



Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program

Final Report

June 2023

Evaluation Branch
Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Chief Audit and Evaluation Executive would like to thank the Evaluation Working Group, evaluation team and individuals who contributed insights and input to this evaluation. Evaluation participants included employees from the Department of Justice Canada, other federal government departments, and project recipients.

ACRONYMS

2SLGBTQI+	2S: at the front, recognizes Two-Spirit people as the first 2SLGBTQI+ communities; L: Lesbian; G: Gay; B: Bisexual; T: Transgender; Q: Queer; I: Intersex, considers sex characteristics beyond sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression; +: is inclusive of people who identify as part of sexual and gender diverse communities, who use additional terminologies.
AJA	Access to Justice Services Agreement
AJA-PLEI	Access to Justice Services Agreement – Public Legal Education and Information component
CFP	Call for Proposal
CTA	Call to Action
FAIA	Family Abuse Intervention Act
GBA	Gender-based analysis
GCIMS	Grants and Contributions Information Management System
Gs&Cs	Grants and contributions
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
JPIP	Justice Partnership and Innovation Program
OLMC	Official Language Minority Community
PLEI	Public Legal Education and Information
PT	Provinces/territories
UN	United Nations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
Recommendation.....	iv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation	1
1.2 Evaluation Scope.....	1
2 PROGRAM PROFILE	2
2.1 Program Background and Objectives.....	2
2.2 Program Sub-Activities and Components	2
2.3 Governance and Financial Resources	3
3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
3.1 Case Studies.....	4
3.2 Literature Review	4
3.3 Document and File Review.....	4
3.4 Key Informant Interviews	4
3.5 Environmental Scan.....	5
3.6 Limitations, Challenges and Mitigation Strategies	5
4 FINDINGS	6
4.1 Relevance	6
4.2 Effectiveness.....	12
4.3 Efficiency.....	17
4.4 Looking Forward	20
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION	25
5.1 Conclusions	25
5.2 Recommendation.....	26
APPENDIX A: EVALUATION QUESTIONS	27
APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS	27

List of Figures

Figure 1: Program Strengths and Challenges	21
Figure 2: Best Practices from Similar Programs.....	22

List of Tables

Table 1: JPIP Allocated Resources during the Evaluation Period	3
Table 2: Summary of Limitations, Challenges and Mitigations Strategies	5
Table 3: Number of Projects Funded through the Project-Specific Components with Linkages to Current Issues and Needs	10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Evaluation of the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP) was conducted by the Department of Justice (JUS) Evaluation Branch and covers five fiscal years (FYs), from 2017-18 to 2021-22. The evaluation was completed in accordance with the Treasury Board's *Policy on Results* (2016). The evaluation examined relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the JPIP. In addition, it provides a forward-looking analysis that focuses on Program strengths, challenges, best practices identified in other similar programs at the federal level, and opportunities at different levels. The evaluation also explored how Gender-based analysis (GBA) Plus considerations have been incorporated into the Program.

The evaluation includes all funding components during the time covered by the evaluation, but excludes the Workplace Sexual Harassment component, assessed in a separate evaluation, and the assessed contributions for participation in the United Nations (UN) bodies, which were assessed as part of the 2016-17 JPIP evaluation. In addition, while not funded through the JPIP, the Public Legal Education and Information (PLEI) component of the Access to Justice Agreements (AJAs) with the territories was also included in this evaluation scope.

Program Description

The overall objective of the JPIP is to support policy directions of the Department of Justice on issues related to family violence, access to justice, and other emerging justice-related issues. The Program provides funding in support of stimulating knowledge development and dissemination, promoting partnership building and collaboration, and building community capacity. The JPIP is based on the premise that although many significant advances have been made over the last twenty-five years in services, legislation, policies and programs to facilitate access to justice, there are still many outstanding and emerging issues for Canadians.

The JPIP funding is allocated through four sub-activities:

- Operational funding in the form of grants, provided to specific organizations on an annual basis;
- Project specific contribution funding to organizations and individuals conducting activities/initiatives related to priority areas of the JPIP;
- Annual educational funding to support Métis and Non-Status Indians in their post-secondary educational pursuits in law studies (administered through Indspire, an Indigenous-led non-governmental organization); and
- Annual funding to meet Canada's assessed contributions for its memberships in international organizations to promote Canada's international interests.

The total allocated resources to the JPIP during the years covered by the evaluation (2017-18 to 2021-22) was \$32.7 million.

Findings

Relevance

The evaluation found that JPIP is relevant and responsive to both federal and departmental roles and priorities. It is an important mechanism for the Department of Justice Canada (Justice Canada) to contribute to the advancement of key commitments, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals, the National Action Plan to End Gender-Based Violence, Calls to Action (CTAs) of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and addressing systemic inequities in the criminal justice system for racialized people. JPIP is an important funding mechanism for recipient organizations doing work in the areas of access to justice, gender-based violence, and systemic racism and inequalities. Without JPIP's funding, many would not be able to continue to operate.

The JPIP is aligned with the needs of Canadians, including those of marginalized and vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, Indigenous and racialized women, persons with disabilities, those who identified as 2SLGBTQI+). Needs identified include alternatives to courts and incarceration, improving justice for Indigenous peoples, partnerships with social organizations, affordability and accessibility of legal services, supporting victims/survivors of intimate partner violence (IPV), and improving access to justice for marginalized groups. The evaluation found that the Program is responsive to these needs, particularly to groups facing marginalization, discrimination or over-representation in the justice system.

The JPIP is responsive to urgent and emerging issues, particularly through its capacity to stay informed of such issues, and the increased flexibility offered by its funding to react quickly to support activities that are consistent with the Program's objectives and terms and conditions. For example, the JPIP was able to act quickly and effectively in response to the issues relating to the Ukrainian Airlines Flight PS752. Evidence demonstrates that the JPIP broad objectives allow for flexibility and responsiveness in addressing priorities and emerging topics or issues. The Program monitors trends and issues through various means, including through consultations and meetings with recipients and other organizations.

Effectiveness

The Program has made good progress towards achieving all its outcomes. The JPIP funding increased recipients' capacity to provide services and carry out activities that build and contribute to knowledge development, awareness, and understanding of various justice issues. Through the JPIP funding, recipients were able to expand the scope of their services or products, undertake projects that promote innovations in the justice system, and build and maintain new partnerships that support the conduct of their activities. Resources, partnerships, training and new approaches developed through JPIP-funded projects are often sustained and further built upon even after the projects' completion. During the COVID-19 pandemic, PLEI and AJA-PLEI organizations received additional funding to support their response to increased demands for pandemic-related legal support. The responsiveness from the Program was reported to have increased the organizations' capacity, and was identified as a Program strength.

Through JPIP, recipients have increased the availability and accessibility of legal information on a variety of topics fostering greater knowledge of the justice system for Canadians. JPIP funding allowed organizations to develop a variety of tools to increase awareness, producing legal information materials that are available to the public, including publications, toolkits and handbooks, videos,

webinars and workshops. One challenge noted by recipients in the achievement of this outcome was the high cost of raising awareness about resources available and services offered by the various funded organizations.

While only a few JPIP projects directly led to policy discussions and procedural changes and thus had a direct impact on the legal framework, collaboration and partnerships between justice stakeholders, as well as training provided through project activities, contributed to a strengthened Canadian legal framework.

The Program has supported an increased access to the justice system, including for marginalized and vulnerable groups, by increasing public legal education and information, supporting professional training, increasing access to court in their communities, etc. PLEI and AJA-PLEI organizations also support access to justice by providing relevant information on processes.

Efficiency

Overall, the JPIP is efficiently managed due to flexible and multi-year funding, good Call for Proposals (CFPs) and application processes, and reasonable reporting. Program staff was identified as a strength and contributing to the efficient management of the Program. The Program is also financially well managed, although recent years have seen some reprofiling, due to external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Some constraints were identified regarding parts of CFPs and application processes, data management and GBA Plus requirements at both the application and reporting stages. For examples, recipients raised challenges with the project assessment criteria, which were sometimes seen as unclear, too narrow, not aligned with clients needs, and unclear in how they would be assessed.

Looking Forward

The JPIP's strengths enable it to remain relevant, effective and efficient. While the Program has been continuously evolving over the years, some challenges remain. Looking forward, there are opportunities for improvement that the JPIP could take into consideration. Leveraging its strength in communication and outreach, and its experience with *ad hoc* recipients' meetings, the JPIP could consider increasing its communication with, and the communication between, funding recipients. This may represent an opportunity for the Program to better promote and support additional networking and information sharing between organizations, while also supporting the Program's monitoring of trends and emerging issues in the justice sector.

