

Priorities Planning Report 2010



Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc.

October 2010

PRIORITIES PLANNING REPORT 2010

LEGAL SERVICES OF EASTERN MISSOURI

Introduction.....	3
I. Needs Assessment	
Demographics & Trends.....	5
LSEM Research: Surveys.....	12
LSEM Research: Focus Groups.....	18
Conclusions from the Surveys and Focus Groups.....	22
II. Priority Planning	24
Acknowledgements.....	29
Appendices.....	30

Introduction

Since 1956, Legal Services of Eastern Missouri (LSEM) has served as a non-profit law firm striving to provide high-quality legal assistance in civil law cases and equal access to justice to low-income individuals. This goal is addressed through a combination of individual representation, community legal education and outreach, and systemic advocacy. Every four years, Legal Services of Eastern Missouri completes a priority setting process to determine the needs of its large service area and set the future priorities for the agency (in accordance with Legal Services Corporation regulations). Currently, the LSEM service area covers 21 counties in Missouri¹. Of the approximately 2,246,434 people in this area, one in seven of these individuals is below the federal poverty line². Therefore, a great number of individuals qualify for LSEM services and they bring a wide range of needs. This priority setting process is essential to ensure LSEM addresses the key legal needs of these current and future clients to continue its mission of providing equal access to justice to the low-income community.

This year, LSEM utilized a multi-step approach to complete the priority setting process and legal needs assessment. To best understand the needs

of the greater community, a Priorities Planning committee of staff and graduate interns questioned a sample of the community through surveys and focus groups. With input from LSEM staff of attorneys, non-attorney advocates, paralegals and social workers, the committee developed two surveys asking for respondents to rate the priority and need of specific legal topics and areas. One survey was distributed to community members and the other to social service providers and the legal community. These surveys were widely dispersed, especially through LSEM community partners, former clients, other attorneys, and posted online, with an emphasis on reaching a large cross-section of the LSEM total service population. In addition to surveys, to more fully evaluate need, the task force also conducted focus groups in the community, asking participants to elaborate on their legal needs and barriers to services. This needs data was compiled and analyzed for consideration in the priority setting process, discussed in the second portion of this report.

To best understand the needs of the community, part I of this report begins with an overview of demographic data describing who lives in the LSEM service area. Within the demographics, key legal and social trends impacting potential clients are discussed. An analysis of the survey data is next, followed by data and analysis from the focus groups, including several participants'

¹ The 21 counties LSEM serves are: Adair, Clark, Franklin, Jefferson, Knox, Lewis, Lincoln, Macon, Marion, Monroe, Montgomery, Pike, Ralls, Schuyler, Scotland, Shelby, St. Charles, St. Louis City, St. Louis County, Warren and Washington.

² 2010-2015 LSEM Strategic Plan

recommendations regarding how to best meet the legal needs of the community. The Needs Assessment portion of the report concludes with implications from the assessment. In part II, the priority setting process and new list of priorities for LSEM are set out, which (resources permitting) also retain current major areas of law in which LSEM practices.

I. Needs Assessment: Demographics & Trends

To first understand the environment in which LSEM and its client base functions, this Needs Assessment and Priority Setting Process explores the recent social and economic trends that have occurred in Missouri. To portray the circumstances that have been affecting the legal needs of the low-income community, demographics and trends around general poverty levels, income and unemployment, healthcare and public benefits, family and children, older adults, immigrants, consumer issues, housing, and support services will be discussed.

Poverty Levels

Poverty has been on the rise in Missouri during the last five years. In 2005, the number of Missourians living below the poverty level was 11.9 percent, while the percentage rose to 13.5 percent by 2008.³ According to the September 2010 United States Census Bureau's report related to poverty estimates for 2009, even more Missourians are now impoverished, 849,009, which amounts to approximately 14.6% percent of Missouri's total population.⁴ St. Louis City is experiencing levels of poverty of up to 26.7

percent, doubling that of that state average.⁵ Missouri ranked sixth among states with highest rates of hunger and food insecurity for families, according to the 2008 USDA Household Food Security report.⁶ There is also an economic racial divide present in Missouri that cannot be ignored: while 21 percent of Caucasian Missourians experience poverty, more than twice as many African American Missourians (48 percent) are living below the poverty line.⁷

Between the 21 counties LSEM serves, there are discrepancies in the levels of poverty. The U.S. Census Bureau estimated that in 2009, 28.7 percent of people living in Adair County would be below the poverty line, making Adair the most impoverished of all counties served by LSEM. Other counties with markedly high numbers of destitute individuals include St. Louis City (23.8 percent), Knox (18 percent), and Washington (17.6 percent).⁸ See Appendix A, Table 1 for the poverty rates and total population of all counties served by LSEM.

Income and Unemployment

According to wage estimates by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics under the U.S. Department of

3 U.S. Census Bureau, "Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2008." September 10, 2009.

4 U.S. Census Bureau, "Poverty 2008 and 2009, American Community Service Briefs," <http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acsbr09-1.pdf>

5 [http://www.census.gov/cgi-](http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saige/saige.cgi?year=2006&type=country&table=country&submit=States%20%26%20Countries&areas=all&display_data=Display%20Data&state=29#SA11)

[bin/saige/saige.cgi?year=2006&type=country&table=country&submit=States%20%26%20Countries&areas=all&display_data=Display%20Data&state=29#SA11](http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saige/saige.cgi?year=2006&type=country&table=country&submit=States%20%26%20Countries&areas=all&display_data=Display%20Data&state=29#SA11)

6 <http://feedingamerica.org/faces-of-hunger/hunger-101/hunger-and-poverty-statistics.aspx>

7 2005-2010 LSEM Strategic Plan. MO Scorecard.

8 U.S. Census Bureau

Labor in May 2009, the national median hourly wage for all occupations was \$15.95, while the national average hourly wage was higher at \$20.90.⁹ This is slightly higher than the median hourly wage for Missouri, which is \$14.70, while Missouri's average hourly wage falls at \$18.87.¹⁰

In 2008, it was estimated that the median household income for Missouri was \$46,847.¹¹ St. Charles County was determined to have the highest median household income at \$72,428; Jefferson County and St. Louis County assumed the fifth and sixth ranks at \$57,897 and \$57,782.¹² No recent data has been collected on average/median wages particularly for Missouri counties since the 2000 census, and thus this information has not been included in the demographics assessment.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of May 2010, the national unemployment rate¹³ was 9.7 percent.¹⁴ Between 2006 and 2008, the unemployment rate in Missouri increased by 30 percent.¹⁵ More recent data suggest that Missouri's current unemployment rate is 9.3 percent.¹⁶ The unemployment rate for St. Louis County is barely higher than the state at 9.5 percent as of April 2010.¹⁷ According to the

Missouri Economic Research and Information Center, Knox County has the lowest unemployment rate at 5.2 percent; followed closely by Adair County at 5.6 percent and Schuyler County at 6.3 percent. The highest unemployment rate of all counties served by LSEM is in Washington County, with a 13.6 percent unemployment rate, trailed by Monroe County at 12.1 percent, and the county of St. Louis City at 11.3 percent (see Table 2).¹⁸

These high rates of unemployment signify a loss of income among LSEM clients, which can greatly impact and increase needs in all other areas, such as housing, family, public benefits, and consumer issues.

Housing: The Foreclosure Crisis

Across Missouri and the rest of the U.S., the housing market continues to be impacted by the recession and economic crisis. The effects of continuing high national levels of citizens un- or underemployed, mounting layoffs and a stressed economy are demonstrated in Missouri's delinquent home loan payments and home foreclosures across the state.¹⁹ In June 2009, Missouri's rate of total loans past due was 8.12 percent, while 3.16 percent of loans were over 90 days past due, and 1.26 percent were in foreclosure. These rates are similar to national averages, as 8.62 percent of all loans are past due in the U.S., 3.16 percent being over 90 days delinquent, and 2.97 percent of homes being in foreclosure.²⁰ The higher the interest rate of a home loan, the more the delinquency and foreclosure rate increases. Those home owners with higher interest rates on their home loans did not qualify for a lower interest rate due to a poor credit history and/or a disadvantageous personal

9 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), "Occupational Employment Statistics: May 2009 Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States", http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#00-0000

10 BLS, "Occupation Employment Statistics: May 2009 State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates Missouri", http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_mo.htm#00-0000

11 MERIC, "Median Household Income Data Series", http://www.missourieconomy.org/indicators/wages/mhi_08.stm

12 Ibid.

13 The unemployment rate as defined by the BLS, is "represents the number unemployed as a percent of the labor force".

14 BLS, New Release # USDL-10-0748, "The Employment Situation - May 2010", <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/empst.pdf>

15 Blouin, A. 2008. "The 'State of the State Budget' Economic Conditions & the Missouri Budget". www.mobudget.org.

16 BLS, "Economy at a Glance: Missouri", May, 2010, <http://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.mo.htm>

17 BLS, "Economy at a Glance: St. Louis, MO-IL", http://www.bls.gov/eag/eag_mo_stlouis_msa.htm

18 Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC), "Northeast Missouri Regional Profile". April, 2010, <http://www.missourieconomy.org/regional/profile/?ac=2915000003>

19 MERIC, "Missouri Information Brief: Home Loan Situation", June 2009, <http://montgomerycountymo.org/pdfs/mohomeloanbrief.pdf>

20 Ibid.

income, thus making it even more difficult to pay bills. Though all Missouri mortgage loans sustained increases in delinquency status in June 2009, one class, \$375,000 - \$424,999 had a miniscule decrease in the sum of loans past due.

In a more micro examination, it is clear that many counties served by LSEM have been hit hard by the foreclosure crisis, with particular counties sustaining more dramatic levels of home loan delinquency (see Table 3). Many of these counties suffer from high unemployment rates, which undeniably impact the rates of home loan delinquency and foreclosure.

Beyond foreclosures, a look at the renters market in Missouri is also important, considering 53 percent of households in St. Louis City and 26 percent in St. Louis County rent.²¹ In St. Louis City and County, a two-bedroom unit at fair market rent is \$695. To afford this unit, or pay 30 percent or less on rent and utilities, a tenant would have to make 205 percent of the minimum wage, which is currently \$7.25.²² In other words, if working a minimum wage job, a tenant in St. Louis would have to work 82 hours a week to afford a two bedroom unit.²³ With these calculations, 61 percent of renters in St. Louis City and 40 percent in the county cannot afford a two-bedroom unit at fair market rent.²⁴ This statistic clearly shows both the need for more affordable housing and the struggles LSEM clients with low incomes face when attempting to rent or remain in a unit with low incomes.

Healthcare and Public Benefits

The economic downturn has made countless impacts on the lives of LSEM clients, and caused cutbacks of social services on the state

level. Individual impacts are made clear by increases in services requested from the Missouri Department of Social Services.

Several services LSEM clients frequently utilize may also be greatly impacted in the coming year. In the 2010 Missouri fiscal budget, \$1.6 million dollars for mental health services and \$1.4 million dollars for federally qualified health centers that provide health care services for the uninsured and Medicaid recipients were cut.²⁵ Also, \$1.5 million dollars were cut from the FY 2010 Missouri budget for home and community-based services for the Medicaid-ineligible, eliminating funding for approximately 2,600 individuals who are elderly or disabled.²⁶

LSEM's Health and Welfare Unit assists clients with problems related to the MO HealthNet (Medicaid) program for children, families and pregnant women, in obtaining either coverage or services. Before these budget cuts even come into effect, cases have become increasingly more difficult to resolve for several reasons.

First, in 2005, Medicaid for the working poor adults was all but eliminated. If a client's case can not be resolved, LSEM works to help clients find other assistance with medical bills and medications. LSEM also tries to connect these clients to other safety net providers and resources to help them find housing, food pantries, utilities assistance and employment.

In addition to coverage being cut, beginning in 2005, the State legislature and the Department of Social Services took a series of steps to "reform" Medicaid that have made it increasingly more difficult for parents to get and keep their kids covered. The multiple changes have kept case workers at the Family Support Division confused, resulting in inconsistencies in the way

21 DeCrappeo, M., Pelletiere, D., Crowley, S. & Teater, E. 2010. Out of Reach: Missouri. National Low Income Housing Coalition. www.nlihc.org.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Missouri Budget Project. 2010. State Policy Update: Special Report on the Budget. http://www.mobudget.org/files/3_15_10.pdf.

26 Ibid.

they handle cases. A massive computer conversion process has brought some efficiency in the way cases are handled, but has also resulted in the termination of all benefits for some families if the parent or the postal service makes one misstep. Most often the parent has to start all over again to regain the family's benefits.²⁷

The downturn in the State budget has also resulted in personnel cuts at the Family Support Division and the MO HealthNet Division, which has made it more difficult to reach employees and keep good contacts. The personnel changes at the MO HealthNet Division have additionally made it more difficult to reach the Medicaid HMOs responsible for denials of services, leading to more protracted appeals.

