevalence of legal problems dimension is comprised of three components. The first component, **Prevalence of Legal Problems in the Population**, is well-represented across the annual reports reviewed (see Table 16). Here, 15 agencies included data from which insight can be gleaned about the extent to which a given population is experiencing legal problems and the nature of those problems. Most commonly, agencies reported on data related to the number and type of legal problems that the clients accessing their services had (as it related to their organizational mandates and services offered). Notably, no agencies tracked information related to whether their clients had more than one legal problem.

Data related to the degree to which there were **Unaddressed Legal Needs in the Population** were available to much a lesser extent. Only two agencies (CLASSIC and Pro Bono Law) reported on data that spoke directly to the proportion of their clientele who have legal needs that likely remained unaddressed. Specifically, CLASSIC reported on the percentage of applications denied due to capacity, while Pro Bono Law indicated the number of clients serviced by panel programs who were unmatched (and matched) to services. Interestingly, both CLASSIC and Pro Bono Law serve clients who may have limited financial means and who have a priority to assist clients whose legal needs may otherwise go unaddressed if not for the services they provide. Thus, they may be particularly interested in highlighting the extent to which legal needs are going unaddressed.

No agencies directly reported on data that pertained to **Public Legal Awareness**. This dimension refers to measuring the public's level of awareness and understanding of their rights, entitlements, and obligations under the law (A2JBC, 2019). However, CLASSIC did report two data elements that may indirectly speak to increasing Public Legal Awareness—namely, its number of social media posts and number of newspaper contributions, which presumably serve, at least in part, to increase awareness of legal rights and entitlements. Similarly, PLEA also reported on markers that may be used to indirectly assess the degree to which the public sought to increase their awareness and understanding of legal rights, such as the number of website page views received, individual requests for legal information handled, and print publications distributed.

Table 16: Prevalence of Legal Needs/Problems by Agency

Agency	Prevalence of Legal Problems in Population	Prevalence of Unaddressed Legal Needs in Population	Public Legal Awareness
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission			
Employment Standards Division			
Financial and Consumer Affairs			
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X		
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee			
Office of Residential Tenancies			
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner			
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X		
Provincial Mediation Board	X		
Public and Private Rights Board	X		
Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner	X		
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation			
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	X		
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	X		
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X		
Saskatchewan Police Commission			
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	X		
Workers Compensation Board	X		
CLASSIC	X	X	~X
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan	X	X	
PLEA	X		~X
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X		
Office of the Treaty Commissioner			
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth	X		

~X: Data reported may only peripherally speak to this component.

Response to Legal Needs

Response to Legal Needs is the second dimension of Improving Population Access to Justice, and it considers the extent to which legal needs of the population are being met (A2JBC, 2019). The first component within this dimension, **People's Choice of Path to Justice**, examines the decisions that individuals make about how to address their legal problems, including their ability to choose various paths to justice (A2JBC, 2019). It can include measures such as the proportion of people who contact a lawyer, go to court or a tribunal, or seek other forms of assistance to solve a legal problem (A2JBC, 2019). Our review of annual reports revealed that the agencies did not report on this type of population-related data. The agencies provided statistics regarding the number of individuals who accessed their (legal) services, but not what proportion of the broader population these individuals represented (with the exception of Legal Aid who indicated the percentage of criminal files in Saskatchewan with Legal Aid representation).

The second component, **Legal Information and Education Needs**, considers the extent to which legal information and education needs are being met within a given population (A2JBC, 2019). It can include the measurement of concepts such as the extent to which relevant legal information can be found and accessed; the understandability, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of legal information; the perceived trustworthiness and usefulness of the legal information; and changes in the amount and quality of legal information resources available over time (A2JBC, 2019). Two organizations reported on data elements in their annual reports that speak to this component. First, Financial and Consumer Affairs had several performance measures that pertained to the understandability, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of the legal information

they shared. Specifically, their performance measures related to their assessment criteria being clear, having clear compliance requirements, and ensuring their users were well-informed of regulatory changes. Second, PLEA reported on various aspects of their dissemination of legal information, including the number of publications distributed, types of resources accessed, number of family law accounts opened, and the percentage of individuals who rated the legal information they obtained to be helpful. Theoretically, changes in the amount and quality of legal information distributed by PLEA over time could be determined by comparing this data to data published in previous years.

The third component, **Legal Advice Needs**, considers the extent to which people who express a need for legal advice are able to obtain it (A2JBC, 2019). Only cursory information was identified in the environmental scan as relating to this component. The Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner reported data on the number of times summary advice was provided, while CLASSIC reported the number of individuals who attended legal advice clinics. Notably, these statistics provided insight into the number of people who were able to obtain legal advice, but not into the larger issue of how many people overall needed legal advice (and whether they were able to access it).

The fourth component, **Need for Legal Representation and Other Legal Assistance**, considers the extent to which individuals are able to access *effective* legal representation and other forms of legal assistance (i.e., legal representation or assistance that led to the satisfactory resolution of their legal problem; A2JBC, 2019). Only three agencies included data in their annual reports that somewhat related to this component. Specifically, Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and Pro Bono Law all provided data on the number of clients for whom they provided legal representation or other forms of legal assistance; however, no data was reported on the effectiveness of the services provided.

The fifth and final component, **Need for Consensual Dispute Resolution Process**, considers the extent to which people have access to alternative dispute resolution mechanisms (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported on data related to the need for consensual dispute resolution processes. Table 17 summarizes the information presented in this section.

Table 17: Response to Legal Needs by Agency

Agency	People's Choice of Path to Justice	Legal Information and Education Needs	Legal Advice Needs	Need for Legal Representation and Other Legal Assistance	Need for Consensual Dispute Resolution Process
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission					
Employment Standards Division					
Financial and Consumer Affairs		X			
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X			X	
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee					
Office of Residential Tenancies					
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner			X		
Ombudsman Saskatchewan					
Provincial Mediation Board					
Public and Private Rights Board					
Public Disclosure Committee					
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation					
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission					
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board					
Saskatchewan Municipal Board					
Saskatchewan Police Commission					
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission					
Workers Compensation Board					
CLASSIC			X	X	
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan				X	
PLEA		X			
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan					
Office of the Treaty Commissioner					
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth					

Fair and Equitable Access to Justice

The Fair and Equitable Access to Justice component of Improving Population Access to Justice considers a variety of aspects associated with accessing the justice system (A2JBC, 2019). The first component, **Accessibility of the Justice System**, considers people's ability to afford, understand, use, and navigate services within the justice system to manage their legal needs or obtain a solution to a legal problem (A2JBC, 2019). In particular, attention should be paid to understanding the extent to which specific subpopulations—namely, Indigenous peoples, people with mental illness, and immigrants and refugees—are able to access and receive meaningful legal assistance (A2JBC, 2019). The majority of agencies (*n*=14) provided data on the number of people who used their services (e.g., the number and type of files opened; complaints or appeals made) which, when taken together, provides insight into the number of individuals who were able to access legal services and the types of problems for which services were sought. Only four organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law, and SACY) specifically reported on the demographic characteristics of the clients they served. Of relevance to this component, all four indicated the percentage of clients served who were Indigenous, while only CLASSIC provided the percentage of clients who were immigrants or refugees. None of the agencies reported data on people experiencing mental illness. However, additional data is needed to fully understand the extent to which these specific demographic groups, as well as the broader population, are able to afford, understand, access, use, and navigate the justice system and receive meaningful legal assistance.

Another component of fair and equitable access to justice is **Financial Access to the Justice System**. Here, the focus is on understanding the proportion of the population that cannot access a particular path to justice due to their financial situation (A2JBC, 2019). This dimension may be measured by metrics such as the proportion of Legal Aid applicants who qualify for services, receive services, or self-select out of services, as well as public perceptions of the fairness of eligibility criteria for determining access to legal services (A2JBC, 2019). Some of the data reported by Legal Aid Saskatchewan reflected the recommended financial access to the justice system measures, including the number of applications and number of files opened; however, the data provided in their annual report did not provide statistics on the proportion of applicants who qualified for, received, or self-selected out of services. In addition, Legal Aid provided the percentage of all criminal files in Saskatchewan with Legal Aid representation, which does speak to the proportion of people with a (criminal) legal problem that were served by Legal Aid. The Automobile Inquiry Appeal Commission was the only other agency that published data related to financial access to justice and included the number of fee waivers provided. No data was identified that examined public perceptions of the fairness of eligibility criteria used to determine access to legal services.

Timeliness of Access to the Justice System was the third component considered and focuses on the assessment of delays in accessing consensual dispute resolution, court, or Legal Aid; the length of time required to obtain a first appearance in court or to conclude a court case; and the costs and consequences of delays in accessing the justice system (A2JBC, 2019). Many of the agencies (*n*=12) published data related to the length of time it took for a file or case to be resolved. Further, Legal Aid reported data on performance measures related to the time required to respond to inquiries and applications and provide full representation to clients. Table 18 summarizes the information presented in this section.

Table 18: Fair and Equitable Access to Justice by Agency

Agency	Accessibility of Justice System	Financial Access to Justice System	Timeliness of Access to Justice System
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission		X	X
Employment Standards Division			
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X		X
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X	X	X
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee			X
Office of Residential Tenancies			
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner			X
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X		X
Provincial Mediation Board			
Public and Private Rights Board			X
Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner	X		
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation			
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	X		
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board			X
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X		X
Saskatchewan Police Commission	X		
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	X		X
Workers Compensation Board	X		X
CLASSIC	X		
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan	X		
Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan	X		
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X		X
Office of the Treaty Commissioner			
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth	X		

Social and Economic Impact of Access to Justice

The final dimension of Improving Population Access to Justice considers the Social and Economic Impact of Access to Justice. The first component of this dimension, **Social Policy Objectives**, examines the extent to which social policy objectives can be linked to changes in a population's level of access to justice (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported data that falls within this component. The second component, **Protection of People's Rights**, focuses on how changes in a population's level of access to justice contribute to the protection of people's rights (e.g., the prevention of discrimination, best interests of the child; A2JBC, 2019). While the annual reports reviewed did not include data on changes in the level of access to justice, some agencies did report data that pertains to the protection of people's rights, largely due to the nature and mandates of those organizations. For instance, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission published data on the number of instances of discrimination reported, CLASSIC described their work on addressing systemic barriers, the Office of the Treaty Commissioner reported the number of individuals reached through various reconciliation activities, and the SACY documented the most common issues faced by children and youth over the past year.

The third component, **Public Confidence in the Justice System**, considers the extent to which changes in a population's level of access to justice affects public confidence in the justice system. Measures of this component may include assessments of the proportion of the population who believe the justice system is fair, effective at helping people resolve their legal problems, and relevant to them (A2JBC, 2019). This was another component that was not captured by the data published by any of the annual reports reviewed. The fourth component, **Public Confidence in Social Institutions**, which focuses on the extent to which changes in a population's level of

access to justice affects their trust and confidence in social institutions, also was not directly reflected in the annual reports. That being said, many of the organizations (e.g., Financial and Consumer Affairs, Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner, Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner, Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board, Saskatchewan Police Commission, Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission, College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan) fielded complaints about various social institutions from which the number of individuals who may lack trust and confidence in these various institutions may be gleaned.

The fifth component, **Gender Equality**, considers the extent to which changes in women's level of access to justice has resulted in greater gender equality and meaningful improvements in the daily lives of women (A2JBC, 2019). A few organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, and Pro Bono Law) reported on gender as a demographic characteristic of their clients; however, it would not be possible to extrapolate this data into an understanding of the extent to which meaningful changes in women's daily lives have occurred. Similarly, the sixth component, **Justice of Indigenous Persons**, focuses on the extent to which changes in Indigenous people's access to justice has resulted in meaningful improvements in the lives of Indigenous individuals, families, and communities (A2JBC, 2019). Again, a handful of organizations (i.e., Legal Aid Saskatchewan, CLASSIC, Pro Bono Law, SACY) reported on ethnicity as a demographic characteristic, but not on changes in Indigenous peoples' level of access to justice and any resulting changes in their lives.

The seventh and final component, **Social and Economic Costs and Benefits to Access to Justice**, assesses the extent to which changes in a population's level of access to justice affects their social and economic development, promotes inclusive growth, and results in social and economic benefits (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies published data that falls within this component. Table 19 summarizes the data presented in this section.

Table 19: Social and Economic Impact of Access to Justice by Agency

Agency	Social Policy Objectives	Protection of People's Rights	Public Confidence in Justice System	Public Confidence in Social Institutions	Gender Equality	Justice of Indigenous Persons	Social and Economic Costs and Benefits of Access to Justice
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission							
Employment Standards Division							
Financial and Consumer Affairs				~X			
Legal Aid Saskatchewan					~X	~X	
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee				~X			
Office of Residential Tenancies							
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner				~X			
Ombudsman Saskatchewan				~X			
Provincial Mediation Board							
Public and Private Rights Board							
Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner				~X			
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation							
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission		X		~X			
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board							
Saskatchewan Municipal Board							
Saskatchewan Police Commission				~X			
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission				~X			
Workers Compensation Board							
CLASSIC		X			~X	~X	
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan					~X	~X	
PLEA							
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan				~X			
Office of the Treaty Commissioner		X					
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth		X		~X		~X	

~X: Data reported may peripherally speak to this component.

4.2.2. Improving User Experiences of Access to Justice

The second element of the A2J Measurement Framework focuses on various aspects of the user experience of accessing justice (A2JBC, 2019). It is comprised of five dimensions: 1) user experience obstacles to access to justice; 2) quality of user experience of the justice system; 3) effectiveness of the justice system in addressing user legal problems; 4) appropriateness of the justice process; and 5) justice outcomes for users.

User Experience of Obstacles to Access Justice

The first component of the User Experience of Obstacles to Access to Justice dimension focuses on **Obstacles to Access**, such as those related to the distance to services, accessing technology, language barriers, and the affordability of legal services (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies published data in their annual reports related to the obstacles encountered by clients. Second, **Eligibility Criteria** is intended to assess the consequences of any criteria utilized to determine whether individuals are eligible to receive legal services (A2JBC, 2019). Within this component, measures may include the perceived clarity and complexity of application procedures; perceived fairness of, and satisfaction with, the eligibility determination process; amount of time between the submission of an application and determination of eligibility; perceived fairness of the complexity and fairness of eligibility determination appeal processes; and the proportion of individuals found eligible for a service who actually received that service (A2JBC, 2019). Several of the agencies reported on data that would broadly fall within this component. For instance, Financial and Consumer Affairs had performance measures assessing the degree to which the: a) criteria of approving applications and renewals was perceived to be clear by users; and b) processing time for approving applications or renewals was reasonable (as compared to the agency's targeted timelines for processing applications). Data published by Legal Aid Saskatchewan on the number of applications received and the number of files opened could be used together to calculate a proxy measure of the proportion of applicants eligible for their services. Also, in line with this component, the Saskatchewan Municipal Board reported on the average turnaround time for application completion. In addition, the Workers Compensation Board published the number of appeals denied. Similarly, CLASSIC provided the number of applications denied (including those denied due to capacity), while Pro Bono Law indicated the number of clients served by their panel programs who were matched and unmatched. No agencies reported on data related to the fairness of the application or eligibility determination process.

Third, the **Affordability of Services** measures the extent to which the costs of legal services are within the financial means of people facing a justice need or problem (A2JBC, 2019). This may include measures such as the perceived affordability of services offered or received and the level of subsidies or loans offered to make services affordable. The agencies largely did not report on the affordability of their services, with the exception of the Automobile Injury Appeal Commission which indicated the number of fee waivers offered.

Fourth, **Delays in Accessing Justice Services and Their Impact** examines the extent to which individuals are appropriately *referred* to access to justice mechanisms in a timely manner (A2JBC, 2019). The agencies included in the environmental scan did not publish data related to providing referrals to individuals seeking access to justice (only data pertaining to accepting referrals was provided by some agencies). Financial and Consumer Affairs, Legal Aid Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan Municipal Board did report on performance measures related to processing time for approving, responding to, and completing applications, respectively;

however, the impact of these processing times on clients is not known. Table 20 summarizes the information presented in this section.

Table 20: User Experience of Obstacles to Access to Justice by Agency

Agency	Obstacles to Access (Distances, Technology, Affordability)	Eligibility for Services	Affordability of Services	Delays in Accessing Justice Services & Their Impact
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission			X	
Employment Standards Division				
Financial and Consumer Affairs		X		X
Legal Aid Saskatchewan		X		X
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee				
Office of Residential Tenancies				
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner				
Ombudsman Saskatchewan				
Provincial Mediation Board				
Public and Private Rights Board				
Public Disclosure Committee				
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation				
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission				
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board				
Saskatchewan Municipal Board		X		X
Saskatchewan Police Commission				
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission				
Workers Compensation Board				
CLASSIC		X		
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan		X		
PLEA				
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan				
Office of the Treaty Commissioner				
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth				

Quality of User Experience of the Justice System

The second dimension of Improving User Experiences of Access to Justice relates to the quality of the user experience of the justice system. Within this dimension, **Quality of Legal Information and Education**, considers whether individuals seeking legal information can obtain meaningful, credible, and trustworthy information that is relevant to their jurisdiction that allows them to determine whether they have a legal problem and offers direction on how to potentially address or resolve their legal problem(s) (A2JBC, 2019). This component may be assessed by examining users' experiences with locating, accessing, and using legal information, as well as the extent to which the information obtained is understood and perceived to be helpful (A2JBC, 2019). Two agencies provided data that related to the quality of legal information and education resources offered. Financial and Consumer Affairs included performance measures assessing the degree to which compliance requirements and regulatory changes were clear to the user, while PLEA documented the percentage of individuals who rated the information on their website to be helpful.

Trust and Confidence in Legal Information, focuses explicitly on the extent to which legal information is perceived to be trustworthy, accurate, complete, up-to-date, and reliable. No agencies published data that explicitly assessed the trustworthiness of legal information.

Similarly, no agencies reported data that related to **User Empowerment**, which focuses on the extent to which users of legal information and education are empowered to manage and resolve their legal needs and problems (A2JBC, 2019).

Quality of Referral Services considers the quality, accessibility, and fairness of the process through which an individual is referred to a legal service or provided with supports to navigate the justice system efficiently and effectively (A2JBC, 2019). This component may be assessed by examining the extent to which various referrals produce favourable outcomes, result in timely access to services, and are perceived to be responsive to clients' needs (A2JBC, 2019). The number of referrals received by an agency is also a possible measure of this component. Two agencies (CLASSIC and PLEA) tracked the number of referrals for their programs, while the Workers Compensation Board reported the outcomes of its referrals, which provides some insight into the appropriateness of the referrals.

Quality of Legal Advice focuses on whether individuals with a legal problem receive meaningful and credible legal advice that is delivered competently, tailored to their specific case, and useful for determining how to proceed with addressing their problem (A2JBC, 2019). A variety of measures may be used to assess this component, including whether individuals with legal problems can access free or inexpensive summary advice; the extent to which clients trusted the legal advice provided, felt they were treated with respect by the legal professional providing the legal advice, and that lawyer-client confidentiality was maintained; and the length of time between applying for, and receiving, legal advice (A2JBC, 2019).

Two agencies reported data that relates to Quality of Legal Advice, although the data provided relates more to whether people with a legal problem could access free or inexpensive advice rather than the quality (e.g., trustworthiness and usefulness) of the legal advice received. Specifically, CLASSIC indicated the number of: (a) walk-in advocacy clients served; (b) files opened; and (c) clients receiving advice at the legal clinic, while Pro Bono Law provided the number of free legal clinics held and the number of clients served.

Quality of Legal Assistance and Representation considers the quality of the services provided by a third party acting on behalf of an individual seeking a solution to a legal problem before a court, tribunal, or other adjudicating authority (A2JBC, 2019). It includes measures such as level of trust in the service provider providing representation, the extent to which clients felt respected by service providers, the perceived usefulness of the legal representation (e.g., whether the legal need/problem was addressed or solved), satisfaction with the case's outcome, and percentage of returning clients (A2JBC, 2019). Only two agencies included data in their annual reports that related to the quality of legal assistance and representation provided. The Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee reported performance measures which documented the percentage of files that had average to excellent service. Similarly, the Saskatchewan Municipal Board indicated the percentage of stakeholders who were satisfied or unsatisfied with their services.

Experience of Self-Represented Litigants is intended to examine unrepresented litigants' chosen paths to justice and their experiences with navigating the legal system to resolve their legal problem (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported data on self-represented litigants. Finally, the **Quality of Consensual Dispute Resolution Processes** considers the degree to which individuals who have chosen consensual dispute resolution processes to address their legal problems were satisfied with the process and found it to be useful, impartial, or effective (A2JBC 2019). Again, no agencies provided data in their annual reports related to consensual dispute resolution processes. Table 21 provides a summary of the information presented in this section.