The Program could also work in close collaboration with other groups within Justice Canada and leverage their expertise to support its efforts in the monitoring of emerging trends, and increase its responsiveness to those issues. Working in collaboration with other groups, such as the Communications Branch, could also represent an opportunity to support funded organizations in disseminating information regarding activities and materials produced through JPIP's funding.

Elements that could have an impact on Canadians and organizations in the justice landscape were also identified. As legal issues are often complex, addressing them may require working on various fronts with a multiplicity of stakeholders. Coordination with other funders on connected issues and projects could minimize the risk for overlap, while targeting root causes of justice issues, and potentially increasing the reach and impact of funded projects.

In addition, the development of new technologies, such as Artificial Intelligence, will affect both funding recipients and Canadians in the upcoming years. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated how technology may open new opportunities (or risks) for improving individual legal knowledge and increasing access to justice, particularly for low-income, marginalized, and more vulnerable Canadians. While this is not under its control, the JPIP should monitor the use of technology in access to justice, as it will continue to play a part in shaping access to justice, including information and services, in the future.

Recommendation

Based on the evaluation findings described in this report, the evaluation offers the following recommendation:

Recommendation: Building on its strengths, the JPIP should explore opportunities to increase communication and information sharing with and between funding recipients (as an example, through recipients' meetings), as well as opportunities to leverage the expertise of other groups within the Department.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the JPIP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Treasury Board *Policy on Results* (2016)¹, which requires departments to measure and evaluate performance and use the resulting information to manage and improve programs, policies and services. The evaluation was undertaken by the Department of Justice Canada's (Justice Canada) Evaluation Branch between October 2022 and April 2023, as per Justice Canada's Internal Audit and Evaluation Plan.

1.2 Evaluation Scope

The objective of the evaluation was to examine the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the JPIP. In addition, it provides a forward-looking analysis that focuses on Program strengths, challenges, best practices identified in other similar programs at the federal level, and opportunities at different levels. Topics such as the implementation of new program components and increased funding, and the incorporation of GBA Plus considerations were explored to support JPIP decision makers going forward. The evaluation covered five FYs, from 2017-18 to 2021-22.

The evaluation encompassed the majority of JPIP components, including Family Justice Support, Family Violence, Revitalization of Indigenous Laws – Call to Action 50 (CTA 50), Independent Legal Advice/Representation, Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls (now ended), PLEI and the JPIP General component. In addition, while not funded through the JPIP, the PLEI component of the Access to Justice Agreements (AJAs) with the territories was also included in this evaluation scope.² Each territory administers its own PLEI funding differently, including direct funding to PLEI-focused organizations and general funding for PLEI resource development by various players.

The Workplace Sexual Harassment component of the Program is not included in this evaluation as it was assessed separately through Justice Canada's Evaluation of Legal Support and Awareness to Address Sexual Harassment in the Workplace, which is planned for completion in 2023-24. The evaluation of the JPIP also excludes the assessed contributions for participation in the UN bodies, as the assessed contributions for the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law and the Hague Conference on Private International Law were assessed as part of the 2016-17 JPIP evaluation.

As limited data on the early impacts of the CTA 50 projects were gathered at the time of the evaluation, the focus was on identifying challenges and opportunities associated with the implementation of this program component.

The scope and conduct of the evaluation were informed by an Evaluation Working Group which included representatives in Justice Canada from the Innovations, Analysis, and Integration Directorate within the Programs Branch.

¹ Treasury Board of Canada. (2016). Policy on Results. Ottawa, ON. Accessed May 2023 from: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=31300>.

² The PLEI funding provided through these agreements is an important component of access to justice to residents in the territories, as these are usually the only available source of PLEI activities in these locations.

2 PROGRAM PROFILE

2.1 Program Background and Objectives

The JPIP, initially implemented in 1996 under a different name, consolidated 25 existing funding agreements at that time. Today, the JPIP includes a number of components, which varied over the years in support to Justice Canada's policy direction, government priorities, and changing conditions affecting Canadian justice policy.

The JPIP is a grants and contributions program that supports Justice Canada's policy directions on family violence, access to justice, and other emerging justice-related issues. The Program provides funding to stimulate knowledge development and dissemination, foster partnership building and collaboration, and build community capacity. The JPIP is based on the premise that although many significant advances have been made over the last 25 years in services, legislation, policies and programs to facilitate access to justice, there are still many outstanding and emerging issues facing Canadians.

The specific objectives of the JPIP are to:

- promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system;
- build knowledge, awareness and understanding among justice stakeholders and/or the public on justice issues and other emerging justice-related issues;
- strengthen the justice system's response and promote public awareness of, and involvement in, the response to family violence; and,
- enable Canada to meet its financial obligations and fulfill its international policy objectives related to private law and criminal law, constitutionalism, democracy and the rule of law by participating in the work of international organizations.

2.2 Program Sub-Activities and Components

The JPIP funding is allocated through four sub-activities:

- Operational funding in the form of grants, provided to specific organizations on an annual basis. Those include:
 - Named grants to six selected organizations (namely the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges, the Canadian Society of Forensic Science, the National Judicial Institute, the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, and the Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy); and
 - Core funding to 10 provincially designated PLEI organizations.
- Project specific contribution funding to organizations and individuals conducting activities/initiatives related to priority areas of the JPIP. During the timeframe of the evaluation, the JPIP provided funding through the following components:
 - Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls;
 - Revitalization of Indigenous Laws – Call to Action 50;
 - Family Violence Initiative;

- Family Justice Support;
 - Intimate Partner Violence/Independent Legal Advice/Representation;
 - JPIP General component; and
 - Sexual Harassment in the Workplace (out of scope).
- Annual educational funding to support Métis and Non-Status Indians³ in their post-secondary educational pursuits in law studies (administered through Indspire, an Indigenous-led non-governmental organization).
 - Annual funding to meet Canada’s assessed contributions for its memberships in international organizations to promote Canada’s international interests (out of scope).

2.3 Governance and Financial Resources

The administration and management of the grant and contribution (Gs&Cs) agreements under JPIP are handled by the Innovations, Analysis and Integration Directorate, within the Programs Branch. The Directorate manages the submission, allocation and reporting process for the agreements. The overall accountability for JPIP’s activities rests with the Director General of the Programs Branch.

For the evaluation period spanning 2017-18 to 2021-22, the total transfer payment budget for the JPIP was \$30.9M. Additionally, the total combined salary, operating and maintenance (O&M) budget and employee benefit plan (EBP) from 2017-18 to 2021-22 was \$1.8M. The specific breakdown per FY is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: JPIP Allocated Resources during the Evaluation Period

	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	Five-Year Total
Grants and Contributions	\$2,963,631	\$3,326,268	\$5,492,656	\$6,442,455	\$12,686,745	\$30,911,755
Salary	\$213,136	\$173,788	\$268,460	\$229,153	\$468,127	\$1,352,664
Operations and Maintenance	\$15,000	\$31,976	\$33,476	\$15,000	\$13,886	\$109,338
EBP*	\$42,627	\$34,758	\$72,484	\$61,871	\$126,394	\$338,134
Totals	\$3,234,394	\$3,566,790	\$5,867,076	\$6,748,479	\$13,295,152	\$32,711,891

* Comprehensive EBP rate aligns with external reporting (Public Accounts). Exercises on or after April 1, 2019 were reported at 27% comprehensive EBP rate (20% prior).

³ Justice Canada (2022). *Legal Studies for Indigenous People Program*. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/fund-fina/acf-fca/lsap-aeda.html>

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was guided by an evaluation matrix, which included evaluation questions, indicators, and data collection methods. The matrix was developed through the evaluation scoping and design process. The methodology for this evaluation included multiple lines of evidence described below. A list of evaluation questions can be found in Appendix A.

3.1 Case Studies

Five case studies were conducted in advance of the evaluation. The subjects of the case studies were selected in collaboration with representatives of the Program, and focused on best practices, lessons learned, the impact of Program funding, and the benefits and challenges of JPIP's operations. The findings from these case studies have been incorporated into the evaluation report. Data collection for each case study included interviews with project stakeholders and a document and file review. Case studies were summarized in individual case study reports. The projects selected for case studies are as follows:

- National Gender Diversity and Inclusion Training Program for Legal Clinics - How Legal Professionals Can Promote Access to Justice for 2SLGBTQI+ People – Egale;
- Building a Comprehensive Framework that Can Support Acceleration of Restorative Justice in all Provinces and Territories – Nova Scotia Department of Justice;
- Access to Justice for Family Violence in Nunavut – Law Society of Nunavut;
- Flight 752 Legal Relief Initiative – Pro Bono Ontario; and,
- Mutilations génitales féminines au Québec : prévention et soutien aux femmes et aux filles⁴ – Réseau d'action pour l'égalité des femmes immigrées et racisées du Québec (le RAFIQ).