Family & Children

The trends discussed above directly impact the lives of families and children in LSEM's service area. The National Center for Children in Poverty reported in October 2008 that out of 73 million children living in the United States, 39 percent live in low-income families, 18 percent of which live below 100 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL).²⁸ In 2008 in Missouri specifically, 18.9 percent of children were below the poverty level,²⁹ although several counties in the LSEM service area had even higher rates of poverty. For example, 35.3 percent of individuals below 18 years old in St. Louis City and 32.9 percent in Washington County were living below the poverty line in 2008.³⁰ Out of

Missouri's 1.5 million families, 9.7 percent are distinguished as falling below poverty level.³¹

LSEM directly responds to the needs of families and children in multiple ways, one being in the family law unit, "Lasting Solutions". According to the 2009 Legal Services Corporation (LSC) "Fact Book," 34.7 percent of all LSC-eligible cases closed in 2009 were related to family law issues. Further analysis of these closed cases reveals that divorce/separation and child custody/visitation are the two most prominent family law cases, followed by domestic abuse and support.³² Similarly, survivors of domestic violence with family law issues represent LSEM's single greatest area of need served. Family law cases represented a full 40% of LSEM's 2009 closed cases.

The needs of children are also directly addressed within educational settings. Due to the high rates of poverty that children experience, often they face housing instability as well and even homelessness. Another LSEM unit/project, Children's Legal Alliance (CLA), assists these families needing assistance with school enrollment and seeking protection under the McKinney-Vento law, which addresses rights of homeless children, to strive for a stable education. However, unstable housing situations sometimes cause students to be further behind their peers in school and raise concerns about a need for special education.

In addition to school enrollment, the CLA also addresses these children's needs for special education. Through several measures, school districts have increased their resistance in identifying children who need special education services. Many school districts unreasonably delay testing of children or too narrowly interpret test results to avoid fulfilling their

28 National Center for Children in Poverty: Douglas-Hall, A. & Chau, M. (October, 2009). "Basic Facts About Low-Income Children: Birth to Age 18", http://www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_845.pdf

29 U.S. Census Bureau. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE). Estimates for Missouri Counties, 2008. <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saie/saie.cgi#SA51>

30 Ibid.

31 DHSS, OSEDA, Missouri Area Agencies on Aging, "Missouri Senior Report 2009", www.missouriseniorreport.org

32 Legal Services Corporation "Fact Book", 2009

obligations under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act of 2004. Staffing of special education classrooms and having a variety of placements across the special education spectrum also has impacted CLA clients. If a child is in need of a private separate placement at this time, school districts are less likely to place a child there, instead trying to serve the child in a self-contained environment or in the classroom. This often results in problems for the child—e.g., the child will be disciplined and removed from school because the right placement is not available.

School districts have dramatically increased their use of Missouri's Safe Schools Act to remove disruptive youth from schools. The period 2009-2010 has seen schools removing more children while failing to provide appropriate alternative educational services or special education services, which often could have avoided such disruption and removal.

The needs of children are also holistically assessed and addressed through LSEM's medical-legal project, "Children's Health Advocacy Project" (CHAP), a collaboration with St. Louis University School of Law's clinic, two children's hospitals--Cardinal Glennon and St. Louis Children's Hospital, and Grace Hill Clinic. CHAP works closely with LSEM's CLA and other units to address unmet needs in the areas of social determinants of health.

Older Adults

The Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED), and ten Missouri Area Agencies on Aging collaborated in 2009 and produced the annual *Missouri Senior Report*.³³ The Missouri

33 DHSS, OSED, Missouri Area Agencies on Aging, "Missouri Senior Report 2009", www.missouriseniorreport.org

senior population (those persons age 65 years or older) is expected to increase from 13.6 percent in 2009 to 15.1 percent in 2015.³⁴ By 2025, Missouri seniors are anticipated to account for almost one fifth of the state's population. In 2009, seniors age 60 and over accounted for 12.7% of LSC clientele.³⁵

It is clear that Missouri seniors are in need of assistance. Though senior households in Missouri earned an average of \$44,665 in 2008, 9.9 percent of Missouri seniors lived in poverty in 2000, as compared with the national senior poverty rate of 10.9 percent.³⁶ Also, 28.2 percent of Missouri's seniors are defined as 'cost burdened' by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as they pay more than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs, which includes mortgage or rent, taxes, insurance, and utilities.³⁷ In St. Louis City, 41.7 percent of seniors are cost-burdened. 4.3 percent of the 259,723 Missouri families with householders aged 65 years or more are considered to be impoverished (for more information see Table 4).³⁸ The recession and foreclosure crises have also impacted Missouri's older adult population, as many have seen their retirement accounts depleted excessively.

Older adults also see a unique range of problems that LSEM helps address. Especially due to the recession and credit crunch of the past two years, there has been a significant increase in collection cases. To address these debtor/creditor issues, LSEM helps older clients both in situations where they are sued and before suit. Related to this recent rise of collection cases, LSEM's Elder Unit has also been experiencing more cases involving wrongful

34 Ibid.

35 LSC "Fact Book", 2009

36 Ibid.

37 U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

38 Ibid.

garnishment and frozen accounts. Elderly clients are often unaware that certain monies such as social security income, pensions, and veteran's benefits are protected under state and federal law. Consequently, wrongful garnishments often result in the inability of an older adult client to afford necessities such as medication. In response to this observed trend, and in collaboration with others, LSEM's Elder Unit put forward a Supreme Court rule change concerning a bank obligation in garnishment situations to better protect our clients' funds. The change became effective in July 2010.

Estate planning cases are also a common legal need seen in the Elder Unit. Initially, elderly clients seek LSEM's services regarding a will, but once aware of non-probate transfer of property, they often want to pass on their property with a Beneficiary Deed. The Elder Unit also tries to increase client awareness of personal planning tools like Durable Powers of Attorney and Health Care Directive documents, which account for around 30 percent of their caseload.

Lastly, the Elder Unit has frequently handled family law cases over the last five years. The majority of these cases tend to involve divorce and guardianships for both minors and adults. Thus, the Elder Unit's community awareness and education efforts strive to include relevant information on these family law cases, and LSEM is known throughout the elder community for providing such services.

Immigration

As of 2008, Missouri had a foreign-born population of 215,214, or 3.6 percent of the entire population,³⁹ which includes those individuals who were not US citizens at birth. This was a 42.3 percent increase in population

39 Missouri Fact Sheet Social & Demographic Characteristics. 2010. Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/state.cfm?ID=MO>

from 2000, which was much higher than the 22 percent increase in the national immigrant population.⁴⁰ 40.5 percent of the immigrant population in Missouri are naturalized citizens.⁴¹ Further, while 30 percent of the Missouri immigrant population is Latino,⁴² over 70,000 immigrants in the St. Louis metropolitan area are from Bosnia.⁴³

In looking at who would qualify for LSEM services, scarce progress has been made among the 17.3 percent of the Missouri foreign-born population who still live in poverty (18 percent were in poverty in 2000), which Missouri figures still exceed the national average of 15.6 percent.⁴⁴ As of 2007, about 22.3 percent of noncitizens were living in poverty.⁴⁵

Hardships from current state laws also include specifically immigrant clients who are victims of serious crimes. After a serious crime has occurred, these individuals may qualify for legal immigration status if they are willing to work with law enforcement on the crime they experienced. However, often these crimes take place in domestic violence situations where the perpetrator is the household breadwinner. Because of Missouri law, the victim often does not qualify for public benefits until the legality of their immigration status is complete. Therefore, when working with law enforcement and separating from their perpetrator, the victim faces potential extreme poverty and homelessness. Issues with domestic violence within the LSEM immigration unit are common and comprehensive in nature.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.

43 Nicklaus, David. 2010. St. Louis needs to embrace immigration. St. Louis Post Dispatch. Retrieved from Stltoday.com.

44 Missouri Fact Sheet Income & Poverty. 2010. Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/state4.cfm?ID=MO>.

45 Ibid.

Within the last few years, LSEM worked to aid immigrants completing the Naturalization process. The US Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has a policy that if an individual has a disability that would prevent him or her from learning English or US Civics, this requirement is waived from his or her Naturalization process. So, when a local Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) office continuously was arbitrarily denying and delaying disabled individuals' Naturalization applications, LSEM filed suit in federal district court for 100 Naturalization applicants. LSEM was successful in helping all of these applicants become Naturalized and forcing the CIS office to change its practices. In a different Naturalization case, LSEM had filed suit to challenge the unlawful delays in the Naturalization process put in place after 2001, due to the FBI completing a "name check" on each applicant. LSEM's case resulted in all clients involved becoming Naturalized and in 2008, the FBI eliminated their backlog.

Access and Availability of Support Services

The demand for social services in the LSEM service area is increasing. The United Way of Greater St. Louis 2010 1st Quarter Report shows that call volume has increased in all areas relevant to LSEM outreach⁴⁶: In St. Louis City calls have increased from 4,272 in 2009 to 5,268 in 2010; calls from St. Louis county have increased from 6,023 in 2009 to 6,763 in 2010; and calls from Jefferson and Franklin counties have increased from 632 in 2009 to 819 in 2010. Assistance with electricity constituted 21% of calls, and rent assistance and income support constituted 17% of calls, showing that these basic needs are of top priority to low-income populations in and around the St. Louis area⁴⁷.

46 United Way of Greater St. Louis 2-1-1 Missouri-Illinois, "1st Quarter 2010 VS 1st Quarter 2009"

47 United Way of Greater St. Louis 2-1-1 Missouri-Illinois, "2010 Q1 Needs Comparison"

Rent and electric/gas assistance were also identified by United Way as the top two unmet needs identified with their clients. Similarly, LSEM has seen between a 25-29% increase in cases handled in the first three quarters of 2010 and about a 15% increase in the persons we must turn away for lack of resources.

Other LSEM community agency partners are also feeling the strain of the economic downturn and Missouri budget cuts. For example, in 2010, \$1.1 million was cut from Missouri Area Agencies on Aging.⁴⁸ These large cuts could greatly impact LSEM clients for years to come.

Conclusion

In setting forth future priorities for LSEM, it is essential to understand the economic and social environment of the community. The increased rates of individuals below the poverty line, increased evictions and foreclosures, and decrease in state spending on other social programs, all demonstrate a critical need among low-income individuals for LSEM's services to fulfill the legal needs that inevitably arise from being in these difficult economic situations, along with other supportive services.

48 Missouri Budget Project. 2010. State Policy Update: Special Report on the Budget. http://www.mobudget.org/files/3_15_10.pdf.

LSEM Research: Surveys

Methodology

To further understand the needs of the LSEM community, data was collected through surveys and focus groups. Two surveys were created, one for community members and another for social service providers and the legal community. Questions focused on both the frequency and level of importance of legal needs. Each general area (housing, family law, education, etc.) listed several specific legal issues on which respondents were asked to comment. Both surveys were available in paper copy and online, and were mailed to previous clients and distributed amongst our community partners and at meetings (see Appendix B for a full copy of the surveys). Overall, 648 surveys were collected, with 310 from the community members and 338 from social service providers and the legal community. An analysis of this data suggests what the low-income community in the LSEM service area ranks as their highest legal priorities and the greatest legal needs cited in the community. The community member survey will be discussed first, followed by the social service and legal community survey, and then conclusions drawn from the results of both.

Results: Community Member Survey

Among the 310 community member surveys collected, 67.4 percent were from women, 56.8 percent from whites and 37.8 percent from African Americans (for a complete listing of demographic data, please see Appendix C). Almost 60 percent (58.5) of individuals were unemployed and 32.5 reported having a disability, of which 83 percent cited a physical disability. Almost half of the

sample (47.4 percent) earned less than \$10,000 a year and almost 90 percent considered themselves to be a low-income household. 16 of the counties LSEM works in were represented, with 58 percent of respondents from St. Louis City and St. Louis County, and 7.7 percent from St. Charles. Every other county had less than 15 representatives. 80 percent lived with 3 or less people in their household. 40 percent are between the ages of 30 and 50 years old. Only three percent of respondents said that English was not their primary language. Half (49.2 percent) of the respondents reported knowing about LSEM services before the survey and 40 percent were former clients. About 20 percent have contacted LSEM, but did not become clients.