Table 21: Quality of the User Experience of the Justice System by Agency

Agency	Quality of Legal Information & Education	Trust and Confidence in Legal Information	User Empowerment	Quality of Referral Services	Quality of Legal Advice	Quality of Legal Assistance & Representation	Experience of Self-Represented Litigants	Quality of Consensual Dispute Resolution Processes
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission								
Employment Standards Division								
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X							
Legal Aid Saskatchewan								
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee						X		
Office of Residential Tenancies								
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner								
Ombudsman Saskatchewan								
Provincial Mediation Board								
Public and Private Rights Board								
Public Disclosure Committee								
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation								
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission								
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board								
Saskatchewan Municipal Board						X		
Saskatchewan Police Commission								
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission								
Workers Compensation Board				X				
CLASSIC				X	X			
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan					X			
PLEA	X			X				
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan								
Office of the Treaty Commissioner								
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth								

Effectiveness of the Justice System in Addressing User Legal Problems

The next dimension of Improving User Experiences focuses on the effectiveness of the justice system in addressing individuals' legal problems. Within this dimension, the first component, **Effective Resolution of Legal Problems**, considers the extent to which justice system users' legal problems are resolved (A2JBC, 2019). Many organizations (*n*=13) provided data on this component with most reporting the number of files that were concluded or resolved, as well as the outcomes of those files (e.g., the nature of the final decision). However, this data does not necessarily indicate whether the resolution of those files was effective or satisfactory. The next component, **Mitigated Impact of Legal Problems**, focuses on the extent to which the impact of the legal problems experienced by justice system users was mitigated (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported data that pertained to this component. The third component, **Prevention of Legal Problems**, examines the extent to which access to justice services helped prevent the emergence of legal problems (A2JBC, 2019). Again, no agencies reported data on this component. The fourth component, **Prevention of Conflict**, considers the extent to which conflicts were prevented, resolved, or kept from escalating further, as well as the extent to which conflict was mitigated (A2JBC, 2019). Similar to the previous two components, it was not reflected by the data reported by agencies in their annual reports. The fifth component, **Unmet Legal Needs and Their Consequences**, focuses on the extent to which individuals' legal problems are unidentified and legal needs are unmet, as well as the personal consequences of these unmet legal needs (A2JBC, 2019). This component was also not captured by the data reported by agencies in their annual reports. The final component, **Limits to the Assistance Received**, considers the degree to which limitations in the scope, coverage, and quality of legal services prevented individuals' legal needs from being fully met. Here, two agencies reported data that may fall within this component. CLASSIC indicated the number of applications denied due to capacity, while Pro Bono Law stated the number clients who were matched and unmatched within their panel program. Table 22 provides a summary of this section.

Table 22: Effectiveness of the Justice System in Addressing User Legal Problems by Agency

Agency	Effective Resolution of Legal Problems	Mitigated Impact of Legal Problems	Prevention of Legal Problems	Prevention of Conflicts	Unmet Legal Needs and Their Consequences	Limits to Assistance Received
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission	X					
Employment Standards Division	X					
Financial and Consumer Affairs						
Legal Aid Saskatchewan						
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	X					
Office of Residential Tenancies	X					
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner						
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X					
Provincial Mediation Board						
Public and Private Rights Board	X					
Public Disclosure Committee						

Agency	Effective Resolution of Legal Problems	Mitigated Impact of Legal Problems	Prevention of Legal Problems	Prevention of Conflicts	Unmet Legal Needs and Their Consequences	Limits to Assistance Received
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation						
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	X					
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	X					
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X					
Saskatchewan Police Commission	X					
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	X					
Workers Compensation Board	X					
CLASSIC						X
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan						X
PLEA						
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X					
Office of the Treaty Commissioner						
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth						

Appropriateness of the Justice Process

Within this dimension assessing the appropriateness of the justice process, **Fairness, Equity, and Impartiality of the Process**, seeks to measure the extent to which justice system users perceive the justice process as being fair, equitable, and impartial (A2JBC, 2019). Second, **Cultural Appropriateness** measures the extent to which justice services delivered to individuals are perceived to be delivered in a culturally appropriate and linguistically useful manner (A2JBC, 2019). Third, **Voice and Participation**, focuses on the extent to which individuals are able to meaningfully participate and be heard in a court of law, tribunal, or other proceedings to resolve their legal problems (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported data that pertained to any of these components.

Justice Outcomes for the User

The final dimension of Improving User Experiences of Access to Justice examines the justice outcomes obtained by justice system users and consists of six components. **Outcomes of the Justice Process** is not described in depth by A2JBC (2019) but, presumably, relates to measuring the degree to which justice system users were able to address their legal needs and resolve their legal problems. Many agencies (*n*=15) reported the number of files or cases that were concluded, as well as the way in which the files were concluded (e.g., the nature of the final decision). **User Satisfaction with the Outcomes of the Justice Process** considers the extent to which users believe that their best interests were considered, fulfilled, and reflected in the outcome of the justice process (A2JBC, 2019). No agencies reported data on users' satisfaction with the outcomes achieved, only on the quality of service provided. **Compliance with Court Orders, Judgements, and Mediated Agreements** focuses on the extent to which court orders, judgements, mediated agreements, and other commitments are enforced or in compliance

(A2JBC, 2019). Two agencies provided data in relation to this component. Financial and Consumer Affairs stated the number of enforcement actions taken, while the Office of Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner reported on the percentage of files in compliance with recommendations.

The last three components were not reflected in any of the data reported by the agencies in their annual reports. **Post-Resolution Support** refers to the extent to which individuals are supported following the resolution of their legal problems (A2JBC, 2019). **User Enhanced Legal Awareness** considers whether, as a result of accessing a particular path to justice, justice service users have greater awareness of the law and of their rights, entitlement, and responsibilities (A2JBC, 2019). Finally, **Enhanced Legal Capability** focuses on the degree to which individuals' experiences with accessing justice services has empowered and enabled them to manage their legal needs beyond the legal problem of initial concern (A2JBC, 2019). Table 23 summarizes the information presented in this section.

Table 23: Justice Outcomes for the User by Agency

Agency	Outcomes of the Justice Process	User Satisfaction with Justice Process Outcomes	Compliance with Court Orders, Judgements, & Mediated Agreements	Post-Resolution Support	User Enhanced Legal Awareness	Enhanced Legal Capability
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission	X					
Employment Standards Division	X					
Financial and Consumer Affairs	X		X			
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	X					
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	X		X			
Office of Residential Tenancies						
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner	X		X			
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	X					
Provincial Mediation Board	X					
Public and Private Rights Board	X					
Public Disclosure Committee	X					
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation						
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission						
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	X					
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	X					
Saskatchewan Police Commission	X					
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission						
Workers Compensation Board	X					
CLASSIC						
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan						
PLEA						

Agency	Outcomes of the Justice Process	User Satisfaction with Justice Process Outcomes	Compliance with Court Orders, Judgements, & Mediated Agreements	Post-Resolution Support	User Enhanced Legal Awareness	Enhanced Legal Capability
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan	X					
Office of the Treaty Commissioner						
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth						

4.2.3. Improving Costs

The final element of the A2J Measurement Framework focuses on Improving Costs. The first dimension within this element considers **Per-Capita Costs of Services** (i.e., the per-capita costs of delivering access to justice services), as well as the impact of new initiatives on per-capita costs (A2JBC, 2019). The second dimension examines **Per-User Costs of Services**, which involves calculating the costs of delivering access to justice services in accordance with the number of users of these services. It also considers the impact of new initiatives on per-user costs (A2JBC, 2019). The final dimension focuses on **Other Costs**, such as the social and economic costs associated with unresolved legal problems or gaps in access to justice services. It also takes into account the impact of unresolved legal problems on costs borne by other sectors (e.g., healthcare, housing, social assistance, child protection). Overall, the data included in the annual reports largely did not reflect the various aspects of the Improving Costs element of the A2J Measurement Framework. Only CLASSIC provided data that could be considered to fall under the umbrella of per-user costs of services—an estimate of the costs of services obtained/retained for their clients was included in their annual report (see Table 24).

Table 24: Improving Costs by Agency

Agency	Per Capita Costs of Services	Impact on New Initiatives on Per-Capita Costs	Per-User Costs by Type of Services	Impact of New Initiatives on Per-User Costs	Social and Economic Costs of Unresolved Legal Problems	Impact of Unresolved Problems on Costs in Other Sectors
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission						
Employment Standards Division						
Financial and Consumer Affairs						
Legal Aid Saskatchewan						
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee						
Office of Residential Tenancies						
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner						
Ombudsman Saskatchewan						
Provincial Mediation Board						
Public and Private Rights Board						
Public Disclosure Committee						

Agency	Per Capita Costs of Services	Impact on New Initiatives on Per-Capita Costs	Per-User Costs by Type of Services	Impact of New Initiatives on Per-User Costs	Social and Economic Costs of Unresolved Legal Problems	Impact of Unresolved Problems on Costs in Other Sectors
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation						
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission						
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board						
Saskatchewan Municipal Board						
Saskatchewan Police Commission						
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission						
Workers Compensation Board						
CLASSIC			X			
Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan						
PLEA						
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan						
Office of the Treaty Commissioner						
Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth						

4.3. Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of the environmental scan was to determine the types of justice-related data pertaining to civil and family law being collected by legal (and non-legal) organizations in Saskatchewan, as reflected by the data published in the annual reports of 24 Saskatchewan organizations. A content analysis was conducted on the data contained within the annual reports using two lenses. First, the categories of data included in the annual reports were identified both inductively and by using a priori categories informed by CREATE Justice's (2019a) survey assessing the data collection practices of justice sector organizations in Saskatchewan. Next, the extent to which the data published in the annual reports mapped onto the Access to Justice Measurement Framework (A2JBC, 2019) was explored. This section presents a summary of the key findings that emerged from the analysis, as well as a discussion of the potential application of the results to the development of a justice data commons in Saskatchewan.

4.3.1. Data Categories Reported by Agencies

Our analysis of the data contained within the annual reports revealed that there were several commonalities in the types of data being collected by the included organizations and that there were both similarities and differences vis-à-vis CREATE Justice's (2019a) survey. To begin, the majority of organizations reported data related to the initial points of contact with, or services requested from, their agency. While the specifics of the data reported varied according to the mandate and nature of the organization (i.e., an initial contact could refer to the receipt of a referral, inquiry, application, claim, complaint, or appeal), the majority of organizations reported on the volume and nature of these contacts. This finding is consistent with CREATE Justice's (2019a) survey assessing the data collected by legal organizations within Saskatchewan, which

also found that most organizations tended to collect data on the volume and type of services requested. CREATE Justice (2019a) also found that about one-third of organizations collected data on referrals; however, a much lower rate was observed in the current study—only two organizations published data that specifically related to referrals in their annual reports.

Another common set of metrics included in the annual reports related to the volume and type of files opened or services delivered (including, in some cases, the specific area of law to which a file pertains). This is consistent with CREATE Justice's (2019a) finding that organizations frequently collected data on the volume and nature of services delivered. Also similar to CREATE Justice (2019a)'s results, a much smaller proportion of agencies collected data on the volume and types of services denied. In the current study, only two organizations provided data related to the volume of services denied, with one organization denoting the volume of services denied due to capacity. The rareness of these measures is problematic as the number of services denied is an important data element for garnering an understanding of the extent to which there are unmet legal needs within the province. Further, in addition to reporting on files opened or services delivered, it was almost equally common for agencies to report on the volume of files concluded (or the volume of final decisions issued) with most also offering data on the nature of the outcomes achieved (or final decision rendered). In some cases, this included documenting the dollar amount of penalties, revenue, or orders secured.

Just under half of the organizations included in the environmental scan provided data related to the length of time between commencing and concluding their legal matter, which was consistent with CREATE Justice's (2019a) study. In addition, several organizations reported on the number of files that were in progress or in queue at the end of the fiscal-year; however, only one organization reported on the number of hearings conducted and the point in the legal process at which outcomes were achieved. Interestingly, substantially more organizations in CREATE Justice's (2019a) study (i.e., 47%) indicated that they collected data related to the point in the legal process at which an outcome is obtained by a user. Further, a handful of organizations in the current study published data related to the length of time required to respond to an inquiry or application, which speaks to the length of time required for legal processes to be carried out. These data elements were not captured by CREATE Justice's (2019a) survey.

Only three organizations reported on the number of clients served, as well as clients' demographic characteristics, which is in contrast to CREATE Justice's (2019a) finding that many organizations collected data on the volume of service users and their demographic characteristics. Of course, it may be that the organizations included in the environmental scan collected this data but did not publish it in their annual reports. Regardless, among the organizations that published their clients' characteristics, the variables that were most frequently reported were gender, age, and ethnicity (especially in relation to being Indigenous). Thus, data was only available on a small subset of possible demographic characteristics. It should also be noted that the organizations included in the environmental scan did not distinguish between new and recurring clients, even though CREATE Justice (2019a) found these to be common data elements collected by organizations.

Many of the remaining data elements identified through the review of annual reports were only reported by a handful of organizations. For instance, only four organizations provided data that

spoke to the quality of services provided to clients, while five organizations published data that related to some aspect of their workforce (e.g., number of employees and volunteers, level of employee engagement, employee professional development), with very few organizations reporting the same metrics. In contrast, employee or service provider-related data was found to be collected by the majority of organizations included in CREATE Justice's (2019a) study. Further, only five agencies reported some type of financial-related data with the data reported being unique to each agency. Finally, three agencies included data that related to access to justice at the population level. For instance, Legal Aid Saskatchewan reported on the percentage of criminal files with Legal Aid representation while the Saskatchewan Police Commission reported on police to population ratios in the province.

There were a number of data categories that CREATE Justice (2019a) identified as being collected by a few or several of the organizations included in their study that were not reflected in the annual reports reviewed. For instance, no organizations reported data on co-occurring services, including whether justice system users sought or received legal advice before, or during, the services they received. Similarly, no data was published on co-occurring user issues. CLASSIC came the closest to reporting this type of data wherein they provided information on the community support program they offered, including the non-legal issues experienced by these clients. Further, there was no data published in the annual reports that indicated whether service users were represented by legal counsel, the point in the process when legal representation was engaged, or when legal counsel ceased to be involved in the case. Finally, data was not reported on adjournments, such as the number of adjournments or reasons for an adjournment. It is important to keep in mind, however, that annual reports are a reflection of the types of data collected by agencies but are unlikely to contain all of the data gathered by a given organization. Thus, the absence of certain data elements, as determined by this environmental scan, should not be taken as evidence that these types of data are not being collected by organizations.

Implications for a Justice Data Commons

Given that one of the driving impetuses behind this study is to work towards establishing a justice data commons, our environmental scan has suggested that data related to the volume and types of initial contacts to an organization (e.g., request for services), the volume and types of services delivered, the volume of files concluded and the outcomes of the files, and the length of time between commencing and resolving a legal matter may be the best types of data to initially focus on for inclusion in the data commons. We make this recommendation on the basis that these data were collected by the majority of agencies and, therefore, constitute a viable starting point for building a centralized data management system of relevance to many agencies. Specifically, it will be important to focus on common data elements during the initial start-up of the data commons to increase the likelihood that agencies will perceive themselves as having something to contribute to the initiative, thereby increasing their likelihood of participation, especially if the data being sought will not require much effort for them to collect beyond their current data collection practices (Hagan et al., 2019c). Once agencies have experience with participating in, and contributing to, the data commons, it can be expanded to include data that is not collected as often (including supporting agencies in expanding their data collection practices). One limitation of using data related to the volume and types of services requested,

delivered, and concluded in the justice data commons, however, is that the way the data is currently collected by the organizations is (understandably) tailored to their own agencies (i.e., each organization captures slightly different data and has different ways of defining its data). Thus, the best way to incorporate similar, yet slightly different, data into a data commons will need to be addressed during the development process (McCashin et al., 2018).

Beyond gaining experience with participating in, and contributing to a data commons, the pooling of data commonly collected by organizations in Saskatchewan will allow A2J stakeholders within the province to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the family and civil law landscape than can be obtained by independently reviewing data from individual organizations. In fact, organizations may hold different, yet complementary, data that, when combined together, allows for a greater amount of insight on how well access to justice is being achieved and any gaps that may exist. For instance, trends related to various aspects of justice system functioning, such as areas of family and civil law in high and low demand, the timeliness with which legal matters are concluded, and the outcomes achieved, can be analyzed to inform future investments and initiatives undertaken within the province to support access to justice. Moreover, as organizations move toward collecting and reporting data in similar ways and using shared metrics (such as those detailed in the A2J Measurement Framework, see Section 4.32, Concluding Observations for greater discussion of the potential applications of this framework to a justice data commons), there will be a greater level of confidence in that data, including that participating organizations are measuring similar concepts or phenomena. In turn, using this shared data may lead to: (a) better, more informed decisions to increase access to justice, potentially resulting in more coordinated responses across involved funders and agencies; and (b) decisions having more widespread support due to the collective nature of the data on which they are based.

4.3.2.   Applying the Access to Justice Measurement Framework

A second goal of our analysis was to determine the extent to which the data reported in the annual reports mapped onto the A2J Measurement Framework developed by A2JBC (2019). The A2J Measurement Framework proposes a number of indicators falling within three overarching domains that can be used to support a shared approach among justice system stakeholders for monitoring and evaluating improvements to access to justice (A2JBC, 2019). Given that it is one of the only justice metrics frameworks that have been developed and adopted in a Canadian context, and it has been given previous consideration in Saskatchewan (i.e., its potential use in Saskatchewan was workshopped at the 2018 Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution), the A2J Measurement Framework was employed as an analytic lens in the current study. Our analysis considered all three elements of the A2J Measurement Framework: 1) Improving Population Access to Justice; 2) Improving User Experience of Access to Justice; and 3) Improving Costs.

Improving Population Access to Justice

The data published in the annual reports included in the environmental scan aligned best with components contained within the Improving Population Access to Justice element of the A2J

Measurement Framework. In particular, the majority of organizations reported on data related to the following components:

- Prevalence of Legal Problems in the Population
- Accessibility of the Justice System
- Timeliness of Access to the Justice System
- (potentially) Public Confidence in Social Institutions

Both the prevalence of legal problems in the population and accessibility of the justice system components draw upon data related to the volume and type of services delivered by the organizations which, as noted in the previous section, were among the most common data elements included in the annual reports. However, more in-depth considerations of the accessibility of the justice system are required, as the extent to which Indigenous peoples, people with mental illness[17], and immigrants and refugees are able to access and receive meaningful legal assistance is not adequately captured by the published data. Indeed, three agencies reported demographic data about the proportion of clients who were Indigenous, one agency reported the percentage of clients who were immigrants and refugees, and no agencies reported data on whether clients had a mental illness. However, reporting demographic data does not provide meaningful insight on the extent to which these populations are able to successfully access and receive legal assistance to meet their legal needs. Moreover, related components of the measurement framework include assessing the extent to which changes in level of access to justice has resulted in gender equality and justice for Indigenous peoples (leading to meaningful changes in the daily lives of women and Indigenous individuals and families, respectively). Again, without understanding the extent to which these groups are able to access justice in the first place, it is impossible to know whether efforts to improve their access to justice have resulted in positive changes in their lives.

The length of time between commencing and resolving a legal matter was another common metric identified in the annual reports, which is why the timeliness of access to the justice system component of the performance measurement framework was well-represented. It is debatable whether public confidence in social institutions is captured as intended by the annual reports. Essentially, many of the agencies included in the annual reports (such as the Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission) are mandated to hold various social institutions accountable for their actions; thus, the data they publish can be used to draw insights into the level of confidence the public has in these institutions. However, the organizations did not publish data that directly assesses the public's confidence in social institutions.

Many of the components of Improving Population Access to Justice that were only minimally or not at all reflected by the data published in the annual reports related to assessing the degree to which unmet legal needs exist in the province, the public's level of awareness and understanding of their legal rights, and the degree to which financial situations limit people's ability to access various paths to justice. Further, limited data was available about the various paths to justice that individuals may choose and the adequacy of the responses available to address people's legal needs, including the need for legal information and education, legal advice, legal representation

---

[17] The A2J Measurement Framework does not define what is meant by having a mental illness (e.g., diagnosed, self-reported). If the framework is employed in the future, key terms within the framework, such as people with mental illness, will have to be defined and agreed upon by involved stakeholders.

and other legal assistance, and consensual dispute resolution process. Notably, any data that was available in relation to these components only provided limited insight into the functioning of these access to justice services.

Finally, almost no data was reported that reflected the social and economic impacts associated with increased levels of access to justice, including linking these impacts to changes in social policy objectives, measuring changes in the public's confidence in the justice system, and determining the impact of access to justice initiatives on social and economic development. One of the reasons why this type of data may not have been well-represented in the annual reports is that some of these components (e.g., public confidence in the justice system) are better captured through other means, such as independent, population-based surveys that can more broadly assess these constructs outside of the context of a single organization. For instance, previous cycles of the General Social Survey conducted by Statistics Canada have examined public confidence in Canadian institutions, including the justice system (Cotter, 2015). The only component of this dimension for which there was some relevant organizational data related to the protection of people's rights wherein the data collected by some organizations could be used to understand how justice-related services are contributing to enhanced social conditions, such as preventing or reducing discrimination and ensuring the best interests of children. It is important to note, however, that the availability of this data was strongly tied to the mandates of particular organizations that have an explicit directive to protect people's rights (e.g., Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, SACY).

