



Research Branch
Direction de la recherche

Corporate Development
Développement organisationnel

**Results of the Legal Services
Client Satisfaction Survey
March 1997– March 1998**



**Results of the Legal Services Client Satisfaction Survey
March 1997 – March 1998**

by:

Roberta Lynn Sinclair, Colleen Anne Dell & Roger Boe

Research Branch
Correctional Service Canada

November, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES	II
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODOLOGY.....	1
RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS.....	2
FINDINGS	6
A. USE OF LEGAL SERVICES	6
B. COMMUNICATION.....	7
<i>Qualitative Analysis'</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Summary of Communication Findings.....</i>	<i>8</i>
C. TIMELINESS.....	10
<i>Qualitative Analysis</i>	<i>10</i>
D. USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE	12
<i>Qualitative Analysis</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Summary of Usefulness of LSU Counsel and Advice</i>	<i>13</i>
E. QUALITY OF SERVICE.....	15
<i>Qualitative Analysis</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Summary of Quality of Service.....</i>	<i>16</i>
F. OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU	18
<i>Qualitative Analysis</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Summary of Overall Courtesy of Service at LSU</i>	<i>19</i>
G. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS	21
APPENDIX A	23
APPENDIX B	25
APPENDIX C	27
APPENDIX D	29

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1:	SURVEY ISSUE & RESPONSE SUMMARY	2
TABLE 2:	NHQ DISTRIBUTION	3
TABLE 3:	JOB TITLE DISTRIBUTION.....	4
TABLE 4:	AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY DISTRIBUTION.....	5
TABLE 5:	COMMUNICATION FINDINGS.....	9
TABLE 6:	OVERALL COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION INDEX.....	9
TABLE 7:	TIMELINESS FINDINGS.....	11
TABLE 8:	OVERALL TIMELINESS SATISFACTION INDEX.....	11
TABLE 9:	USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE	14
TABLE 10:	OVERALL USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE SATISFACTION INDEX	14
TABLE 11:	QUALITY OF SERVICE.....	17
TABLE 12:	OVERALL QUALITY OF SERVICE SATISFACTION INDEX	17
TABLE 13:	OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU	20
TABLE 14:	OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU SATISFACTION INDEX	20

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this survey is to measure the Legal Services Unit's (LSU) maintenance of its service standards as well as provide a forum for suggestions to improve service delivery. The survey covers a wide range of issues: use of legal services, communication, timeliness, usefulness of LSU counsel and advice, quality of service, and overall courtesy of service at LSU.

The survey was constructed on a six point scale with space for explanations and examples following six of the seven sections (communication, timeliness, usefulness of LSU counsel and advice, quality of service, and overall courtesy of service at LSU). Additional space was provided for respondent suggestions and/or comments.

The survey was conducted in both official languages.

METHODOLOGY

Between March 2 and March 30, 1998, a mail-out survey of the clients of the LSU was conducted. The survey sample size is **238**¹. The total number of returned surveys was 172, denoting a response rate of 72%. Although all regions had fairly high response rates, the Prairie region had the highest (74%) with the other regions and NHQ falling between 58% - 63%. The Atlantic region had the highest percentage of respondents who had used the service (100%), closely followed by respondents in the Ontario region (96%). The Pacific region had the lowest percentage of respondents who had used Legal Services within the past year (64%). See Table 1.

The high response rate is partially attributed to the respondent contact process. A letter introducing the survey was issued by e-mail on February 24, 1988 approximately

¹ The sample was achieved through: (1) a list of senior management was provided by the five regional centres and client lists were submitted by LSU lawyers. In total, 249 individuals were issued a survey; (2) 18 surveys were returned 'undeliverable'; and (3) the correct address was obtained for 7 of the 18

one week prior to the surveys arrival by Canada Post or interdepartmental mail (see Appendix A). A second introductory letter was provided by Carolyn Kobernick, LSU Senior Counsel, with the issued survey on March 2, 1988 (see Appendix B). Two weeks following the approximate arrival of the survey (March 14, 1988), a third letter was sent by e-mail reminding the recipients of the survey and the importance of providing feedback on the level of services provided to them, if used (see Appendix C).