When looking beyond the basic demographic information in the community member surveys, several trends appear regarding the importance of specific legal areas. The highest ranked area by importance was public benefits, with health insurance issues, TANF and food stamps, and Medicaid eligibility and appeals as the top rated areas. Closely behind is both housing and family

Survey Data Quick Facts

- *648 surveys collected*
- *310 community member surveys from:*
 - *St. Louis City and County: 58%*
 - *St. Charles: 7.7%*
 - *Other Counties/unknown: 34.2%*

law, with over 50 percent of respondents citing utility payments, the availability of low-income housing, obtaining or keeping child custody and child support as important or very important. Similarly, about 50 percent of respondents also marked problems with bill collectors, loans and collection defense as a high priority that LSEM should address. Please see Table 5 for a listing of top priorities across categories. Table 6 describes each legal category and the frequency for each legal issue.

In terms of the relationship between geography and priority, several interesting correlations do exist. Community members from St. Louis County ranked preventing foreclosures a much higher priority than any other geographic region, while also putting housing code violations, “landlords not making repairs” and security deposit issues as top priorities. St. Charles ranked family law a higher priority than other regions, especially in the areas of child custody issues. Loan modifications and credit problems were also top priorities more so in St. Charles than other regions. Conversely, the St. Charles region ranked immigration law as the lowest priority far below other areas. In terms of miscellaneous legal areas, St. Louis County was much higher than expected in terms of a need for traffic violation assistance.

To address the question of need, the community member survey asked respondents if they or a member of their household has experienced specific legal problems in the past four years

Top Priorities Ranked by Community Members:

1. *Health Insurance Problems*
2. *TANF/Food Stamps/Medicaid*
3. *Utility Payments*
4. *Bill Collection*
5. *Child Support*

(because that was when the last LSEM priorities report was conducted), and how they addressed that problem. The highest unmet legal issue was regarding debt and credit issues, with 23 percent of respondents experiencing this problem and 52 percent of that group unable to meet their need (Table 7). Similar to the priority listing, the top unmet debt and credit topics were bill collector problems, collection defense and modifying loans. Family and housing law problems were other high areas of unmet need, with over 40 percent of those who experienced a legal need being unable to address it. About 18 percent of respondents experienced a problem pertaining to family law and 16 percent to housing law. Interestingly, 23 percent of respondents experienced an issue about public benefits, but only 19 percent of those experiencing this need said the need went unmet. In almost every category, the highest unmet need community members faced was also a top ranked priority, suggesting consistency in the measure. This is true except in immigration law, where relief for domestic violence was the top priority, but not the highest unmet need. However, only 3.6 percent of respondents experienced any type of legal immigration problem, thus the sample size was very minimal.

The survey also questioned respondents on the need for community legal education and access to legal assistance. Nearly half of respondents agreed that the legal process can be difficult to understand (Table 8) and about 68 percent agreed that if legal information was available online, they would use it to educate themselves (Table 9). 72 percent agreed that legal presentations on a variety of subjects would be valuable. Presentations at a community center, school or church during the day were most popular. In terms of access to LSEM services, about one in five people said they have limited phone access, limited transportation options, and difficulty with contacting the LSEM office between the hours of eight thirty and five (Table 8). Age differences in reporting were very apparent in the

community education section, especially among older adults over 65 years old. This age group was significantly more likely to not have access to the internet and not have the desire to educate themselves through the internet. Older adults more than other age groups also largely preferred for legal presentations to be at a church or housing complex during the day. The Baby Boomer Generation (1946-1964) was the most likely to see the value in and would go to legal presentations, while Generation Y (1981-2000) was the least likely to attend. Regardless of age however, the data seems to suggest that community outreach and education is highly valued and would be well received.

Results: The Social Service Providers and the Legal Community Survey

To obtain a clear picture of the legal needs and priorities of the community, surveys were also distributed to social service providers and the legal community. Of the 338 surveys from social service providers, 172 were from social service providers, 48 from lawyers, 3 from judges, and over 100 were in other positions. This figure also includes 42 LSEM staff members (for a complete listing of demographic data, please see Appendix C). A wide range of other agencies were represented, including Developmental Disability Resources, Salvation

Army, Mideast Area Agency on Aging, St. Louis Effort for Aids and area school districts, among many others. 43 percent of respondents described their work as direct client services and over 90 percent reported they work directly with low income populations. Each of the 21 counties LSEM serves was represented, yet the counties most represented where providers served clients were in St. Louis City (60 percent), St. Louis County (62 percent) and St. Charles (40 percent).

When questioning service providers and the legal community, respondents looked at the same general categories and specific legal areas listed on the community member survey, and ranked them by priority in terms of the frequency and impact each issue is seen to have in low-income areas. Similar to the community member survey, legal help around public benefits was perceived as one of the top priorities, especially around the issues of Medicaid eligibility, enrollment and appeals, SSI or SSDI cases, and general health insurance issues (Table 10). However, the highest priority across general topics was the availability of low-income housing, with 71 percent of respondents stating this should be a high or very high priority for LSEM. The second highest area was addressing the legal issues of domestic violence in family law (chosen by 65 percent), followed by preventing evictions (61 percent). For a complete listing of all priorities ranked by category, please see Table 11.

The service providers and legal community were also questioned about the degree of discrimination they see in the community. Over 50 percent of respondents agreed that some type of discrimination is occurring often or very often in the community. One in four agreed that income discrimination is taking place often or very often. Nearly 20 percent of community members also agreed that they have experienced discrimination due to their income. Housing and employment were the places discrimination is taking place the most, followed by in schools and in the legal process (either in court or

of Social Service Provider/Legal Community Surveys collected: 338

Social service providers: 172

Lawyers: 48 LSEM Staff: 42

Judges: 3 Other: 100+

Over 90% reported to work with low-income populations

Top Priorities Ranked by Service Providers and the Legal Community:

- 1. Availability of Low-Income Housing*
- 2. Domestic Violence*
- 3. Medicaid Eligibility/Appeals*
- 4. Preventing Evictions*
- 5. SSI / SSDI Cases*

with police officers). As LSEM continues to work to provide equal access to justice to low-income people, it is essential for our advocates to be aware of and continue to stand against the discrimination their clients are experiencing.

In addition to ranking priority on legal problems, service providers and the legal community were also questioned on issues of community education and “economic and community development”. Three-fourths of providers agreed that legal presentations on topics such as landlord-tenant law, consumer protection, public benefits and family law are valuable to individuals in low-income communities (Table 12). Further, 60 percent of providers agreed if legal information was available online, they would encourage their clients to learn about their legal rights and responsibilities. A low 27 and 21 percent of providers respectively agreed that their clients would be interested in attending legal presentations and that their clients have access to the internet to utilize online resources. This in contrast to the community member survey where nearly 60 percent of respondents said they would attend legal presentations and do have access to the internet.

In terms of community and economic development, about one in four providers (23.5 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that their agency could benefit from legal assistance with complying with state and federal requirements (Table 13). 22 percent also stated a need for assistance around employment issues. Issues such as working with individual

contractors, volunteers, negotiating a lease and corporate governance issues were seen as less important and stated as a need by only 15 percent of respondents. These administrative issues however were being ranked largely by individuals in direct client services, not management level individuals who would be more actively identifying these organizational legal needs which help develop and stabilize nonprofits.

Comparisons and Discussion

Interestingly, there are some discrepancies between the community member survey and social service provider and legal community survey regarding what the greatest legal needs in the community are and what LSEM top priorities should be. Agreement is present with housing law being a top area, especially around the availability of low-income housing and utility payments. The top identified needs were similar within several substantive areas of public benefits (Medicaid, health insurance, and TANF), debt and credit (bill collector problems and loan modification), immigration (domestic violence) and miscellaneous legal work (removing barriers to employment and housing caused by old misdemeanor and traffic ticket arrest warrants and healthcare directives). However, when looking at family law, the areas most important to community members (obtaining and modifying child custody, divorces and child support) are ranked far below the issues most important to service providers (domestic violence, hotline calls and orders of protection). Similarly, in terms of legal problems around educational issues, community members set Individual Education Program (IEP) issues and troubles at school due to discrimination above other areas. Service providers ranked these two categories the lowest among other areas, and ranked other educational areas (school enrollment while homeless, suspensions/expulsions and delinquency) much higher priorities than community members.

When comparing the top ranked legal needs of community members to service providers across

categories, we observe differences. For example, while service providers rank domestic violence, preventing evictions, hotline calls for child abuse, orders of protection, and “school enrollment while homeless” within their top ten priorities, these legal needs are not in the top ten priorities among community members surveyed. Similarly, problems with TANF and food stamps, bill collector issues, child support, and custody modifications are on the community’s top ten needs but not the service providers’. Thus, there is 50 percent variability between the two lists.

There are several possible explanations for why these discrepancies may exist. While it is possible that the needs as perceived by the low-income population are truly different than what service providers report, an alternative explanation is that both, community members and service providers choose what they believe LSEM’s top priorities should be based on what they have worked with or experienced in the past. While low-income individuals of any age, gender and household composition can experience issues with health insurance, food stamps, and credit problems-- problems with domestic violence, child custody and support, and school issues are generally more applicable to a more specific group. Further, while 50 percent of the service providers surveyed reported working with domestic violence situations, it is doubtful statistically, yet impossible to determine, that 50 percent of the community member sample also had a background with domestic violence situations. Regardless of the reasoning, it is important to recognize that within the limited survey responses, the priorities service providers set may sometimes differ from the stated needs of the community. As LSEM sets our own priorities, both sets of needs must be considered, while also deciding where LSEM can best utilize our resources, where other resources exist, and what issues can be best addressed by LSEM advocates.

Both surveys asked about the need for certain miscellaneous legal issues that LSEM has addressed

in the past or is frequently asked about. According to the community survey, about 30 percent of respondents have experienced a municipal or traffic violation, and 10 percent of these people were unable to resolve their problem (Table 14). Creating a will and handling an existing warrant were both experienced by about 20 percent of the respondents, and 45 percent of those with an existing warrant stated their need is unmet (Table 14). This sentiment is matched in the service provider survey, with 40 percent of service providers ranking existing warrants as a high or very high priority. However, regarding serious criminal charges underlying many warrants, LSEM cannot handle criminal matters under our LSC regulations. Nevertheless, the surveys indicate that many potential LSEM clients are facing a plethora of civil legal issues that LSEM does not have sufficient resources to address fully at this time.

In addition to describing legal needs and priorities, the surveys reinforced another need in the community—legal outreach and education. Both community members and service providers agreed that the community benefits from legal education in the form of workshops and presentations. Knowing personal legal rights and information on issues such as housing, consumer and family law can help individuals avoid certain legal situations and protect themselves, while also informing people when legal assistance is necessary. Both are reasons that LSEM has always included community legal education and outreach as part of its service delivery to both the client community and agency partners. Similarly, individual survey respondents expressed a desire to have legal information available online to further educate themselves on their rights. Due to current levels of limited resources, LSEM can not now reach all of the low-income individuals who are eligible and in need of legal assistance; therefore, continuing LSEM’s legal education and outreach efforts will remain an important method of service delivery, particularly in areas such as consumer law, where education, planning, and prevention methods

can sometimes be more effective in addressing the issue than litigation after the problem exists. Legal outreach and legal community education, however, have their limits in resolving legal problems identified and would never be a better solution than access to an attorney or advocate for advice and representation.

While a careful analysis of the data above is useful and beneficial to LSEM, it is also important to recognize the limitations that also exist. For example, when ranking priority on the community survey, the questions had about a 60 percent response rate, which means many questions were left blank. The length and complexity of the survey possibly thwarted receiving more complete data. In addition, like many written materials, the survey was not able to respond to the degree of literacy of the respondents, which could have led to misunderstandings and unanswered questions for a respondent with low literacy skills. Further, it was not practicable for LSEM to provide survey respondents with a monetary or other incentive to complete the survey, and thus, some respondents may not have given each question their full effort or thought. Due to the convenient sampling method used, the survey sample is not completely statistically representative of the low-income community LSEM serves, (e.g., slightly lower representation from rural community members and non-English speaking community members). Thus, the needs of these populations not fully expressed within the survey results were addressed in focus groups. In addition, with 40 percent of the

community member sample being LSEM former clients, this sample may have a different perspective of the agency than the general public. Convenience sampling was also used with the service provider surveys, and thus distributed mainly to community partners with whom LSEM already has relationships. This may have led to biased responses, because those providers already are working with LSEM in certain capacities and will likely want to see LSEM continue working in those capacities. However, while all of these limitations are important to note, the data collected from the surveys can still be viewed as valuable information for us.

Therefore, the surveys collected from community members, social service providers and the legal community present an array of legal issues and needs that the community is facing. This information, coupled with knowledge of the current demographic and economic trends in the LSEM service area and the research from the focus groups that will be presented next, helps present a better picture of the community's needs and how to best set LSEM's future priorities.