Improving User Experiences of Access to Justice

Overall, the agencies included in the annual report did not report data that relates to improving user experiences of access to justice. Two components of the measurement framework that were commonly captured by the agencies related to the effective resolution of legal problems and the outcomes of the justice process, as the majority of agencies reported the number of files that were concluded and the outcomes of those files. While these data may be considered appropriate measures for either component, we would argue that these data are better aligned with documenting the outcomes of the justice process rather than speaking to the effective resolution of legal problems. That is, it is difficult to use knowledge about the final decisions made in relation to a legal matter to discern the extent to which the outcomes achieved were considered to be effective or satisfactory, especially to the justice system user involved.

A handful of agencies reported data that can be utilized to understand the appropriateness of the eligibility criteria used by agencies to determine access to legal services and the timeliness of eligibility determination processes. In addition, a few agencies published data that can be used to determine timeliness in individuals' ability to access legal assistance by providing statistics on processing times required to approve, respond to, and complete applications. Similarly, a handful of agencies reported data that related to the quality of legal information and education provided. Based on the performance measures suggested by A2JBC (2019), a few agencies also provided data that related to components focusing on the quality of referral services, legal advice, and legal assistance and representation provided. However, we would argue that the data included in the annual reports related to the quality of referral services and legal advice does not capture the

quality of these services, but instead provides some insight into the number of users accessing these services.

No data was available in relation to the many other aspects of the user experience identified within the A2J Measurement Framework. For instance, no agencies reported on obstacles to accessing justice services (such as those related to distance, technology, language), with the exception of one agency that published data related to the affordability of services. In addition, no agencies provided data in their annual reports that related to users' trust and confidence in the legal information they obtained and the extent to which this information has empowered justice system users to manage their legal needs, the quality of consensual dispute resolution processes, and the experiences of self-represented litigants with navigating the legal system. Further, any of the A2J Measurement Framework components focused on prevention (e.g., mitigated impact of legal problems, prevention of legal problems, prevention of conflicts) were not reflected in the data published by agencies. It is not surprising that these components were not captured by the annual reports as it can be quite challenging for agencies to measure legal needs and problems that do not happen because they have been prevented. Indeed, the measurement of prevention can require complex evaluation designs such as comparing baseline data to data from future years, comparing outcomes between a 'treatment' group and a comparison group, or monitoring the incidence of legal problems over time (Thacker et al., 1994). Data related to the fairness, equity, and impartiality of the justice process; the cultural appropriateness of justice services; and the extent to which individuals are able to meaningfully participate and be heard in legal processes also was not reflected in the annual reports. Finally, components related to directly measuring the user experience (e.g., user satisfaction with the outcomes of the justice process, post-resolution support received by users, users' enhanced legal awareness and capability with respect to understanding and managing their legal needs) were not captured by the data included in the annual reports. While agencies may be able to incorporate measures for some of these components (e.g., user satisfaction with the outcomes achieved) into their data collection practices (that is, if they are not already collecting this type of data and simply not publishing it), other components related to users' enhanced awareness and ability to navigate the justice system may be more appropriately measured through non-organizational data. For example, several surveys have been conducted that focus on users' everyday legal problems and their experiences with managing and resolving those problems (Farrow et al., 2016; Savage & McDonald, 2022; World Justice Project, 2019a, 2019b). User-centred surveys are likely the best modality for capturing these types of data.

Improving Costs

Improving Costs is the final element of the A2J Measurement Framework and considers per-capita costs services, per-user costs of services, and the social and economic costs associated with unresolved legal problems or gaps in access to justice services (A2JBC, 2019). Only one agency published data that related to this element of the measurement framework—CLASSIC reported the costs of services obtained/retained for their clients. It may be possible to derive estimates about the costs of services provided by the agencies by looking at information contained within their audited financial statements; however, a review of financial statements was beyond the scope of the current study.

Concluding Observations about the Access to Justice Measurement Framework

Taken together, the data published in the annual reports of the agencies included in the environmental scan did map onto some elements of the A2J Measurement Framework; however, most aspects of the measurement framework were not reflected in the data published by the organizations. Further, for the components to which available data did pertain, oftentimes the data collected by the organizations only offered limited insight into the components, as the data collected by agencies tended to focus on the volume and types of services delivered and concluded. The agencies typically did not report on more difficult to measure concepts such as the quality of the services provided, the degree to which unmet legal needs exist, the prevention of legal problems in the future, and improvements in justice system users' ability to understand, navigate, and resolve their legal problems and needs. In addition, some of the same measures could be applied to more than one component of the measurement framework depending on how the various components are defined and operationalized, which present challenges for determining which component particular data types is best suited to represent. It is also likely the case that some of the performance measures identified by the measurement framework are better suited to alternative data sources, such as user-centered, population-based surveys designed to measure justice system users' experiences with everyday legal problems and their efforts to resolve them (Farrow et al., 2016; World Justice Project, 2019a, 2019b).

Notably, if justice system user data is of value to justice stakeholders in Saskatchewan, agencies may benefit from pooling resources to support the conduct of user experience surveys on an ongoing basis (e.g., every five years). A limitation of user experience surveys is that they tend be costly given the need to develop and implement complex sampling schemes and cost-intensive data collection strategies (e.g., telephone surveys, mail surveys) to adequately sample the general public about their justice-related problems and experiences (Dillman et al., 2014). Thus, it is likely not feasible for a single agency to independently bear the cost of such a survey, especially on an ongoing basis. However, if several justice agencies in Saskatchewan valued this data, were willing to prioritize its collection, and agreed to share the costs of the survey, it would be more realistic to conduct on an ongoing basis. It would also help to ensure that these data are more widely accessible to justice stakeholders in the province as there would be many "owners" of the data. In turn, this literal 'buy-in' may increase the likelihood that data are used to enhance access to justice in the province, potentially in a more coordinated manner, as stakeholders may have greater investment in using and applying that data to inform future strategies and initiatives and will be using the same data to inform decisions.

Importantly, the A2J Measurement Framework did not capture all of the data types reported by the agencies included in the environmental scan. Specifically, some agencies published data related to their workforce, including information about their employees and volunteers, such as the number of employees, employees' workload, their organization's ability to manage increasing workloads, employee engagement, and employment learning opportunities. Within the health sector, which developed the original Triple Aim approach to performance measurement upon which the A2J Measurement Framework was based, it has been suggested that a fourth aim be added that captures components related to improving the work life of health care providers (Bodenheimer & Sinsky, 2014). Based on the observation that some legal agencies are already collecting data related to the health of their workforce, it appears this may be an important

dimension within the justice sector as well. Further, the results of the environmental scan suggest that there is a willingness to collect this data, at least among a subset of the agencies included in the scan.

Overall, the A2J Measurement Framework was a useful analytic lens in our study and has the potential to be a useful tool for guiding the development of a justice data commons. The current study revealed that not all data reported annually by the organizations fit perfectly within the measurement framework and there are many aspects of the measurement framework for which data does not currently exist in Saskatchewan (at least not in the published annual reports); however, the A2J Measurement Framework provided a helpful rubric for understanding the scope of justice data available in the province in reference to a much larger possible range of justice metrics (as identified by the framework). It also provided concrete direction on areas that would be important to measure in the future.

With respect to building a justice commons, adopting the A2J Measurement Framework may create efficiencies in moving forward with a data commons as it provides a readymade starting point for identifying common measurement priorities. For instance, the A2J Measurement Framework could be used to facilitate discussions among justice stakeholders about the types of data that are most important to include in the data commons, including data elements that are most readily available and those for which there are existing gaps. Relatedly, it can be used to establish a strategy for the types of data that will be added to the data commons over time and guide organizations in how to expand and refine their performance measures in a coordinated way, particularly in areas that are under-measured as a whole. In addition, the framework could be used as an organizational tool to structure the various types of data to be included in the data commons to ensure that it includes data that measures both outputs (e.g., data reflecting the volume and types of services utilized) and outcomes (e.g., data that can be used to determine if meaningful change in access to justice has occurred). Indeed, Lowenberger and colleagues (2021) have previously underscored the benefits of adopting the A2J Measurement Framework, many of which are directly relevant to creating a justice data commons, including that it can facilitate a shared understanding of the types of data that should be collected and the meaning behind various data elements among justice stakeholders; provide a common language for discussing various dimensions of access to justice, including desired goals and outcomes; lead to improved comparability between jurisdictions, projects, and organizations; and support the coordination of programs, projects, and collaborations within and between various jurisdictions.

Moreover, if the development of a justice data commons in Saskatchewan moves forward without an overarching measurement framework, the usefulness of the data commons may be compromised if there is not a strong strategic direction for measurement in place, including a shared understanding among stakeholders of what metrics should be measured on an ongoing basis. Thus, given: (a) the ability of the A2J Measurement Framework to provide detailed and comprehensive direction on the types of metrics that should be collected by the justice sector to measure improvements in access to justice, including the achievement of key objectives and outcomes over time; and (b) the traction that the A2J Measurement Framework has had in Saskatchewan (e.g., through the 2018 Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution [McCashin et al., 2018], its adoption to guide the evaluation of the Listen Project [Lowenberger et al., 2021]) and in Canada more broadly (e.g., 50 organizations in British Columbia endorsed

the framework in 2019 [Provincial Court of British Columbia, 2019], the Social Security Tribunal of Canada incorporated the framework into its own measurement framework [Government of Canada, 2021]), we recommend the A2J Measurement Framework as a suitable, appropriate, and helpful framework for guiding the collection of justice data through a data commons in Saskatchewan.

5. Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were conducted with representatives from government and not-for-profit legal agencies that have a vested interest in access to justice within the province of Saskatchewan. In addition, a supplemental interview was conducted with an individual who had experience with establishing a data portal in Saskatchewan. The interviews broadly explored three domains: a) data collection practices, including the usage of data, type of data collected, and the mode and frequency of data collection; b) data sharing practices, including existing policies and facilitators and barriers associated with sharing data with external parties; and c) perceptions of establishing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan, including possible benefits, barriers, and facilitators associated with such an initiative.

5.1. Data Collection Practices

5.1.1. Data Usage

Service Provision

All of the government and not-for-profit legal organizations included in the study actively collected and used their data for numerous purposes. One key way agencies used data was to monitor and inform their delivery of services by identifying gaps and trends related to the services they provide. Upon identifying gaps, agencies may explore how their partners can assist with those areas or they may develop new resources, programs, or policies internally to address the need.

> *We try to identify trends within and gaps within what…resources are missing, where can we provide better service. We try to get that to fill those gaps from our partners and try to see if they have anything to support the work that we do or develop our own resources to fill those gaps.* (Government)

> *We definitely utilize it for tracking volumes of files to get a good grasp on how many we're doing. We try to get a better understanding of the nature of disputes and where people might be struggling so that we can create programs and services that meet that need.* (Government)

> *We'll use that data to inform us what the issues that most need community legal education are.* (Not-for-Profit)

Some agencies also actively used their data to evaluate working hypotheses about who needs services the most to ensure that decisions about service delivery are grounded in evidence and not based on perception. In addition, one organization utilized data to determine the best model of service provision to employ. Accordingly, several interviewees indicated that their organization's data collection practices were dynamic and that the variables collected shifted over time based on the utility of the information they provide.

We had anecdotally noticed 7 or 8 years ago that there seemed to be a lot of people coming to our in-person service who were either newcomers to the country or they were survivors of family violence, and so we started tracking those numbers to see... do we just notice these because they feel more intense at the time or are there actually more of these people coming to us? And, sure enough, proportionate to how many newcomers or survivors of family violence there are in our general population, there's a high proportion of them coming to our in-person service. (Government)

Students were actually tipping the scales away from the clients and so now we've changed that model…we used data in our decision-making around how to change that student model to come up with a theory about what might better strike a balance. (Not-for-Profit)

We make those shifts whenever we see that there's information not really being used for any purpose. We stop collecting it. And when we do identify that there are segments of population that seem to be utilizing our service or needing certain things, that's what we're more focused on now. (Government)

Further, several of the not-for-profit legal organizations used the data they collected in a more immediate fashion to inform the direct provision of legal services to clients. Here, information collected about clients was used to assign them to a lawyer who can provide them with services in the area of law they require.

At the client service level, we collect information about the clients for the purposes of providing them legal services. (Government)

Information and context about clients is very important for us to be able to determine how to book them an appointment plus the appropriate appointment to be booked, what type of law… It also helps us to provide referral information or legal information to the clients so they can better prepare for the appointment. (Not-for-Profit)

Funding

A second key purpose for which data was used by the organizations sampled related to funding, both in terms of justifying the need for funding and determining what levels of funding are required to appropriately meet the demand for legal services. With respect to justifying the need for funding, this was often done by not-for-profit organizations when seeking funding.

I would say funding is our one of our biggest data needs. We have to demonstrate the need for funding. (Not-for-Profit)

It's very important to have these…sorts of numbers and statistics, because we have to report to funders. We have to apply to funders…When we [apply]…each time we're saying, here's the good we're doing. This is how many people we've helped. This is how it's helped them. These are further needs we've identified… and, obviously, the more we

can back up things with stats, data like that, hopefully it increases our chances of getting the application approved. (Not-for-Profit)

In contrast, for government organizations, justification was often required internally to establish and maintain units and staff positions, as well as to demonstrate that government funds are being spent wisely.

We started collecting information or statistics to establish that our program, as a pilot project, met the needs of families to assist families with government's goal of allowing access to justice. Our office keeping the statistics and collecting all of that data, it seemed time-consuming and it was a large undertaking, but to be able to provide that information to establish the existence of our program, the continuing existence of our program, it's all valuable. (Government)

And then within government, too…there's justification for spending on your programs. It's an important thing to be able to feed that information upwards so that government can wisely determine how it should be allocating its dollars and public spending. There's a large responsibility…for us to maintain good data to be able to tell the story about how government is using its funds. (Government)

In addition, data related to the need for services offered by a given agency was utilized to inform strategic directions about the size of a given unit or organization and ensuring optimal workload distribution across existing staff.

[Data is used to] make some decisions about how we operationalize…staff workloads, that kind of thing, but also in terms of our future directions... so we can make strategic decisions about how better to serve the clients. (Government)

We collect data in terms of the types of cases, the length of cases, so we can make sure that we've got an equitable balance for workload distribution for staff. (Not-for-Profit)

Part of our strategic planning right now is to review our scope of practice and so, of course, we have to go back and use that data... to track the trends to help us in our decision-making around whether or not we're going to restrict our areas of practice or how we address that. (Not-for-Profit)

Reporting

Reporting was the third purpose for which the agencies utilized the data they collected. Three agencies indicated that they reported to the federal government, while two agencies reported to the provincial government, typically in relation to funds obtained. For instance, one interviewee from a government agency commented, "*We report to the federal government in relation to funding we receive from them.*" In two cases, data was also reported through federal surveys in an effort to contribute to national databases about various aspects of the legal system in Canada. The surveys to which the organization(s) contributed data are presented in Table 25.

Table 25: Federal Surveys to which Provincial Contributions are Made

Survey	Description of Contribution

Survey of Family Courts	• Manual survey – staff pull files and manually input survey responses
	  o Participate only in the judicial centre of Regina as a result
	• Sponsored by Department of Justice Canada
	• Data is provided about:
	  o Range and type of claims made
	  o Timelines and dates for when files are opened and closed
	  o Outcomes of the files

Survey of Maintenance Enforcement	• Automated survey
	• Sponsored by the Canadian Centre for Justice and Community Safety Statistics (CCJCSS)
	• Data is provided about:
	  o Volume of files
	  o Types of enforcement actions taken
	  o Number of files in arrears
	  o Global amount ($) in arrears

Civil Court Survey	• Automated Survey
	• Sponsored by CCJCSS
	• Data is provided about:
	  o Total number of divorce applications, applications for support or parenting arrangements or property division
	  o Timelines for applications to get to first disposition, the first court order on a file, how long a file is in the system
	  o Outcomes of the file (i.e., concluded or withdrawn)
	  o Activity on the file

Equally common, three agencies indicated that they used their data to report back to the general public through annual reports or provincial audit processes. However, one agency representative commented that reporting to the public is one area where the courts in particular may be able to improve, as very little court-specific data is currently available the public.

> *Data collection is used for public reporting, so things like annual reports, provincial audit chapters that get reported.* (Government)

> *Courts are public records, and one of the opportunities I think that will be coming forward for us is to be able to think about: what is it we want the public to know? What would be helpful for people coming to the court to know about the kind of statistics or the volumes in the court?* (Government)

Further, it was noted that data is often used internally to provide reports and updates to upper management (including Boards of Directors who may oversee not-for-profit legal organizations). For government organizations, this may include preparing briefing notes for Ministers that contain information about the statistics collected by a particular branch or unit.

5.1.2. Types of Data Collected

The types of data collected by the agencies was similar in nature to the types of data reported in the annual reports reviewed through the environmental scan component of this study (see Section 4). In fact, when representatives from the four agencies that published annual reports were explicitly asked about the extent to which the reports reflected the type of data collected by their organizations, all indicated that their reports were accurate reflections of the data collected, but that more detailed or granular data was available internally for their own analytic purposes.

> *Most of the internal data we wouldn't put in there is either data that's broken down further or it's for internal purposes.* (Government)

> *I think a lot of the data that we collect is reflected in that [annual report], but with more reporting and less analysis.* (Not-for-Profit)

Initial Contact with Agency

Three agencies collected data related to the initial contacts that individuals may have with their organization (see Table 26)[18]. Within this domain, agencies tracked data related to the volume and modality of contacts (e.g., by phone or email), the reason for the contact, and how the service user heard of the agency. Notably, the agencies that recorded this type of information typically provided legal information to the individuals who contacted them. In addition, two agencies collected information about the applications submitted to their organization for services, including variables such as the number of applications received, various characteristics of the applicants, and the number of applications denied.

---

[18] Given the way in which agencies provided information about the data they collected during the interview (i.e., recall from memory), it is possible that some agencies collected data types that were not captured during the interviews.

Table 26: Type of Data Related to Initial Contacts with Agency

Data Related to Initial Contacts with Agency	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Contacts with Agency	
Volume of contacts made with agency	2
Modality of contact with service users • Number of phone calls received • Number of emails received	3
Reasons for contacts • Type of information requested • Nature of inquiry	2
How service user heard of agency	1
Applications	
Number of applications received	2
Applicant Information • Name • Case number • Date received • Referral source • Financial information • File status	1
Number of applications denied	1

Services Provided

All of the agencies collected data that pertained to the services they provided (see Table 27). Typically, the agencies tracked either the volume of service users or files opened, as well as the type of services provided (e.g., the number of service users accessing a particular program). Two agencies that provided legal information also recorded the number of materials (e.g., publications, self-help kits) distributed to service users. In addition, four agencies collected data on the type of legal issue that a service user was experiencing or the area of law in which services were required. Only one agency collected data on the non-legal needs being experienced by their clients.

Two agencies tracked data related to program registrations and attendance, including the proportion of registrants who attended a given program session. Further, three agencies recorded the number and types of referrals they provided to clients (e.g., referrals to other agencies who could provided the required legal services). At least two agencies collected information related to the status of a given file, including the number of contacts with the service user. In addition, four agencies tracked data related to various aspects of legal proceedings, such as the number of service users in legal proceedings, number of trials, and number of services users who had legal representation or were self-represented litigants. Other types of information collected by one or two agencies related to whether files were interjurisdictional and the number and amount of fee

waivers issued. Finally, at least three organizations collected data on the outcome of their files, including the number of files closed and the type of resolution that occurred (e.g., resolved, partially resolved, not resolved).

Table 27: Type of Data Collected Related to Service Provision

Data Related to Service Provision	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Services Provided	
Volume of service users	3
Number of files commenced / opened	5
Type of services provided • Type of program	4
Number of materials distributed to service users • Number of publications distributed • Number of self-help kits distributed	2
Type of legal need or area of law needed • Type of legal issue to be resolved • Area of law provided	3
Non-legal needs of clients	1
Number of individuals who are ineligible for services	1
Registration and Attendance	
Number of individuals who register for services	2
Number of individuals who attend services	2
Proportion of registrants who attend services	2
Referrals Provided to Service Users	
Number of referrals provided to service user	3
Type of referrals provided to service user	3
File Status	
Number of contacts with service users • Number of emails sent	2
File status • Date opened • Progress to date • Court order received • Date closed	1
Legal Proceedings	
Number of service users in legal proceedings	2
Number of trials	2
Number of service users who had legal representation	1
Number of self-represented litigants	2
Interjurisdictional Files	
Number of interjurisdictional support files	1
Number of out-of-province orders	1

Data Related to Service Provision	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Fee Waivers	
Number of fee waivers issued	1
Amount ($) of fee waivers issued	1
Outcome of File	
Number of files closed	3
Type of resolution (e.g., resolved, partially resolved, not resolved)	3

Demographic Characteristics of Service Users

It was also common for the agencies to collect data related to the demographic characteristics of their clients with all but one organization collecting this type of data (see Table 28). Some of the common data elements collected were clients' financial status (often to determine eligibility for services), marital status/family situation, number of children or dependents, and the geographic location where they reside. One agency collected data on gender, while two collected ethnicity data. It is possible that other agencies also collected this information but did not mention it in the interviews. Further, two agencies recorded whether clients were experiencing domestic violence, while one tracked whether their clients were currently incarcerated.