TABLE 1: SURVEY ISSUE & RESPONSE SUMMARY

Region	Valid Mail-outs	Response Rate by Region (%)	Respondents Who Were Service Users (%)
Atlantic	24	14 (58%)	14 (100%)
Quebec	66	39 (59%)	32 (82%)
Ontario	38	24 (63%)	23 (96%)
Prairie	27	20 (74%)	17 (85%)
Pacific	23	14 (61%)	9 (64%)
NHQ	60	37 (62%)	34 (92%)
Region not Stated		24	5 (21%)
TOTAL	238	172 (72%)	134 (78%)

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

As reflected in the design of the survey, this report is primarily interested in LSU users in the past year. One hundred and thirty-four individuals (78%) indicated they had used LSU in the past year and 36 (22%) had not (2 missing). The remainder of this report focuses on those respondents who have used LSU in the past year.

surveys and then reissued. All 7 were returned, achieving the final sample size of 238.

As shown in Table 1, of the 134 respondents who indicated they had used LSU in the past year, 129 indicated their region: 14 respondents in Atlantic, 32 in Quebec, 23 in Ontario, 34 at NHQ, 17 in Prairie and 9 in Pacific. For those at NHQ, the sector distribution was:

TABLE 2: NHQ DISTRIBUTION

Sector	Number
Aboriginal Issues	1
Women Offender	3
Corporate Development	5
Corporate Service	3
Correctional Affairs	1
Correctional Operations and Programs	11
ACPT	1
Corrections Directorate	1
Executive Secretariat	1
Finance	2
PA	2
Personnel and Training	4
SDC	1
Other	1
TOTAL	37

Note: Three individuals indicated their sector but did not indicate NHQ as their region.

The greatest number of respondents worked in institutions (37%), followed closely by NHQ (27%) and RHQ (26%) and to a much lesser extent by parole (9%) and other (1%). One hundred and thirty individuals responded to this question. One hundred and thirty one respondents indicated their job title. The greatest representation was from Directors (n=21), Regional Administrators (n=21) and Wardens (n=16). See Table 3.

TABLE 3: JOB TITLE DISTRIBUTION

Job Title	Number
Area Manager	5
Associate Warden	2
Assistant Commissioner	5
Deputy Commissioner	5
Executive Director	2
Deputy Warden	7
Director General	5
Director	21
District Director	7
Manager	7
Regional Administrator	21
Warden	16
Assistant Warden	10
Policy/Analyst/Advisor	5
Officer	6
Coordinator	2
Chief	2
Other	3
TOTAL	131

Note: Missing = 3

Area of employment responsibility was indicated by 109 respondents. The primary areas were other (n=32), followed by community/reintegration (n=14), management services (n=11) and correctional operations and institutions (both n=10). See Table 4.

TABLE 4: AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY DISTRIBUTION

Area of Responsibility	Number
Institution	10
Policy	7
Programs	6
Technical Services	4
Case Management	9
Correctional Operations	10
Community/Reintegration	14
Management Services	11
Performance Assurance/Measurement	6
Other	32
TOTAL	109

Note: Missing = 25.

FINDINGS

The survey findings are categorized by the 7 sections of the survey: communication, timeliness, usefulness of LSU counsel and advice, quality of service, overall courtesy of service at LSU, and additional suggestions or comments. Within each section, both the quantitative and qualitative² analyses are provided as well as a table of the survey findings and an overall satisfaction index³. A summary is located at the conclusion of each section.

A. USE OF LEGAL SERVICES

- Fifty-six percent of respondents stated that in the past 12 months they had approached LSU on a particular matter between 1-10 times, 15% between 11-20 times, and 29% approached LSU over 21 times.
- Fifty-six percent of respondents indicated they received the assistance they requested 1-10 times, 16% indicated 11-20 times, and 28% received the requested assistance 21 times or more.
- Fifty-three percent of survey respondents approached LSU for Legal Advice, followed by Policy Advice, 45%.
- Seventy-four percent of respondents worked most often with a Staff Lawyer and 21% worked with both a Staff Lawyer and the Director.

² This section of the survey is open-ended and thus the categories are not mutually exclusive. The percentages, therefore, do not add to 100.

³ The overall satisfaction index is the average rate of satisfaction for the total number of questions in each section.