3.2 Literature Review

A review of information of the relevant literature was completed to identify trends and issues related to access to justice and provide context for the Program. The literature review included a review of recent academic and research literature on access to justice issues.

3.3 Document and File Review

A review of government and publicly available documents was conducted to respond to the evaluation questions. As well, 56 files of projects funded through various Program components were reviewed, including the application and any interim or final reports submitted.

3.4 Key Informant Interviews

A total of 20 interviews were conducted, including: 17 with funding recipients (three via the JPIP General component, three via Independent Legal Advice/Representation and IPV, five via CTA 50 funding, and six via PLEI) and three with Justice Canada representatives. The 20 interviews include two interviews with those familiar with PLEI funding provided through AJAs with the territories.

⁴ In English: Female genital mutilation in Quebec: prevention and support for women and girls.

3.5 Environmental Scan

After identifying 12 possible federal programs for review, information for six was reviewed and three were selected for deeper exploration, including an interview with each of the program representatives and a document review. The programs selected for the environmental scan included:

- Community Resilience Fund, Public Safety Canada;
- Health Care Policy and Strategies Program, Health Canada; and,
- Social Development Partnerships Program, Employment and Social Development Canada.

3.6 Limitations, Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

The evaluation encountered a few methodological limitations or challenges.

Table 2: Summary of Limitations, Challenges and Mitigations Strategies

Line of Evidence	Limitation or Challenge	Mitigation Strategy
Key informant interviews and case studies	Challenges included potential response biases from the sampling approach (selective, non-random), the voluntary nature of participation, and self-reporting (reporting on own activities).	The evaluation used multiple lines of evidence and triangulation to confirm results.
Data review	Challenges in accessing project data from the Grants and Contributions Information Management System (GCIMS), particularly for CFPs due to the limited extracting capacities of the information management system.	A spreadsheet was created where available GCIMS information for each project was captured manually. As well, the evaluation featured a file review to capture information about target audiences, outputs and outcomes from various sources.
All lines of evidence	As expected at the planning stage, limited data on the early impacts of projects funded under the CTA 50 component were available, due to the recency of this funding component.	Any specific examples of early results achieved through this component, gathered through interviews or interim reports, has been included in the evaluation as anecdotal evidence, where relevant.

4 FINDINGS

The following section presents the evaluation findings by evaluation issue. Where appropriate, Program strengths, challenges and best practices in other similar federal programs are identified with the following icons:



The dumbbell icon represents a Program **strength**.



The mountain icon represents **challenges**.



The ribbon icon represents **best practices** put in place by other similar federal programs. Those best practices were informed through the environmental scan.

4.1 Relevance

4.1.1 Alignment with Federal Roles and Priorities

The JPIP is aligned with federal and departmental roles and priorities, such as increasing access to justice, strengthening the justice system's response to family violence, increasing awareness of PLEI, and revitalization of Indigenous laws.

The evaluation found that the JPIP is well aligned with federal government priorities. In particular, the JPIP is well aligned with Justice Canada's 2020-21 departmental priority that "*Canadians in contact with the justice system have access to appropriate services enabling a fair, timely and accessible justice system.*"⁵ This is an ongoing priority for Justice Canada. The JPIP contributes to this priority by:

- Providing core funding to designated organizations with a mandate to provide justice-related services⁶;
- Maintaining and establishing partnerships with other levels of government and stakeholders, nationally and internationally, on access to justice issues; and,
- Awarding project funding to eligible organizations for the implementation of projects in line with immediate government priorities related to access to justice.

⁵ Justice Canada. Departmental Plan 2020-21. Accessed May 2023 from: https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/cp-pm/rpp/2020_2021/rep-rap/p3.html.

⁶ JPIP provides core funding to ten provincially designated PLEI organizations, and selected organizations with goals and objectives closely linked to the mandate and priorities of the Department such as the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges; Canadian Society of Forensic Science; National Judicial Institute; Uniform Law Conference of Canada; and, the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy.

In this way, the JPIP and the AJA-PLEI in the territories contribute to the federal government's ability to fulfill its roles in areas such as promoting access to justice, and fulfilling its role in the shared jurisdiction with provinces and territories (PTs) for the administration of justice.

These programs are also aligned with federal and departmental roles and priorities in the following areas:

Access to justice

The JPIP aligns with Justice Canada's commitment to working to advance a people-centred approach to justice that puts consideration of the individual at the heart of justice responses by providing access to information, programs and policies.⁷ Justice Canada is the lead department within the Government of Canada for achieving sustainable development goal #16 of the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development⁸. This goal commits the global community to work together to "promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels". The JPIP is aligned with this commitment as the long-term outcome of the JPIP is to increase access to justice in Canada, and its funded projects and organizations work towards this goal. To this end, JPIP funds organizations such as PLEI organizations that provide legal information and education to individuals to enable them for an informed access to the justice system.

Gender-based violence

The Prime Minister's December 2019 mandate letter to the Minister of Justice asked that the Minister "work with provinces and territories to provide free legal advice and support to survivors of sexual assault and intimate partner violence." In the context of the Government of Canada's "Advancing a National Action Plan to End Gender-Based Violence," Budget 2021 announced an investment of \$35 million over five years through Justice Canada to provide additional supports for victims of IPV in the family justice system, including assisting these victims to access and navigate the family justice system, and improving justice system responses. In addition, \$48.75 million over five years through two Justice Canada programs were also invested to ensure access to free legal advice and legal representation for survivors of sexual assault and IPV.

Under its "Family Violence Initiative", the JPIP's objectives are to strengthen the justice system's response to family violence and promote continued public awareness of family violence and public involvement in the response to family violence. To this end, JPIP funded 23 organizations that were targeted to victims of family, partner or gender-based violence. Project activities such as the Pan-Canadian Conference on Gender-based Violence, development of video capsules on domestic violence, and research on causes, contributing factors and effects of gender-based violence on specific population were funded through this program component.

Truth and reconciliation

JPIP also delivers funding allocated through Budget 2021 to advance the CTAs of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission through the CTA 50 funding across Canada. Justice Canada is

⁷ Department of Justice Canada (date last modified 2021) Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/access-acces/index.html>

⁸ UN (2015). Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>

responsible for the implementation of 14 of the CTAs, including CTA 50, which calls for funding the establishment of Indigenous law institutes for the development, use, and understanding of Indigenous laws and access to justice in accordance with the unique cultures of Aboriginal peoples in Canada. To this end, the JPIP funded a total of 27 CTA 50 projects over the evaluation period, which were assessed with the support of a review committee, which included Indigenous individuals. The JPIP also made funding available for eight projects focused on “Violence against Aboriginal Women and Girls” between 2017-18 and 2019-20.

Systemic racism and inequalities

JPIP delivers funding allocated through Budget 2021 to support the provision of culturally appropriate legal information and resources, and to pilot legal advice services for racialized communities across Canada. This funding is intended to help fill gaps in legal services and supports for racialized communities in Canada.⁹ JPIP launched a CFP for these services in November 2021, with implementation beginning in 2023. This supports the Minister’s 2021 Mandate Letter commitment to invest in actions to address systemic inequities in the criminal justice system in recognition of the disproportionate impacts on groups including Black Canadians and Indigenous peoples.

4.1.2 Alignment with the Needs of Canadians, Including Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups

The JPIP is aligned with the needs of Canadians, including the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, Indigenous and racialized women, persons with disabilities, those who identified as 2SLGBTQI+).



The evidence demonstrates that JPIP addresses current and continuing needs, including those of marginalized and vulnerable groups. There is an overall need for greater public awareness about public legal education and information, which is addressed through the various Program components.

The number of projects that focus on current issues and needs are shown in Table 3, organized based on the needs identified in Justice Canada’s 2018 *What we Heard: Transforming Canada’s Criminal Justice System*¹⁰) report and the Department’s 2020 *Looking to 2025 and Beyond* report¹¹.

Alternatives to courts and incarceration

The Canadian justice system continues to explore alternatives to courts and incarceration through, for example, the use of restorative justice. Restorative justice refers to “an approach to justice that seeks to repair harm by providing an opportunity for those harmed and those who take responsibility for the harm to communicate about and address their needs in the aftermath of a crime.”¹² In line with this

⁹ Department of Justice Canada (2021). Funding to provide legal services and supports for racialized communities. Accessed May 2023 from: https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/fund-fina/f_15.html

¹⁰ Department of Justice Canada (2018). *What we Heard: Transforming Canada’s Criminal Justice System - a report on Provincial and Territorial Stakeholder Consultations*. Accessed May 2023 from: https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/other-autre/tcjs-tsjp/WWH_EN.pdf

¹¹ Justice Canada - Research and Statistics Division (2020). *Looking to 2025 and Beyond*. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/rg-rco/2021/docs/rsd-2020-r-g-forward-looking-project-eng.pdf>

¹² Department of Justice Canada (2021). *Restorative Justice*. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/rj-jr/index.html>

concept of restorative justice, some JPIP-funded projects have focused on alternatives to incarceration, as shown in Table 3, where there were four such projects under the JPIP General component over FYs 2017-18 to 2021-22. For example, one project aimed to accelerate the use of restorative justice across Canada through various means, including modeling an innovation incubator to support inter-jurisdictional collaboration for restorative justice innovation, and piloting a model for education and training curriculum for a restorative approach to justice.