LSEM Research: Focus Groups

Methodology

In addition to surveys, in order to obtain more qualitative and narrative feedback on the legal needs in the community, ten focus groups were conducted by LSEM staff and interns. These focus groups were organized through partnerships with the following organizations: Project Ark, the Independence Center, Life Source Consultants, International Institute, Ahepa 53 Senior Apartments, Bi-Lingual International Assistant Services, Gateway Homeless Services, the LSEM Client Activities Committee and the Committee of Related Agencies (CORA) in two rural areas of Kahoka and Hannibal. Focus groups were held with both urban and rural residents, with eight focus groups in the St. Louis area, one in Kahoka, and one in Hannibal, Missouri. Groups ranged from 4 to 20 people and consisted of only clients, only social service providers, or a combination of the two. Over 100 people participated in these focus groups, with 63 percent being potential clients and 37 percent service providers.

Each focus group was facilitated by one or two Masters of Social Work interns, who were also accompanied by a LSEM attorney 70 percent of the time. Each group followed the same general agenda, beginning with asking the participants about their initial impressions of “Legal Services” or “Legal Aid.” This gave the facilitators a sense of what the reputation is of LSEM in the community. Then, after the facilitator gave a very brief overview of the

services LSEM offers, participants were asked to discuss the following questions:

1. Keeping the presentation in mind, in which legal areas have you experienced the most difficulty in the past four years?
2. How did you resolve these difficulties? With LSEM or using other resources?
3. Has anything kept you from accessing LSEM services?

These questions lead to a discussion of the legal needs present in the community and the barriers preventing clients from more fully accessing LSEM services. Below is a synthesis of this

Focus Group Participants:

Project Ark

Life Source Consultants

CORA (Kahoka and Hannibal)

Independence Center

International Institute

AHEPA 53 Senior Apartments

*Bi-Lingual International
Assistant Services*

Gateway Homeless Services

*LSEM Client Activities
Committee*

research and major conclusions reached.

Results

During the focus groups, several legal issues were discussed, as well as strengths and weaknesses of LSEM. In general, when discussing impressions of the agency, there was a broad understanding that LSEM provided free legal services. Further, those who were fully aware of the agency had a strong respect for it, recognizing LSEM as one of the very few places to access free legal services. Frequently, potential clients reported learning about LSEM from case managers or other agencies. However, most individuals (service providers and clients alike) were unaware of all of the types of law LSEM practices, often knowing about just one particular area. At several client focus groups, a majority of the group had not heard of LSEM before and was very appreciative to learn these legal services are available. For those individuals who were former clients, almost all expressed very positive experiences and recognized LSEM as a source for accurate legal information. However, several groups also stated one of their impressions was that it can be difficult to get through the intake process and become a LSEM client.

When discussing legal difficulties, several major themes arose. By far, the top three legal areas discussed were consumer law, housing issues, and public benefits. In terms of consumer law, predatory lending, bankruptcy, and education on consumer rights and avoiding scams were largely cited. Second was housing related issues, especially in terms of landlord-tenant disputes, questions with Section 8 vouchers, and the availability of low-income units. Nearly at the same rate as housing topics, the issue of public benefits was also very prevalent, especially regarding healthcare. Individuals had many questions about qualifying for Medicaid, the SSI

process, and healthcare for children. Several focus groups also discussed problems with discrimination and understanding their basic civil rights, especially in terms of housing and employment, due to their sexuality, a mental disability, or previous criminal history. Lastly, the fifth most frequently cited legal issue was obtaining child support and child custody problems.

Beyond these areas, several other legal issues were discussed, specific to certain populations. For example, more so than other focus groups, clients at Gateway Homeless Services thoroughly expressed a need for shelter and addressing traffic violations. The International Institute discussed a need for educational materials to give to employers regarding the

Top priority areas for focus groups:

- 1. Consumer law*
- 2. Housing*
- 3. Public benefits*
- 4. Civil rights and discrimination*
- 5. Child support & custody*

work authorization documents required by immigrants and refugees.

After discussing the legal difficulties individuals and the community are frequently experiencing, participants were also asked about how these problems are most frequently addressed if LSEM is unable to take the case.

Overwhelmingly, individuals said the problem often goes unaddressed and unresolved. Also, individuals frequently turn to agencies or churches they currently are involved in, and case managers struggle to resolve their clients' issues

to the best of their abilities without legal expertise. Some clients expressed trying to contact a different attorney, but struggle to afford good legal assistance. Overall, many expressed that their legal difficulties would be more fully addressed with the help of LSEM or other legal assistance.

In addition to legal needs and the mechanisms individuals use to resolve these, the focus groups discussed the barriers the community experiences in accessing LSEM services.

Amongst client and service provider focus groups alike, the largest barrier was a lack of knowledge, a very common problem for non-profits. Focus group participants often either simply did not know who LSEM was, or many knew some aspects of LSEM, but were completely unaware of the many and varied types of legal problems for which LSEM provides assistance. These focus groups were successful not only for needs assessment data but also in fulfilling a secondary purpose for LSEM of conducting further needed legal outreach and education to various target communities. This success was demonstrated after several focus groups, when agencies such as the International Institute, the Coalition of Related Agencies, and Project Ark, requested that LSEM return to present an overview of its range of services to front-line staff, so these case managers can better refer clients and have the tools to help clients facing legal troubles.

Because of quick staff turn-around in many agencies, yearly visits were suggested if our resources permitted. These agencies agreed with LSEM's philosophy that this type of outreach can be very efficient and effective to spread knowledge about LSEM services and reach more individuals who are in need. Further, service providers at the Independence Center and Bi-Lingual International Assistant Services were also very interested in presentations in specific legal areas to educate their clients on

frequent legal problems they experience. They believe these presentations would help individuals in the low-income community learn about LSEM and a particular topic.

In addition to the community need for more general knowledge about LSEM, the other largest barrier discussed by focus group participants was completing the intake process and becoming accepted as an LSEM client. Unfortunately, this is a result of our severe lack of sufficient financial resources to handle anywhere near the full legal problems, outreach and legal education needs of the several hundred thousand low-income persons eligible for LSEM's help throughout our 21 county service area. Individuals expressed some feelings of despair when needing legal assistance but being turned away from LSEM, knowing there was often no place else to go. Some focus group potential clients stated they simply did not understand the intake process and were unsure of the best way to reach the LSEM office (calling, walk in, etc.), while also needing assistance with paperwork, transportation, or phone service. Participants suggested that including intake information in community outreach presentations could be helpful to both clients and service providers and add clarity to the process, which LSEM outreach efforts do address. Another concern with intake was not getting through the process quick enough or not being assigned an advocate soon enough to address a legal issue when needing immediate help. These concerns about the intake process were especially high among the rural focus groups. These unmet needs further motivate LSEM to continue to fight for sufficient funding to provide equal access to justice for all the low-income community.

Several focus groups, such as the LSEM Client Activities Committee, expressed the importance of more publicity regarding the individual

successful cases that LSEM has. Recognizing that due to a lack of resources, LSEM will be unable to serve every eligible low-income individual; they suggested however, that LSEM can garner more public support by showing the impact we do have among those accepted for representation. They believe this could help the public continue to view LSEM as a viable option to turn to with legal issues.

Discussion

Overall within the focus groups, many legal issues were expressed in the community, but the top legal problems discussed were in consumer law, housing and public benefits. These particular legal topics impact people of all ages and backgrounds. Further, in each of these topics, participants requested not just one-on-one legal consultation and representation, but also basic legal education and prevention methods. The community views LSEM as a credible source to provide valuable information regarding how to navigate these systems and protect themselves and their families. LSEM utilizes this trust when conducting legal education and outreach in these areas for the purposes of helping potential clients both prevent future problems and recognize their needs for legal assistance so that timely requests for help are made. In 2009, LSEM reached 15,277 persons through outreach, community education and publications.

Responding to focus group requests for more public outreach and legal education about what LSEM does, our intake process, and the impact of our limited resources, can ultimately help LSEM reach those with legal needs and further our mission of fighting for justice in the low-income community. These focus groups and continuing outreach efforts help LSEM continue to stay rooted to more clients and understand their changing legal needs.

Conclusions From the Surveys and Focus Groups

In looking at the results from both the surveys and focus groups, several major themes emerged regarding the legal needs in the community and avenues to expanding LSEM services.

First of all, both research methods suggest that consumer law, public benefits and housing are major needs for LSEM clients. Community members and service providers ranked public benefits and health insurance concerns at the top of their priority list, and this was also a main need discussed among the focus groups. Consumer issues were another top issue discussed in focus groups and on the community member survey, ranked high in priority lists and were the highest unmet need. Housing topics also were ranked a high priority by community members and service providers on surveys and focus groups, and were the third highest unmet need ranked by community members. Issues around family law were the second most unmet legal need and were given high priority by service providers. Similar to the focus groups, the largest emphasis by community members around issues of family law were around child support and child custody issues. The repetition of consumer, housing and public benefit issues suggests these areas may need special consideration when setting priorities.

Another similarity between the focus groups and survey data was the overwhelming support for community education through legal presentations and information online as areas of need. Focus group results were similar to the survey results that over 70 percent of community members and service providers find legal presentations valuable. While increasing the number of educational presentations on specific legal topics is one way to help address the prevalent consumer and housing issues in the community, without increased resources to

handle additional requests generated for legal help in these areas, the value of the legal education remains limited.

Issues with discrimination also were discussed in the surveys and focus groups. Discrimination and individual rights, especially in housing and employment settings, were top issues discussed in focus groups. On surveys, social service providers also reported some type of discrimination occurring frequently or very frequently. These raised issues of discrimination bring a better understanding to LSEM of the environment in which our low-income community clients are living.

While all of this data is valuable, it is also important to keep in mind the limitations of the collected research. For example, through the focus groups and surveys, it is unclear if all of the needs community members and service providers indicated can be best met by an attorney. Further, the low percentage of need expressed in several categories, such as immigration and education, may be a larger indicator that these populations were not as well surveyed as other populations, rather than indicating that a need is not present. Lastly, how individuals rank priorities may depend more on their immediate needs (such as the availability of TANF or food stamps) instead of larger issues that have more lasting affects (like issues of intimate partner violence). Despite these limitations, the data collected is representative of a large sample in LSEM's service area, is still very useful in determining priorities, and provides information relevant to current legal service delivery and legal outreach and education. LSEM notes that of the surveys filled out by former clients with cases closed in 2010, over 90 percent said yes, they were satisfied with the quality of LSEM's services, 93 percent

were satisfied with the way they were treated and 97% percent would refer a friend to LSEM.

Thus, the survey and focus group data helped to present a better picture of the legal needs of the LSEM service area. This information combined with LSEM capacity limits and consideration of how to best utilize available staff will help further develop future priorities, in accordance with multiple factors laid out by LSC regulations, and described in the next section II.

II. LSEM Priority Setting Process

I. PROGRAM PRIORITIES PLAN

The goal of LSEM is to provide high-quality legal services that address the needs of the client community. As stated in LSEM's 2010-2015 Strategic Plan, "[b]y deploying our expertise, commitment and leadership capacity, continuing to explore and incorporate best practices, LSEM plans to provide legal help through a multi-faceted service delivery system:

- a full mix of individual legal representation and advocacy,
- community legal education/outreach and
- impact/systemic advocacy,
- often in partnership with a wide range of health, human services and educational service providers."⁴⁹

This Strategic Plan further states: "The heart of legal aid is the positive difference legal services make in the lives of our clients and their communities—outcomes of greater safety, stability, educational and economic opportunity for example. In keeping with our vision of client-centered services, as described in more detail below, LSEM strives to provide clients with comprehensive high-quality legal services addressing multiple needs. That may mean additional cases per person served; holistic services incorporating LSEM social work staff to connect clients to other needed social services; and system-changing advocacy when the client's problem is due to flaws in the

systems that fail to meet our clients' needs or violate their rights."⁵⁰

The LSEM priorities are also designed to help achieve the seven basic "Improved life conditions/outcomes for clients" set out in the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan.

- Meaningful Economic Opportunity and economic stability: e.g., increased self-sufficiency by removing barriers to employment, reducing debt problems through enforcement of consumer law rights,
- Shelter: e.g., safe, stable, secure housing,
- Safety: e.g., Freedom from violence and abuse,
- Health Care, Security and Well-being: e.g., access to health care, basic nutrition, and disability benefits,
- Education: e.g., access to appropriate educational opportunities for long-term self-sufficiency,
- Family stability: e.g., through assistance with family law issues,
- Human dignity and justice: e.g., systemic work for the homeless, civil rights, refugee assistance, etc.

Thus LSEM's priorities are consistent with the LSC "suggested list of priorities" in FR Doc. 96-13413, which include: "Support for Families", "Preserving the Home", "Maintaining Economic Stability", "Safety, Stability and Health", and "Populations with Special Vulnerabilities."