B. COMMUNICATION

- The majority of respondents (70%) stated they were *very satisfied* with the time LSU lawyers took to listen to their requests carefully, while 28% indicated they were *satisfied*.
- Approximately half (49%) of the respondents were *very satisfied* with the availability/accessibility of the LSU lawyer working on their file, and 40% were *satisfied*. Two percent of respondents expressed *dissatisfaction* and 2% were *neutral*.
- Focussing on whether LSU lawyers regularly informed respondents of developments, 37% were *very satisfied* and 39% were *satisfied*. Very low levels of dissatisfaction were reported (1% *dissatisfied* and 1% *very dissatisfied*).
- Forty percent of respondents stated they were *very satisfied* with the explanation of the legal and cost implications of proposed or available courses of action and 35% were *satisfied*. This question was *not applicable* for 17% of respondents.
- In terms of LSU consultation with respondents (regarding provision of strategies, risk assessments and options), more than 1/3 of respondents (37%) were *very satisfied* and a higher percentage (43%) were *satisfied*. Only 1% of respondents stated they were *dissatisfied*.
- There was strong respondent satisfaction with LSU lawyers' identification of opportunities for alternatives to the judicial or regulatory process. Twenty-nine percent expressed they were *very satisfied* and 33% were *satisfied*.
- Nearly half of the respondents stated they were *satisfied* with LSU's delivery of complete, consistent and clear advice over time and by various lawyers. A large percentage, 43%, were *very satisfied*.

Qualitative Analysis^{4, 5}

Fourteen respondents provided a written comment. Forty-three percent praised the high quality of customer service provided by LSU. Twenty-one percent commented on its prompt service and 21% on its tardiness. Thirty-six percent of the clients dealt with one lawyer and were very satisfied with the service provided and 21% indicated they dealt with various lawyers who provided inconsistent advice. Seven percent commented LSU was hard to get in touch with and 7% noted LSU's voice mail was not updated regularly. A further 7% commented LSU knows the "realities" of its clients and 14% stated it does not. Lastly, 29% of respondents indicated that LSU provided concise advice and never made the client feel they were asking a "dumb" question.

Summary of Communication Findings

Overall, LSU had a very high communication rating. The majority of respondents stated they were either *very satisfied* or *satisfied* with the communication services provided by LSU staff in the past 12 months. Extremely low levels of dissatisfaction (*dissatisfied* and *very dissatisfied*) were indicated for all of the seven communication variables. LSU rated highest with the time LSU lawyers take to listen to client requirements. The weakest area was LSU lawyer's lack of identification of opportunities for alternatives to the judicial or regulatory process (i.e., alternative dispute resolution). Only 61% of respondents indicated satisfaction in this area, while on other variables the combined average is well above 70%, and in many cases is close to 90%.

⁴ A total of 47 respondents (35%) also provided written responses to some part of the survey, whether it be the request for an example at the end of a section or in the space provided for additional comments and/or suggestions. The section responses have been analyzed individually.

⁵ Due to the low number of written responses, the findings are not included in the section summaries.

TABLE 5: COMMUNICATION FINDINGS

QUESTION	SATISFIED n %	NEUTRAL n %	DISSATISFIED n %
1. Time LSU lawyers take to listen to my requirements carefully.	130 99%	2 1%	--
2. The LSU lawyer who is working on my file is readily available/accessable.	117 89%	9 7%	3 3%
3. LSU lawyers keep me regularly informed of developments.	100 76%	16 12%	2 2%
4. LSU lawyers explanation of the legal and cost implications of proposed or available courses of action.	97 74%	12 9%	--
5. LSU lawyers consultation with me and provision of strategies, risk assessments and options.	105 80%	11 8%	1 1%
6. LSU lawyers indentificaion of opportunities for alternatives to the judicial or regulatory process (i.e., alternative dispute resolution).	79 61%	13 10%	--
7. LSU's delivery of complete, consistent and clear advice over time and by various lawyers.	116 89%	10 8%	--

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

TABLE 6: Overall Communication Satisfaction Index

SATISFIED %	NEUTRAL %	DISSATISFIED %
81%	8%	6%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