Table 28: Type of Data Related to Service User Characteristics

Data Related to Service User Characteristics	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Financial status (e.g., income)	4
Marital status / family situation	2
Number of children	3
Age of children	1
Geographic location	3
Gender	1
Ethnicity • Indigenous, non-Indigenous	2
Experiencing domestic violence	2
Incarceration status	1

Quality of Services Provided

Three agencies collected data related to the quality of the services they provided to their clients (see Table 29). One agency collected data on the length of time to open a file, another collected data on the usefulness of legal information provided (e.g., by asking clients questions such as: Was the information helpful? Would you recommend the resource to others?), while the third solicited feedback on clients' satisfaction with the legal services they received through the agency.

Table 29: Type of Data Related to Quality of Services Provided

Data Related to Quality of Service Provided	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Length of time to open file	1
Usefulness of legal information provided	1
Satisfaction with legal service received	1

Employee- and Volunteer-Related Data

Finally, three agencies collected data on variables related to their employees and volunteers (see Table 30). Two agencies recorded the time spent on each file, while another recorded the number and areas of specialization of its volunteers.

Table 30: Type of Data Related to Employees and Volunteers

Data Related to Employees and Volunteers	Agencies Collecting Data Type (*n*)
Employee-Related Data	
Time spent on file	2
Volunteer-Related Data	
Number of volunteers	1
Volunteers' area of law specializations	1

5.1.3. Frequency and Modality of Data Collection

To further understand the agencies' data collection practices, interviewees were asked about the frequency at which their organizations collected and compiled data, as well as the modality for data collection (e.g., whether it was manual or electronic, reliant upon a spreadsheet or database). In general, the agencies collected data on an ongoing basis whenever there was contact with clients. For most agencies, applications forms, intake forms, and call logs were key data sources; however, one agency also conducted surveys with the general public to gather data related to their services. From there, several agencies compiled the data collected by different staff on either a monthly, quarterly, or annual basis, depending on the timeframe that best met their organizational requirements (e.g., required reporting frequency to management or Board of Directors).

In terms of the modality of data collection, the majority of agencies (*n* = 6) had all or most of their data in an electronic format. Approximately half of the agencies recorded their data in Excel spreadsheets, while the other half employed case management or client management databases. Among the agencies using databases, two organizations used databases developed in-house, one used J-STAR (a database adopted by the Ministry of Justice and Attorney General that includes case management, financials, and judicial scheduling), and another used SharePoint. Notably, one of these agencies had only somewhat recently adopted an electronic database and was continuing to engage in some manual data collection processes for the time being to ensure the electronic database was capturing data as intended.

With the new system, our desire is to move away from any paper data collection…we're still so new into J-STAR and getting used to what the system can do for us, what information it can collect, that we still do have some manual paper processes, almost for now as a check and balance against the electronic system to verify that it's capturing the information in the way we expect it is. And, again, the desire is to get to a fully electronic state, so that we don't need to do manual data collection as well. (Government)

Three additional agencies also employed manual data collection (i.e., use of paper files) to at least some extent to record data. This was typically the case in organizations that relied upon Excel Spreadsheets to track their data where data recorded manually or in paper files may be transferred to the spreadsheet. In addition, it was noted that there may be some variations in manual data collection practices across staff, depending largely on individuals' comfort with technology and Excel spreadsheets. Finally, agencies engaged in manual data collection processes noted that they can be "*time-consuming and laborious*" and, as a result, data collection was limited to the most important types of data to collect.

We're basically a belt and suspenders [agency] because we still work on a hard copy system because we don't have the funding for paperless and so a lot of that data is contained within the file on different forms. (Not-for-Profit)

I am not very good technologically, which is why I just email…how many phone calls I dealt with last week...We don't have necessarily consistent [practices], but I mean that's the essence of having manual systems of collection, right, that it can and does vary. (Government)

5.2. Data Sharing Practices

5.2.1. Data Collection and Sharing Policies

The organizations varied in terms of whether they had data collection and sharing policies in place. All of the government-affiliated agencies indicated that they followed provincial legislation with respect to collecting and sharing personal information, including requirements around data breaches and data storage. One not-for-profit legal organization also indicated that they had a privacy policy related to collecting and sharing client information.

Because we're government...we have very specific requirements on anything that we collect. It has to be kept confidential first of all. There's…Freedom of Information and Protection (FOIP), we have to follow all of those guidelines. There are specific questions and policies and procedures respecting data in government, they are very clear on confidentiality and privacy. So we would have a lot of those pieces in the work that we do as well. (Government)

We have a privacy policy on our client data collection…it informs the clients that we're allowed to share client information within the organization in order to facilitate our programs…it [also] says…if it's for the purpose of research or improving our

skills…we're allowed to do that, but there is a parameter on our ability to provide it to third party resources or third parties. (Not-for-Profit)

The other not-for-profit legal organizations did not have any formal policies related to data collection and data sharing. The data collection practices of these organizations were driven by what is useful to collect. They also indicated that they would need to seek approval from their Board of Directors before they share the data.

I don't believe we've got anything formal in the way of data collection policies whatsoever. It's always been we collect this because it's useful. (Not-for-Profit)

I would say we have more of a practice and procedure right now than a formal policy. (Not-for-Profit)

We would probably bring that forward to [our Board] to get a formal motion passed that we're able to share that data. (Not-for-Profit)

Importantly, one of the government agencies indicated that sharing aggregate data was under their own purview and they did not have formal policies governing how they share data in this capacity.

The formal policies are really more around when you can share personal information, which we're not trying to do in this…I don't think there is any restriction on [sharing aggregate data]…Amongst our partners, I think sometimes we do share that data. For our help sessions, we were partnered with different organizations, so sometimes, you know, somebody else has collected it, the data, and we need to get it from them and vice versa…So some of that data we just share upon request, and we don't really have any policy around it. It's freely shared. (Government)

5.2.2. Past Experiences with Data Sharing

All but one not-for-profit agency had past experiences with sharing data. The agencies most commonly shared data with other government departments, the Judiciary, parent agencies (e.g., national umbrella organizations overseeing provincial chapters), and external partners working on similar initiatives.

I think the main ones right now are largely internal to the Ministry of Justice and Attorney General, so those would be our folks like in Public Prosecutions, in our internal policy and planning branches, as well as the Judiciary themselves. (Government)

[Data sharing] comes about…through our national umbrella organization…and those at our counterpart…agencies in Canada, which is a real collaborative and supportive group. We'll always share with one another, everything from ideas to best practices to other approaches to any sort of data as well. (Not-for-Profit)

Several of the organizations indicated that they decided to share data on a case-by-case basis. Two organizations utilized data sharing agreements or Memorandum of Understandings to share data, whereas others did not have formal processes in place to facilitate data sharing, especially when aggregate data was being shared. In fact, most organizations only shared aggregate data, as they recognized that justice data is sensitive and reflects individuals' experiences of difficult situations in their lives.

> *I think it'd be a case-by-case decision and the purpose of getting access to that information. What is the information being used for?* (Not-for-Profit)

> *I don't think we necessarily use any one template but having something like a Memorandum of Understanding in place is pretty standard for these types of projects.* (Government)

> *What we've done with data sharing in the past – we've done data sharing agreements and we've provided, for the most part, anonymous data.* (Government)

> *When we're dealing with individuals here in a justice context, maybe having the worst time of their life, nobody has interest in adding to that stress so, you know, it needs to be aggregated, it can't reveal particular things.* (Government)

In terms of the reason for sharing data, the organizations typically did so to advance or establish similar initiatives. Specifically, several organizations indicated that they shared data to learn from each other and to develop a business case for establishing a similar program or services. In addition, one organization shared data with their partners to help advance various access to justice initiatives in which they are involved and to better understand gaps that may exist.

> *If we are thinking of going in a different direction, it's very helpful to have this kind of comparative data that we can look at. Because, in government, as you know, we always have to make a business case for why we want to do something, and the strongest business case is can we improve access? Is it more efficient for us to do? If we can show a demonstration of how it's worked elsewhere and how it's been effective, then that helps our case too.* (Government)

> *There are a couple of access to justice working groups in the province that are not just government but community-based organizations…with some mandate dealing with access to justice. And certainly, from time to time, we've had requests or we have been the ones requesting to the other entity "what are your numbers?" just to get a more comprehensive picture about what, for example, we think the need is for self representing people…So we might try and fill in some of the gaps that way to give a better estimate* (Government)

5.2.3. Facilitators of Data Sharing

When asked what helps facilitate data sharing with their organization, having trust and an established relationship with the recipient of the data were identified as key factors by most interviewees.

> *Can we just say trust?...It's having built those relationship…Trust in the people asking.* (Government)

> *Having trusted folks that are asking for it. I think that helps a lot.* (Government)

Part of what feeds into developing a trusting relationship is having a mutual understanding of how the data will be used. An interviewee from a not-for-profit legal organization also indicated that it is essential that data requests take into consideration the resources required by the organization to provide that data and ensure that appropriate compensation is built into the project. This individual described key facilitators of data sharing as the following: *"Trust and compensation and reciprocity is the overlapping of the two."*

> *I'm pretty intentional about what professors we work with…we have a good working relationship with [one professor] who will often work into her funding a way to compensate us for that, because we're busy, and we don't really have a lot of time to be generating data for professors… I think academics have a lot to learn about how to do community-engaged research, and so, if they don't do it right, I'm not interested in working with them.* (Not-for-Profit)

5.2.4. Barriers to Data Sharing

A number of barriers to data sharing were also identified through the interviews. One factor that may decrease an organization's willingness to share data related to concerns that the data may be misunderstood. As a result, some organizations were careful about what data was shared to avoid misinterpretation of it, especially if that data would be shared independent of any explanation of it.

> *I mean we're trying not to be too cagey about our data but, at the same time, we are a little careful about how we share it. Sometimes I think, especially with justice data, it can get misinterpreted pretty quickly, so it's not always as useful without somebody going along to answer questions.* (Government)

In addition, some organizations were hesitant to share data that could potentially jeopardize their funding out of concern about how that data may be used politically or by the media. As a result, organizations may only share data that paints the best picture of their services and may be hesitant to provide data on areas that require improvement.

> *I think sometimes…in government, there's a bit of nervousness about presenting anything…that could jeopardize what you're already doing. So, if your numbers are a bit low in a certain year, you better have a good explanation for why that is or you could*

risk losing funding. So I think sometimes there can be a bit of a negative incentive for sharing information really open-handedly…it's hard if you have an area that needs work or improvement to feel like you can be particularly transparent about that…if it wasn't followed up with a good explanation, we could risk losing funding. And so that's maybe just a bit of a scary reality – if it got spun the wrong way politically or spun the wrong way in the media. (Government)

It's not a barrier, but I've seen reluctance from agencies sharing data because they're concerned about their funding and getting into a bit of a turf war around funding. (Not-for-Profit)

Another set of barriers to sharing data related to the pragmatics of providing the data. Interviewees from both government and not-for-profit legal organizations indicated that they had limited resources to pull or clean data for sharing purposes. Consequently, not having the required resources to ensure that data were entered and collected properly in the first place created some hesitation in sharing data, especially if there was the potential for some variables to be of low quality (e.g., it may be unclear what data was actually captured). One organization also indicated that they may not have the technological skills to provide the data in the manner desired by the recipient, while another indicated that data requests have to be prioritized along with other requests that they receive. Thus, it may take a long time for the request to be processed.

People in agencies, especially in our sectors and in the non-profit sector, they're so involved in everyday work that it's so often hard to find time or people to respond to requests for data. (Not-for-Profit)

We don't share all of our data too because I don't know if all of our data is as clean as it should be…We have to be sure that the things that we're collecting are really tight and clean, and some of that involves a lot of heavy administrative work which means that folks need to be closing their files and all the correct data has to be in there. In order to ensure that you're doing that properly, you have to make sure that you're auditing those processes so that all of the good data is being collected in the first place so that it can be analyzed and presented in a way that's meaningful. And, honestly, in government, we don't always have that level of time or resources to ensure that the data is as pristine as it could be. And so I think that sometimes there's a hesitation in sharing data because it doesn't feel perfect enough. (Government)

I think a barrier for a lot of non-profits, and we experience this, is expertise in being able to deal with the data. So I can export to an Excel sheet but I can't do much from that, so if a third party is expecting a certain format…we're busy with serving clients and so lots of times, we don't have additional time to be working on formatting datasets or providing analysis on that in order for it be used by another party. So I guess just time in general to be able to deal with a request. (Not-for-Profit)

The extraction of the data sometimes isn't the hardest part. It's then taking the time to ensure that it's correct, to verify, to do all the other things to put it in a format that is

easily digestible and that's been verified. That can take some time…there's lots of court-related data out there and, at any given time, there is lots of things being prioritized in a queue internally or even externally, so part of the issues that arise is how that request might be prioritized…you could be at a significant wait time for a particular report. (Government)

In addition, one organization indicated that some of the data they hold is not necessarily theirs to share (in, this case, it may belong to the Judiciary) and that sometimes they do not have the type of data requested available to share. Misunderstandings about the type of data available can also lead to delays related to redesigning a given research study to better fit the data that does exist. It was noted that such barriers can be avoided by having an established relationship with an organization, including an understanding of their processes and the type of data they routinely collect.

Not all data is ours to share I guess is the thought that I want to leave with you in our system of judicial independence. (Government)

I think the other big hurdle for me was the availability of the data. You know, them wanting a specific set of data that we just didn't already have, and then that obviously creates a few more hurdles, them having to rearrange priorities or whatever it looks like. (Government)

Finally, one organization indicated that a potential barrier to sharing data is whether doing so would compromise the trust that their clients have in their organization. In some cases, the organization may be legally permitted to share the data but doing so may not be well-received by their clientele. Indeed, the interviewee with past experience with data commons initiatives indicated that having the "social license" to share data (i.e., whether a particular client base condones how data is being used) is an emerging area that is garnering attention within the practice of data sharing.

The first thing that comes into my head is Solicitor/Client confidentiality. And, you know, maybe not necessarily a legal barrier but a trust factor with our type of clientele – we serve low-income marginalized populations so trust of institutions is a hard thing for a lot of our clients and so ensuring that our organization can be seen as a trustworthy organization that can be trusted by our clients. (Not-for-Profit)

There's a new body of literature…around the concept of "social license"…which is about this gap between what entities are legally allowed to do and what they are actually not going to get in a lot of trouble for doing [from the public]. (Data Commons SME)

5.3. Data Commons Perceptions

5.3.1. Interest in Data Commons

Participants were asked to share their thoughts on developing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan, and all indicated that they were interested in the idea of a data commons. Several organizations explicitly stated that they were ready and willing to be involved in such an initiative, while one agency was unsure about their level of readiness. However, even among the organizations who expressed readiness to participate, caveats were offered about their potential involvement, such as the amount of time that would be required to participate, as well as questions about how the data will be used and what benefits the data commons will have for involved agencies and/or the broader community.

> *It's a good idea, just so long as we're not the ones that are doing the level of quality control and updating and monitoring, because we don't have the resources to do that.* (Government)

> *I think we're fairly ready. It's just a matter of how much time would be required.* (Government)

> *If it's going to be helpful to get more resources for legal services, then I'm all supportive of that. Again, there are so few non-profit legal providers in Saskatchewan that I see, from our point of view, that if it's going to be time and effort taken away from serving clients, I would have a concern on that. Because I think what happens a lot is these ideas come up, but then it's on the non-profit to resource it and provide that information when, again, we're not overly resourced here in Saskatchewan for non-profit legal service providers.* (Not-for-Profit)

> *What's the reciprocity? What would be the benefit? If you were going to dedicate staff time to inputting data, what's the benefit to the communities you serve or your agency?* (Not-for-Profit)

Some of the factors underlying interviewees' interest in the data commons was a desire to know what type of data other organizations held and a valuing of open data.

> *I think it's a good idea. I mean I would certainly selfishly be very interested in what other people have.* (Government)

> *Fabulous, fantastic idea. Because we don't know what's out there and…what other data is being collected.* (Government)

> *I am a big fan of open data…the more we can collect and collaborate, the better we are all off.* (Government)

5.3.2. Perceived Value of Data Commons

When asked to reflect on the possible value of a data commons, nearly all organizations indicated that the greatest potential benefit is being able to more readily identify gaps with respect to access to justice and the provision of legal services within the province. By having a better understanding of the work that other agencies are doing and the data they are collecting, some saw the opportunity to better understand what gaps exist, how organizations could collaborate to address those gaps, what new initiatives should be undertaken to ensure better access to justice, and what social policy reforms are needed.

> *I think that a lot of us do very similar work or work that kind of can build upon other people's data. So if we can identify gaps, but don't have the resources to act upon that, there might be somebody else that is doing the work to help in that area that, you know, that the information we collect helps them that way.* (Government)

> *I think in order to be successful across the board with improving access to justice for people we do need to share information…. I'm sure that we're holding pieces that would be very useful to, say, the university or other institutions that I'm sure could help Saskatchewan as a whole be better suited into the future.* (Government)

> *Some agencies collect information that [we] don't…There's times that information could be beneficial to allow us to target services or provide better support…if we knew some of those variables.* (Government)

> *Probably the biggest benefit would be identification of social policy gaps.* (Not-for-Profit)

> *I think that's the whole goal is to show the need. How people are being underserved for legal issues if you are a middle to no income person… I think it is helpful for outside organizations like the government or courts to have concrete numbers to show that there are issues.* (Not-for-Profit)

In addition, one organization believed that the enhanced access to data brought about by a data commons could help address known data gaps (e.g., with respect to race-based data) and make organizations more competitive for funding opportunities.

> *We're in the process of having to put together a business proposal…to request funding so that we can access reports on behalf of our clients from racialized communities. But we have no race-based data, and so I've been desperately seeking race-based data from other places. And it doesn't really exist in a format that would be of any help…Those kinds of funding opportunities…would be better enhanced through shared data.* (Government)

Some agencies also saw the potential for a data commons to enhance the data collected by participating organizations both in terms of *how* data is collected and *what* data is collected. In addition, one interviewee commented that, by learning about the data held by other

organizations, it is likely that learning about best practices will occur simultaneously, which can lead to enhanced services being provided to clients. It was suggested that having a more complete understanding of clients' engagement with various agencies could lead to better services for clients as well.

> *If we all are in agreement about the type of data, we can really enhance our own data as well. We might get better ideas about how we collect or what we collect.* (Government)

> *It just seems to me that if you're learning [about] data, you're going to learn about best practices as well. There's sort of a natural connection for sure. Like if someone was doing a project where their participation or their orders or requests just shot up because of it, we could see there's a way to do something.* (Not-for-Profit)

> *I think it'll help provide better services for clients because there'll just be a better understanding of, if you can get more information about a client, you can provide a better service to them. So I think it would be very helpful. I also feel like a lot of our clients interact with a lot of different agencies and they aren't necessarily aware of what's going on. So it could be very good.* (Government)

Notably, one interviewee indicated that they were unsure of the value of a data commons due to their perception that data is already freely shared among their partners within the province. They suggested that a data commons may be more beneficial in larger provinces that are less centralized.

> *I think we have good relationships with all our partners. We all know what we're all doing, and we get together regularly enough to be able to do this. I think maybe because we are a smaller province population-wise, that makes it easier. There might be greater value in somewhere where it's less centralized and having more moving parts…I don't know how much value there would be, because it's all kind of pretty freely shared now anyways.* (Government)

5.3.3. Perceived Barriers to Establishing a Data Commons

Interviewees were asked to reflect on potential barriers to establishing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan. Most commonly, the agencies identified barriers associated with resourcing these types of initiatives, both in terms of the high costs associated with establishing a data commons and the resources and time required by each agency to contribute to it. Specifically, agencies commented on having limited resources (capacity, expertise, and time) to prepare their data for sharing, including ensuring that it is accurate and up-to-date.

> *I don't see there being…within government…I don't think there's millions of dollars there to build it.* (Government)

> *Who's paying for this – the time of the people who are going to contribute to this?* (Not-for-Profit)

My first thought goes to what's the level of resources that you need to dedicate to making sure that the data is up-to-date. (Government)

Time and resources. (Government)

How much time and effort it takes for us to prepare that and how often we have to be doing that. We have to reflect on what resources we have in time and expertise to be able to actively participate. (Not-for-Profit)

Where you're going to run into challenges is a lot of the groups themselves might not have the capacity to actually share their data...like the actual human resources to do it because it's still a bit of work. It's not like a one-year project. It could be as little as 40 hours depending on the organization and the size of their dataset, but even 40 hours for a non-profit that's running on a shoestring budget can be a lot of money. (Data Commons SME)

Also related to funding, another potential barrier to establishing a data commons (and gaining support for it) is the funding source sought for the initiative. One participant from a not-for-profit legal organization stated that they were supportive of a data commons as long as it did take not away funding from the provision of legal services in Saskatchewan (i.e., they did not want the data commons to draw upon the same funding sources that not-for-profit organizations rely upon to fund their services).