⁴⁹ 2010-2015 LSEM Strategic Plan (June 2010), pp.5-6.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p.7.

However, the resources of the program are limited, and LSEM is not able to accept every case for an individual, group or entity in which service is requested. It is necessary to prioritize the areas in which we provide services so that resources are maximized. The factors listed in 45 CFR Part 1620.3(c) were fully considered in establishing the program's priorities and all of Part 1620 was followed. With these guidelines taken into consideration, and based upon the above appraisal of needs, the following plan was developed for the priorities of LSEM.

In order to maximize the participation of volunteer attorneys and judicare attorneys in meeting the needs of the client community, the following areas are priorities for staff, the VLP and judicare attorneys. Within these priorities, LSEM continues to follow all LSC regulations.

A. Case Acceptance and Advocacy

The program must continue to find ways to provide more services with fewer financial resources. The program seeks to achieve this goal in large part by retaining an experienced staff, which can represent a large number of clients, by expanding its VLP, and utilizing limited judicare components. With these components remaining in place, LSEM will continue to place emphasis on accepting for service cases which affect the basic survival needs of its clients, as well as services to prevent crises from disrupting the health, safety and shelter of the low-income community. LSEM will use all available means of advocacy, where advisable, when such an action /approach will maximize the benefits to the client community.

Listed below are the areas of law that are priorities for case acceptance. Each area is a priority and the list is not a ranking of importance:

CONSUMER

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

DISABILITY

EDUCATION

ELDERLY

FAMILY LAW TO PREVENT ADULT OR CHILD ABUSE AND/OR TO STABILIZE FAMILIES

HEALTH

HOUSING

IMMIGRATION, as allowed under 45 CFR Part 1626

INCOME MAINTENANCE, including unemployment compensation

PUBLIC BENEFITS

PROBATE, where avoiding homelessness or impoverishment of a family is the goal

TAX MATTERS may be handled in situations where the client's employment or home may be affected.

Due to insufficient resources to meet the legal needs of the low-income community, of necessity, the variety of any cases accepted within each of the priority areas will be determined on the basis of adequate resources, including funding, staffing, available technology, and on the basis of the specific case acceptance protocols within each substantive unit/project/office, which protocols are reviewed and revised as necessary, by the managing attorneys, in consultation with the Associate Directors, Director of Advocacy and Executive Director.

Through either the staff or the VLP, LSEM will continue to reach out to client-eligible individuals and populations who have special legal problems or special difficulties of access to legal services.

B. Community Education and Training and Collaboration

Community education remains a priority for the program. LSEM has a long history of providing community education presentations and materials in a variety of forums. The program will present

as many topics as possible in community education seminars and materials when those topics affect our client community. In order to reach as many low-income persons as possible, LSEM provides community education and training both directly to the client community and to agencies/entities who also serve the client community, with whom we collaborate to deliver the most effective service. Such community education may include information or assistance with pro se representation and other forms of self-help. LSEM staff also serves on various task forces and other collaboration entities to provide legal education and training and advocate for the needs of clients.

Staff training in areas relevant to skills and LSEM's priority legal areas is likewise important. Effective advocacy is dependent upon proficient skills and staying abreast of changing legal theories, which prove successful in litigating or advocating concerning poverty issues.

Many private attorneys participating in our volunteer or judicare programs may wish to have training in areas of the law relating to serving the low-income community. In order to continue to meet the needs of our clients, LSEM will provide training sessions for the private volunteer and judicare attorneys who assist our clients.

C. Staff Model

LSEM continues to maintain that the staff model program is the most cost effective and efficient method of delivering high-quality representation to clients in its metropolitan service area. Therefore, LSEM places a high priority on the staff model for service delivery, supplemented by the VLP, and by judicare services in the northeastern counties. As recommended by LSC, LSEM continues to utilize technology to screen, research and respond to client needs.

D. Funding

Continuing efforts to maintain or expand LSEM's funding is a high priority in order to meet the needs expressed in the 2010 needs assessment data. Our ability to serve the greatest number of

clients is directly related to our financial resources.

E. Changes in Priorities

In the case of emergency circumstances, the executive director or designee shall have the authority to add or delete program priorities. An emergency may include a case or matter requiring immediate legal action, circumstances involving the necessities of life, a significant risk to the health or safety of the client or immediate family members, or issues that arise because new and unforeseen circumstances, such as natural disasters or unanticipated changes in the law affecting large numbers of clients.

In determining an emergency, the following factors may be among those considered by the executive director or designee:

1. the time period in which action must be taken to protect the client's interests;
2. the severity of the consequences to the client if no action is taken;
3. the likelihood of success if urgent legal action is taken;
4. whether action must be taken immediately because of the applicable statute of limitations;
5. the capacity of another source of free or low-cost legal assistance to undertake the particular case; and the effect the problem presented will have on the client community.

The executive director or his designee must approve the handling of a case on an emergency basis (approval form attached to the priorities report).

II. PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES IN THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES OF LSEM

Periodically, or at least every four (4) years, LSEM will conduct an appraisal of needs of its client community. The next appraisal will be

completed no later than Dec. 31, 2014. The following procedures will be utilized in establishing priorities in the allocation of resources.

LSEM will conduct an effective appraisal of the needs of eligible clients in the geographic areas served by the program, and their relative importance, based on information received from potential or current eligible clients, solicited in a manner reasonably calculated to obtain the attitude of all significant segments of the client population. The appraisal shall also include input from LSEM employees, board members, the private bar, and other interested persons, and to the extent feasible, should include outreach to eligible clients, which may include the use of such techniques as questionnaires and surveys. In addition to substantive legal problems, the appraisal shall address the need for outreach, training, and support services.

LSEM shall ensure an opportunity to participate by all significant segments of the client community and program employees in the setting of priorities, and in the annual review required by 45 CFR 1620.5, and provide an opportunity for comment by interested members of the public.

The following factors shall be among those considered by LSEM in establishing priorities:

- A. the suggested priorities promulgated by LSC;
- B. the appraisal described above;
- C. the population of eligible individual clients in the LSEM service area, including all significant segments of that population with special legal problems or special difficulties of access to legal services;
- D. the resources of LSEM;
- E. the availability of another source of free or low-cost legal assistance in a particular category of cases or matters;
- F. the availability of other sources of training, support, and outreach services;
- G. the relative importance of particular legal problems to the individual clients of LSEM;

- H. the susceptibility of particular problems to solution through legal processes;
- I. whether legal efforts by LSEM will complement other efforts to solve particular problems in the area served;
- J. whether legal efforts will result in efficient and economical delivery of legal services; and
- K. whether there is a need to establish different priorities in different parts of the LSEM service area.

LSEM will allocate resources consistent with the purposes and requirements of the LSC Act, regulations, guidelines and instructions, including 45 CFR 1620.3, and shall make a reasonable effort to provide that all potentially eligible clients in LSEM's service area have reasonably equal access to similar types of services. The types of services may vary so as to take into account different priorities in different parts of the service area, a higher incidence of a particular kind of legal problem, the considerably higher costs of providing services, or differences in individual client financial resources.

The LSEM Board of Directors shall review priorities annually. LSEM shall submit to LSC, and make available to the public, an annual report summarizing the review of priorities, the date of the most recent appraisal, the timetable for the future appraisal of needs and evaluation of priorities, mechanisms which will be utilized to ensure effective client participation in priority setting, and any changes in priorities. The report will also include the case acceptance policies and procedures for LSEM.

The following factors shall be among those considered in determining whether LSEM's priorities should be changed:

- A. the extent to which the objectives of the priorities have been accomplished;
- B. changes in the resources of LSEM;
- C. changes in the size, distribution or needs of the eligible client population;
- D. the volume of non-priority emergency cases or matters in a particular substantive area since the last annual priorities review.

10/2006

LEGAL SERVICES OF EASTERN MISSOURI, INC.
APPROVAL FOR REPRESENTATION IN AN EMERGENCY
NON-PRIORITY CASE OR MATTER

NAME OF POTENTIAL CLIENT

DATE

TRACKING NO.: _____ DATE FACTS OBTAINED: _____

NATURE OF LEGAL PROBLEM, ISSUE, OR MATTER:

HAVE YOU TRIED TO REFER THIS PERSON OR MATTER TO PRIVATE COUNSEL?

___ YES ___ NO IF YES, TO WHOM?

IF YES, WHY WASN'T THE CASE OR MATTER ACCEPTED?

IF NO, WHY NOT?

DETAIL NATURE OF EMERGENCY:

HAVE YOU ADVISED THE POTENTIAL CLIENT THAT ONLY LIMITED SERVICES MAY BE PROVIDED DUE TO THE EMERGENCY NATURE OF THE PROBLEM, AND LSEM MAY WITHDRAW FROM THE CASE OR MATTER IF LSEM'S PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ARE CONSISTENT WITH WITHDRAWAL AND AN EMERGENCY NO LONGER EXISTS? _____ YES
_____ NO

I AM REQUESTING APPROVAL TO REPRESENT THE ABOVE-MENTIONED PERSON AND/OR HANDLE THE MATTER SET OUT ABOVE.

CASE HANDLER'S NAME

REPRESENTATION OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED PERSON OR HANDLING OF THE MATTER SET OUT ABOVE IS HEREBY:

___ APPROVED ___ DENIED

APPROVED ON THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/DESIGNEE SIGNATURE

DATE

Acknowledgements

Several different partners were essential pieces in this 2010 Needs Assessment and Priority Setting Process. We would like to thank all of our community partners that completed and helped distribute surveys, for without their assistance, we would not have been able to reach as many clients and service providers. We are very grateful to those agencies that organized meetings and hosted focus groups: Project Ark, the Independence Center, Life Source Consultants, International Institute, Ahepa 53 Senior Apartments, Bi-Lingual International Assistant Services, Gateway Homeless Services, the LSEM Client Activities Committee and the Committee of Related Agencies (CORA) in

Kahoka and Hannibal. Further, we offer thanks to all of the community members who completed the surveys and participated in focus groups, offering LSEM their valuable feedback. Lastly, we thank our LSEM staff advocates who consulted in the planning stages of the survey design and participated in focus groups and survey disbursement. In particular, a special thanks goes to the Priority Planning Committee, which included: Daniel Glazier, Jeanne Philips-Roth, Betty Springfield, Gayle Williams, Jennifer Heggemann, Laura Halfmann, Natasha Miller (MSW intern), and Penny Brummett (MSW intern).

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1: Demographics on Missouri Counties Served by LSEM

County	Total Population: 2009 ⁵¹	Percent below Poverty Line: ⁵²	Total Poverty Population ⁵³	Percent of Poverty Population of LSEM Service Area ⁵⁴
MISSOURI	5,987,580	13.30%	796,348	
Adair	25,135	28.70%	7,214	2.81%
Clark	7,127	14.10%	1,005	0.39%
Franklin	101,263	9.50%	9,620	3.74%
Jefferson	219,046	7.90%	17,305	6.73%
Knox	3,981	18.00%	717	0.28%
Lewis	9,791	16.10%	1,576	0.61%
Lincoln	53,311	9.80%	5,224	2.03%
Macon	15,359	12.50%	1,920	0.75%
Marion	28,449	15.00%	4,267	1.66%
Monroe	8,993	11.90%	1,070	0.42%
Montgomery	11,698	11.80%	1,380	0.54%
Pike	18,406	15.50%	2,853	1.11%
Ralls	9,634	8.70%	838	0.33%
Schuyler	4,144	17.00%	704	0.27%
Scotland	4,803	16.80%	807	0.31%
Shelby	6,325	16.30%	1,031	0.40%
St. Charles	349,407	4.60%	16,073	6.25%
St. Louis City	356,587	23.80%	84,868	33.02%
St. Louis Co.	992,408	9.10%	90,309	35.13%
Warren	31,485	12.60%	3,967	1.54%
Washington	24,400	17.60%	4,294	1.67%
Total LSEM	2,281,752	11.27%	257,043	

51. U.S. Census Bureau. 2009. www.census.gov.

52 All percentages are based on 2000 U.S. Census data, except for Adair, Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, Marion, St. Charles, St. Louis City, St. Louis, Warren and Washington Counties, which come from: American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates. 2006-2008. U.S. Census Bureau.

53 Calculated by multiplying the total population by the percent below the poverty line

54 Calculated by dividing the population of a county by the total population of the LSEM service area

Table 2: Unemployment Rates of LSEM Counties⁵⁵

LSEM Area Served	Unemployment Rate
Adair County	5.6%*
Clark County	10.5%
Knox County	5.2%
Lewis County	7.6%
Lincoln County	11.0%
Macon County	7.0%
Marion County	8.5%
Monroe County	12.1%
Montgomery County	10.3%
Pike County	8.4%
Ralls County	7.8%
Schuyler County	6.3%
Scotland County	6.8%
Shelby County	7.8%
Warren County	11.1%
Washington County	13.6%
Franklin County	10.6%
Jefferson County	10.0%
St. Charles County	8.5%
St. Louis County	8.7%
St. Louis City County	11.3%

* The highest and lowest percentages are highlighted.

Table 3: Percent of All Loans Delinquent
By Three or More Months⁵⁶

County	Percent of Delinquent Loans
Lewis	6.5%
St. Louis City	6.4%
Marion	5.5%
Lincoln	5.4%
Warren	5.1%
Washington	4.8%
Pike	4.7%
Clark	4.6%
Montgomery	4.5%
Macon	4.4%
Franklin	4.1%
St. Louis	4.1%
Jefferson	3.9%
Ralls	3.6%
Monroe	3.2%
St. Charles	2.8%
Shelby	2.7%
Adair	2.6%
Schuyler	2.0%
Scotland	1.6%
Knox	1.3%

⁵⁶ Or in foreclosure. MERIC, "Missouri Information Brief: Home Loan Situation", June 2009, <http://montgomerycountymo.org/pdfs/mohomeloanbrief.pdf>

Table 4: Demographics on Missouri Seniors, LSEM Counties⁵⁷

County	Total Population, 2008	% Pop. 65+, 2008	Seniors in Poverty	% Housing Cost-Burdened
MISSOURI	5,911,605	13.6%	9.3%	28.2%
Adair	24,943	12.2%	12.5%	25.6%
Clark	7,180	17.1%	13.2%	23.9%
Franklin	100,898	13.2%	10.6%	31.1%
Jefferson	217,679	10.7%	6.8%	25.5%
Knox	4,020	20.9%*	17.1%	23.3%
Lewis	9,951	17.5%	12.2%	21.0%
Lincoln	52,775	10.1%	8.5%	33.6%
Macon	15,621	19.2%	13.6%	27.2%
Marion	28,225	15.7%	8.6%	22.1%
Monroe	9,127	17.6%	8.5%	27.0%
Montgomery	11,804	17.8	8.7%	25.9%
Pike	18,476	14.8%	12.5%	28.7%
Ralls	9,832	16.8%	8.8%	22.0%
Schuyler	4,110	20.8%	18.3%	22.1%
Scotland	4,798	16.5%	14.0%	20.0%
Shelby	6,411	19.5%	14.7%	16.8%
St. Charles	349,407	10.6%	2.5%	25.4%
St. Louis city	354,361	11.3%	15.5%	41.7%
St. Louis Co.	991,830	14.4%	5.9%	29.8%
Warren	31,214	13.5%	9.8%	26.8%
Washington	24,548	13.2%	11.75%	19.1%

* The highest percentages for each column are highlighted.

⁵⁷ DHSS, OSEDA, Missouri Area Agencies on Aging, *Missouri Senior Report 2009*, www.missouriseniorreport.org

Table 5: Top Priorities Across Categories in Community Member Surveys

	1. Not Important	2. Somewhat Important	3. Important	4. Fairly Important	5. Very Important	Total	Percentage of Very Imp.	Percentage of Fairly and Very Important
Health Insurance issues	50	9	16	17	100	192	52.08%	60.94%
TANF or Food Stamps	45	10	21	20	96	192	50.00%	60.42%
Utility payments	51	11	20	20	89	191	46.60%	57.07%
Medicaid eligibility/appeals	53	11	19	13	92	188	48.94%	55.85%
Bill collector problems	53	6	26	15	89	189	47.09%	55.03%
Child support	67	9	16	12	98	202	48.51%	54.46%
Availability of low-income housing	64	6	17	16	83	186	44.62%	53.23%
Getting or keeping custody	76	5	11	8	95	195	48.72%	52.82%
SSI or SSDI (disability)	68	5	17	16	81	187	43.32%	51.87%
Medicare eligibility/enrollment	66	9	14	14	81	184	44.02%	51.63%
Loan you can't pay, need modified	60	11	22	11	82	186	44.09%	50.00%

Table 6: Priorities in Community Member Surveys

Housing	1. Not Important	2. Somewhat Important	3. Important	4. Fairly Important	5. Very Important	Total	Percentage of Very Imp.	Percentage of Fairly and Very Important
Utility payments	51	11	20	20	89	191	46.60%	57.07%
Availability of low-income housing	64	6	17	16	83	186	44.62%	53.23%
Other	42	2	0	2	37	83	44.58%	46.99%
Preventing foreclosure	76	16	13	9	82	196	41.84%	46.43%
Preventing an eviction	74	13	18	5	79	189	41.80%	44.44%
Security deposit issues	63	6	9	13	55	146	37.67%	46.58%
Landlord won't make repairs	83	9	13	13	65	183	35.52%	42.62%
Problems with Housing Authority (Public housing/Section 8)	88	10	16	11	65	190	34.21%	40.00%
Housing code/occupancy violation	86	14	21	10	50	181	27.62%	33.15%

Family Law

Getting or keeping custody	76	5	11	8	95	195	48.72%	52.82%
Child support	67	9	16	12	98	202	48.51%	54.46%
Child custody modifications	78	9	16	10	77	190	40.53%	45.79%
Divorce	89	7	18	6	74	194	38.14%	41.24%
Domestic violence	93	6	12	6	72	189	38.10%	41.27%
Order of protection/restraining order	93	6	13	11	63	186	33.87%	39.78%
Guardianship (of a child or an adult)	87	13	16	9	60	185	32.43%	37.30%
Accusation of child abuse	101	8	9	8	53	179	29.61%	34.08%
Hotline call for child abuse/neglect	103	8	13	7	51	182	28.02%	31.87%
Preventing termination of parental rights	101	10	17	5	49	182	26.92%	29.67%
Other	50	2	3	1	18	74	24.32%	25.68%

Education

Individual Education Program (IEP)	84	7	15	16	63	185	34.05%	42.70%
School troubles due to discrimination	96	7	11	10	58	182	31.87%	37.36%
School enrollment when homeless	98	7	12	9	52	178	29.21%	34.27%
Suspension/expulsion	93	9	19	13	49	183	26.78%	33.88%
Delinquency	93	9	19	15	44	180	24.44%	32.78%
Other	49	1	4	2	13	69	18.84%	21.74%

Public Benefits

Health Insurance issues	50	9	16	17	100	192	52.08%	60.94%
TANF or Food Stamps	45	10	21	20	96	192	50.00%	60.42%
Medicaid eligibility/appeals	53	11	19	13	92	188	48.94%	55.85%
Medicare eligibility/enrollment	66	9	14	14	81	184	44.02%	51.63%
SSI or SSDI (disability)	68	5	17	16	81	187	43.32%	51.87%
Unemployment benefits	73	5	18	18	67	181	37.02%	46.96%
Veterans' benefits	85	5	12	8	61	171	35.67%	40.35%
In-home medical services	77	7	21	15	58	178	32.58%	41.01%
Other	41	2	1	2	14	60	23.33%	26.67%

Debt and Credit

Bill collector problems	53	6	26	15	89	189	47.09%	55.03%
Loan you can't pay, need modified	60	11	22	11	82	186	44.09%	50.00%
Credit card debt/collection defense	59	10	25	16	76	186	40.86%	49.46%
Bankruptcy	70	6	21	9	73	179	40.78%	45.81%
Identity theft	78	4	14	11	72	179	40.22%	46.37%
Car: fraud/repossession	80	7	22	9	59	177	33.33%	38.42%
Unfair credit reporting problems	76	7	23	14	59	179	32.96%	40.78%
Payday lending and title loans	84	12	18	7	59	180	32.78%	36.67%
Other	40	1	3	1	17	62	27.42%	29.03%

Immigration

Relief for domestic violence	105	4	11	6	39	165	23.64%	27.27%
Employment/work authorization	105	5	15	5	35	165	21.21%	24.24%
Applying for or establishing citizenship	108	5	12	3	34	162	20.99%	22.84%
Relief for human trafficking	110	6	10	5	31	162	19.14%	22.22%
Deportation case	110	4	13	5	28	160	17.50%	20.63%
Petitioning for a visa for a relative	112	7	11	6	27	163	16.56%	20.25%
Other	47	0	3	3	7	60	11.67%	16.67%

Miscellaneous Priority Listing

Municipal/traffic violations	85	9	18	5	52	169	30.77%	33.73%
Durable Power of Attorney forms/Healthcare directives	79	9	17	12	51	168	30.36%	37.50%
Existing arrest warrants	96	5	11	6	46	164	28.05%	31.71%
Background check for employment or housing	83	10	17	7	45	162	27.78%	32.10%
Wills	79	10	24	14	45	172	26.16%	34.30%
Grandparent guardianships	93	8	14	7	39	161	24.22%	28.57%
Beneficiary deeds	87	10	22	8	38	165	23.03%	27.88%
Other	41	1	3	2	9	56	16.07%	19.64%

Table 7: Unmet Needs in Community Member Surveys

Substantive Legal Area	Percent Who Experienced the Need	Percent Whose Need Was Unmet	Percent of Those Who Experienced the Need but It Went Unmet
Debt and Credit	23.1	11.94	51.69
Family	17.88	7.58	42.37
Housing	15.97	6.6	41.31
Miscellaneous	16.2	6.53	40.32
Public Benefits	23.44	4.67	19.91
Immigration	3.61	0.68	18.75
Education	5.71	0.98	17.14

Table 8: Accessibility in Community Member Surveys

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
I was aware of the services LSEM offered before this survey	124	128	252
I have difficulty calling or visiting LSEM during the hours their office is open (8:30 AM - 5:00 PM)	56	189	245
My access to a phone to contact LSEM is limited	43	204	247
I have difficulty finding transportation to get to LSEM	52	195	247
I struggle with understanding the legal process for my particular issues	104	148	252
My mental or physical disability prevents me from utilizing LSEM's services	15	229	244
I struggle with communicating in English, especially about my legal issues	10	234	244
Working with a lawyer is intimidating to me	37	201	238
I am/was a client of LSEM	89	140	229
If yes, I am/was a client of LSEM, I am satisfied with the quality of services I received	75	7	82
If yes, I am/was a client of LSEM, I am satisfied with how the staff at LSEM treated me	78	6	84
I would recommend LSEM to a friend or family member	67	2	69

I asked for assistance from LSEM, but was told they could not help me (if you answer yes, please reply to the next question—what were you told)	45	169	214
---	----	-----	-----

Table 9: Accessibility in Community Member Surveys

Answer Options	1. Strongly disagree	2. Disagree	3. Agree to some extent	4. Agree	5. Strongly agree	Response Count	Percentage of Agree/Strongly Agree
Legal presentations, such as landlord/tenant law, consumer protection, public benefits, and family law are valuable	20	11	34	31	140	236	72.46%
If legal information was available online, I would use it to educate myself	24	15	40	33	130	242	67.36%
I have access to the internet to use online legal resources	49	17	30	37	106	239	59.83%
I would attend a presentation on legal topics.	28	19	51	38	102	238	58.82%
During the day	41	17	32	37	84	211	57.35%
In the evening (after 5:00 PM)	45	15	35	40	81	216	56.02%
At a community center	32	13	48	47	71	211	55.92%
At a church	39	17	55	42	55	208	46.63%
At a school	36	19	54	39	56	204	46.57%
At a group already meeting	42	22	58	35	48	205	40.49%
At a housing complex	54	33	53	27	30	197	28.93%

Table 10: Top Priorities Across Categories in Service Provider and Legal Community Surveys

Service Provider's Importance	1. Very low priority	2. Low priority	3. Average priority	4. High priority	5. Very high priority	No opinion	Response Count	Percentage of High and Very High Priority
Availability of low-income housing	10	7	35	69	155	40	316	70.89%
Domestic violence	12	7	56	80	115	33	303	64.36%
Medicaid eligibility/enrollment/appeals	5	15	51	80	108	43	302	62.25%
Preventing evictions	11	15	45	81	112	50	314	61.46%
SSI or SSDI (disability)	9	9	59	94	91	39	301	61.46%
Utility payments	11	16	56	64	121	47	315	58.73%
Hotline call for child abuse/neglect	17	25	50	79	96	39	306	57.19%
Health insurance issues	9	18	58	69	100	45	299	56.52%
Order of protection/restraining order	12	14	64	81	86	48	305	54.75%
School enrollment when homeless	23	34	37	62	98	43	297	53.87%
Medicare eligibility/enrollment	10	22	53	76	81	58	300	52.33%

Table 11: Priorities in Service Provider and Legal Community Surveys

	1. Very low priority	2. Low priority	3. Average priority	4. High priority	5. Very high priority	No opinion	Response Count	Percentage of High and Very High Priority
Housing								
Availability of low-income housing	10	7	35	69	155	40	316	70.89%
Preventing evictions	11	15	45	81	112	50	314	61.46%
Utility payments	11	16	56	64	121	47	315	58.73%
Preventing foreclosures	33	31	51	77	61	60	313	44.09%
Landlord refusing to make repairs	23	34	65	70	59	60	311	41.48%
Problems with Housing Authority (Public housing/Section 8)	17	31	75	68	53	69	313	38.66%
Security deposit issues	22	45	63	53	57	69	309	35.60%
Other	0	1	2	4	15	52	74	25.68%
Housing code/occupancy violations	34	44	78	44	34	77	311	25.08%
Family Law								
Domestic violence	12	7	56	80	115	33	303	64.36%
Hotline call for child abuse/neglect	17	25	50	79	96	39	306	57.19%
Order of protection/restraining order	12	14	64	81	86	48	305	54.75%
Child support	17	25	63	73	69	59	306	46.41%
Accusation of child abuse	23	32	72	57	72	49	305	42.30%
Guardianship of a child or an adult	17	32	81	64	56	50	300	40.00%
Getting or keeping custody	22	19	82	55	65	63	306	39.22%
Divorce	35	33	80	51	58	48	305	35.74%
Child custody modifications	30	26	89	50	50	61	306	32.68%
Preventing termination of parental rights	28	37	75	49	44	71	304	30.59%
Other	0	2	0	4	6	47	59	16.95%
Education								
School enrollment when homeless	23	34	37	62	98	43	297	53.87%
Suspension/expulsion	22	26	59	69	71	50	297	47.14%
Delinquency	23	23	60	75	64	50	295	47.12%

Individual Education Program (IEP) issues	24	26	60	58	80	49	297	46.46%
Troubles with school due to discrimination	47	51	50	39	46	60	293	29.01%
Other	0	2	2	5	4	42	55	16.36%

Public Benefits

Medicaid eligibility/enrollment/appeals	5	15	51	80	108	43	302	62.25%
SSI or SSDI (disability)	9	9	59	94	91	39	301	61.46%
Health insurance issues	9	18	58	69	100	45	299	56.52%
Medicare eligibility/enrollment	10	22	53	76	81	58	300	52.33%
TANF or Food Stamps	11	20	77	78	71	44	301	49.50%
Unemployment benefits	20	23	80	65	57	56	301	40.53%
In-home medical services	20	30	63	70	45	69	297	38.72%
Veterans' benefits	29	31	60	48	42	87	297	30.30%
Other	0	1	0	1	1	48	51	3.92%

Debt and Credit

Payday lending and title loans	21	32	49	62	66	68	298	42.95%
Bill collector problems	12	25	79	72	54	56	298	42.28%
Loans that can't be paid, need to be modified	16	23	77	68	50	65	299	39.46%
Credit card debt or collection defense	19	35	71	64	49	58	296	38.18%
Bankruptcy	23	34	77	52	47	64	297	33.33%
Identity theft	32	52	67	45	35	67	298	26.85%
Unfair credit reporting problems	33	43	74	33	35	80	298	22.82%
Car: fraud/repossession	33	47	76	32	29	78	295	20.68%
Other	0	2	1	1	1	47	52	3.85%

Immigration

Relief for domestic violence	23	14	51	55	76	76	295	44.41%
Relief for human trafficking	37	19	33	38	68	100	295	35.93%
Applying for or establishing citizenship	33	21	53	52	53	84	296	35.47%
Employment/Work authorization	35	21	47	60	39	93	295	33.56%
Deportation case	38	22	44	37	43	109	293	27.30%
Petitioning for a visa for a relative	36	29	60	37	29	106	297	22.22%
Other	0	2	3	2	2	47	56	7.14%

Miscellaneous

Existing arrest warrants	24	27	62	62	58	61	294	40.82%
Durable Power of Attorney forms/Healthcare directives	28	27	58	44	67	72	296	37.50%
Grandparent guardianships	31	29	70	65	44	57	296	36.82%
Background check for employment or housing	24	34	69	56	48	65	296	35.14%
Municipal/Traffic violations	29	35	74	53	40	65	296	31.42%
Wills	40	46	61	32	36	78	293	23.21%
Beneficiary deeds	42	50	65	25	24	86	292	16.78%
Other	1	0	0	1	1	45	48	4.17%

Table 12: Community Education in Service Provider and Legal Community Surveys

	1. Strongly Disagree	2. Disagree	3. Agree to some extent	4. Agree	5. Strongly agree	No opinion	Response Count	Percentage of Agree and Strongly Agree
Legal presentations, such as landlord/tenant law, consumer protection, public benefits, and family law, are valuable	5	11	39	74	140	18	287	74.56%
If legal information was available online, I would encourage my clients to use it to learn more about their legal rights and responsibilities	6	18	67	82	91	21	285	60.70%
My clients are interested in attending legal presentations	15	51	99	44	34	43	286	27.27%
My clients often have access to the internet to utilize online legal resources	32	73	96	40	22	22	285	21.75%

Table 13: Community Economic Development in Service Provider and Legal Community Surveys

	1. Strongly Disagree	2. Disagree	3. Agree to some extent	4. Agree	5. Strongly agree	No opinion	Response Count	Percentage of Agree and Strongly Agree
Compliance with State and Federal requirements	19	27	44	37	21	99	247	23.48%
Employment (employee handbook/advice)	18	29	40	28	25	104	244	21.72%
Individual contractors (written agreements)	22	31	38	26	14	116	247	16.19%
Volunteers (handbook/policies)	21	32	50	24	15	104	246	15.85%
Renting space/negotiating a lease	25	34	36	18	20	113	246	15.45%
Corporate governance (board/staff relations)	25	31	33	21	17	120	247	15.38%
Intellectual property (trademarks/name/logo)	28	37	33	11	11	125	245	8.98%
Obtaining nonprofit status	42	31	20	9	7	102	211	7.58%

Table 14: Experienced Need in Community Member Survey

	Percent Who Experienced Need	Percent Whose Need Was Unmet	Percent of the Unmet of those who Had Need
Grandparent guardianships	6.80%	3.88%	57.06%
Background check for employment or housing	11.59%	5.31%	45.82%
Existing arrest warrants	18.18%	8.13%	44.72%
Wills	20.38%	8.53%	41.85%
Beneficiary deeds	11.54%	4.81%	41.68%
Municipal/traffic violations	29.05%	10.00%	34.42%
Durable Power of Attorney forms/Healthcare directives	17.37%	5.63%	32.41%

Appendix B: Community Member Survey

LEGAL SERVICES OF EASTERN MISSOURI, INC. (LSEM)

4232 Forest Park Avenue | St. Louis, MO 63108 | (314)534-4200

LEGAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY 2010

For Community Members

Legal Services of Eastern Missouri (LSEM), often called “legal aid”, receives thousands of requests each year from low-income people needing free legal help in many different areas of civil law. (LSEM does not handle criminal cases). As a client, or potential client, we are asking for your help please in determining what the legal needs of your community are, so we can further decide what kind of legal help we should offer and prioritize which kinds of problems are most important to you. Please take a few moments to complete this survey and return it to us by **May 14, 2010**. This survey is also available online at www.lsem.org. All answers are confidential. Thank you for your time, your input is extremely valuable to us.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

We do not need your name or any identifying information but this information will help us determine what services are needed by persons like you.

Year of Birth: _____	County you are currently living in: _____	Number of people living in your household: _____
Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Man <input type="checkbox"/> Woman <input type="checkbox"/> Transgender		
Marital status: <input type="checkbox"/> Married <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced <input type="checkbox"/> Separated <input type="checkbox"/> Never married		
Race: <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> African American/Black <input type="checkbox"/> Mexican/Hispanic/Latino	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Native American	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-racial <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Is English your primary language? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Do you have a serious health problem or disability? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
What language(s) do you speak at home? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If yes (Check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Physical <input type="checkbox"/> Mental <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional	
Are you employed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Household income level per year: <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$10,000 (\$833/mo) <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000-\$19,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000-\$29,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000-\$39,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000-\$49,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 or more
If you do not wish to fill in your income range above, do you consider your household to be struggling to get by with a low-income? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Where did you receive this survey? <input type="checkbox"/> LSEM <input type="checkbox"/> Another agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Received in mail <input type="checkbox"/> Received in email	<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop/Presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Resource fair <input type="checkbox"/> Focus group <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Appendix B: Community Member Survey

HOUSING

In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Preventing foreclosure						1	2	3	4	5
Preventing an eviction						1	2	3	4	5
Problems with Housing Authority (Public housing/Section 8)						1	2	3	4	5
Housing code / occupancy violation						1	2	3	4	5
Landlord won't make repairs						1	2	3	4	5
Utility payments						1	2	3	4	5
Security deposit issues										
Availability of low-income housing						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5

FAMILY

In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Child support						1	2	3	4	5
Child custody modifications						1	2	3	4	5
Getting or keeping custody						1	2	3	4	5
Guardianship (of a child or an adult)						1	2	3	4	5
Divorce						1	2	3	4	5
Domestic violence						1	2	3	4	5
Hotline call for child abuse/neglect						1	2	3	4	5
Preventing termination of parental rights						1	2	3	4	5
Accusation of child abuse						1	2	3	4	5
Order of protection/restraining order						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B: Community Member Survey

EDUCATION AND JUVENILE LAW										
In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Suspension/expulsion						1	2	3	4	5
Delinquency						1	2	3	4	5
School enrollment when homeless						1	2	3	4	5
Individual Education Program (IEP)						1	2	3	4	5
School troubles due to discrimination						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5
PUBLIC AID OR PUBLIC BENEFITS										
In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Medicaid eligibility / appeals						1	2	3	4	5
Medicare eligibility / enrollment						1	2	3	4	5
Health insurance issues						1	2	3	4	5
In-home medical services						1	2	3	4	5
TANF or Food Stamps						1	2	3	4	5
SSI or SSDI (disability)						1	2	3	4	5
Unemployment benefits						1	2	3	4	5
Veterans' benefits						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5
DEBT AND CREDIT PROBLEMS										
In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Loan you can't pay, need modified						1	2	3	4	5
Payday lending and title loans						1	2	3	4	5
Bankruptcy						1	2	3	4	5
Bill collector problems						1	2	3	4	5
Credit card debt /collection defense						1	2	3	4	5
Identity theft						1	2	3	4	5
Unfair credit reporting problems						1	2	3	4	5
Car: fraud/repossession						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B: Community Member Survey

IMMIGRATION

In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Applying for or establishing citizenship						1	2	3	4	5
Employment/Work authorization						1	2	3	4	5
Petitioning for a visa for a relative						1	2	3	4	5
Relief for domestic violence						1	2	3	4	5
Relief for human trafficking						1	2	3	4	5
Deportation case						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5

MISCELLANEOUS

In the past 4 years, have you or a member of your family needed assistance with:	Part 1: Check (✓) the column that most applies to you.					Part 2: Please circle how important each issue is to you.				
	Yes, LSEM helped me.	Yes, another lawyer or agency helped me.	Yes, I addressed the issue on my own.	Yes, but the need is/was unmet.	No	1 Not Important				5 Very Important
Existing arrest warrants						1	2	3	4	5
Municipal/Traffic violations						1	2	3	4	5
Background check for employment or housing						1	2	3	4	5
Wills						1	2	3	4	5
Beneficiary deeds						1	2	3	4	5
Grandparent guardianships						1	2	3	4	5
Durable Power of Attorney forms/Healthcare directives						1	2	3	4	5
Other:						1	2	3	4	5

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

In the past 4 years, have you or someone in your family felt discriminated against in the workplace, at home, at school, as a consumer, with a law officer, or in receiving health care or social services due to:

Discrimination based on:	Yes	No	Don't Know	If Yes, where?
Race				
Ethnicity				
Immigration Status				
Age				
Disability				
Income				
Gender				
Sexuality				
Other:				

Appendix B: Community Member Survey

ACCESS TO LSEM SERVICES

Please check yes or no for each statement.	Yes	No
I was aware of the services LSEM offered before this survey.		
I have difficulty calling or visiting LSEM during the hours their office is open (8:30am-5pm).		
My access to a phone to contact LSEM is limited.		
I have difficulty finding transportation to get to LSEM.		
I struggle with understanding the legal process for my particular issues.		
My mental or physical disability prevents me from utilizing LSEM's services.		
I struggle with communicating in English, especially about my legal issues.		
Working with a lawyer is intimidating to me.		
I asked for assistance from LSEM, but was told they could not help me.		
- If yes, what were you told? _____		
I am/was a client of LSEM.		
- If yes, I am satisfied with the quality of services I received.		
- If yes, I am satisfied with how the staff at LSEM treated me.		
I would recommend LSEM to a friend or family member.		

COMMUNITY EDUCATION ON LEGAL ISSUES

Please circle the extent to which you agree with each statement, with 1 being "Strongly Disagree" to 5 being "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
If legal information was available online, I would use it to educate myself.	1	2	3	4	5
I have access to the internet to use online legal resources.	1	2	3	4	5
Legal presentations, such as landlord tenant law, consumer protection, public benefits, & family law, are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5
I would attend a presentation on legal topics.	1	2	3	4	5
The best place/time for me to attend a workshop is:					
At a community center	1	2	3	4	5
At a group already meeting	1	2	3	4	5
At a school	1	2	3	4	5
At a church	1	2	3	4	5
At a housing complex	1	2	3	4	5
During the day	1	2	3	4	5
In the evening (after 5 pm)	1	2	3	4	5

Do you have any further comments about LSEM services or your previous experience and knowledge of LSEM?

Please return to Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc.

Via Fax:
(314) 534-1425

Via Mail:
Attn: Jeanne Philips-Roth
4232 Forest Park Ave
St. Louis, MO 63108

Complete online:
At www.lsem.org

LEGAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY 2010

For Service Providers and the Legal Community

Legal Services of Eastern Missouri (LSEM), often called “legal aid”, receives thousands of requests each year from low-income people needing free legal help in many different areas of civil law. (LSEM does not handle criminal cases). As a service provider or legal professional, we are asking for your help in determining what the legal needs of our community are, so we can further decide what services we should offer and prioritize. Please take a few moments to complete this survey with your knowledge of the needs of the general low-income community and return it to us by **May 14, 2010**. This survey is also available online at www.lsem.org. Thank you for your time, your input is extremely valuable to us.

BASIC INFORMATION

Are you a: Social Service Provide Lawyer Judge Other: _____

Are you a: LSEM Board Member LSEM Staff Member Neither

What agency are you a part of? _____

What is your position? Management Trial Judge Large law office (100+) Small law office (2-20) Corporate Lawyer Direct client service Appellate Judge Medium law office (10-99) Solo law Other: _____

Do you serve any of the following populations? **Check all that apply:** Low-income Children Domestic violence Homeless Elderly Immigrant

In which county(s) do you serve? **Check all that apply:** Adair Lewis Montgomery Scotland St. Louis County Clark Lincoln Pike Shelby Warren Franklin Macon Ralls St. Charles Washington Jefferson Marion Schuyler St. Louis City Other: _____ Knox Monroe

In the following sections, please circle the level of priority for the general low-income population for each issue, with 1 being a “Low Priority” to 5 being a “High Priority. If you do not have a strong understanding of a particular need, circle 0 for “No Opinion.”

Please consider the frequency and impact of each issue when ranking priority.

HOUSING

	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Preventing foreclosures	1	2	3	4	5	0
Preventing evictions	1	2	3	4	5	0
Problems with Housing Authority (Public housing/Section 8)	1	2	3	4	5	0
Housing code or occupancy violations	1	2	3	4	5	0
Landlord refusing to make repairs	1	2	3	4	5	0
Utility payments	1	2	3	4	5	0
Security deposit issues	1	2	3	4	5	0
Availability of low-income housing	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0

Appendix B: Service Provider and Legal Community Survey

FAMILY

	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Child support	1	2	3	4	5	0
Child custody modifications	1	2	3	4	5	0
Getting or keeping custody	1	2	3	4	5	0
Guardianship (of a child or an adult)	1	2	3	4	5	0
Divorce	1	2	3	4	5	0
Domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5	0
Hotline call for child abuse/neglect	1	2	3	4	5	0
Preventing termination of parental rights	1	2	3	4	5	0
Accusation of child abuse	1	2	3	4	5	0
Order of protection/restraining order	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0

EDUCATION AND JUVENILE LAW

	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Suspension/expulsion	1	2	3	4	5	0
Delinquency	1	2	3	4	5	0
School enrollment when homeless	1	2	3	4	5	0
Individual Education Program (IEP) issues	1	2	3	4	5	0
Troubles with school due to discrimination	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0

PUBLIC AID/PUBLIC BENEFITS

	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Medicaid eligibility / enrollment / appeals	1	2	3	4	5	0
Medicare eligibility / enrollment	1	2	3	4	5	0
Health insurance issues	1	2	3	4	5	0
In-home medical services	1	2	3	4	5	0
TANF or Food Stamps	1	2	3	4	5	0
SSI or SSDI	1	2	3	4	5	0
Unemployment benefits	1	2	3	4	5	0
Veterans' benefits	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0

DEBT AND CREDIT PROBLEMS

	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Loan you can't pay, need modified	1	2	3	4	5	0
Payday lending and title loans	1	2	3	4	5	0
Bankruptcy	1	2	3	4	5	0
Bill collector problems	1	2	3	4	5	0
Credit card debt or collection defense	1	2	3	4	5	0
Identity theft	1	2	3	4	5	0
Unfair credit reporting problems	1	2	3	4	5	0
Car: fraud/repossession	1	2	3	4	5	0

Appendix B: Service Provider and Legal Community Survey

Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0
IMMIGRATION						
	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Applying for or establishing citizenship	1	2	3	4	5	0
Employment/Work authorization	1	2	3	4	5	0
Petitioning for a visa for a relative	1	2	3	4	5	0
Relief for domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5	0
Relief for human trafficking	1	2	3	4	5	0
Deportation case	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0
MISCELLANEOUS						
	Low Priority				High Priority	No Opinion
Existing arrest warrants	1	2	3	4	5	0
Municipal/Traffic violations	1	2	3	4	5	0
Background check for employment or housing	1	2	3	4	5	0
Wills	1	2	3	4	5	0
Beneficiary deeds	1	2	3	4	5	0
Grandparent guardianships	1	2	3	4	5	0
Durable Power of Attorney forms/Healthcare directives	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other:	1	2	3	4	5	0
INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS						
Have you witnessed <u>discrimination</u> impacting your clients in our community; for example in the workplace, in housing, at school, or in the delivery of health care or social services due to:	Never		Frequently		Very Often	
Race	1	2	3	4	5	
Ethnicity	1	2	3	4	5	
Immigration Status	1	2	3	4	5	
Age	1	2	3	4	5	
Disability	1	2	3	4	5	
Income	1	2	3	4	5	
Gender	1	2	3	4	5	
Sexuality	1	2	3	4	5	
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	
If you answered "Frequently" to "Very Often" (3-5) above, please explain how and where this discrimination is occurring.						

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Appendix B: Service Provider and Legal Community Survey

Please circle the extent to which you agree with each statement, with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” to 5 being “Strongly Agree.”	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	No Opinion
Legal presentations, such as landlord tenant law, consumer protection, public benefits, and family law, are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5	0
My clients are interested in attending legal presentations.	1	2	3	4	5	0
If legal information was available online, I would encourage my clients to use it to learn more about their legal rights and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	0
My clients often have access to the internet to utilize online legal resources.	1	2	3	4	5	0

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

If you are a <u>social service provider</u>, please circle the extent to which you agree with each statement, with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” to 5 being “Strongly Agree.”	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	No Opinion
My agency could benefit from free legal assistance with:						
- Corporate Governance (board/staff relations)	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Employment (employee handbook/advice)	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Volunteers (handbook/policies)	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Individual Contractors (written agreements)	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Intellectual Property (trademarks/name/logo)	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Compliance with State and Federal Requirements	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Renting space/Negotiating a lease	1	2	3	4	5	0
- Obtaining nonprofit status	1	2	3	4	5	0

Do you have any further comments about LSEM services or your previous experience and knowledge of LSEM?

Please return to Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc.

Via Fax:
(314) 534-1425

Via Mail:
Attn: Jeanne Philips-Roth
4232 Forest Park Ave
St. Louis, MO 63108

Complete online:
At www.lsem.org

Thank you for your time, your input is extremely valuable to us.

Appendix C: General Demographic Data - Frequency Tables

Community Member Surveys

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 1946	43	13.9	14.2	14.2
	1946-1960	78	25.2	25.8	40.1
	1961-1980	118	38.1	39.1	79.1
	1981-2000	63	20.3	20.9	100.0
	Total	302	97.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	8	2.6		
Total		310	100.0		

County

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
St. Charles	24	7.7	7.7
St. Louis City and County	180	58	58
Unknown	39	12.6	12.6
Elsewhere	67	21.64	21.6
Total	310	100.0	100.0

Gender

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Man	31.9%	95
Woman	67.4%	201
Transgender	0.7%	2
<i>answered question</i>		298
<i>skipped question</i>		12

Martial Status

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Married	21.5%	64
Widowed	7.4%	22
Divorced	24.6%	73
Separated	11.8%	35
Never married	34.7%	103
<i>answered question</i>		297
<i>skipped question</i>		13

Ethnicity/Race

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
White	56.8%	168
African American/Black	37.8%	112
Mexican/Hispanic/Latino	1.7%	5
Native American	0.0%	0
Asian	2.0%	6
Multi-racial	1.7%	5
Other (please specify)		5
<i>answered question</i>		296
<i>skipped question</i>		14

Primary Language

Is English your primary language?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	97.0%	295
No	3.0%	9
<i>answered question</i>		304
<i>skipped question</i>		6

Employed?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	41.5%	117
No	58.5%	165
<i>answered question</i>		282
<i>skipped question</i>		28

Health

Do you have a serious health problem or disability?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	32.5%	95
No	67.5%	197
<i>answered question</i>		292
<i>skipped question</i>		18
If you said "yes", you do have a serious health problem or disability, please check all that apply:		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Physical	83.0%	78
Mental	37.2%	35
Emotional	41.5%	39
<i>answered question</i>		94
<i>skipped question</i>		216

Yearly Household Income

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than \$10,000(\$833 per month)	47.4%	120
\$10,000 - \$19,999	19.8%	50
\$20,000 - \$29,999	11.5%	29
\$30,000 - \$39,999	10.3%	26
\$40,000 - \$49,999	2.4%	6
\$50,000 or more	8.7%	22

Community Member Survey Demographic Data

<i>answered question</i>	253
<i>skipped question</i>	57

If you did not enter an income level, do you consider your household to be struggling to get by with a low income?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.8%	191
No	11.2%	24
<i>answered question</i>		215
<i>skipped question</i>		95

Where did you receive the survey?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
LSEM	29.7%	82
Another agency	8.0%	22
Received in mail	25.7%	71
Received in e-mail	1.8%	5
Workshop or Presentation	2.2%	6
Resource fair	1.1%	3
Focus group	3.6%	10
Other	27.9%	77
Please specify what your "other" choice is:		70
<i>answered question</i>		276
<i>skipped question</i>		34

Social Service Providers and the Legal Community Surveys

Career

Are you a:		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Social Service Provider	52.3%	172
Lawyer	14.6%	48
Judge	0.9%	3
Other	32.2%	106
Please specify what your "other" choice is:		112
<i>answered question</i>		329
<i>skipped question</i>		9
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
LSEM Board Member	2.6%	8
LSEM Staff member	13.4%	42
Neither	84.0%	263
<i>answered question</i>		313
<i>skipped question</i>		25

Social Service Provider and Legal Community Survey Demographic Data

Position

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Management	18.6%	58
Direct client services	43.3%	135
Trial Judge	1.0%	3
Appellate Judge	0.0%	0
Large law office (100+ lawyers)	1.0%	3
Medium law office (20-99 lawyers)	2.9%	9
Small law office (2-19 lawyers)	4.2%	13
Solo law	3.2%	10
Corporate lawyer	0.3%	1
Other	25.6%	80
Please specify what your "other" choice is:		80
	<i>answered question</i>	312
	<i>skipped question</i>	26

Populations Served

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Low-income	90.6%	289
Homeless	73.7%	235
Children	64.6%	206
Elderly	43.3%	138
Domestic violence	49.8%	159
Immigrant	44.8%	143
	<i>answered question</i>	319
	<i>skipped question</i>	19

Social Service Provider and Legal Community Survey Demographic Data

Counties Served

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Adair	7.0%	23
Clark	9.2%	30
Franklin	28.1%	92
Jefferson	34.3%	112
Knox	6.4%	21
Lewis	7.3%	24
Lincoln	26.0%	85
Macon	7.3%	24
Marion	8.0%	26
Monroe	7.6%	25
Montgomery	8.9%	29
Pike	9.2%	30
Ralls	8.0%	26
Schuyler	7.0%	23
Scotland	7.0%	23
Shelby	7.3%	24
St. Charles	39.8%	130
St. Louis City	59.6%	195
St. Louis County	62.4%	204
Warren	24.8%	81
Washington	15.6%	51
Other	17.7%	58
Please specify what your "other" choice is:		62
<i>answered question</i>		327
<i>skipped question</i>		11