C. TIMELINESS

- Forty-three percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with the promptness with which LSU informed them of the lawyer that would be handling their file(s). Thirty-nine percent were *satisfied* and 2% of respondents expressed *dissatisfaction*.
- Nearly half (49%) of the respondents expressed they were *very satisfied* with the promptness of service they received from LSU and 41% expressed *satisfaction*. Only 3% expressed *dissatisfaction*.
- One third of respondents (32%) were *very satisfied* with LSU's regular updates on the status and progress of their files and 41% reported *satisfaction*. Only 2% of respondents expressed *dissatisfaction*.
- Greater than one-third of respondents (35%) were *satisfied* with LSU staff attention on informing them of anticipated delays and 26% were *very satisfied*. Only 5% indicated *dissatisfaction*.
- Thirty-six percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with LSU's ability to complete work by the agreed upon deadlines and 44% were *satisfied*. Two percent reported *dissatisfaction*.
- A high level of satisfaction with LSU's overall timeframe for completion of work was reported: 38% of respondents were *very satisfied* and 47% were *satisfied*. Five percent of respondents reported they were *dissatisfied*.

Qualitative Analysis

Fourteen respondents provided a written response. Forty-two percent indicated their dissatisfaction with the long length of time it took for LSU to respond to their

requests while the same percentage noted LSU’s quick response rate. An additional 21% noted the quickness of LSU’s response in an emergency situation. Fourteen percent noted they were not informed of delays when they occurred with their file and 15% of those who responded claimed LSU did not return telephone calls. Twenty-one percent indicated their awareness that LSU was extremely busy.

Summary of Timeliness Findings:

Although rating well in this area, respondents were more apt to report they were *satisfied* rather than *very satisfied*. The strongest level of respondent satisfaction pertained to the promptness of service received from LSU (90% of respondents expressed *satisfaction*). The area of least satisfaction was LSU staff keeping respondents informed of anticipated delays (62%). The remaining areas revealed levels of satisfaction near 80%.

TABLE 7: TIMELINESS FINDINGS

QUESTION	SATISFIED n %	NEUTRAL n %	DISSATISFIED n %
1. The promptness with which LSU informed me of the lawyer handling my file(s).	108 82%	7 5%	3 2%
2. The promptness of service I receive from LSU.	120 90%	9 7%	4 3%
3. LSU keeps me regularly informed on the status and progress of my file.	98 74%	17 13%	2 2%
4. LSU staff inform me of any anticipated delays.	82 62%	20 15%	6 5%
5. LSU completes work by agreed upon deadlines.	107 80%	10 8%	3 2%
6. LSU’s overall time frame for completion of work.	112 85%	8 6%	6 5%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

TABLE 8: OVERALL TIMELINESS SATISFACTION INDEX

SATISFIED %	NEUTRAL %	DISSATISFIED %
79%	9%	3%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

D. USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE

- Well over half (64%) of the respondents reported they were *very satisfied* with the LSU lawyers' professionalism and depth of information. Thirty-four percent indicated they were *satisfied* and a mere 1% of respondents reported they were *dissatisfied*.
- Fifty-three percent of respondents stated they were *very satisfied* and 40% were *satisfied* with LSU's provision of clear advice to guide actions. Similar to the above finding, only 1% expressed *dissatisfaction*.
- In terms of LSU's provision of useful predictions of likely developments in the law, only 21% of respondents were *very satisfied*, whereas 40% were *satisfied*. Approximately 40% were divided between the *neutral* and *not applicable* categories.
- Thirty-nine percent of respondents stated they were *very satisfied* with LSU's provision of practical solutions to their legal problem(s). However, a greater number (49%) reported they were *satisfied*. Two percent of respondents expressed *dissatisfaction*.
- In response to LSU's provision of adequate legal training sessions, only 20% of respondents reported they were *very satisfied* while 34% stated they were *satisfied*. Two percent of respondents were *dissatisfied* with the legal training sessions provided by LSU.

Qualitative Analysis

Nine individuals provided a written response. Forty-four percent commented on the usefulness of training seminars and the need for additional ones. Sixty-seven percent commented specifically on the clarity and appropriateness of the sessions. With respect to LSU services, 11% of respondents indicated that LSU knows the field of corrections, 33% stated the opinions provided by LSU were clear and concise and 11% noted LSU's proposed solutions were realistic. Conversely, 11% of respondents stated that LSU was not able to provide advice on how to implement the solutions. Thirty-three percent of respondents indicated general satisfaction with LSU.