Resourcing it, who's going to pay for this?...Resourcing is a sensitive topic in that our stance is that the government should be funding more legal resources and so, if the government is not going to fund the legal commons, then the legal commons is going to have to go to other pockets of money that non-profits also have to fight over. I perceive resourcing it can be a challenge if the government is not going to take on that responsibility, because then you are fighting over the same money that other non-profit frontline resources are 'fighting' for. (Not-for-Profit)

5.3.4. Supports and Considerations for Developing a Data Commons

Dedicated Resources and Expertise

Given the various concerns interviewees raised regarding the time and resources required to participate in a data commons, it is not surprising that one of the key facilitators identified as being necessary to support their involvement in a potential data commons relates to resources. All agencies indicated that additional dedicated resources (both human and financial) would be needed to support their ability to participate in a data commons, especially if their involvement requires them to do any extra work over and above their current responsibilities with respect to data. Further, several organizations believed that a full-time data commons teams would be the best approach to ensure that agencies are not participating in the data commons "*off the side the desk.*" One stakeholder also perceived that it was important for a particular group to "own" the

data commons to ensure that the initiative advances in a timely manner, as they did not think a dispersed ownership model would be effective.

> *If we're being asked to provide certain things and…it's something that we're not tracking, if it's please accumulate this particular data, and then it requires either a full-time staff member to do this work, or it requires somebody to give up 20% of their job to now do this work, then the bureaucracy kicks…and then it becomes more complicated. Then you see potential obstacles where…somebody does have to rubber stamp it, whereas if it is simply a 'we're sharing this, it's what we're already collecting, it really is no additional work,' there's less likely to be an obstacle there.* (Government)

> *You need some dedicated resources, so again, not off the side of the desk.* (Government)

> *You need a full-time team…that is responsible for developing it, managing it, coordinating it…pulling the partners together on a regular basis. There would be all kinds of things that they need to do. I would think it would be a full-time team.* (Government)

> *Resources to just have it their full-time job to just get the data…make it useful.* (Government)

> *What I wouldn't want to see is dispersed ownership, because committees are not effective. I think the agencies would have to give up a little bit of control and say, okay, we're going to trust that this group is doing this work, and we don't own it, and we share it, and we don't need to do it ourselves. Because often you get a committee, one person from every agency, and then just things get bogged down.* (Government)

Within a data commons team, it was acknowledged that there would need to be several types of expertise. Several interviewees mentioned that both technical and legal expertise would be required. Specifically, technical ability will be needed to pool data from various databases in a way that is meaningful. In addition, legal experts who can establish a legal and privacy framework for the data commons and who have a full understanding of the legal requirements and restrictions (e.g., privacy legislation, regulations around data pertaining to youth versus adults) of sharing data in this manner will be needed.

> *The biggest challenge is going to be how do the systems talk to each other to be able to pull that information in a way that makes it make sense. And, again, it's some of those common terms, you know, we even within our ministry, we've got more than one database and they don't talk to one another, so, and that's just within one ministry, so I think it would be a huge challenge.* (Government)

> *It's a complex idea. It would require a lot of technical ability to pull in all of these different databases…A lot of the data that we deal with is restricted in one way or another…the privacy legislation if it's a youth file versus whether it's an adult file and whether this involves vulnerable children. There are a lot of safeguards for people's*

> *privacy into who can look at what…I would put it to a lot of the technical people to say, 'okay, how could this work?'* (Government)
>
> *You asked about what kind of expertise is involved, so one is definitely a general legal policy/privacy framework. Although I would be mindful whenever you engage legal and privacy folks that you emphasize the goal – We're not going to pose the question as 'Can we do this?' We're going to pose it as 'How can we do this?'* (Data Commons SME)

Another form of expertise perceived to be required on the data sharing team was operational knowledge of the data being shared (i.e., what the data means, how data is collected, when data is collected, and the accuracy of the data collected). This would also include an understanding of any legal terminology employed by a given agency.

> *Very much you would need someone with that [legal] knowledge to be able to really help make sense of the data or give context for what the data may mean or what it relates to as far as…how it might be entered in the system or how it can be verified.* (Government)
>
> *You really need to understand how they're putting information in, when they're putting information in, and how accurate some of this is…you need to have those connections and understand all of those pieces of like how does this work, how do people use it, so you can actually pull accurate information out of it. Because I find all of these things are quite under-resourced and, so, you have to understand the limitations of each of them.* (Government)
>
> *Sometimes a barrier to understanding the information is the legal terminology which is maybe another failing of the justice system…Government has a tonne of acronyms and that can be really difficult for people. So someone that has a little bit of knowledge on a government/legal spectrum would be great.* (Government)

One interviewee also noted that it is important to have someone on the data commons team who is focused on the "user experience" of the data commons. That is, someone who understands how the anticipated users of the data commons wish to use the platform and ensures that the platform developed meets their needs. Related to this idea, another interviewee indicated that it will be important for any platform developed to be "*easy to use and quick to use.*"

> *The biggest problem with [an existing platform] is it's just so un-user friendly. And it's not clear how I, as a researcher, could pull data out of it and actually work with it. It's also not clear how, as a local advocate, I could pull data from it and use it. So there's a usability piece. So you need to have those user experts and actually identify who those users would be…There's something about having people embedded in the working group that has that end user understanding, so I think that's important.* (Data Commons SME)

A final type of expertise identified related to individuals who have organizational and systems experience with implementing major initiatives. These would be individuals who have a thorough understanding of the partners involved, including when and how to engage the partners, and ensuring that resources are maintained and sustained throughout the initiative.

They understand where the levers are in the…system. So they know how 'hey, we've made a decision, who actually has decision-making authority for this, how do we approach that person and get them to pay attention to what we're doing and sign off on it' and then an adjacent group to that are people that know how to get resources and move resources around…People with organizational and systems experience that know how to actually implement things is really important…Having people on your team that understand these dynamics, and at the outset are like, 'if we're going to talk to so and so at this stage, we need to talk to them at this stage'. That's a skillset. (Data Commons SME)

Clear Purpose and Model

Beyond resources, participants also identified additional facets of a data commons that would be important to clarify from the outset of the initiative. Several interviewees stressed that it is critical for the data commons to have a clear purpose and audience, including a mutual understanding across partners of what data will be included and how it will be used. Having clarity about the purpose of the data commons will enhance its effectiveness and allow organizations to determine whether they want to be involved in the initiative. Relatedly, some interviewees also noted that a clear definition of family and civil law will be required and that common definitions for any variables of interest will need to be developed.

As with so many things, I would start by saying, 'well, what's the purpose of this,' and be really clear about the purpose that it would serve and how it meets the needs of…clients, and that it's helpful for people who are involved in the justice system first and foremost. So I think get the principles right, get the purposes right, understand who the audience are, and then the technical stuff is going to be difficult, there's no question about it. (Government)

I guess the biggest thing would be around maybe how the data commons would define family and civil law for the purposes of their data collection…I would have clarity of definition around what the objective is, what the areas of law entail, because then that'll help you drill down, right?...And then probably a really strong…what it will be used for and how it will be used, because then people can make that really informed decision around whether it would be worth their time to partner on that initiative or not. (Not-for-Profit)

I think anytime you're trying to create a common data collection source, you have to kind of agree on some definitions and key things that you are collecting on, key definitions. And the one that always springs to mind first is, you know, self-representation. How are you defining that? Are you making a distinction between…the unrepresented and the self-represented? (Government)

As part of the process of determining the purpose of the data commons, it will also be necessary to determine the level of data to be shared—that is, whether the data commons will be a repository for aggregate level data or if it will focus on microdata that may have personal

identifiers. It may be easier and less resource-intensive for agencies to share aggregate-level data as there would not be as many security concerns associated with sharing this type of data. As a result, less funding would be required to establish a platform based on sharing aggregate data. In contrast, a data commons based on sharing microdata would allow for deeper analysis of the data provided, but would require a significant capital investment to establish a platform that is sufficiently secure and has the necessary analytic capabilities. In fact, the Data Commons SME suggested that the latter platform may only be possible with government funding and support. He also raised the possibility that starting with a simpler platform that relies upon aggregate data may motivate future investment in a more complex platform once the value of sharing data in this manner is better understood.

> *Sometimes people don't want access to the microdata, what they actually really want is a data dashboard, which provides summary statistics that they can work with that aren't interpreted, but they're not sensitive because they're just summary data and providing that kind of access is actually, as long as you can actually have somebody somewhere accessing the microdata, it's a lower bar than actually trying to provide microdata access…you create standards and instructions for different agencies to be able to report aggregate data in a common and relatable way and then that becomes your sort of common data portal. But…the analysis that you can do is limited.* (Data Commons SME)

> *How do you design a platform that is secure, that can't easily be hacked, and then how do you maintain it? And there's certain like financial outlays, like, there's certain resource outlays that are required if you're going to be actually storing that data. And it might, it's probably beyond a single organization…if you got the…Ministry of Justice…that might get to the economy of scale…where making that investment to build that infrastructure is actually worthwhile or is actually viable.* (Data Commons SME)

> *Sometimes I think about it as what's viable now and, if we do the most viable thing now…and take it as far as we can get it, that might actually motivate future work...In this area, just having the aggregate data would be maybe a step further, so much further than where we've been before.* (Data Commons SME)

When asked about the types of data that should be focused on in the data commons, a variety of data elements were identified (see Table 31).

Table 31: Data Types of Interest for the Data Commons

Type of Data	Description
(Unmet) Legal Needs of Clients	*"Demographic and financial for us is important. So trying to understand the legal needs of our clients and those who we may not be reaching, what the gaps are."* (Government) *"I think it'd be very helpful to show the need of outside what Legal Aid currently covers…even if you are eligible for Legal Aid, they might not cover the area of law that you're doing or if it's an area of law that they do, they don't provide certain services in certain areas….Those stats I think would be helpful for governments, the*

Type of Data	Description
	public, and the courts to reflect on about the deep need for further legal resources is in Saskatchewan." (Not-for-Profit)
Clustering of Legal Problems	*"It would be interesting to have more detailed information about clustering specific to Saskatchewan, income levels associated with that. There's always a role for knowing about how many people are getting some sort of assistance to help navigate these problems, even if it's not with the lawyer."* (Government)
Ineligibility for Existing Programs	"*Any data on why and the number of people who were excluded from being eligible for existing programs. I always find that to be extremely helpful…knowing what those reasons are and the number of people – I think it's very helpful because it helps identify gaps.*" (Government)
Geographic Differences	"*One thing important for us to know is the locations we're hitting, geographically…in most Canadian regions, the north is always such a challenge. So the more we could learn about serving there would be the better.*" (Not-for-Profit)
People who Experience Poverty and Injustice	"*I would just really encourage that if this is going to be a project that we don't forget about people who experience poverty and injustice, that they're included in the thinking around this rather than just the people we more often see.*" (Not-for-Profit)
Long-term Outcomes of Individuals Navigating the Justice System	"*I've even thought from the civil side, if we could connect our services to what happens to them once they leave our office…there's a big gap once people leave our office that we don't know what happened to them. And that gap I would be very interested in connecting with the court to figure it out or lawyers...Where are people going to resolve their disputes?*" (Government)

5.4. Summary and Conclusion

Key informant interviews were conducted with representatives from government and not-for-profit legal agencies with a vested interest in access to justice to inform the creation of a justice data commons in Saskatchewan. Accordingly, the interviews explored agencies' data collection practices, including the types of data they collected and the frequency and modality of data collection. In addition, organizations' experiences with data sharing were investigated, including the policy frameworks in which they operate and possible facilitators and barriers to data sharing. Finally, the interviews shed light on the organizations' perceptions of establishing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan, including their interest in such an initiative, its perceived value, possible barriers to establishing a data commons, and supports and considerations needed to create it. Perceptions of the supports and resources required to establish a data commons were enhanced by the perspective offered by a subject matter expert with past experience in developing a data portal. The key findings from the key informant interviews are discussed in the following section, including the implications for moving forward with developing a justice data commons in Saskatchewan.

5.4.1. Data Collection Practices

Data Utilization

An important lens to understanding organizations' data collection practices, including the types of data they collect, is understanding how they use the data they collect. In fact, all participants began their interviews by explaining how their organization utilizes data, and all agencies (both government and not-for-profit) used data in similar ways to: 1) enhance service delivery; 2) justify funding; and 3) complete reporting. With respect to **enhancing service delivery**, the agencies used their data to identify gaps and trends over time to develop new resources, programs, and policies to meet emergent needs. As a result, data collection practices within organizations tended to be dynamic, with the collection of some variables that no longer served a purpose being halted and new variables being added to monitor emerging trends. Some organizations also used the data collected to directly and immediately inform the provision of legal services to their clients.

In terms of **funding**, most organizations (both government and not-for-profit) relied upon data to justify the need for funding (including the maintenance of specific programs/units and staff positions) and to determine the levels of funding required to meet the demand for legal services. For instance, data was used for planning purposes to inform the size of a given unit or to achieve optimal workload distribution across staff.

For **reporting**, most of the agencies reported to the federal and/or provincial governments, largely with respect to funding that had been received. Some were also required to report back to the general public (e.g., through annual reports, provincial audit processes). Further, all agencies used their data to report to either upper management or their Board of Directors, depending on the nature of the organization. Notably, two agencies also participated in surveys coordinated by the federal government to create national databases related to family and civil courts (i.e., Survey of Family Courts, Survey of Maintenance Enforcement, Civil Court Survey). Thus, the data from these surveys, along with other surveys[19] that have ben conducted by the federal government and/or academic institutions, may also be mined for Saskatchewan-specific content and considered for inclusion in a data commons.

---

[19] Other relevant surveys include: 2009 National Study on the Legal Problems of Everyday Life (Justice Canada; Currie, 2009), 2016 National Study of Everyday Legal Problems (Canadian Forum on Civil Justice; Farrow et al., 2016), 2017 Global Study of Everyday Justice Problems (World Justice Project, 2019a), 2018 Provincial Inquiry of Unmet Legal Needs (Legal Services Task Team, 2019), 2021 National Study of Legal Problems (Statistics Canada; Savage & McDonald, 2022), and the Social Security Tribunal of Canada. Review of the data collected by these surveys was beyond the scope of the current study.

Type of Data Collected

Given that the agencies had similar uses for their data, it is not surprising that there were similarities in the types of data collected across the organizations. There were also similarities between the data elements mentioned in the interviews and those identified through the environmental scan of annual reports in the first component of this study. To begin, several agencies collected data related to inquiries made to their agency, including the volume, modality (e.g., phone, email), and reasons for the contact. In addition, two agencies collected data on the number of applications received, with one recording the number of applications denied. All of these data elements were consistent with what was found in the environmental scan.

It was even more common for the agencies to track data related to the provision of services. Some of the most common data elements collected pertained to the volume of files opened and closed, the volume of service users, the types of services provided, and the area of law required or type of legal need to be addressed. One type of data that was discussed by the interviewees, but was not identified through the environmental scan, related to the number of individuals who registered and attended various program offerings, including the proportion of registrants who attended services. Also not identified through the environmental scan was the number of referrals that agencies provided to service users to access other services (in the environmental scan, if agencies reported on referrals, it reflected the referrals they had received). Some agencies in the interview sample also collected data about legal proceedings, including the number of service users who had legal representation or were self-represented litigants. Again, these data elements were not identified in the environmental scan, but the A2J Measurement Framework does recommend that data be collected on legal representation and the experience of self-represented litigants (A2JBC, 2019). Thus, it is valuable to know that this data is being collected to some extent within Saskatchewan. A few agencies also collected data on interjurisdictional files and fee waivers.

Several organizations collected data on the demographic characteristics of their clientele. An important data element collected by the organizations was the financial status of an individual, as this data was used by several organizations to determine eligibility for services. Many of the organizations also provided services in the area of family law; thus, it was important to understand the marital status of their clients, including information about their dependents. Geographic location was another common characteristic collected (in part to offer insight into issues related to the accessibility of services). Interestingly, two agencies explicitly tracked whether clients were experiencing domestic violence, which was not identified as a variable collected by agencies in the environmental scan. Other demographic characteristics collected were gender, ethnicity, and whether someone was incarcerated.

A handful of agencies collected data related to the quality of services provided, such as the length of time to open a file, the usefulness of legal information provided, and satisfaction with the legal service received. In addition, some data was collected on employees' workload (e.g., time spent on file) and volunteers affiliated with a given organization (e.g., number of volunteers, area of specialization). These types of data elements were also identified through the environmental scan.

Overall, the interviews provided evidence that the types of data uncovered through the environmental scan are similar to the types of data that organizations self-reported collecting during the interviews. Moreover, the interviews suggested that organizations are tracking some data elements that are not necessarily reflected in their annual reports (e.g., related to referrals, self-represented litigants, specific client characteristics) but are recommended areas of measurement within the A2J Measurement Framework (A2JBC, 2019). When taken together, there is a wide variety of data being collected in Saskatchewan that reflects the various dimensions of access to justice.

Frequency and Modality of Data Collection

Most agencies tracked data on an ongoing basis (e.g., during each contact with clients) and compiled that data monthly, quarterly, or annually, depending on their organizational needs. Approximately half of the agencies recorded their data in an Excel spreadsheet, while the other half used a case management or client management database. One agency largely collected data manually (e.g., using paper-based forms). Due to the time and labour required for manual data collection, there was a limited amount of data this agency could collect.

In terms of the implications of these findings for informing the development of a data commons, based on the agencies' current practices for compiling their data, it would be realistic to have organizations provide data on an annual basis. Further, most agencies would be in a position to provide data electronically; however, given the diversity of methods used to collect and store data (e.g., Excel Spreadsheet, database), it would be necessary to work with each agency to determine the technicalities of sharing their data.

5.4.2. Data Sharing Practices

Data Sharing Policies

The key informant interviews provided a number of useful insights into the participating agencies' experiences with data sharing. From a policy perspective, all government-affiliated agencies are required to abide by Privacy and Access legislation (e.g., Freedom of Information and Protection [FOIP]) with respect to collecting and using personal information. Thus, if it is desired that personal information be shared for the purposes of the data commons, attention will have to be paid to ensuring that any data sharing abides by this legislation. Privacy and security concerns are common issues that emerge in relation to sharing personal information (Hagan et al, 2019). Importantly, some interviewees indicated that sharing aggregate-level data was not subjected to the same level of scrutiny and was within the control of individual departments to share. Only one of the not-for-profit legal organizations indicated that they had a privacy policy (their policy seemed similar to existing provincial privacy and access legislation); the other two not-for-profit legal organizations did not have formal data collection or sharing policies and considered their approach to data collection and sharing to be a practice and procedure.

All agencies, with the exception of one not-for-profit legal organization, had past experiences with sharing data. The agencies most commonly shared data with other government departments, the Judiciary, parent agencies (e.g., national umbrella organizations overseeing provincial

chapters), and external partners working on similar initiatives. These existing practices align with what Hagan et al. (2019a) consider informal data sharing and can be seen as a first step towards establishing a data commons. Decisions to share data were typically made on a case-by-case basis and, in most cases, organizations only shared aggregate data due to the sensitive nature of the data they held (i.e., justice data typically reflects difficult situations that people are experiencing in their lives). Two organizations utilized data sharing agreements or Memorandum of Understandings to share data (which are common tools used to facilitate data sharing arrangements; Hagan et al., 2019c), whereas others did not draw upon such formal processes (largely due to the aggregate and anonymized nature of the data being shared). Overall, the interviews suggested that the level of data being considered for the data commons (i.e., aggregate vs. personally identifying data) will influence the ease and requirements to share data and that policies and procedures for sharing data may vary according to each organization participating in the data commons.

Facilitators and Barriers to Data Sharing

In an effort to gauge what may help or hinder data sharing, each interviewee was asked to reflect on facilitators and barriers they have previously encountered or could anticipate in the future. Having trust in the data recipient emerged as the most important factor influencing an organization's willingness to share data. This included having a long-term relationship with the data recipient and a mutual understanding of how the data will be used. Another facilitator of data sharing, especially from the perspective of not-for-profit organizations, was providing the agencies with the monetary resources needed to provide the data requested, as these agencies had limited resources to draw upon to fill data requests.

With respect to barriers to data sharing, interviewees noted that there may be some hesitancy within their organizations to share data that may be misunderstood or that could jeopardize their funding if it was misinterpreted politically or in the media. Thus, organizations may only be willing to share a subset of their data that highlights their areas of strength. Another recurrent theme across the interviews related to having minimal resources to pull, clean, and verify data for sharing purposes. All organizations (government and not-for-profit) indicated that they had limited resources for engaging in research-related activities and had to prioritize these requests alongside their other responsibilities. Hesitancy also was expressed about sharing data that had not been verified or which may be of low quality. In addition, many interviewees indicated that there was limited technological experience within their organizations to share data, depending on the format requested. Issues related to the cost of sharing data and the usability of existing data are known barriers to establishing open access legal data sources (Hagan et. al, 2019a).