Partnerships with social organizations

There is a continued need to increase partnerships and collaboration with social, health and other relevant sectors that work to address root causes of involvement in the justice system (e.g., poverty, homelessness, substance use, mental illness, trauma, including that of youth in care). This has been a focus of a number of JPIP-funded projects under components such as the Family Violence component. For example, one project developed a compliance guide destined to support the work of social workers, while another worked in collaboration with clinicians and external organizations to provide support to individuals with mental health, substance abuse, and/or cognitive issues going through the justice system.

Affordability and accessibility of legal services

The expensive cost of accessing legal representation coupled with issues of insufficient legal aid have contributed to an upsurge in self-represented litigants, whose lack of legal and procedural knowledge can result in added challenges for courts and access to justice issues. Correspondingly, there is a need for reducing the financial barriers to accessing justice, including more opportunities to access free legal advice and legal representation, particularly for victims of gender-based and family violence. The initiatives funded under JPIP's Independent Legal Advice and Representation and PLEI seek to address the affordability as well as accessibility (in part through public legal education) of legal services. PLEI organizations also respond to the need for greater public awareness about public legal education and information, and any free legal advice opportunities available.

Improving Access to Justice for marginalized and vulnerable groups

Marginalized and vulnerable groups, including but not limited to visible minority populations, Indigenous peoples, newcomers and those belonging to the 2SLGBTQI+ community, often face additional barriers within the justice system, such as literacy and language barriers¹³. There is an identified need to invest in enhancing public trust in the justice system, including for Indigenous and Black Canadians and other racialized communities. Efforts to build this trust involve addressing systemic racism within the justice system, and ensuring access to culturally appropriate services and trauma-informed legal information. Many of the projects funded under JPIP have sought to address the needs of specific groups facing marginalization, discrimination or over-representation in the justice system. JPIP-funded projects have focused on the needs of Indigenous peoples, victims of family/intimate partner or gender-based violence (who are most often women), children or youth, people identifying as 2SLGBTQI+; Northern communities and the wrongly convicted (note that some projects targeted more than one of these groups).

¹³ Department of Justice Canada (2021). Access to Justice. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csjsjc/access-acces/index.html>

Out of the 128 projects funded through the project-specific components during the period covered by the evaluation, 76% (n=97) specifically aimed to respond to the needs of a marginalized or vulnerable group. Of those, 48% (n=47) are intended to benefit Indigenous peoples, and 53 (41%) are intended to benefit victims (more often, women). While PLEI organizations do not specifically target marginalized or vulnerable groups, evidence indicates that they have information and programming that benefit specific populations, most commonly newcomers, Indigenous peoples and women (including victims of violence and assault), but also youth/students, seniors, people with disabilities (including intellectual and physical disabilities), and incarcerated people.

Table 3: Number of Projects* Funded through the Project-Specific Components with Linkages to Current Issues and Needs

Categories	Family Violence	Family Justice Supports	CTA 50	Independent Legal Advice and Representation	JPIP-General	Violence Against Aboriginal Women	PLEI
Total number of projects by Component	23	4	27	15	40	8	11
Supporting Victims (Survivors)	23	4	-	15	3	8	-
Improving Justice for Indigenous Peoples	4	-	27	2	10	8	0
Affordability and accessibility of legal services	-	-	-	15	3	-	11
Partnerships with Social Organizations	10	-	-	2	1	4	-
Improving Access to Justice for Marginalized Groups	4	-	-	-	3	-	-
Alternatives to Court and Incarceration	-	-	-	-	4	-	-

* Each project may address one or more current issue and need

4.1.3 Responsiveness to Urgent and Emerging Issues

The JPIP is responsive to urgent and emerging issues, particularly through its capacity to stay informed of such issues, and the increased flexibility offered by its General component to react quickly to support activities that align with the Program's objectives and terms and conditions. For example, the JPIP was able to act quickly and effectively in response to the issues relating to the Ukrainian Airlines Flight PS752.

As the JPIP supports activities that respond to changing conditions affecting Canadian justice policy landscape, responsiveness to urgent and emerging needs is a key element of the Program.

Emerging issues on which the JPIP focuses are often identified through Government priority documents (e.g., mandate letters, Speeches from the Throne, and Budget speeches), from senior management, or through JPIP's network with PTs, non-for-profit organizations and other stakeholders. Priorities identified and assigned to JPIP often come with budget allocated to specific areas. As an example, the CTA 50 component was implemented in response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's CTA 50, and the funding to support it was announced through the Budget 2019.

In other cases, urgent and time-sensitive issues that had not been anticipated might arise. This was the case, as an example, of the shooting down of the Ukrainian Airlines Flight PS752. In unusual cases such as this one, the JPIP might leverage its General component to provide support and address this unexpected need.

On January 8, 2020, the Ukrainian Airlines Flight PS752 was shot down shortly after takeoff from Tehran, Iran, where Canada has no consular presence. Fifty-five Canadian citizens and 30 permanent residents lost their lives in the plane crash. In response to this tragedy, funding from the JPIP General component was quickly provided to Pro Bono Ontario, to offer legal assistance across Canada to the families of Canadian victims. About two weeks after the plane was shot down, Pro Bono Ontario could begin providing support to the affected families.

The project-specific component of the JPIP General component represents a small portion of the JPIP. It has a small budget, and additional funding is usually obtained through departmental resource reallocation exercises. This Program component does not conduct CFPs, and instead, aims to respond to needs as they arise, sometimes reaching out to specific organizations to address time-sensitive or very specific emerging issues. In some cases, organizations submit unsolicited proposals directly to the Program to respond to such issues. Similar approaches are used in other federal departments, where programs aim to react quickly to emerging issues (e.g.,

societal movements such as Black Lives Matter).

Evidence demonstrates that using the General component to address emerging and urgent needs is a best practice, and enables the Program to respond to various types of issues. The JPIP General component's broad objectives allow for flexibility and responsiveness in addressing priorities and emerging topics or issues. It should be noted, however, that the breadth of objectives can also lead to high demands for funding from organizations, as a high number of projects might contribute to those objectives.



To identify urgent and emerging needs, JPIP has begun to reach out to recipients and other organizations through consultations/meetings. It was noted that the Program plans to do more of this type of outreach moving forward, as it provides relevant information on the justice landscape and challenges that funding recipients may be facing.



Other federal funding programs are working in closely with their policy and/or research unit(s) to identify emerging issues, understand the broader context and federal role with respect to emerging issues, and identify key stakeholders with relevant knowledge and experience. These programs also regularly engage with experts and practitioners, undertake literature reviews and new research, and participate in international forums. This approach, which was not applied in a consistent manner by the JPIP during the period covered by the evaluation, represents an opportunity to enhance its monitoring of trends and emerging issues in the justice sector.

4.2 Effectiveness

4.2.1 Increased Capacity to Build Knowledge, Awareness, and Understanding of Justice Issues

The JPIP's funding has contributed to an increased capacity to build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues by recipient organizations, particularly in terms of innovation, emerging and urgent issues, PLEI materials, and enhanced information/knowledge-based collaboration.

The JPIP funding increased recipients' capacity to provide services and carry out activities that build and contribute to knowledge development, awareness, and understanding of various justice issues. According to all interviewed recipients, without the JPIP funding, they could not have undertaken their projects or expanded their capacities. In fact, half of the interviewed recipients indicated they could not have continued to operate without JPIP funding.

The JPIP supports various projects and organizations that sometimes operate in very specific and/or innovative justice-related areas, making it somewhat difficult to find funding opportunities to support their activities. By providing support to projects that promote innovations in the justice system, the JPIP contributes to increasing the capacity of organizations that would not have otherwise been able to conduct their activities. As example, the JPIP funds an organization that is undertaking a pilot project providing trauma-informed mental health support to citizens who have performed jury duty, assisted with a peer support program. This organization is reportedly the first such organization in the world. Similarly, the case study on *the Réseau d'action pour l'égalité des femmes immigrées et racisées du Québec* indicated that no other source of funding could have supported their project to increase awareness about female genital mutilation. Without JPIP funding, this project would not have been possible; the organization was able to hire a project manager and officers, move into its own space and begin its project activities in earnest.

Funding recipients use the JPIP funding to enhance their capacities through means such as funding salaries and expanding their services, locations, scope, or products. A few organizations undertook consultations, and used the funding for research and data collection. In some cases, the JPIP funding is also used to develop knowledge resources for internal use. In the Flight 752 Legal Relief Initiative project, the JPIP funding was used to develop a series of knowledge resources to ensure the provision of consistent, culturally appropriate and trauma-informed responses to clients. Those resources were shared with staff and volunteer lawyers contributing to the projects and used to update the organization's procedures and ensure the promotion of a culture of safety, empowerment, and healing.

Furthermore, the Program provides additional opportunities for funding recipients to increase capacity by promoting and supporting the development of partnerships. The Program promotes and supports collaboration and information-sharing among program recipients and other stakeholders. In some cases, JPIP officers directly supported the establishment of partnerships by connecting various stakeholders from different jurisdictions. With the support of stakeholders, such as subject-matter experts or social organizations, funding recipients reported developing new and informed approaches and tools that supported the design and delivery of their activities. The collaboration of professionals and target populations provided the practical guidance needed to align project outcomes with the needs of the target audience. Further, stakeholder collaboration helped promote diversity, inclusiveness, and identify and address overlooked biases. In addition, collaboration and partnerships expanded the organizations' legal network to better serve a more diverse and vulnerable population.

It is important to note that the resources, partnerships, training and new approaches developed through JPIP-funded projects are often sustained and further built upon even after the project's completion. All case study respondents were planning on using the findings, products, or lessons learned developed as part of their JPIP-funded projects after the end of the funding period. As an example, one case study recipient reported developing new resources based on their research results, and using new knowledge and experience acquired during the project to contribute to consultations and reviews of different aspects of justice issues.

Provincial PLEI organizations, as well as AJA-PLEI organizations, receive annual funding to support their core operations. In 2019, funding amounts provided to these organizations were increased for the first time in over twenty years, which provided critical support for their operations. PLEI and AJA-PLEI organizations used this additional funding to hire new staff, and to create and update content. It is important to note that PLEI organizations operating in the territories face additional challenges and costs in disseminating information, as large portions of the territories are populated by small and remote communities, with sometimes limited access to telephone and internet services.



In addition to the 2019 funding increase, the JPIP provided one-time additional funding to PLEI organizations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This funding was intended to support the accessibility and dissemination of legal information and resources in a pandemic environment. The responsiveness of the Program to the urgent issue that was COVID-19 was identified as a strength.

The JPIP's response assisted the PLEI and AJA-PLEI organizations in addressing the increased demand for legal information and advice on pandemic-related issues. Further, it enabled the organizations to make this information available to the public in a pandemic environment. PLEI organizations used the funding to improve their virtual service offerings, including: changes to their

websites, developing new COVID-related content, developing videos/webinars, and offering live chats and tools (e.g., fillable online forms).

4.2.2 Increased Knowledge of the Justice System for Canadians

JPIP-funded projects have contributed to an increased awareness and knowledge of the justice system for Canadians in areas such as better legal information and services and accessibility, greater awareness of Indigenous laws and legal traditions, and better knowledge of family justice and family violence.

The majority of JPIP-funded projects contributed to increasing Canadians' knowledge of the justice system. Across its various components, the JPIP has funded projects that have increased the availability and accessibility of legal information on a variety of topics, such as Indigenous laws and legal traditions, family justice, and support for IPV survivors.

JPIP funding allowed organizations to develop a variety of tools and resources, aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the justice system. These include the creation of legal information materials including publications, toolkits and handbooks, videos, webinars and workshops. For example, as part of its JPIP-funded project, one organization developed a six-part webinar series aimed at legal professionals on various areas of law and how to improve outcomes for 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, and posted the videos on its website for further access.

Dissemination of the materials developed occurred through different channels such as websites, emails, a variety of social media platforms and information sessions.

PLEI organizations play a major role in increasing awareness and knowledge of the justice system within their respective PTs. They have developed information on a variety of topics, including laws, obligations and rights, key players in the justice system, the nature of the courts and related processes, navigating the justice system, the rule of law, and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

As part of the **Access to Justice for Family Violence in Nunavut** project, the Law Society of Nunavut led an awareness campaign to provide information on dealing with family violence through the *Family Abuse Intervention Act* (FAIA) and other supports. Various materials and events, such as fact sheets, radio broadcasts and podcast, community events, and resource handbook were organized and shared to increase awareness.



One limitation noted during the evaluation was the high cost of raising awareness about resources available and services offered by the various funded organizations. The evaluation evidence points to opportunities to increase awareness of the services offered by the funded organizations, particularly pertaining to PLEI. Increasing the public's awareness of the availability of these free resources could have a positive impact on Canadians' knowledge of the justice system. It was suggested that public education campaigns in the media would increase the potential outreach of funded organizations and projects. Any efforts to increase awareness about the existence of the organizations that provide public legal information would ultimately increase the reach of the information they provide about the Canadian justice system.

4.2.3 Strengthened Legal Framework

While not all JPIP-funded projects have a direct impact on the Canadian justice system, various activities, including training activities and partnerships built as part of funded projects have contributed to a strengthened legal framework.

The JPIP contributes to a strengthened legal framework in various ways. A few JPIP projects directly led to policy discussions and procedural changes and thus had a direct impact on the legal framework. Anecdotal evidence from case studies, such as the Nova Scotia Department of Justice (see example below), and the Law of Society of Nunavut, which provided input in the Nunavut Department of Justice review of the FAIA, demonstrates that JPIP-funded projects can directly impact the Canadian legal framework.

As part of the **Building a Comprehensive Framework that Can Support Acceleration of Restorative Justice in all Provinces and Territories** project, the Nova Scotia Department of Justice collaborated with five other PTs and the federal government to support the development of a consistent framework to accelerate the use of restorative justice in the criminal justice system.

Through policy discussion, a paper presenting four key elements/best practices which can guide efforts to transform restorative justice into a formal justice option in Canada was developed. This framework subsequently received endorsement from Ministers at the FPT meeting of Ministers Responsible for Justice and Public Safety in November 2018, and the paper was published on the Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat website.

While not all projects contribute directly to this Program objective, collaboration and partnerships between justice stakeholders, as well as training provided through project activities, contributed to a strengthened Canadian legal framework.

The majority (73%) of projects included in the file review reported having established partnerships with other justice stakeholders as part or as a result of their activities. For example, partnerships were established with provincial, territorial and national organizations (including provincial courts, pro bono organizations, various Indigenous groups, universities and schools, and social organizations representing marginalized and vulnerable populations (such as 2SLGBTQI+ individuals)).

Through these partnerships, project recipients reported receiving assistance in conducting research, identifying gaps and emerging trends, and enhancing the effectiveness, accessibility and reach of the PLEI materials developed. Interviewees noted that increasing awareness of various legal issues, developing and informing new models in the justice system, and encouraging the participation of diverse voices in the justice system would ultimately contribute to a strengthened legal framework.

Projects that developed and delivered training to legal professionals are also considered to contribute to a strengthened legal framework. Various projects funded through the JPIP aimed to provide training to judges, court staff, and other legal justice stakeholders. For example, in one case study, the recipient (i.e., Egale) developed and provided lawyers and other legal professionals with training on the challenges faced by 2SLGBTQI+ individuals and how best they can navigate the system. One of the webinars developed as part of this project touched specifically on the future of laws, addressing new dynamics that impact the 2SLGBTQI+ community of which legal practitioners should be aware. Other organizations, such as those receiving named grants, contribute to a strengthened legal framework by, for example, maintaining professional standards, providing educational programs for federal, provincial, and territorial judges, and working on the harmonization of laws of the PTs

4.2.4 Increased Access to the Justice System

Through its various components, the JPIP has supported an increased access to the justice system for Canadians, including marginalized and vulnerable groups and official language minority communities, in areas such as pandemic-related issues, culturally responsive services and family justice.

Access to the justice system is often complex, and entangled with various other issues such as housing, employment, and family violence. Access to information, resources and informal services, education and guidance is a key element in supporting an increased access to justice¹⁴. By developing and disseminating information about the Canadian justice system and people's rights and obligations, JPIP-funded projects contributed to an increased access to justice for Canadians.

While some issues remain in Canada, especially for marginalized and vulnerable groups, positive developments in access to justice were noted in the 2021 *Canada's Justice Development Goals*¹⁵ report. Noted improvements included the delivery of public legal education and information in the COVID-19 pandemic environment using innovative approaches, the increased use of technology, work being done to provide more culturally appropriate services for Indigenous peoples, racialized individuals, 2SLGBTQI+ communities and other Canadians, as well as the development of new tools and resources for self-represented litigants.

While JPIP's contribution to these improvements could not be precisely quantified in this evaluation, many of the projects funded through the Program implemented activities related to those areas. COVID-related projects, including the one-time funding provided to PLEI (and AJA-PLEI) organizations, is an example of the Program's response that contributed to an increased access to justice for Canadians during the pandemic. The funding provided through the CTA 50 component supported the revitalization of Indigenous laws and access to justice in accordance with the cultures of Indigenous peoples in Canada.

Most projects funded by the JPIP contributed directly to an increased access to justice. This was done by increasing information for victims (e.g., IPV projects), supporting professional training, increasing access to court in their communities, etc. PLEI organizations also support access to justice by providing relevant information on processes.

Access to justice for minorities in Canada was also supported by JPIP-funded projects. A majority of projects reviewed as part of the file review supported the Official Language Minority Communities (OLMC - francophones outside of Quebec and anglophones in Quebec) through provision of translated materials and bilingual services. A few projects also provided bilingual services for Indigenous-language speakers.

¹⁴ Department of Justice Canada (2021). Access to Justice. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/access-acces/index.html>

¹⁵ Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. (2021). *Canada's Justice Development Goals: 2020 – Challenge and Change*. Accessed May 2023 from: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/60804beaba3bc03016513a59/t/609d9ab372b8f876777a7ee9/1620941495000/jdgreport2020challengechange.pdf>

4.3 Efficiency

4.3.1 Management of the JPIP

Overall, the JPIP is efficiently managed due to flexible and multi-year funding, good CFPs and application processes, and reasonable reporting. The Program is also financially well managed, although recent years have seen some reprofiling, due to external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Some constraints were identified regarding parts of CFPs and application processes, data management and GBA Plus requirements at both the application and reporting stages.

Funding Management

Generally, the evidence suggests that the funding is seen as flexible, allowing recipients to use the funds as necessary, for example, to engage human resources and administrative expenses. That said, some recipients highlighted that being allowed to move funds between FYs could facilitate the success of their projects.

The current levels of funding available through JPIP are seen as an important feature of the Program. Particularly, the PLEI recipients all noted and expressed appreciation that their funding had been increased in 2019. This increase in funding helped them address the erosion of the JPIP funding in real dollars that had occurred over time. However, most PLEI recipients also commented that the core funding they receive from JPIP should be indexed to inflation.

Furthermore, since 2019, the provincial PLEI organizations receive JPIP funding through a five-year cycle. Prior to 2019, the organizations had to apply for funding every year, which represented a considerable burden for some of them. This new multi-year funding structure was greatly appreciated by the provincial PLEI organizations, as it reduces the administrative burden related to planning and reporting of their activities.

The evidence indicates that JPIP's financial management is efficient, with some reprofiling¹⁶ of funds due to external factors. For example, FY 2019-20 saw a larger amount of lapsing for Vote 1 (O&M); reprofiling was needed due to the September 2021 federal election. FYs 2020-21 and 2021-22 had lapses in Vote 5 (Gs&Cs); reprofiling was requested to help better support organizations and projects funded by the Program, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the inability of organizations to fully expend their funds. It was also noted that during the evaluation period, the Program has benefited from lapsed funds of other Justice Canada programs.

CFPs and Application Processes

JPIP's CFPs and application processes were seen as efficient. JPIP issues most of its project-specific funding through specific CFPs, with the exception of the JPIP General component. The CFP process was seen as effective and qualified as "smooth" by recipients. It was also noted that the Program generally did a good job at identifying opportunities for CFPs, as well as the process to launch the calls.

¹⁶ Reprofiling provides for unused authorities from one FY to be made available in subsequent FYs to reflect changes in the expected timing of Program implementation.

Some constraints were identified regarding the CFP process. For example, although the outreach was generally seen as efficient (i.e. when Justice Canada program officers reach out to potential applicants to either advise them of the CFP and/or invite them to apply), some recipients, mostly IPV recipients, indicated that the outreach could be strengthened, as sometimes they were only made aware of the funding opportunity through another organization.



Some recipients raised challenges with the project selection criteria. They were sometimes seen as unclear (e.g., whether only racialized-led organizations would be eligible for funding for calls aimed at projects targeting racialized Canadians), or too narrow (e.g., not reflecting the value of projects that have broad target audiences). In addition, some recipients noted that project selection criteria were not necessarily well aligned with client needs (e.g., specific requirements for the activities of projects that are not what the organization would have undertaken to meet the needs of their clients), or was unclear in how the criteria would be assessed (e.g., the relative importance of background, staffing, approach).

The JPIP General component is the only project-specific component that does not use a CFP process. While this may allow the Program to provide funding in a timely manner when urgent issues arise, the lack of transparency and accessibility to those funds was raised as an issue by both Justice Canada staff and funding recipients.

Programs assessed in the environmental scan, which operate broad funds, faced similar issues. It was noted that although open CFPs are administratively burdensome, they are more transparent and likely to engage a broader swath of recipients. On the other hand, invitational CFPs are timelier, but they often limit the Program to known service providers. The type of CFP selected (opened vs. invitational) was often chosen based on timelines, funding amounts available, and Program capacity to assess received applications. During the evaluation, it was suggested that a two-step process that starts with a letter of interest before applicants are asked to invest in the development of a proposal would be useful.

In terms of the application process, evidence suggests that overall, it is easy and straightforward. It is worth noting that JPIP staff provide direct support and tools (such as GBA Plus materials) to applicants to guide them in the application process. However, constraints were raised regarding some requirements (e.g., support letters from provincial governments). The short turnaround time to complete and submit applications was also raised as a constraint. The lack of time for consultation with project beneficiaries represented an issue for applicants, as consultation with target audiences and other justice stakeholders in the design phase of a project was identified as a means to ensure the effectiveness and appropriateness of the funded activities.



JPIP staff were identified as contributing to the efficient management of the Program. Most recipients indicated that they appreciated that the staff reached out to them about funding opportunities, including upcoming CFPs, and were grateful for organizing opportunities to network and meet with other funding recipients.

As for AJA-PLEI, the evidence suggests that the agreements are well-managed¹⁷. Justice Canada receives reports from the territories that illustrate how the funding was spent (though there is less information available on outcomes of the funding) and each agreement is audited. Territories have the flexibility to move the funding between its Legal Aid, Indigenous Courtwork Services, and PLEI components to meet needs.

Reporting and Monitoring



The evidence suggests that recipients perceived that the reporting required by the JPIP was appropriate and reasonable. For example, the reporting was aligned with other Gs&Cs level requirements, and focused on outputs rather than on outcomes, which facilitated tracking the results in the short term. That said, a few constraints were raised regarding the financial reporting, as it was seen as complicated and onerous, and with inconvenient requirements for audited financial statements.



At the Program level, it was noted that the JPIP encounters challenges telling a compelling performance story for projects funded through the JPIP General component, since these may vary greatly from one another. Examples of activities that were funded through this component include research projects (with or without a public legal education and information portion), conferences on a variety of topics (such as legal support), the development of national strategies on alternative justice, and the provision of experiential learning for students.

In terms of information management systems, JPIP uses GCIMS¹⁸ to capture information about funded projects. The evaluation found limitations to extract and/or generate information from the system. Although GCIMS is a corporate information management system used by other Justice Canada programs as well, it is seen as not fully meeting JPIP's program management needs. A new corporate information management system is expected to be implemented in the near future, which will help address these limitations.



All programs assessed in the environmental scan are working to improve project monitoring and information management systems that yield meaningful and timely performance reporting for their program. Some practices noted include: enhancing electronic platforms for online reporting, using standardized tools and indicators to support aggregation of impacts at the program level, and hosting learning events for funding recipients to share results, with participation of experts.

GBA Plus Considerations

Evidence confirms that applicants and funding recipients provide relevant GBA Plus information to the Program through the application process, assessment process, and interim and final reporting. During

¹⁷ While provincial PLEI organizations are funded through grant agreements, AJA-PLEI organizations receive funding through contribution agreements, and have different reporting requirements.

¹⁸ The Grants and Contribution Information Management System (GCIMS) is a transfer payment management system that automates transfer payment business processes, and manages funding agreement information.

the application and assessment stages, the Program considered various GBA Plus factors such as the inclusion of a GBA Plus analysis in project design, demonstrated expertise working with racialized communities and delivering culturally relevant services, identification of the target populations that will directly benefit from their proposed project, and the explanation of how the project will demonstrate sensitivity to diversity and gender equality issues. Applicants also need to describe how the project will take into consideration the needs of OLMCs.