Summary of Usefulness of LSU Counsel and Advice

LSU fared well in specific portions of this section. The highest level of satisfaction was reported in respondent's perception of LSU's provision of informed and professional lawyers. Strong levels of satisfaction were also indicated in respect to LSU's provision of clear advice and provision of practical solutions to legal problems. The lowest level of satisfaction was associated with the training sessions provided by LSU (54%), followed by its predictions of developments in the law (61%). Overall, respondents expressed very low levels of dissatisfaction.

TABLE 9: USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE

QUESTION	SATISFIED n %	NEUTRAL n %	DISSATISFIED n %
1. LSU provides informed and professional lawyers.	130 99%	1 1%	--
2. LSU provides clear advice to guide actions.	123 93%	8 6%	1 1%
3. LSU provides useful predictions of likely developments in the law.	80 61%	25 19%	--
4. LSU focusses on providing practical solutions to my legal problem(s).	115 87%	8 6%	2 2%
5. LSU provides adequate legal training sessions.	71 54%	27 21%	3 2%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

TABLE 10: OVERALL USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL AND ADVICE SATISFACTION INDEX

SATISFIED %	NEUTRAL %	DISSATISFIED %
79%	11%	1%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

E. QUALITY OF SERVICE

- Fifty-six percent of respondents stated they were *very satisfied* and 39% were *satisfied* with the overall quality of services provided by LSU.
- Twenty-one percent of respondents reported they were *very satisfied* with LSU's contributions to non-legal policy making. Twice as many individuals (42%) expressed *satisfaction* and 14% reported *neutrality*.
- Fourteen percent of respondents indicated they were *very satisfied* with LSU's advice on contracts or real property matters. Twenty-four percent of respondents indicated they were *satisfied* and 16% expressed *neutrality*.
- Twenty-two percent of respondents noted they were *satisfied* and 13% were *very satisfied* with LSU's assurance of consistency with intergovernmental and international agreements.
- Thirty-nine percent of respondents were *very satisfied* and 36% were *satisfied* with LSU's advice/counsel on their department's mandates, statutes and regulations. For 18% of respondents this question was *not applicable*.
- Thirty-two percent of respondents revealed they were *very satisfied* with LSU's assistance in dealing with disputes prior to litigation. Twenty-seven percent revealed *satisfaction* and 8% stated *neutrality*. For 33% of the respondents this question was *not applicable*.
- With respect to LSU's advice regarding proposed legislation and/or legal instruments, 41% of respondent's claimed they were *satisfied* and 31% *very satisfied*. Only 1% of respondents reported *dissatisfaction*. This question was *not applicable* for 23% of respondents.

- Thirty-two percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with LSU's advice on civil or criminal litigation. Thirty-two percent of respondents were *satisfied*, 6% were *neutral* and 29% indicated the question was *not applicable*.
- Thirty-seven percent of respondents indicated they were *very satisfied*, 37% *satisfied*, 4% *neutral* and 1% *dissatisfied* with LSU ensuring departmental compliance with the *Charter*. Twenty-one percent noted the category was *not applicable*.
- Twenty-five percent of respondents indicated they were *very satisfied* with the overall quality of legal training sessions provided by LSU. Thirty-one percent indicated they were *satisfied*, 13% were *neutral*, 1% *dissatisfied* and 1% reported they were *very dissatisfied*. This question was *not applicable* for 30% of respondents.

Qualitative Analysis

Twelve respondents commented in this section. Eight percent indicated that LSU requires a strategic plan in respect to provision of advice on proposed legislation. A further 17% suggested LSU provide increased training time. A third suggestion by 8% of respondents was that LSU be more proactive in ensuring departmental compliance with the *Charter*. Noting the positive attributes of LSU, 25% mentioned the high quality of assistance, especially in emergency situations, 8% noted the availability of LSU staff, 25% commented on the clear and consistent advice provided to them by LSU, 17% indicated they were impressed with LSU's professional training and 8% were impressed with the written feedback provided by LSU.

Summary of Quality of Service

The highest level of satisfaction pertained to the overall quality of service provided by LSU (95%). The lowest degree of respondents' satisfaction was with LSU's assurance of consistency with intergovernmental and international agreements (35%) and with LSU's advice on contracts or real property matters (39%). These are the lowest

percentages of all components measured in this survey. The two areas receiving only slightly above 50% satisfaction were overall quality of legal training sessions provided and LSU’s assistance in dealing with disputes prior to litigation.