Interestingly, the notion of having the "social license" to share the data also arose in two interviews. Within this context, not only do the legalities of data sharing need to be considered (i.e., can the data be shared?), but also how the sharing of data will be perceived by an organization's client base (i.e., do clients condone their data being shared with a given agency?). In other words, organizations may have the right to share their data under existing policy and legislation but doing so may jeopardize clients' trust in the agency if they do not agree with the anticipated use of the data (Shaw et al.., 2020). If a justice data commons is developed in Saskatchewan, it will be important to take steps to ensure it has "public" approval (whatever that may look like based on the purpose and audience of the data commons; Shaw et al., 2020).

5.4.3. Establishing a Data Commons

All of the interviewees expressed interest in the notion of a provincial justice data commons, with some organizations indicating that they would be willing and ready to participate and others requiring more information about the intended purpose of the data commons. Among all, however, was the caveat that any potential involvement would be influenced by the time and resources required to participate in such an initiative. Being able to more readily identify and address gaps with respect to access to justice and the provision of legal services in the province was identified as one of the potential benefits of a data commons. In addition, some interviewees believed that participating in the data commons may lead to enhanced data collection practices within their own organization, both in terms of how and what data is collected. Some interviewees also thought that the data commons would lend itself to learning about best practices with respect to addressing clients' legal needs. Notably, one individual was uncertain about the value of a data commons as they perceived that data was already freely shared among their partners.

As previously discussed, limited resources within each agency to contribute to the data commons was the most significant potential barrier identified in the interviews. All agencies cited their limited capacity (in terms of time and expertise) to pull data, clean and verify that data to ensure it is accurate and up-to-date, and share data in whatever format is needed. Finding funding for the data commons (which was anticipated to be a costly initiative) was also perceived to be a barrier, especially if it funds are sought from sources relied upon by not-for-profit organizations. Taken altogether, to achieve buy-in from participating agencies, it will be important for the data commons to: a) have a purpose that clearly benefits the involved agencies and/or the broader community they serve; and b) be sufficiently resourced, including direct support for agencies' involvement in the data commons (and by funding sources that do not take away from the provision of legal services).

Necessary Supports and Resources

Looking more broadly at the elements required to successfully establish a data commons, interviewees emphasized the need for dedicated human and financial resources to support the development of the data commons. Most suggested that a dedicated full-time team would be required to ensure this work does not occur "off the side of the desk." One individual also indicated that it will be important for one group to own the data commons as it was believed that a dispersed ownership model would be ineffective. Within this team, it was recognized that many types of expertise would be required, including legal and privacy, technical, operational, user experience, and organization and systems (see Table 32). Hagan et al. (2019c) also surmised that it is important to have a working group to create and maintain a data commons and to ensure that various forms of expertise are represented in this group (e.g., expertise in technical infrastructure, legal policies and procedures, and users' needs).

Table 32: Expertise Required to Establish Data Commons

Types of Expertise	Description
Legal and Privacy	Expertise in the legal and privacy legalisation that must be followed
Technical	Expertise in compiling data from multiple databases and data sources
Operational	Expertise in the data being shared, including what the data means, how it is collected, when it is collected, and the accuracy of the data collected
User Experience	Expertise in understanding how the data will be used and how the data commons needs to be developed to meet those purposes
Organization and Systems	Expertise in understanding how to engage partners throughout the initiative and obtain and maintain support and resources for it

As mentioned earlier, it was also identified that it will be necessary for the data commons to have a clear purpose to ensure it has a solid foundation, as well as to facilitate agencies' involvement in it. There needs to be a mutual understanding across partners about the type of data that will be included in the data commons, how the data commons will be used, and by whom, all of which are conditions for developing a data commons that have also been identified by Hagan et al. (2019c). As part of the work to develop a data commons, interviewees also indicated that clear definitions of family and civil law will need to be developed for the purposes of this particular initiative, as well as for any variables of interest that will be included in the data commons. Based on the interviews, some of the key data elements of interest for inclusion in the data commons related to the unmet legal needs of clients, clustering of legal needs, ineligibility for legal services, geographic differences, people who experience poverty and injustice, and long-term outcomes of individuals navigating the justice system. These topics, combined with the results of the environmental scan, may point to areas to initially focus on when establishing the data commons.

Finally, it will be necessary to determine the level of data that will be targeted by the data commons (i.e., aggregate data vs. microdata with personal identifiers). The level of data may be dictated by the amount of funding available to support the initiative. A platform designed to accommodate personally identifiable data will require a much more sophisticated platform than a platform designed to house aggregate data due to the higher level of security needed to protect personal information. It will also require a much more complex legal and privacy framework to allow for the sharing of data. As a result, one interviewee indicated this type of model may only be realistic if a significant government investment is available to fund the initiative. On the other hand, the need and comfort level of participating agencies may also influence the direction that is taken. Based on the current study, most agencies were experienced and comfortable with sharing aggregate data. It may be advantageous to build off this experience by establishing a platform for sharing aggregate data and then use that experience to leverage a more advanced platform that accommodates microdata in the future. It should be noted that a major limitation of a platform based on aggregate data is that the types of possible analyses will be limited (e.g., it will not be possible to determine the outcomes of individuals' journeys through the justice system).

5.4.4. Conclusion

An important contribution of the current study is that it provides baseline information about organizations' interest and ability to participate in a data commons within the Saskatchewan context. Findings pertaining to agencies' data collection and data sharing practices indicated that they are: a) actively collecting data; and b) already engaged in some data sharing practices, particularly around the sharing of aggregate data. Further, there seems to be some interest in, and support for, participating in a justice data commons; however, two factors will ultimately dictate agencies' level of interest in being involved: a) the purpose of the data commons, including the benefit of being involved for the agencies and/or the broader community being served; and b) the resources (time, capacity, expertise) available to support their involvement in the data commons. Trust in the organization spearheading the data commons will also play a significant role in garnering support for, and involvement in, the initiative.

6. Recommendations for Establishing a Data Commons

The current study provides insight into the unique contextual factors and concerns that will need to be taken into consideration if steps are taken to develop a data commons in Saskatchewan. The identified factors relate primarily to what is required to ensure buy-in and engagement in the data commons; however, the technical aspects of creating a data commons will also need to be considered. In moving forward with establishing a data commons, the following suggestions and recommendations are offered for consideration.

1. Determine the **purpose of the data commons** and ensure it is grounded in a **strong measurement framework**, such as the A2J Measurement Framework (A2JBC, 2019).

   - Ensuring transparency about the purpose of the data commons may help organizations decide whether to be involved in it.

   - Being clear about the purpose of the data commons may also help with eliciting public approval for the data commons and ensure it has the "social licence" to exist.

2. Determine who the **primary audience(s)** are for: a) contributing to the data commons; and b) analyzing and using the data in the commons.

   - The data commons should be developed with the experiences of all users in mind.

3. When seeking funding for the data commons, ensure that **resources** are sought to directly support participating agencies' involvement in the data commons to support their ability to pull, clean, and verify data to contribute to the data commons.

   - Agencies are also concerned about their data being understood correctly; thus, it will be necessary to consider how data can be shared in a way that it will not be misunderstood or misinterpreted.

- Funding sources sought to establish the data commons should not take away funding opportunities that not-for-profit legal organizations need to fund their services.

4. Establish a **dedicated, full-time team** for developing the data commons with expertise in the following areas:
   - Privacy and access legislation.
   - Technical knowledge of how to access and compile data from multiple data sources.
   - Operational knowledge of the data (including what variables mean, how and when it is collected, and any limitations).
   - User experience with respect to using the data commons for analysis.
   - Organizational and systems experts to engage partners and maintain support and resources for the initiative.

5. Determine the **level of data** that will be targeted by the data commons: aggregate data or microdata that includes personal identifiers. Consider whether to build the data commons using a **phased approach**, focusing first on aggregate data and then moving towards a platform that can accommodate personal data.

   - Focusing on aggregate data may be easier as many organizations are already actively sharing this type of data and a less secure (and, therefore, less costly) platform is needed to house this type of data.

   - Focusing on microdata with personal identifiers will allow for more sophisticated analyses to be completed and may allow data commons users to achieve the type of results in which they are most interested (e.g., long-term outcomes of clients); however, a more secure (and costly) platform would be required to house this type of data due to the security and privacy concerns associated with sharing personal information.

6. Consider initially focusing on **common types of data** (as informed by the environmental scan and key informant interviews) to increase organizations' comfort with, and capacity to, participate in the data commons.

References

Access to Justice British Columbia. (2019). *Access to justice measurement framework*. Access to Justice BC (A2JBC). https://icclr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Access-to-Justice-Measurement-Framework_Final_2017.pdf?x94276#:~:text=A2JBC%20is%20proposing%20a%20measurement,developed%20in%20the%20health%20sector

Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. (2019a). *Measuring access to justice: A survey of approaches and indicators in A2J metrics initiatives*. Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. http://www.justicedevel opmentgoals.ca/sites/default/files/a2j_indicators_report-actioncommittee.pdf

Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. (2013). *Access to civil & family justice: A roadmap for change*. Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. https://www.cfcj-fcjc.org/sites/default/files/docs/2013/ AC_Report_English_Final.pdf

Bodenheimer, T., & Sinsky, C. (2014). From triple to quadruple aim: Care of the patient requires care of the provider. *Annals of Family Medicine, 12*(6), 573-576. doi: 10.1370/afm.1713.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Canadian Bar Association. (2013). *Reaching equal justice report: An invitation to envision and act*. The Canadian Bar Association. https://www.cba.org/CBAMediaLibrary/cba_na/ images/Equal%20Justice%20-%20Microsite/PDFs/EqualJusticeFinalReport-eng.pdf

Canadian Institute for Health Information (2020). *CIHI's annual report, 2019-2020*. Canadian Institute for Health Information. https://www.cihi.ca/sites/default/files/document/cihi-annual-report-2019-2020-en.pdf

Cotter, A. (2015). *Public confidence in Canadian institutions*. Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 89-652-X2015007. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89-652-x/89-652-x2015007-eng.pdf?st=ucOfX9ke

CREATE Justice. (2019a). *Justice data inventory survey report*. Centre for Research, Evaluation, and Action Towards Equal Justice (CREATE Justice), University of Saskatchewan College of Law. https://law.usask.ca/createjustice/documents/justicedatainventory _executivesummary_june2019.pdf

Currie, A. (2009). *The legal problems of everyday life: The nature, extent and consequences of justiciable problems experienced by Canadians*. Department of Justice Canada. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/rr07_la1-rr07_aj1/rr07_la1.pdf

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Farrow, T. C. W., Currie, A., Aylwin, N., Jacobs, L., Northrup, D., & Moore, L. (2016). *Everyday legal problems and the cost of justice in Canada: Overview report*. Canadian Forum on Civil Justice. http://www.cfcj-fcjc.org/sites/default/files/Everyday%20Legal%20Problems%20and%20the%20Cost%20of%20Justice%20in%20Canada%20-%20Overview%20Report.pdf

Hagan, M., Dempsey, J., & Jiménez, J. G. (2019a, April 1). *A data commons for law*. Medium. https://medium.com/legal-design-and-innovation/a-data-commons-for-law-60e4c4ad9340

Hagan, M., Dempsey, J., & Jiménez, J. G. (2019b, April 2). *The key models for a legal data commons*. Medium. https://medium.com/legal-design-and-innovation/a-data-commons-for-law-a8ca365d10fe

Hagan, M., Dempsey, J., & Jiménez, J. G. (2019c, April 3). *How can we build a data commons for law?*. Medium. https://medium.com/legal-design-and-innovation/how-can-we-build-a-data-commons-for-law-165be97adeca

Hseih, H-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288). https://doi/10.1177/1049732305276687

Legal Services Task Team. (2018). *Final report of the Legal Services Task Team*. https://www.lawsociety.sk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/107840-legal_services_task_team_report_august_14-_2018-1.pdf

Lowenberger, B., Heavin, H., McCutcheon, J., & Nelson, M. (2021). Measuring improvements in access to justice: Utilizing an A2J measurement framework for comparative justice data collection and program evaluation across Canada. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice, 37*(2), 337-357. https://doi.org/10.22329/wyaj.v37i1.7281

McCashin, C., Santos, A., & Steele, D. (2018). *Civil and family justice metrics: Towards a framework for Saskatchewan*. Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution, University of Saskatchewan College of Law. https://law.usask.ca/documents/research/deans-forum/CivilandFamilyJusticeMetrics-PolicyDiscussionPaper.pdf

McCashin, C., Santos, A., & Steele, D. (2018). *Follow-up report and summary notes on civil and family justice metrics: Towards a framework for Saskatchewan* . Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution, University of Saskatchewan College of Law. https://law.usask.ca/documents/research/deans-forum/Followup_Report_Summary_Notes-Civil_and_Family_Justice_Metrics2018.pdf

Provincial Court of British Columbia. (2019). Why the BC Provincial Court endorses A2JBC's Triple Aim. https://www.provincialcourt.bc.ca/enews/enews-13-06-2019

Savage, L., & McDonald, S. (2022). *Experiences of serious problems or disputes in the Canadian provinces, 2021.* Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 85-002-X. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00001-eng.pdf?st=icsjGyGw

Shaw, J. A., Sethi, N., & Cassel, C. K. (2020). Social license for the use of big data in the COVID-19 era. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, *3*(1), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00342-y

Social Security Tribunal of Canada. (2021). Access to justice (A2J) framework. https://sst-tss.gc.ca/en/our-work-our-people/access-justice-a2j-framework

Stoliker, B., Jewell, L. M., Lowenberger, B., & Heavin, H. (2023). *Legal needs in Saskatchewan*. Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies, University of Saskatchewan.

Thacker, S. B., Koplan, J. P., Taylor, W. R., Hinman, A. R., Katz, M. F., & Roper, W. L. (1994). Assessing prevention effectiveness using data to drive program decisions. *Public Health Reports, 109*(2), 187-194.

Townend, J., & Wiener, C. (2021). *'Justice system data': A comparative study*. The Legal Education Foundation. https://research.thelegaleducationfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/JS-Data-Report-Jul21-V5-FAW.pdf

World Justice Project. (2019a). *Global insights on access to justice: Findings from the World Justice Project general population poll in 101 countries*. World Justice Project. https://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/documents/WJP-A2J-2019.pdf

World Justice Project. (2019b). *Measuring the justice gap: A people-centered assessment of unmet justice needs around the world*. World Justice Project. https://worldjustice project.org/sites/default/files/documents/WJP_Measuring%20the%20Justice%20Gap_final_20Jun2019_0.pdf

Appendix A: Ethics Certificate

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Behavioural Research Ethics Board (Beh-REB)   20-Jan-2021

Certificate of Approval

Application ID: 2345

Principal Investigator: Lisa Jewell

Department: Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies

Locations Where Research Activities are Conducted: Saskatchewan, Canada

Student(s): Bryce Stoliker

Funder(s): Law Foundation of Saskatchewan
Law Society of Saskatchewan

Sponsor: University of Saskatchewan

Title: Legal Needs in Saskatchewan

Approved On: 20-Jan-2021

Expiry Date: 20-Jan-2022

Approval Of: Behavioural Research Ethics Application

Appendix A: Interview Invitation Letter

Appendix B: Interview Consent Form

Appendix C: Interview Guide

Appendix D: Transcript Release Form

Appendix E: Survey Invitation Letter and 2 Reminder Letters

Appendix F: Legal Needs Assessment Consent Form and Survey (updated)

Acknowledgment Of: Bryce Stoliker TCPS2 Certificate

Review Type: Delegated Review

CERTIFICATION

The University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board (Beh-REB) is constituted and operates in accordance with the current version of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TPCS 2 2018). The University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board has reviewed the above-named project. The proposal was found to be acceptable on ethical grounds. The principal investigator has the responsibility for any other administrative or regulatory approvals that may pertain to this project, and for ensuring that the authorized project is carried out according to the conditions outlined in the original protocol submitted for ethics review. This Certificate of Approval is valid for the above time period provided there is no change in experimental protocol or consent process or documents.

Any significant changes to your proposed method, or your consent and recruitment procedures should be reported to the Chair for Research Ethics Board consideration in advance of its implementation.

ONGOING REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

In order to receive annual renewal, a status report must be submitted to the REB Chair for Board consideration within one month prior to the current expiry date each year the project remains open, and upon project completion. Please refer to the following website for further instructions: https://vpresearch.usask.ca/researchers/forms.php.

Digitally Approved by Stephanie Martin
Vice-Chair, Behavioural Research Ethics Board
University of Saskatchewan

Appendix B: Sampling Frame for the Environmental Scan

Sampling Frame for the Environmental Scan (Review of Annual Reports)

Agency	Annual Report Available Online
Access and Privacy Branch: Services for the Public	No
Agricultural Implements Board	No
Agricultural Operations Review Board	No
Agri-Food Act Appeal Committee	No
Automobile Injury Appeal Commission	Yes
Board of Revenue Commissioners	No
Boiler & Pressure Vessel Safety Appeal Board	No
Community Justice Division: Public Complaints Commission	No
Court Services	No
Employment Standards Division	Yes
Family Justice Services Branch	No
Farmland Security Board	No
Financial and Consumer Affairs	Yes
Joint Medical Professional Review Committee	No
Labour Relations Board	No
Law Reform Commission	No
Legal Aid Saskatchewan	Yes
Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee	Yes
Office of Residential Tenancies	Yes
Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner	Yes
Office of the Sheriff	No
Office of the Worker's Advocate	No
Ombudsman Saskatchewan	Yes
Provincial Mediation Board	Yes
Public and Private Rights Board	Yes
Public Disclosure Committee	Yes
Saskatchewan Building and Accessibility Standards Appeal Board	No
Saskatchewan Housing Corporation	Yes
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	Yes
Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board	Yes
Saskatchewan Municipal Board	Yes
Saskatchewan Police Commission	Yes
Saskatchewan Provincial Court	No
Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission	Yes
Surface Rights Board of Arbitration	No
Workers Compensation Board	Yes

Appendix C: Environmental Scan Data Collection Template

Environmental Scan Data Collection Template

Agency Name
Weblink

Data Source: Annual Report 2021 ([HYPERLINK)](#))

Availability of Annual Reports: YEAR until YEAR

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded

Appendix D: Key Informant Interview Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
College of Law
LAW.USASK.CA

CREATE Justice
Centre for Research, Evaluation,
and Action Towards Equal Justice
Access to Legal Services · Dispute Resolution · Systemic Justice

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Centre for Forensic
Behavioural Science
and Justice Studies
USASK.CA/CFBSJS

Consent Form for Legal Data Scan Interviews

Project Title:

Legal Needs in Saskatchewan

Researchers:

Dr. Lisa Jewell Research Associate, Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies, University of Saskatchewan lisa.jewell@usask.ca 306-966-2707	**Heather Heavin** Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, College of Law, University of Saskatchewan heather.heavin@usask.ca 306-966-5880	**Brea Lowenberger** Director, CREATE Justice and Access to Justice Coordinator, University of Saskatchewan b.lowenberger@usask.ca 306-966-8635	**Dr. Bryce Stoliker** Postdoctoral Fellow, Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies, University of Saskatchewan bryce.stoliker@usask.ca 226-280-1966

Purpose and Objective of the Research:
The overall purpose of this research is to increase access to justice by identifying legal needs and gaps in Saskatchewan, especially with respect to family and civil law. In this study, a data scan is being conducted to develop a better understanding of the types of legal data that are being collected by organizations within the province that speak to met and unmet legal needs. As part of this scan, the extent to which this data can be accessed and utilized by other justice stakeholders will be examined to determine how this data can be used more broadly to identify legal needs and gaps, inform service delivery, improve the justice system and, potentially, establish a data commons. This data scan is part of a broader study intended to address the deficit of Saskatchewan-specific data related to met and unmet legal needs in the province.

Procedures:
You are invited to participate in an interview. If your organization collects legal data, we will ask questions to explore the types of data that your agency collects, as well other details related to data collection, such as how often the data is collected, the format it is collected in, whether the data is accessible to external parties for analysis and, if so, the process that is required to share this data with external parties. We will also ask your thoughts on establishing a data commons in Saskatchewan. If your organization has been involved in a data commons-related initiative, we will ask questions about that initiative, including its governance structure, steps taken to establish the initiative, technical aspects of the initiative, and any positive or negative impacts associated with the initiative.

- The interview will take approximately 60 minutes and will be conducted over Zoom (an online platform) or telephone, depending on your preference.

- The interview will take place in a private location at the researcher's home or office and individuals from outside the research team will not be present during the interview. We recommend that you also find a private location for the interview to ensure that others cannot hear your responses to the interview questions.

- With your permission, the interview will be recorded via Zoom or, if conducted by phone, by a digital audio-recorder to ensure that the information you provide is accurately recorded. You can ask for the recording to be stopped at anytime without giving a reason. If you do not give permission to the recording, detailed notes will be taken instead.