At the reporting stage, recipients are required to explain, when applicable, how their project impacted marginalized and vulnerable groups, whether they took any specific measures to increase or encourage the participation of these groups in the project, and how they integrated their different perspectives into the development and/or delivery of the project.



Some challenges were raised by recipients regarding GBA Plus data due to a lack of knowledge, varying interpretations and definitions, and a lack of capacity to collect such data (e.g., issues on collecting personal information, lack of in-house expertise or because it is seen as non-applicable). Although JPIP representatives explain GBA Plus considerations and provide resources to applicants and funding recipients, it is particularly challenging for smaller organizations that have lower capacity and time for training to collect and report GBA Plus data. In addition, it is unclear how this data is used by the Program to inform decision-making beyond the initial eligibility evaluation of prospective applicants.



All programs reviewed during the environmental scan included GBA Plus considerations in their program through different approaches. For example, some programs require applicants to think about how GBA Plus was considered in their project design, provide disaggregated performance data, and implement outreach activities to ensure diversity of organizations applying for funding. Applying a GBA Plus lens to outreach activities is considered to be a best practice.




4.4 Looking Forward

This section of the reports adopts a prospective perspective based on the main findings of this evaluation. Particularly, it looks at JPIP's strengths and challenges, best practices from other similar federal programs, and array of opportunities with the objective of highlighting factors that should be taken into consideration by the JPIP moving forward. Although the level of influence that the Program has on these elements may vary, particularly for best practices and opportunities, the evaluation found that these are key elements to consider in the future.

4.4.1 Strengths, Challenges, Best Practices and Opportunities

The JPIP's strengths enables it to remain relevant, effective and efficient. While the Program has been continuously evolving over the years, some challenges remain. Other similar federal programs have put in place best practices that facilitate the delivery and management of their activities. Looking forward, there are a number of opportunities available for program improvement that the JPIP could take into consideration.



Throughout the report, specific elements for considerations were highlighted using the following icons:

	<p>The dumbbell icon represents a Program strength.</p>
	<p>The mountain icon represents challenges.</p>
	<p>The ribbon icon represents best practices put in place by other similar federal programs. Those best practices were informed through the environmental scan.</p>

Strengths, Challenges and Best Practices


By identifying strengths, the evaluation first aimed to identify what the Program does best. For the purpose of the evaluation, strengths are internal to the Program and under its control, and are key elements to the Program’s achievement of results. Challenges represent potential areas of improvement for the Program, or elements that could hinder the achievement of results. It is worth noting that the JPIP has been in place for almost 30 years. Over the years, improvements have been made to the JPIP, and while challenges remain, some of the identified challenges are outside of its control. Figure 1 depicts the strengths and challenges identified throughout the report.

Figure 1: Program Strengths and Challenges

 Program Strengths	 Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach and communication with funding recipients (including <i>ad hoc</i> recipient meetings) • Responsiveness to urgent issues (such as the COVID-19 pandemic) and current issues • Appropriateness of administrative requirements for recipients • Support and guidance from Program staff 	<p>At the recipient level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost of raising awareness about their organization and services • Application of GBA Plus analysis <p>At the Program level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of GBA Plus analysis beyond projects’ assessment • Development of a performance story (more specifically related to the JPIP General component) • Clarity and appropriateness of project assessment criteria

All of the programs included in the environmental scan featured broad objectives to address general social or health challenges. These programs address multiple objectives and attempt to fund projects that have regional representation or are diverse in other respects. In that sense, they were considered similar to those of the JPIP. These were examined as part of the evaluation, with the intent of identifying best practices. While those programs often operate in similar ways to the JPIP, they operate in different areas. Relevant best practices were identified throughout the report. Figure 2 depicts best practices from other federal programs identified throughout the report.

Figure 2: Best Practices from Similar Programs

 Best Practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working in close collaboration with departmental policy and research units, and engaging with practitioners and subject-matter experts to identify emerging issues• Monitoring funded projects using various practices, including enhancing electronic platforms for online reporting, using standardized tools and indicators to support aggregation of impacts, and hosting learning events for funding recipients to share results, with participation of experts• Applying GBA Plus lens into outreach activities to ensure the diversity of funding applicants

Opportunities for the JPIP

In light of the strengths, challenges, and best practices identified in the report, along with other findings, the evaluation aimed to identify how the JPIP could take advantage of some opportunities to improve its operations going forward.

The evidence suggests that the JPIP could benefit from seeking additional opportunities for increased communication and information-sharing, both with and between funding recipients, and with other groups within Justice Canada (such as with policy and research units, and the Communications Branch).

Increased Communication with Funding Recipients

Leveraging its strength in communication and outreach, and its experience with *ad hoc* recipients' meetings, the JPIP could consider repeating and expanding these exercises in a structured and regular manner. This best practice, identified through the environmental scan, may be an opportunity for the Program to promote and support additional networking between funded organizations, potentially leading to increased collaboration, information sharing, and the establishment of new and/or strengthened partnerships with and between funded organizations. As highlighted in section 4.2, this could increase funded organizations' capacity to increase their knowledge, awareness, and understanding of the Canadian justice system. When appropriate, inviting additional justice stakeholders, such as subject-matter experts, or representatives from specific groups (such as Indigenous and/or 2SLGBTQI+ individuals), the JPIP could also help inform funding recipients of specific needs/challenges these populations may face, and contribute to informing the projects' approaches. In addition to supporting the funding recipients in the planning and implementation of their activities, this could address one of the Program's challenges, namely, the incorporation of the GBA Plus principles beyond the initial project selection assessment.

Organizing those meetings would also represent an enhanced learning opportunity for the Program itself. Meeting regularly and systematically with various justice stakeholders, including experts and practitioners who work directly with Canadians, could help the Program reinforce its monitoring of trends and emerging issues in the justice sector.

Increased Leverage of Justice Canada Expertise

It was noted in the environmental scan that other federal programs are working in close relationships with their policy and/or research units, enabling them to quickly identify emerging issues, and to understand the broader context in which those issues occur. Working in closer collaboration with those groups within Justice Canada could support JPIP's efforts in the monitoring of emerging needs and further increase its responsiveness to those issues. Leveraging such departmental expertise could in turn support the JPIP in its response to address those needs through its funding activities. Having a better knowledge of specific emerging justice issues, and of the justice landscape in general, could also support the Program in the design of project assessment criteria for CFPs, which was identified as a challenge by funding recipients.

An increased internal collaboration could also represent an opportunity for JPIP to better support an enhanced awareness of the funded organizations and their projects. The high cost of raising public awareness about available resources and services offered was also identified as a challenge for the various organizations funded through the JPIP, particularly pertaining to PLEI. By working with other groups within Justice Canada (such as the Communications Branch), the Program could seek opportunities to increase the reach of the dissemination of information regarding activities and materials produced by the organizations funded through the JPIP. The increase of public awareness of organizations, projects and related outputs could contribute to informing Canadians of their existence, and further increase access to justice.

Justice Landscape

The evaluation identified additional considerations for the Program. While those elements are not necessarily under the JPIP's control, they should be considered for decision-making, as they were noted as important in the justice landscape, and are likely to have an impact on Canadians and organizations evolving in this area.

Legal issues are often complex and entangled with other factors such as mental health, housing, and employment. Addressing issues that have an impact on Canadians' access to justice may require working on various fronts, with a multiplicity of stakeholders, such as PT organizations, community-level organizations, practitioners, and other funders. Some recipients noted an overlap between the work of various funders, sometimes between federal departments, which may fund projects with similar objectives, in the same geographic area, and/or with the same target audience. Coordination with other funders on connected issues and projects could minimize the risk for overlap, while targeting root causes of justice issues, and potentially increasing the reach and impact of funded projects.

In addition, the evidence suggests that the development of new technologies will affect both funding recipients and Canadians in the upcoming years. New technologies may affect the availability of resources and services, as well as the way that Canadians access information. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated how technology could be used to provide alternatives to access information, and how quickly the use of technology, both by funding recipients and Canadians, can evolve. New

technologies, such as artificial intelligence, may open new opportunities (or risks) for improving individual legal knowledge and increasing access to justice, particularly for low-income, marginalized, and more vulnerable Canadians. While this is not under its control, the JPIP should monitor the use of technology in access to justice, as it will continue to play a part in shaping access to justice, including information and services, in the future.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Relevance

The JPIP and the AJA-PLEI support Justice Canada's policy directions on justice-related issues, and are aligned with federal and departmental roles and priorities, such as increasing access to justice, strengthening the justice system's response to family violence, increasing awareness of Public Legal Education Information, and revitalizing Indigenous laws.