TABLE 11: QUALITY OF SERVICE

QUESTION	SATISFIED n %	NEUTRAL n %	DISSATISFIED n %
1. Overall quality of services provided by LSU.	126 95%	5 4%	2 2%
2. Contributions to non-legal policy making.	82 62%	19 14%	1 1%
3. Advice on contracts or real property matters.*	51 39%	21 16%	--
4. Ensuring consistency with intergovernmental and international agreements.*	46 35%	24 18%	1 1%
5. Advice/counsel clients on department mandates, statutes and regulations.	99 75%	7 5%	2 2%
6. Assistance dealing with disputes prior to litigation.	77 58%	11 8%	1 1%
7. Advice regarding proposed legislation and/or legal instruments.	95 72%	6 5%	1 1%
8. Advice on civil or criminal litigation.	86 65%	8 6%	--
9. Ensuring departmental compliance with the <i>Charter</i> .	98 74%	5 4%	1 1%
10. Overall quality of legal training sessions provided.	73 56%	17 13%	2 2%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

* Question 3 & 4 are not included in the satisfaction index calculation. This area was identified as unique requiring specialized counsel. Counsel has since been hired to address this weakness.

TABLE 12: OVERALL QUALITY OF SERVICE SATISFACTION INDEX

SATISFIED %	NEUTRAL %	DISSATISFIED %
89%	10%	1%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

F. OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU

- The level of satisfaction with the availability of LSU personnel during office hours was rated as *very satisfactory* by 47% of respondents, *satisfactory* by 46%, *neutral* by 3% and 2% of respondents were *dissatisfied*.
- Sixty-seven percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with the professional and courteous manner in which LSU treated them and their staff at all times. Thirty-one percent of respondents reported to be *satisfied*.
- Fifty-two percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with the promptness with which LSU returned phone calls. Thirty-eight percent reported *satisfaction*, 7% *neutrality* and 2% *dissatisfaction*.
- Forty-three percent of respondents were *very satisfied* with the promptness with which LSU returned e-mail inquiries. Thirty-eight percent reported *satisfaction*, 7% *neutrality* and 2% *dissatisfaction*. This question was *not applicable* for 10% of respondents.
- LSU's response time in emergency situations was rated as *very satisfactory* by 59% of respondents and *satisfactory* by 13%. Five percent of respondents expressed *neutrality* while the question was *not applicable* for 23%.

- Fifty-eight percent of respondents expressed they were *very satisfied* with LSU services. Thirty-eight percent reported they were *satisfied*, 3% expressed *neutrality* and only 1% reported *dissatisfaction*.

Qualitative Analysis

Nine individuals provided a written comment. Fifty-six percent of respondents indicated that the service provided by LSU was excellent, professional and/or courteous. A further 33% noted it was respectful and 44% noted that the service was timely. Twenty-two percent of respondents indicated they were not satisfied with the timeliness of LSU's service.

Summary of Overall Courtesy of Service at LSU

The highest level of satisfaction corresponded with LSU's professional and courteous treatment of its clients (99%). This is the highest rating of all categories measured in this survey. A significantly lower level of satisfaction was indicated for LSU's response time in emergency situations (72%). The remainder of the categories in most cases rated well above 80% satisfaction.

TABLE 13: OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU

QUESTION	SATISFIED n %	NEUTRAL n %	DISSATISFIED n %
1. Availability of LSU personnel during regular office hours.	125 93%	4 3%	3 2%
2. LSU treats myself and my staff in a professional and courteous manner at all times.	132 99%	--	1 1%
3. LSU returns phone calls promptly.	121 90%	9 7%	3 2%
4. LSU returns e-mail inquiries promptly.	108 81%	9 7%	3 2%
5. LSU response time in emergency situations.	97 72%	6 5%	--
6. Overall satisfaction with LSU services.	127 96%	4 3%	1 1%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

TABLE 14: OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE AT LSU SATISFACTION INDEX

SATISFIED %	NEUTRAL %	DISSATISFIED %
89%	4%	1%

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to N/A responses.

G. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Twenty-two individuals (16% of respondents who used LSU services in the past year) provided a written response to the final comment and suggestion section of the survey. The following is a qualitative analysis of their responses.

Recognition of the good or excellent quality of service that LSU staff provide was referred to 27 times in the 22 written comments. This finding concurs with the overall positive response and satisfaction with LSU services by its clients. Many took advantage of the provided space to praise the work of LSU.

Further, LSU's helpfulness and willingness to provide assistance and promptness of technical and legal advice was praised by 64% of respondents. An additional 23% indicated the ability of LSU to provide legal services. The courteousness of LSU was recognized by 27% of respondents.

Fourteen percent of respondents noted the positive and useful nature of the Quebec pilot project, while 5% indicated a lack of services in the Quebec region.

With respect to areas of improvement, the following were suggested:

- 32% the necessity to assign only one lawyer to a specific area because specified knowledge is required and it is not advantageous to switch lawyers in the midst of dealings because different opinions are provided;
- 27% suggested legal bulletins be provided to staff nationally so that they would be aware of new issues, such as amendments to the criminal code;
- 23% CSC staff be provided with increased legal education, specifically management officers;
- 18% increased promptness of responses by LSU;

- 14% lawyers' lack of operational understanding;
- 14% LSU was at times "over-protective" and "over-cautious" and thus attention is placed on what cannot be done rather than what can;
- 14% suggested LSU be part of the policy team and not merely passive reviewers of legislation;
- 9% elimination of voice mail at LSU; and
- 5% Not impressed with the current level of training provided.

The following regarding LSU lawyers were acknowledged once (5% of total):

- Need to use "understandable" language;
- Need the ability to adjust communication style (specifically when it is a high stress situation);
- Need to be able to adequately take over for one another; and
- Need to provide clear legal opinion

APPENDIX A

February 24, 1998

Re: Upcoming Legal Services' Client Satisfaction Survey

This is to inform you that within the next week you will be receiving CSC's Legal Service's Unit's Client satisfaction Survey by Canada Post. You, and other Senior Managers across Canada, are being asked to complete a survey in order to measure LSU's performance in maintaining its service standards and improve service quality.

We ask that you please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. It is important for us to receive feedback on the level of services provided to you.

If you have any questions, please contact the coordinators, Colleen Dell or Roberta Sinclair, at (613) 995-3006.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Colleen Dell and Roberta Sinclair
Project Coordinators

APPENDIX B

March 2, 1998

Re: Legal Services' Client Satisfaction Survey

CSC's Legal Services Unit (LSU) is committed to providing high-quality legal services to CSC. You, and other Senior Managers across Canada, are being asked to complete a survey in order to measure the LSU's performance in maintaining its service standards and improving service quality. It is important for us to receive feedback on the level of services provided to you.

The survey is brief and covers a range of issues - use of legal services, communication, timeliness, usefulness of LSU counsel and advice, quality of service and overall courtesy of service by the LSU. We have provided space for your suggestions and comments, and I encourage you to take the opportunity offered to do so.

We ask that you take a few minutes to complete the following questionnaire and return same in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. Please help make the survey a success by returning the questionnaire to Correctional Service Canada, Research Branch, **BY FRIDAY, MARCH 20**. All replies will be confidential.

NOTE: IF YOU HAVE NOT USED LEGAL SERVICES WITHIN THE PAST YEAR, PLEASE INDICATE THIS ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE SURVEY AND RETURN IT UNCOMPLETED.

If you have any questions, please contact the coordinators, Colleen Dell or Roberta Sinclair, at (613) 995-3006.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Kobernick
Senior Counsel
Correctional Services, Legal Services

APPENDIX C

March 14, 1998

REMINDER: LEGAL SERVICES' CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

This is to remind you that if you have not yet completed CSC's Legal Services' Client Satisfaction Survey, please do so and return it to Correctional Service Canada, Research Branch, **BY THE END OF THIS WEEK.**

If, by chance, you have not received a copy by mail, please contact the coordinators, Colleen Dell or Roberta Sinclair, at (613) 995-3006. One will be sent out immediately.

NOTE: IF YOU HAVE NOT USED LEGAL SERVICES WITHIN THE PAST YEAR, PLEASE INDICATE THIS ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE SURVEY AND RETURN IT UNCOMPLETED.