- Following the interview, the recording will be transcribed by the research team and destroyed once the transcripts have been reviewed for completeness and accuracy.

- After your interview, and prior to the data being included in the final report, you will be given the opportunity to review the transcript of your interview, and to add, alter, or delete information from the transcript as you see fit. You will have <u>two weeks</u> to review your transcript. If we have not heard back from you after two weeks, we will use the transcript we sent you "as is" when we analyze the data.

Please feel free to ask any questions regarding the procedures and goals of the study or your role.

<u>Funded by:</u>
This study is funded by the Law Foundation of Saskatchewan and the Law Society of Saskatchewan.

<u>Potential Risks:</u>
There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to withdraw at any time. If we ask any question that makes you feel anxious or uncomfortable, you have the option of not answering it.

<u>Potential Benefits:</u>
By participating in the study, you will contribute to furthering our understanding of the types of data on met and unmet legal needs collected within Saskatchewan. Based on this research, recommendations about data sources that can be pursued for analysis in the future; strategies for cleaning, cross-referencing, and aggregating datasets; and the infrastructure and processes required to create a justice data commons can be developed.

<u>Compensation</u>*:*
We will not pay you for the time you take to be in this study.

<u>Confidentiality:</u>
Your interview responses will be kept completely confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside the research team. You will not be identified by name in any reports, publications, fact sheets, and presentations that result from this study— a pseudonym will be

used to protect your identity and the data will be reported in aggregate form so that it will not be possible to directly identify individuals. Moreover, the consent forms will be stored separately from the data so that it will not be possible to associate a name with any given set of responses. Similarly, a master-list linking your identity to a pseudonym will be stored separately from the interview data and consent forms. However, due to the small number of people being interviewed for this study, there is a chance you could be indirectly identified because of the unique information or perspective you provide.

Please let us know if you permit us to audio record this interview and if you would like to review a copy of your transcript (put a check mark in the box if permission is provided):

I grant permission to be audio recorded

I would like to review a copy of my transcript.

I wish to be identified as _____ (pseudonym) in the communication of this research.

Storage of Data:
Data will be stored securely at the University of Saskatchewan either on a secure network drive or in a locked filing cabinet. If the data is collected while the researchers are working remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all electronic data will be stored securely on the University of Saskatchewan's OneDrive cloud storage service and will only be accessible to the research team. All electronic devices used in the researchers' homes are secure, password-protected devices that are not accessible to other individuals living in the home. In addition, any paper-based data will be stored in locked filing cabinets in the researchers' homes that are not accessible to others living in the home. The data and master-list will be stored for five years post-publication; at that time, they will be destroyed permanently and beyond recovery. The Principal Investigator, Dr. Lisa Jewell, is responsible for the storage of the data.

Right to Withdraw:
Your participation is voluntary and you can answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. You may withdraw from the research project for any reason, at any time, without explanation or penalty of any sort. Should you wish to withdraw, we will terminate the interview and your data will be deleted from the research project and destroyed.

Your right to withdraw data from the study will apply until results have been disseminated by way of a written report, which is anticipated to occur by March 31, 2022. After this date, it is possible that some form of dissemination will have already occurred and it may not be possible to withdraw your data.

Your organization will not be informed about whether you have completed or withdrawn from the study. Whether you choose to participate or not will have no effect on your employment or how you will be treated.

Follow up:
A summary of the results of this study will be posted on: 1) the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies' website: https://cfbsjs.usask.ca/; and 2) CREATE Justice's website:

https://law.usask.ca/createjustice/. The results will be available in May 2022. The results of this study will also be reported in an academic journal article.

Questions or Concerns:

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the researcher(s) using the information at the top of page 1. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to that committee through the Research Ethics Office: ethics.office@usask.ca; 306-966-2975; out of town participants may call toll free 1-888-966-2975.

Oral Consent:

I read and explained this consent form to the participant before receiving the participant's consent, and the participant had knowledge of its contents and appeared to understand it.

Name of Participant	*Researcher's Signature*	*Date*

Appendix E: Key Informant Interview Guides

Interview Guide for the Legal Data Scan—Data Collection by Agencies with a Vested Interested in Access to Justice

This interview is a part of a scan of existing data sources within Saskatchewan that contain data related to legal gaps/needs that exist in the province. The purpose of the scan is to: a) develop a better understanding of the type of data that is already being collected within the province by various organizations (e.g., government, pro bono groups, legal education groups, and Courts); and b) determine the accessibility and usability of that data in terms of identifying gaps in the justice system, informing service delivery, and improving the justice system.

Background and Data Collection

1. Can you tell me about your role in your agency as it relates to data (including data collection, analysis, or utilization)?
    a) How long have you been in this role?

2. Can you tell me about the role that data collection plays in your agency?

3. What type of data does your agency collect? How does this data relate to justice-related problems in Saskatchewan?

    a) [If annual report is available] Does your agency collect data that does not appear in your annual report? Can you describe what additional data your agency collects?

    b) How does your agency collect those data?

    c) In what format is the data stored in your agency?

    d) How frequently does your agency collect those data?

    e) How is data used by your agency?

4. Can you describe any policies that your organization has related to:
    a) Data collection?
    b) Data analysis?
    c) Data sharing?

5. Has your organization been involved in any initiatives to share data (e.g., through research, government-based evaluations, a data warehouse/portal/commons)?
    [IF Yes]
    a) Can you briefly describe the initiative(s)?
    b) What worked well? What challenges were encountered?

[IF No]
  c) Are the data collected by your agency accessible to external parties (e.g., USask) for analysis (e.g., through data sharing agreements)?

If Data Sharing is Possible

6. Can you describe the process that would be required to share your data for analysis (e.g., with researchers at USask)?

7. What challenges have you previously encountered when sharing data?
  a) Are there any legal or procedural barriers that may affect the process of accessing data collected by your organization?
  b) Are there any perceived challenges or fears that affect your organization's willingness to share data?

8. What can help facilitate data sharing with your organization?

9. Are there any challenges that may affect how easy it is to use the data collected by your agency (e.g., the format that the data is stored, excessive amount of data available, etc.)?

If Data Sharing is Not Possible

10. What contributes to your organization's decision to not share data with external parties? What prevents your organization from sharing data with external parties?
  a) What concerns or reservations does your organization have about sharing data with external parties?

11. What could help facilitate data sharing with your organization in the future?

Data Commons

12. What are your thoughts on developing a data commons in Saskatchewan? *A data commons is a centralized system for data collection, management, and sharing. It would serve as a secure repository for integrating and linking data and information collected by varying agencies (e.g., courts, government agencies, legal and non-legal service providers, etc.)*
  a) What would be the potential benefits of creating a data commons?

  b) What would be the barriers and challenges to creating such a data commons?

  c) What type of data would be most useful to make available through a data commons for your organization?

13. What is your organization's level of readiness for participating in a data commons?
  a) Would your organization be interested in participating in a Saskatchewan justice data commons?

b) What type of supports or resources would be required to facilitate your organization's involvement in a data commons? What advice would you offer for establishing a data commons in Saskatchewan?

14. Is there anything else that you would like to mention that we haven't already talked about?

Interview Guide for the Legal Data Scan—Data Portal/Warehouse Initiatives

This interview is a part of study intended to develop an understanding of the availability, accessibility, and usability of existing data related to legal gaps/needs in Saskatchewan for the purpose of improving access to justice initiatives. Ultimately, we are conducting this research to establish a foundation for creating a justice data commons in Saskatchewan and would like to learn from other agencies in the province that have undertaken similar initiatives to inform this work.

1. Can you tell me about your role in the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?
    a) How long have you been in this role?

2. Can you tell me about your [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?
    a) What is the purpose of the initiative?

3. Can you describe the stakeholders involved in the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?
    a) Who are the stakeholders involved? Are they internal or external to your organization?
    b) How did you engage the stakeholders in the [data warehouse/data portal]?
    c) Are stakeholders who contribute data to the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative actively engaged in developing and maintaining the [data warehouse/data portal]?

4. What is the governance structure of the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?

5. What steps were taken to establish the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?
    a) What challenges or barriers were encountered when establishing the [data warehouse/data portal]?

    b) What helped facilitate the establishment of the [data warehouse/data portal]?

    c) What skillsets were needed among those involved in establishing the [data warehouse/data portal]?

    d) What policies, if any, were developed to support the [data warehouse/data portal]?

6. Can you describe the technical aspects of the [data warehouse/data portal]?
    a) Where are data housed?
    b) What type of data are shared?
    c) Who contributes data for inclusion in the [data warehouse/data portal]?
    d) How is data shared?
    e) How is data linked within the [data warehouse/data portal]?
    f) How is the privacy and security of the data protected?
    g) Who is responsible for data storage?
    h) Who can access the data?
    i) How are data accessed?

j) What costs are associated with obtaining, cleaning, storing, and accessing the data handled?

k) What costs are associated with technology and infrastructure for the [data warehouse/data portal] initiative?

7. How has the [data warehouse/data portal] positively or negatively impacted those involved in the initiative?

a) In what ways, if any, has the [data warehouse/data portal] benefited those involved in the initiative? Please describe.

b) In what ways, if any, has the [data warehouse/data portal initiative] negatively affected those involved in the initiative? Please describe.

8. What advice would you give to other groups who want to establish a [data warehouse/data portal]?

9. Is there anything else that you would like to mention that we haven't already talked about?

Appendix F: Environmental Scan of Annual Reports

F.1. Saskatchewan Government-Affiliated Organizations

Automobile Injury Appeal Commission
https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/automobile-injury-appeal-commission

Data Source: Ministries of Justice and Attorney General and Corrections, Policing, and Public Safety Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2012-13 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
File Information	# of files opened	2020-21
	# of final decisions issued • #/% of final decisions issued within 60 days of the hearing concluded/last evidence filed	2020-21
	Average # of years from file opening until written decision issued	2020-21 2019-20
	# of on-the-record hearings	2020-21
	# of fee waivers approved	2020-21
	# of mediations with resolved appeal	2020-21
	# of mediations in queue for scheduling	2020-21
No-Fault Appeal Statistics	Comparative activity levels • Appeal files opened • Appeal files closed prior to hearing • Hearings held • Decisions issued	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18

	Status of appeal files opened in a particular year
	• Appeal files opened
	  o Less closed prior to hearing
	  o Less decision issued
	• Outstanding
		2020-21
		2019-20
		2018-19
		2017-18

Employment Standards Division

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/business/employment-standards/complaints-investigations-enforcement-and-fines/enforcement-outcomes-and-statistics

Data Source: Prosecutions Outcomes and Statistics Online Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2013-14 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Employment Standards Prosecutions Statistics	# of prosecutions initiated, convictions, acquittals, and total penalties ($)	2020-21 to 2010-11
Outcomes by Year	Employer (Company name), Conviction Date, Fine, Violation	2020-21 to 2013-14

Financial and Consumer Affairs
https://fcaa.gov.sk.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2010-11 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Performance Measures	Effectiveness of the FCAA as a Regulator, % agreement that: • FCAA's assessment criteria for approving applications and renewals are clear • FCAA clearly describes ongoing compliance requirements • FCAA's processing time for approving applications or renewals is reasonable • FCAA keeps me well informed of regulatory changes and other information I need to conduct business	2020-21
	Build Employee Engagement • % employee agreement	2020-21
	Learning and Training Opportunities • % of employees	2020-21
	Variance from Operational Budget • % over budget	2020-21
Client Service Standards	Consumer credit • # of licensing applications reviewed	2020-21
	Insurance and Real estate • # of licensing applications reviewed	2020-21
	Pension • # of applications for plan registration	2020-21
	Securities • # of registration submissions reviewed • # of long form prospectuses reviewed • # of short form prospectuses reviewed	2020-21
	Consumer Protection • # of telephone inquires • # of licensing applications reviewed	2020-21
Consumer Credit Division	# of licenses/registration in force by category	2020-21 2019-20
	# of complaints and investigations	2020-21 2019-20
	# of enforcement actions	2020-21 2019-20

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Consumer Protection Division	# of licenses/registration in force by category	2020-21 2019-20
	# of complaints and investigations	2020-21 2019-20
	# of enforcement actions	2020-21 2019-20
Insurance and Real Estate Division	# of licenses/registration in force by category	2020-21 2019-20
	# of complaints and investigations	2020-21 2019-20
	# of enforcement actions	2020-21 2019-20
Pension Division	# of plans supervised	2020-21 2019-20
	# of members in plans supervised	2020-21 2019-20
	# of complaints and investigations	2020-21 2019-20
	# of enforcement actions	2020-21 2019-20
Securities Division	# of registration in force	2020-21 2019-20
	# of receipts for prospectuses	2020-21 2019-20
	# of reporting issuers in SK	2020-21 2019-20
	# of complaints and investigations	2020-21 2019-20
	# of enforcement actions	2020-21 2019-20
Communication	# of public education campaigns	2020-21 2019-20
	# of consumer/investor alerts	2020-21 2019-20
	# of Facebook reach	2020-21 2019-20
	# of Twitter reach	2020-21 2019-20
	# of website visitors	2020-21 2019-20

Legal Aid Saskatchewan

https://legalaid.sk.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2015-16 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
LAS Employment Profile	#/type of staff	2020-21
	# of offices	2020-21
	# of staff who are Indigenous, have disabilities, women (including women in management), visible minorities	2020-21
	Employee engagement score – extent to which benchmark is met	2012 2015
	95% of lawyers with caseloads and time reporting within the accepted range – extent to which benchmark is met	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% of positions that carried a reasonable workload and worked a reasonable number of hours for the year	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Average number of sick days (by lawyers, legal assistants, admin staff, out of scope)	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Clients Served	# of applications	2020-21
	% of clients by gender + Indigenous, type of service, age	2020-21
	% of clients by marital status	2020-21
	% of clients by dependents	2020-21
Client Service Standards	90% of clients seen within 3 weeks for full-service representation– extent to which benchmark is met (%)	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	100% of online application that receive a response in 2 days– extent to which benchmark is met (%)	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	95% of complaints that receive a response within 2 weeks–extent to which benchmark is met (%)	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% of legal matters completed (%)	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% of applications approved on the same day or within same day of service data • By criminal, family, duty counsel service, or therapeutic service	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Avg. # of calendar days to assign a file to a lawyer after applicant is determined to be eligible • By criminal, family, duty counsel service, or therapeutic service	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% of calls to Application Centre answered within 2.5 minutes	2020-21 2019-20
	% of applications by phone and online	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19
Activity Measures	# of charges/average per Application • full-service criminal files • duty counsel service files	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17 2015-16
	# of new full-service files opened by area offices • by staff / private bar	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19
	# of new opened files by lawyer/legal director FTE	2020-21 5-year avg
	# of files opened by area office by area of law • criminal adult, criminal youth, duty counsel adult, duty counsel youth, therapeutic courts, family, and child apprehension	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 5-year avg
	# of files closed by area office and area of law	2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	• criminal adult, criminal youth, duty counsel adult, duty counsel youth, therapeutic courts, family, and child apprehension	5-year avg
	% of duty counsel service files concluded by guilty plea	2020-21
	# files opened/closed by area office and duty counsel advice and summary advice	2020-21 5-year avg
	# of appeals • by area of law	2020-21
	# of Supreme Court of Canada and Saskatchewan Court appeal files	2020-21
Professional Development by Lawyers	Avg. hours spent on professional development	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Criminal Files / Child & Spousal Orders	% of all criminal files in SK with Legal Aid representation	TBD
	# of new or variation orders secured for child or spousal support	2020-21
	Total amount ($) of child and spousal orders secured	2020-21

Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/office-of-the-public-guardian-and-trustee

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 1999-2000 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Service Provided	# of clients services provided by service/client type	2020-21
	% files where supervisory reviews shows quality service to clients	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18
Estate Service Unit	% beneficiaries who received average, above average, or excellent service from the Estate Unit – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files closed within 3 years of being opened – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% estates where Letters of Administration were issued within six months – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files where tax return data of death is completed within nine months of appointment – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Children and Youth Services Unit	% files where a child's account is released within five days of receipt of a signed release – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files where payments are made within five days of receipt of the request – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	% clients and parents who received average, above average, or excellent service from the Children and Youth Services Unit – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files where a Certificate of No Infants is issued within five days of receipt of all required information – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Adult Services Unit	% personal representatives who received average, above average, or excellent service – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files where an acknowledgement is signed within 90 days from the date the Certificate of Incapacity is Received – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% files where the request for an investigation or inventory is made within 30 days from the date that an Acknowledgement is signed – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% annual accountings of property guardians that have been reviewed within 10 days of receipt – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% of new adult clients where case plan is completed within nine months of the date the Acknowledgement is signed – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Accounting and Administration Unit	Average # of days to process invoices and expenses – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20
	# of payments processed by EFT – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	Difference between the 4-year average rate of return on client assets invested by the PGT and the benchmark identified in the investment policy	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Average number of days to set up clients' assets following an initial investigation – target and actual performance	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18

Office of Residential Tenancies

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/office-of-residential-tenancies

Data Source: Ministries of Justice and Attorney General and Corrections, Policing, and Public Safety Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2012-13 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Applications	# of total applications received	2020-21
	# of landlord applications	2019-20
	# of tenant applications	2018-19
	Revenue ($)	2017-18
		2016-17
Inquiries	# of inquiries • In-person • Email (received and sent) • Phone (inbound and outbound) • Fax (phased out in 2019-20) • Total	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19

Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner
https://oipc.sk.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2003-04 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Extent to which benchmark goals are achieved	Manage the increasing caseload so that citizens obtain the results in a reasonable period of time – target and actual performance	2020-21
	Resolve a matter by early resolution within 30 calendar days – target and actual performance	2020-21
	Issue a report or resolve a matter on review of an access request within 130 calendar days – target and actual performance	2020-21
	Issue a report or resolve a matter regarding a breach of privacy within 130 calendar days – target and actual performance	2020-21
	Complete or close a consultation file within 30 calendar days – target and actual performance	2020-21
	Respond to an application to disregard within 20 calendar days – target and actual performance	2020-21
Files and Reports	# of files opened	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	#/% of types of files opened • Consultations • Disregards • Investigations • Reviews	2020-21
	# of files closed	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	% resolution of files by: • Went to report • Consultations • Informally resolved • Early resolution • Not proceeded with	2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	# of reports issued	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Compliance with Recommendations	% of reports with: • Full compliance • Partial compliance • No compliance • No response • Application to disregard approval • Application to disregard denied	2020-21
	No compliance by: • Government institution, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with • Local Authority, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with • Trustee, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with	2020-21
	Partial Compliance by: • Government institution, report #, recommendation(s) not or partially complied with • Local Authority, report #, recommendation(s) not or partially complied with • Trustee, report #, recommendation(s) not or partially complied with	2020-21
	No response received by: • Government institution, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with • Local Authority, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with • Trustee, report #, recommendation(s) not complied with	2020-21
Response Times	# of days to issue a report or achieve resolution	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
Summary advice	# of summary advice provided	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
		2016-17
	% of advice given in relation to statutes • FOIP • LA FOIP • HIPA • General • Non-jurisdictional and private sector • Process-related	2020-21

Ombudsman Saskatchewan
https://ombudsman.sk.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2000 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Complaints	# of complaints (total)	2020
	# of complaints from organizations within their jurisdiction	2020
	# of complaints related to COVID-19	2020
	# of complaints by Sector, including # related to covid-19 • Corrections • Social Services • Health • Municipalities	2020 2019
Corrections	# of complaints received by correctional centre	2020 2019 2018
Social Services	# of complaints received by program delivery area	2020 2019 2018
Municipalities	# of complaints received by community type (cities, towns, etc.)	2020 2019 2018
Health	# of complaints received by health organization	2020 2019 2018
Crown Corporations	# of complaints received by crown corporation	2020 2019 2018
Other Ministries and Entities	# of complaints received by other ministries, boards, commissions, and agencies and other organizations	2020 2019 2018
Complaints by Region	# of complaints by regions and larger cities, and other locations (e.g., correctional centres, out of province, unknown)	2020
How complaints were received	# of complaints by letters, emails, internet forms, walk-ins, phone calls	2020
Complaints received outside jurisdiction	# of complaints received outside jurisdiction by topic	2020
Complaint Outcomes	# of complaint outcomes	2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	• Initial support • Resolved • Recommendation made • No further action	
	Time to process cases – target and actual • Files closed within 90 days • Files closed within 180 days	2020

Provincial Mediation Board

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/provincial-mediation-board

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2012-13 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Files	# of debt repayment files opened	2020-21
		2019-20
	# of debt repayment files active at year end	201-19
	Debt payments received from debtors ($)	2017-18
	Administrative levy on debt payments ($)	2016-17
	# of notices of mortgage foreclosure / cancellation of agreement more sale	
	# of tax enforcement files opened	
	Tax enforcement fees ($)	
	# of Landlord and Tenant Act Applications	
Inquiries	# of inquiries	2020-21
	• In-person	2019-20
	• Email	2018-19
	• Phone	
	• Fax (phased out in 2019-20)	
	• Letters sent	
	• Total	

Public and Private Rights Board

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/public-and-private-rights-board

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2003 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Number and Nature of Claims Negotiated in 2020	# carried forward from 2019 • route, situation, or design • compensation • subtotal	2020
	# of new claims received in 2020 • route, situation, or design • compensation • subtotal	2020
Number and Nature of Claims Completed in 2020	# claims completed in 2020 • route, situation, or design • compensation • total	2020
Number and Nature of Claims Carried Forward in 2021	# claims carried forward into 2021 • route, situation, or design • compensation • total	2020
Number and Nature of Claims Received by the Board in 2020 (by Expropriating Authority)	# of claims received by expropriating authority (SaskTel, SaskEnergy, SaskPower, Ministry of Highways, Miscellaneous) by • route, situation, or design • compensation • total	2020
Number and Nature of Claims Completed by the Board in 2020 (by Expropriating Authority)	# of claims completed by expropriating authority (SaskTel, SaskEnergy, SaskPower, Ministry of Highways, Miscellaneous) by • negotiated successfully • negotiated unsuccessfully • withdrawn • total	2020
Number and Nature of Claims Received by the Board from 2010 to 2020	# of claims received by • route, situation, or design • compensation • total	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2015

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
		2014
		2013
		2012
		2011
		2010
Number and Nature of Claims Received by the Board in 2020 (by Expropriating Authority)	# of claims received by expropriating authority • Conservation and Development Area Authorities • SaskTel • SaskEnergy • SaskPower • Ministry of Highways • Miscellaneous	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2015 2014 2013 2012 2011 2010

Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner
https://ombudsman.sk.ca/pidc/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2012-13 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Files from Saskatchewan Health Authority (SHA)	# of inquiries, disclosures, and complaints of reprisals from SHA	2020

Inquiries and Disclosures	# of files received
	• Inquiries
	    o Within jurisdiction
	    o Outside jurisdiction
	• Total inquiries
	• Disclosures/complaints of reprisal
		2020
		2019
		2018

Saskatchewan Housing Corporation

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/crown-corporations/saskatchewan-housing-corporation

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2015 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Programs and Services	# of organizations (local housing authorities and non-profit groups) with managing operating agreements with Saskatchewan Housing Corporation (SHC)	2020
	# of units of SHC-own rental housing portfolio	
	# of units (rental units and special purpose housing units) owned and operated by non-profit groups and cooperatives	2020
	% distribution of households in the portfolio (seniors, families, special purpose, singles)	2020
Rental Development	Amount of funds allocated to SHC's affordable rental development programs ($)	2020
Saskatchewan Home Repair Programs	Amount of funds allocated to repairs ($)	2020
	# of homes repaired across the province	2020
Housing Support for the North	# of rental houses in the north (including in La Loche and through the Methy Housing Corporation)	2020
	# of properties sold in Sandy Bay to Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation	2020
	# of multi-agency staff housing units completed in La Loche	2020
	Amount of funds invested to develop on new rental units ($)	2020
	Amount of fund invested to repair 7 homeowner units ($)	2020
Supporting Government of Saskatchewan Strategies	# of accessible units owned that allow people who use walkers or wheelchairs to enter the building or unit	2020
	# of accessible units owned that allow individuals who are wheelchair users to live comfortably in the unit	2020
Supporting Affordable Homeownership	Amount of funds provided through federal/provincial National Housing Strategy ($)	2020
	# of units to be constructed	2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	# of communities in which units are to be constructed	2020
Partnerships to Develop New Group Home Spaces	# of group homes completed/under construction	2020
	# of group homes undergoing renovation	2020
New Partnerships for Innovative Solutions to Housing Need	# of units rented to clients transitioning from acute care to more permanent housing	2020
	# and type of partnerships to develop innovative solutions	2020
Expenditures	Total amount of expenditures ($)	2020 2019
	% of expenditures by category (operating, grants and subsidies, amortization, interest, and other)	2020
	Costs of operating the rental portfolio ($)	2020 2019
	Costs by each element ($) • Maintenance and renovation expenditures • Utilities expenditures • Grants in lieu of property taxes • Other operation expenditures	2020 2019
	Amount of grants and subsidies ($), including: • Total expenditures • Grants under affordable housing programs • Subsidy assistance to non-profit and co-operative housing providers • Recoveries under the Graduate Retention program – First Home Plan	2020 2019
Revenues	Total Revenue ($)	2020 2019
	% of revenues by category: • Clients • Federal • Provincial • Municipal and other	2020
	Amount of federal contributions ($)	2020 2019
	Amount of provincial contributions ($)	2020 2019
	Gains on disposal of properties, interest income and other contributions (including municipal contributions) ($)	2020 2019
	Worth of investment in properties, including # of units and replacement value ($)	2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	Amount invested in new properties	2020
Key Financial Operating Results	Total Revenues ($) • Rent, interest, other income and contributions • Recognized provincial contributions • Recognized federal contributions	2021 (Forecast) 2020 2019 2018 2017
	Total Expenses ($) • Operating costs and other charges • Grands and Subsidies • Amortization • Interest	
	Net Operations ($)	

Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission
https://saskatchewanhumanrights.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2003-04 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Complaints	# of new complaints received	2020-21
	# of complaints formalized	2020-21
	# of inquiries	2020-21
	% of formalized complaints alleging sexual harassment	2020-21
	# of disability-related complaints formalized	2020-21
	# of files closed in 2020-21	2020-21
	# of business line inquiries	2020-21
	% of formalized complaints alleging discrimination based on sex/pregnancy	2020-21
	Summary of complaints formalized by Grounds and Category	2020-21
	# of files opened/closed	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	# of business line inquiries	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18
Social Media Engagement	# of page views on Commissions website	2020-21
	# of people reached via the Commission's Facebook account	2020-21
	% increase in Instagram followers	2020-21
	# of views of the COVID-19 and Human Rights sections on the Commission website	2020-21
	# of visits to the Commission's website	2020-21
	% increase in Facebook followers	2020-21
	% increase in Twitter followers	2020-21

Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board
http://www.sasklabourrelationsboard.com/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 1991-92 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Applications Filed	# of applications filed by • Matter type • Total Part VI • Total: Part VI (Essential Services) • Parts II, III, IV, V • Total Parts II, III, IV, V • Grand Total: Parts II, III, IV, V, VI	2020-21 2019-20 201-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Average # of days for certification votes • Date of application to direction for vote • Date of direction for vote to certification • Date of application to certification	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Average # of days from application order by fiscal year, certification, rescission, and total average • Each fiscal year	2020-21 2019-20 201-19 2017-18 2016-17 2015-16 2014-15 2013-14 2012-13 2011-12
	# of type of applications	2020-21
	# of applications by disposition	2020-21
	# of applications by disposition: Part VI	2020-21
	# of all applications filed with Board • LRB file no., date filed, issued, applicant, respondent	2020-21
	Appeals of adjudicator's decisions: Part IV • LRB file no., date filed, issued, applicant, respondent	2020-21
	Applications to appoint an adjudicator: employment standards, Part II • LRB file no., date filed, issued, applicant, respondent	2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	Applications to appoint an adjudicator: occupational health and safety, Part III • LRB file no., date filed, issued, applicant, respondent	2020-21
	Decisions rendered final • LRB file no., date filed, matter type, applicant, respondent, status, date first heard, date last heard, day concluded, total days to decision, decisions/order, # of reasons, char/vice, Panel 1, Panel 2, Direction for Vote, Chair/Vice	2020-21
	Matter ordered in fiscal year 2019-20, but reasons for decision issued in 2020-21 • LRB file no., date filed, matter type, applicant, respondent, status, date first heard, date last heard, day concluded, total days to decision, decisions/order, # of reasons, char/vice, Panel 1, Panel 2, Direction for Vote, Chair/Vice	2020-21
	Summary of decisions rendered, final, and interim	2020-21
	Number of certifications and total applications filed by fiscal year	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17

Saskatchewan Municipal Board

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/saskatchewan-municipal-board

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2013 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Stakeholder Satisfaction	% of stakeholders satisfied/unsatisfied	2020
Issuing of Decisions	#/avg/highest number of days to release decision	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
Issuing of Approvals for Local Government Committee applications	# of applications completed /avg turnaround time (days)	2020 2019
	Avg turnaround time (days)	2018 2017 2016
Local Government Committee Activity	% type of applications approved	2020
	# of each type of applications approved • Water & sewer • Other • Local improvement • Local authorization • Debt limit • Debenture • Bylaw	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	% of applications received by Local Authority Type (towns, villages, rural municipalities, resort villages, other)	2020
	Debt limit	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
Appeals Activity	# of appeals received by type	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	# of assessment appeals received in year 1, 2, 3, 4	2017 projection

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Assessment Appeals Committee (AAC) Activity		2013 2009
	AAC appeals: quarter received, and total # of appeals	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	% of AAC appeals received by municipality	2020
Planning Appeals Committee (PAC) Activity	PAC appeals caseload overview • # received, invalid, withdrawn, decided, to be heard, heard decision pending	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
Road Maintenance Agreement Committee (RMAC) Activity	RMAC agreements caseload overview • # received, invalid, no jurisdiction, withdrawn, awaiting information, decided	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
Board of Revenue Commissioners (BRC) Activity	BRC appeals caseload overview • # received, invalid, withdrawn, decided, to be heard	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	#/$ of cancellations, write-offs and totals	
Summary of Matters Appealed to Court of Appeal or Court of Queen's Bench	# of appeals at Court of Appeal by status, AAC, and PAC	2020

Saskatchewan Police Commission

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/saskatchewan-police-commission

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2001-02 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Meetings	# of meetings held	2020-21
	# of matters addressed by email	2020-21
Appeals to the Commission	# of appeals	2020-21
Regulations	# of regulatory amendments made in 2020-21	2020-21
Audits and Reviews	# of audits and reviews completed and/or in progress	2020-21
Police Services	List of cities, towns, and villages policed by municipal/First Nations police • # of sworn officers authorized • # of sworn officers actual • population • police ratio to population	2020-21
	# of firearms discharged involving municipal/First Nations police	2020-21
	# of firearms discharged involving RCMP	2020-21
	# of conducted energy weapons used by municipal/First Nations police	2020-21
Disposition of Police Discipline Files	# of police discipline files concluded by police service and outcome (no offence against discipline, non-disciplinary disposition, member resigned or retired, remedial action ordered, formal discipline, member dismissed from service)	2020-21

Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission

https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/government-structure/boards-commissions-and-agencies/saskatchewan-public-complaints-commission

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2006-07 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Complaints	Number of complaint files opened by police service	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18
	% of complaint files completed within given timeframes • 0-30 days • 31-60 • 31-90 • 91-120 • 121-150 • 151-180 • Over 180 • Pending	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18
	Findings of complaints received by police service: # of substantiated, unsubstantiated, unfounded, withdrawn/other, s.45(5), informal resolution, service/policy, not yet completed, total.	2020-21
	Classification of substantiated and unsubstantiated complaints by: • police service, # substantiated, and description	2020-21
	Complaint findings • % substantiated, unsubstantiated, unfounded, withdrawn/other, s.45(5), informal resolution, service/policy, not yet completed	2020-21
	Revised complaint findings • % substantiated, unsubstantiated, unfounded, withdrawn/other, s.45(5), informal resolution, service/policy, not yet completed	2019-20
	Five Year comparative complaint findings statistics • # substantiated, unsubstantiated, unfounded, withdrawn/other, s.45(5), informal resolution, service/policy, not yet completed	2020-21 2019-20 2018-19 2017-18 2016-17
	Incidents received by source: • % by website, police service, in person, mail, fax, other, email, telephone, FSIN-SI, Board, RCMP	2020-19 2019-20 2018-19

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	Types of complaint received by Police Service: • # of discreditable conduct, neglect of duty, insubordination, improper disclosure of information, corrupt practice, abuse of authority, improper use of firearms, damage to police property, improper wearing of uniform, misuse of liquor/drugs, criminal conduct, other, not yet completed	2020-21

Workers Compensation Board

https://www.wcbsask.com/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2010 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Board Appeal Tribunal	# of hearings held	2020
	# of decisions issued	2020
	Appeals activity • # of appeals received • #accepted • # denied • # of total appeals decided • # of appeals withdrawn • # of appeals pending • Avg # of days to decision • # of hearings	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	Source of Appeals (#) • Worker's advocate • Worker • Employer • Other representative • Lawyer • Union Official • Family	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
	Nature of appeals decided by total/accepted (#)	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016
Appeals Department	# of prior year's pending	2020 2019
	# of appeals registered	2018
	# of total Appeals	2017
	# accepted	2016
	# denied	
	# returned for development	
	# subtotal completed	
	# withdrawn	
	# appeals pending	
	Avg. days to decision	
	% of appeals decided within 30 days	

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	% of appeals decided within 45 days	
	# of appeal meetings	
Fair Practices Office	# of new inquiries received	2020
	# of new inquiries resolved	2019
	How inquiries were resolved (#) • Completed by FPO without referral • Called the WCB for clarification • Referral to the WCB for review • Referred to outside entity	2018 2017 2016
	Outcomes of referrals to WCB • # of decisions changed • # of new action taken • # reviewed but no change	
	Source of new inquiries (#/%) • Worker • Employer • Other	
	Purpose of Inquiry • Decision/decision-making process • Communication/services • Timeliness • General information • Other	
	Response time to close new inquiries (% of inquiries) • 0-7 days • 8-30 days • Over 30 days	

F.2. Legal Not-for-Profit Organizations

CLASSIC
http://www.classiclaw.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2007-08 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Organization Characteristics	# of staff	2020-21
	# of programs offered	2020-21
	# of phone calls	2020-21
	# of students trained	2020 - cumulative
	# of hours of student education	2020 - cumulative
	# of clients served	2020 - cumulative
Walk-In Advocacy Clinic	# of clients served	2020-21
	# of applications received	
	# of files opened	
	# of files carried over from last fiscal year	
	# of applications denied	
	% of applications denied due to capacity	
	Areas of law clients needed (%)	
Walk-In Advocacy Clinic Client Demographics	% of clients identifying as Indigenous	2020-21
	# of clients identifying as Immigrant/refugee, Indigenous, Métis, non-Indigenous, Other	
	% of clients < 40 years	
	% of clients male, female, or who did not identify as male/female	
	Cost of services obtained/retained for clients ($)	
Legal Advice Clinic	# of clients receiving advice on family, criminal, civil, and immigration/refugee law	2020-21
	# of volunteers	
Student Training and Education Program (STEP)	# of independent directed research projects	2020-21
	# of projects in partnerships with Law 433.3 Sallows Seminar in Human Rights	
	# of paid, part-time students	
	# of social work practicum students	
Community Support Work	# of community support clients (primary clients, total case files)	2020-21
	% of clients with various presenting problems	
Community Engagement	Examples of community groups and events CLASSIC engaged in	2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Social Media & News Articles	# of contributions to news articles	2020-21
	# of social media posts	
	# of social media followers	
Project ID	% of clients who attended booked appointments	2020-21
	# of ID packages distributed	
	# of referrals for ID program	
	# of client ID files opened	
Fundraising	Amount raised ($)	2020-21
Addressing System Barriers and Issues	Type of systemic barriers addressed – claw backs to treaty land claim settlement, prison law, human rights, immigration, housing law, social services, community support	2020-21

Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan
https://pblsask.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2014 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Free Legal Clinic Program	# of free legal clinics	2020
	# of communities where free legal clinics held	2020
	Free legal clinic partner organizations	2020
	# of clients served	2020 2019 2018 2017
	% of clients male, female, and non-binary	2020
	% of clients unemployed, employed, on disability	2020
	Avg. gross monthly income	2020
	Avg. # of children	2020
	% of clients who are White/European, Indigenous, Asian, Black, Middle Eastern/Arab, Latinx	2020
	% of clients heterosexual, prefer not to say, LGBTQ2S+	2020
	# of cases by area of law	2020
Panel Program	List of panel programs	2020
	# of clients served – match, unmatched, total	2020
Volunteers	# of volunteers – by location	2020

Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan (PLEA)
https://www.plea.org/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2017 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Resources	# of publications distributed	2020
	# of website page views	
	Types of resources	
	Partners (listed)	
	# of individual requests for legal information handled	
	% of individuals who rated the information on PLEA's websites to be helpful	
	# of Listen and Shift referrals created	
	# of family law accounts	
Funding	% of grants from Law Foundation of SK, Gov. of SK, Department of Justice Canada	2020
Staff	# of staff	2020

College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan
https://www.cps.sk.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2015 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Quality of Care	# of files	2020
	# of allegations	2020
	# of allegations by type • Treatment and care • Quality of interaction, communication • Practice management/access • Quality of care • Competence and knowledge • Systemic • Other	2020
	# of file determinations by outcome • Founded • Unfounded • Partially founded • No determination • Files still in review • Known complication • System error • Resolved without physician • Resolved without committee • Withdrawn	2020
Quality of Care Advisory Committee	# of files and # of allegations handled by the committee	2020
	# of files by allegation type • Treatment and care • Quality of interaction, communication • Practice management/access • Quality of care • Competence and knowledge • Systemic	2020
	# of days to receipt of file to closed	2020
	# of days to receipt of file to final letter	2019
	# of days closed to final letter	2018

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
		2017 2016
Quality of Care (QoC) Department	# of incoming contacts	2020 2019 2018
	# of incoming contacts by phone and email/mail	2020
	# of incoming contacts by inquiry type • Direct resolutions • Complaints • Information • Other • QoC Advisory Committee • Physician Support	2020
Joint Medical Professional Review Committee	# number of complaints alleging unprofessional conduct	2020 2019 2018
	Average # of complaints alleging unprofessional conduct	2011-2016
	# of memoranda reviewed by Executive Committee	2020 2016
	# of disciplinary complaints	2011-2020
	# of physicians charged with unprofessional conduct	2011-2020
	# of discipline cases in progress	2020
	# of ADR agreements with physicians	2020
	# of ADR files and # of files by category	2020
	# of Court actions involving the College	2020

Office of the Treaty Commissioner
http://www.otc.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020-21

Availability of Annual Reports: 2007-08 until 2010-11 and then from 2017-18 until 2020-21

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Public Education	# of individuals attending "Teaching Treaties in the Classroom"	2020-21
	# of individuals reached through sessions	2020-21
	# of individuals engaged with online National Indigenous Peoples Day event	2020-21
Reconciliation through Treaty Implementation	# of Reconciliation Circles	2020-21
	# of persons involved in Reconciliation Circles	2020-21
Social Media Engagement	# of Facebook likes	2020-21
	# of Twitter Followers	
	# of retweets of content shared	
	# of impressions	
	# of newsletter subscribers	

Saskatchewan Advocate for Children & Youth
https://www.saskadvocate.ca/

Data Source: Annual Report 2020

Availability of Annual Reports: 2017 until 2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
Intake and Common Issues	% who contacted the children and youth advocate • Parent • Professional or Band Official • Extended family • Child or youth • Other • Foster parent • Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth (SACY) initiated	2020
	% of ministries the SACY received calls about • Social Services • First Nations Child & Family Services Agencies • Corrections, Policing, and Public Safety • Education System • Health System	2020
	% most common issues in 2020 • Case planning and case management • Rights issues • Custody and access issues • General inquiries • Lack of service and supports / timeliness of services issues • Quality of care issues	2020
Child Death	Violence-related notifications • Deaths • Critical Injuries	2020 2019 2018 2017 2016

	# of deaths by
	• Ethnicity
	  o First Nations and Metis
	  o Non-First nations or Metis,
	  o Unknown
		2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded

	• Age
	  ○ 0-5
	  ○ 6-10
	  ○ 11-15
	  ○ 16-18
	  ○ 19+
	• Type of Service at Time of Death
	  ○ CFS – in care
	  ○ CFS – receiving other services
	  ○ CFS – Receive services prior to death (in care of other)
	  ○ Corrections – Custody (open and secure)
	  ○ Corrections – Community
	  ○ Corrections – Received services prior to death (custody or Community)	

	% of child deaths – identified causes • Cause not yet available • Undetermined • Suicide • Medically fragile • (Suspected) homicide • Hit by motor vehicle • Illness • Drowning • Drug/Alcohol toxicity	2020

Child Critical Injury	# of critical injuries by
	• Ethnicity
	  ○ First Nations and Metis
	  ○ Non-First nations or Metis,
	  ○ Unknown
	• Age
	  ○ 0-5
	  ○ 6-10
	  ○ 11-15
	  ○ 16-18
	  ○ 19+
	• Type of Service at Time of Death
	  ○ CFS – in care
	  ○ CFS – receiving other services
	  ○ CFS – Receive services prior to death (in care of other)
		2020

Data Category	Data Elements Collected	Years of Data Recorded
	o Corrections – Custody (open and secure) o Corrections – Community o Corrections – Received services prior to death (custody or Community)	
	% of critical injuries – identified causes • Suicide attempt • Self-harm • Motor vehicle accident • Drug/alcohol toxicity • Assault with a knife or blade • Shooting • Physical assault – other • Burn • Suspected non-accidental and/or child abuse • Other accident • Illness • Other	2020