The evaluation found that the JPIP and AJA-PLEI are relevant due to their capacity to address the needs of Canadians, including marginalized and vulnerable groups, in the areas of family violence, access to justice, and various other issues. The JPIP is responsive to urgent and emerging issues, particularly through its capacity to stay informed of such issues, and the increased flexibility offered by its General component to react quickly when urgent needs arise to support activities that align with the program's objectives and terms and conditions.

5.1.2 Effectiveness

The JPIP and AJA-PLEI were effective in contributing to its intended outcomes. Through its funding, the Program has contributed to an increased capacity to build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues by recipient organizations, particularly in terms of innovation, emerging and urgent issues, PLEI materials, and enhanced information/knowledge-based collaboration.

JPIP-funded projects have contributed to an increased awareness and knowledge of the justice system for Canadians in areas such as better legal information and services, accessibility, revitalization of Indigenous laws and legal traditions, and better knowledge of family justice and family violence. While not all JPIP-funded projects have a direct impact on the Canadian justice system, various activities, including training activities and partnerships built as part of funded projects have contributed to a strengthened legal framework.

Finally, through various components, the JPIP and AJA-PLEI supported an increased access to the justice system for Canadians, including marginalized and vulnerable groups, by supporting access to public legal education and information resources and services, the training of legal professional and stakeholders, and funding projects that specifically aimed to address justice-related issues faced by Indigenous peoples.

5.1.3 Efficiency

Overall, the JPIP and AJA-PLEI are efficiently managed due to flexible and multi-year funding, good CFPs and application processes (specifically in the case of JPIP), and reasonable reporting. The Program is also financially well managed, although recent years have seen some reprofiling, due to external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Some constraints were identified regarding parts of CFPs and application processes, data management and GBA Plus requirements at both the application and reporting stages.

5.2 Recommendation

Recommendation: Building on its strengths, the JPIP should explore opportunities to increase communication and information-sharing with and between funding recipients (as an example, through recipients' meetings), as well as opportunities to leverage the expertise of other groups within the Department.

Expanding on the *ad hoc* recipients' meeting that the JPIP has held in the past could enable the Program to better support and promote additional networking between funded organizations, potentially leading to increased collaboration and partnerships, and increasing organizations' capacity to build knowledge and awareness of the Justice system.

Collaborating with other stakeholders within the Department could also represent an opportunity for the JPIP to further increase its monitoring of, and responsiveness to emerging and urgent issues, and could represent an opportunity to disseminate information on the funded organizations and projects to the Canadian public, potentially increasing their reach.

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Issue #1: Relevance

- 1.1. To what extent is the JPIP relevant and responsive to federal and departmental roles and priorities in the area of access to justice, family violence, public legal education and information, and revitalization of Indigenous laws?
- 1.2. To what extent is the JPIP relevant and responsive to current, emerging and urgent needs of Canadians, including the needs of various vulnerable groups (i.e., youth, Indigenous and racialized women, persons with disabilities, those who identified as LGBTQ2S+)?

Issue #2: Effectiveness

- 2.1. To what extent has the JPIP led to an increased capacity to build knowledge, awareness and understanding of justice issues?
 - 2.1.1. To what extent and in what manner does the JPIP enable funding recipients to increase awareness on urgent and emerging justice issues?
- 2.2. To what extent has the JPIP provided Canadians with an increased awareness and knowledge of the justice system, including their rights and obligations?
- 2.3. To what extent has JPIP contributed to a strengthened legal framework?
- 2.4. To what extent has JPIP increased access to the Canadian justice system?

Issue #3: Efficiency

- 3.1. Is the JPIP efficiently managed (e.g., related to contribution agreements, reporting requirements, etc.)?
 - 3.1.1. To what extent has the JPIP been effective in managing funding and changes in Program components?

Issue #4: Looking Forward

- 4.1. What are the JPIP's strengths and weaknesses? How can JPIP's strengths be leveraged, and weaknesses minimized?
- 4.2. What are the challenges/risks or opportunities associated with the JPIP, including new Program components?
- 4.3. What are the best practices and lessons learned of JPIP and similar programs? To what extent could they be incorporated in JPIP strategic planning?
- 4.4. How are GBA Plus considerations incorporated in JPIP strategic planning? What measures could the JPIP put in place to facilitate the participation of underrepresented and vulnerable groups?
- 4.5. To what extent has JPIP increased access to the Canadian justice system?

APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Program Component	Description	Number of Projects Funded during the period covered by the evaluation
Access to Justice Services Agreements – Public Legal Education and Information	The Access to Justice Services Agreements (AJA) are funding arrangements between the federal government and Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. The AJAs support the delivery of access to justice-related services, including public legal education and information.	N/A
Family Justice Support	Through Budget 2021, the Government of Canada announced an investment of \$35 million over five years for enhanced family justice system supports for victims of intimate partner violence (IPV). The objectives of the funding is to improve support and access to justice for these victims of who are involved in the family justice system. Funding can support a range of activities that assist victims of IPV to access and navigate the family justice system and improve justice system responses.	4
Family Violence Initiative	The Family Violence Initiative supports the development, implementation, testing and assessment of models, strategies, and tools to improve the justice system’s response to family violence. It also supports projects that raise public awareness of the issue and encourage public involvement in responding to family violence. Funding is available to organizations that want to conduct pilot projects to develop, test and assess models, strategies and tools to improve the justice system’s response to family violence. Funding is also available for PLEI projects to promote public access to family violence information. Funding is only available for short-term projects.	23
Intimate Partner Violence/Independent Legal Advice/ Representation;	<p>In Budget 2021, in the context of “Advancing a National Action Plan to End Gender-Based Violence”, the Government of Canada announced an investment of \$48.75 million over five years through two Justice Canada programs to ensure access to free legal advice and legal representation for survivors of sexual assault and intimate partner violence.</p> <p>Funding through the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program (JPIP) will support the development and implementation of pilot models of Independent Legal Advice (ILA) and Independent Legal Representation (ILR) for survivors of intimate partner violence. ILA programs provide victims with tailored legal advice regarding their legal options following intimate partner violence. ILR programs provide victims with legal counsel to represent their interests in</p>	15

Program Component	Description	Number of Projects Funded during the period covered by the evaluation
	<p>specific instances as provided for in the <i>Criminal Code of Canada</i> (i.e. in s. 276 and s. 278 proceedings as a part of a criminal sexual assault trial).</p> <p>The objective of the funding is to reduce re-traumatization of victims of IPV when engaging with the justice system, and work towards increasing confidence in the justice system's response to gender-based violence.</p>	
JPIP General	<p>JPIP provides contribution funding for projects that support ensuring a fair, relevant and accessible Canadian justice system. JPIP supports activities that respond effectively to the changing conditions affecting Canadian justice policy. Priorities include access to justice, family violence, and emerging justice issues.</p> <p>The objectives of the Program are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote and encourage involvement in the identification of emerging trends, issues and/or gaps and possible responses with respect to the justice system. • To promote innovations in the justice system to ensure greater access to the justice system. • To build knowledge, awareness, understanding and informed dialogue among justice stakeholders and/or the public on justice issues including access to justice, racism, official languages, anti-terrorism, sentencing and other emerging justice issues, including justice related issues in the international fora. • To inform Canadians about access to justice issues and the justice system in order to contribute to increased public understanding, participation, confidence and trust in the justice system. 	40
Public Legal Education and Information (PLEI)	<p>The JPIP provides core funding annually to 10 PLEI organizations across Canada (one per province). PLEI materials and activities provided by these organizations assist the public in understanding the law, their rights and obligations, and the Canadian justice system.</p>	10
Revitalization of Indigenous Laws – Call to Action 50 (CTA 50)	<p>In Budget 2019, in the context of “Making Progress on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s Calls to Action” the Government of Canada responded to Call to Action 50 by proposing to invest \$10 million over five years</p>	27

Program Component	Description	Number of Projects Funded during the period covered by the evaluation
	<p>in support of Indigenous law initiatives across Canada through the Justice Partnership and Innovation Program , to improve equality for Indigenous Peoples in Canada’s legal system. This funding will support renewed legal relationships with Indigenous peoples by funding initiatives that will advance the development, use and understanding of Indigenous laws.</p> <p>The objective of this initiative is to fund projects that support to development, use and understanding of Indigenous laws and access to justice in accordance with the unique cultures of Aboriginal peoples in Canada. The intention is to fund Indigenous law revitalization projects in all regions of Canada involving First Nations, Inuit, and Métis legal traditions.</p>	
<p>Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls</p>	<p>The Justice Partnership and Innovation Program – Violence Against Aboriginal Women and Girls supports Aboriginal communities in breaking intergenerational cycles of violence and abuse through awareness activities, pilot projects, tools and resources to reduce vulnerability to violence and to build healthy relationships.</p>	<p>8</p>