To those who have already returned the questionnaire, thank you.

APPENDIX D

**LEGAL SERVICES CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY
1998**

The Department of Justice is committed to providing high-quality legal services to government departments and agencies. CSC's Legal Services Unit (LSU) has adopted general service standards to ensure consistency in the quality and level of service and to ensure that CSC is satisfied with the legal services provided by the lawyers and support staff in your legal services unit. You are being asked to complete this survey in order to measure the Legal Services' performance in maintaining these service standards and improve service delivery. Thank you for your cooperation.

I. RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Job Title (i.e., Assistant Warden): _____
Area of Responsibility: _____
2. Location: Institution Parole RHQ NHQ Other _____
3. In which region do you work? Pacific Prairie Quebec Ontario Atlantic NHQ
4. If you work at NHQ, indicate which sector. _____

II. USE OF LEGAL SERVICES

1. How many time in the past 12 months have you approached the LSU on a particular matter? _____
2. How many times did you receive the assistance you requested? _____
3. What is the main type of service you approached LSU for? Policy Advice Legal Advice General Information Legal Awareness Training Other _____
4. Who do you usually work with at LSU? Staff Lawyer Director Both Other _____

Sections III through VIII address your satisfaction, over the past 12 months, with the services provided by LSU staff in terms of the handling of work you or your Branch/Bureau/Division has requested of it. Please indicate your level of satisfaction to each of the following statements:

III. COMMUNICATION

- 1. Time LSU lawyers take to listen to my requirements carefully. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 2. The LSU lawyer who is on my file is readily available/accessable Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 3. LSU lawyers keep me regularly informed of proposed or available courses of action. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 4. LSU lawyers explanation of the legal and cost implications of proposed or available courses of action. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 5. LSU lawyers consultation with me and provision of strategies, risk assessments and options. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 6. LSU lawyers identification of opportunities for alternatives to the judicial or regulatory process (i.e., alternative dispute resolution) Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 7. LSU’s delivery of complete, consistent and clear advice over time and by various lawyers. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered ‘dissatisfied’ or ‘very dissatisfied’ to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example.:

IV. TIMELINESS

- 1. The promptness with which LSU informed me of the lawyer handling my file(s). Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 2. The promptness of service I receive from LSU. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 3. LSU keeps me regularly informed on the status and progress of my file. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 4. LSU staff inform me of any anticipated delays. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 5. LSU completes work by agreed upon deadlines. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 6. LSU’s overall timeframe for completion of work. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered ‘dissatisfied’ or ‘very dissatisfied’ to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example:

V. USEFULNESS OF LSU COUNSEL & ADVICE

- 1. LSU provides informed and professional lawyers. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 2. LSU provides clear advice to guide actions. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 3. LSU provides useful predictions of likely developments in the law. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 4. LSU focuses on providing practical solutions to my legal problem(s). Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 5. LSU provides adequate legal training sessions. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example:

VI. QUALITY OF SERVICE

1. Overall quality of services provided by LSU. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
2. Contributions to non-legal policy making. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
3. Advice on contracts or real property matters. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
4. Ensuring consistency with intergovernmental and international agreements. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
5. Advice/counsel on clients department's mandates, statutes and regulations. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
6. Assistance dealing with disputes prior to litigation Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
7. Advice regarding proposed legislation and/or legal instruments. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
8. Advice on civil or criminal litigation. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
9. Ensuring departmental compliance with the *Charter*. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
10. Overall quality of legal training sessions provided. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example:

VII. OVERALL COURTESY OF SERVICE OF LSU

- 1. Availability of LSU personnel during regular office hours. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 2. LSU treats myself and my staff in a professional and courteous manner at all times. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 3. LSU returns phone calls promptly. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 4. LSU returns e-mail inquiries promptly. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 5. LSU response time in emergency situations. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 6. Overall satisfaction with LSU services Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example:

VIII. LSU SUPPORT STAFF (Director(s) and Lawyers excluded)

- 1. The promptness with which administrative support staff responded to my request for assistance. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 2. LSU staff was accurate and comprehensive in response to my request. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A
- 3. LSU staff treated me in a courteous and professional manner at all times. Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied N/A

If you answered 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' to any of the above questions please explain and provide an example:
