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2018 in numbers

Grants

Funding partners
21
Justice First Fellows
15
Total awarded since TLEF began in 2013
£21m
Grants since 2013
370

Total awarded in 2018
£5,666,666,000
12% up on 2017
Using law as a powerful means to an end

Matthew Smerdon
Chief executive

“If you don’t know your rights, you don’t know how to fight. Knowledge is power, and that’s what it gives us.” Lynda Gilbert

Allan and Lynda Gilbert are the parents of a disabled child. This year, they took part in Central England Law Centre’s RIPPLE project, which TLEF funded, and which the Gilberts feel enabled them to ensure their child receives the support they are entitled to have.

RIPPLE worked with seven groups of people using health and social care services or their families. RIPPLE focused first on what participants wanted to achieve and the issues that were important to them; next, it asked what role the law could play in tackling these issues. RIPPLE helped not only these individuals and their families, but it also brought wider benefits. It helped participants increase their knowledge and win direct improvements, and then used this as a platform for widening awareness of rights more generally, and for establishing constructive relations with public bodies, which led to a number of benefits, including increased provision of services. The project encompassed legal capability, legal services, complex casework, strategic litigation, and policy advocacy, with legal education driving action at all these levels.

As we mark the fifth anniversary of our transition from the College of Law to The Legal Education Foundation, projects like RIPPLE encapsulate what we are aiming to achieve. Since TLEF was launched in 2013, we have developed an approach centred on helping citizens to understand and use the law to secure rights, fair treatment, and protection. Legal education plays an essential role in helping citizens to know and access their rights; it helps organisations in the field to improve the ways they identify and resolve legal need; and it can shape the wider systems, context and environment in which this work takes place.

In the past five years, we have made 370 grants totalling £21m. It feels like an impossible task to fully capture the breadth.
Introduction

Since TLEF was launched in 2013, we have developed an approach centred on helping citizens to understand and use the law to secure rights, fair treatment, and protection.

and depth of work delivered by the organisations we have supported, but as our work develops, a number of themes have emerged:

• Law is not the end. It’s a powerful means to an end, and can give people an essential tool for bringing about change. Collaboration within the legal sector and with other voluntary organisations, and with the public and private sectors, can position legal education and access to law in the places where it is most needed and where it can have greatest effect.

• Our operating principle is to support people and systems to act early, and to focus on supporting change that prevents problems from happening in the first place.

• We must invest in and help strengthen the people and organisations that make the change we want to see happen; and we need to understand how we as a grant-maker can play our part effectively.

• The work we support takes place in wider systems and structures, and policy and constitutional environments, which are complex, dynamic and under great strain. Civil society organisations need to be supported to engage and to share expertise and to make heard the voices of the communities they represent.

• Robust evidence is key to understanding the context in which the work is done, and to designing effective structures and interventions to meet needs.

• Information technology is not a magic bullet, but it has a crucial role to play.

• Good communications are vital for maximising the impact of the work we support and highlighting the way law can be a tool for transforming lives.

We have learned a lot in five years, and the early part of 2019 will be spent devising our plan for the next half decade. As that work develops, we will continue to benefit from the contribution of our knowledgeable and engaged board of governors, and the professional members of our investment and audit committees. We can only deliver our work thanks to: support from a network of brilliant organisations and individuals across all four countries in the UK and beyond; our valued partners in the funding world; and our expert staff team, across all areas of our operations.

Matthew Smerdon

Vision

We believe that the law plays an essential part in supporting civil society, economic development and democracy. Our vision is of a society where everyone understands the role and value of the law and has the capability and opportunity to use it to ensure their rights, and to fulfil the obligations that accompany these rights.

Mission

Our charitable purpose, set out by Royal Charter, is to “promote the advancement of legal education and the study of the law in all its branches”. We do this so that those working in legal services can be equipped to meet legal needs to the highest standards, and reflect the diversity of our society. We also do this so that individuals and organisations with legal needs can learn how to use the law, so as to secure fair treatment and protection.
Introduction

2018 in brief

Our 2018 annual review showcases the breadth of TLEF activities last year across our three strategic objectives.

Each section of the review includes a short summary of every grant given under that objective, plus a longer case study. In the Strategy section, we reflect on our approach to grant-making, and how we are using research, information technology, policy work and communications to help bring about our aims.

Objectives

Understanding and using law: The legal education activities funded have engaged different communities, from people navigating public decision-making processes, to parliamentarians and policymakers drafting new legislation. We have built on the success of work funded in previous years by supporting it to scale and to reach wider audiences.

Improving legal training and practice: Grants have funded training and legal publishing across a range of areas of law and using a variety of methods, particularly online and e-learning. The Foundation has also increasingly been supporting work to promote collaboration and to strengthen the infrastructure of organisations and help them become more effective and sustainable.

Supporting next generation of lawyers: 2018 saw the number of Justice First Fellowship posts funded by the Foundation rise to more than 50, and the scheme was supported by a growing number of partners including Unbound Philanthropy, BBC Children in Need, City Bridge Trust, AB Charitable Trust, and law firms.

Strategy

Grant-making: We welcomed Rachael Takens-Miline to the team as head of programme support, bringing a wealth of experience in the foundation sector and of work on the critical role of law in people’s lives. Rachael is helping us to enhance our approach to grant-making and our capacity to select and manage grants, to support funded organisations, and to capture learning. This year, we held our annual reception in Glasgow, welcoming organisations in the Scottish legal sector and profiling the work of our grantees.

Research and learning: The Foundation is pursuing an ambitious project to advance empirical approaches to research in civil and administrative justice. Dr Natalie Byrom, director of research and learning, has brought together academics, senior members of the judiciary, and colleagues in government and the sector to develop these plans. This year we also collaborated with Joseph Rowntree Foundation on the role of unresolved legal problems in pathways into and out of destitution.

Information technology: A significant proportion of the Foundation’s grants support work that is linked to expanding the use of technology. Alan Humphreys, deputy chief executive, has led work involving the essential upgrade to IT infrastructure in organisations that are playing particularly important strategic roles. The Foundation is also supporting experiments in online tools and the delivery of legal education and services across the UK, as well as continuing to capture and share developments in other countries.

Law, policy and regulation: Swee Leng Harris, head of policy and public affairs, leads the Foundation’s policy programme, launched in response to the profound legal implications of the decision to leave the European Union. Work has centred on supporting expert civil society organisations to engage with parliamentarians and policymakers to contribute their expertise in understanding and shaping the new constitutional environment.

Communications: Fiona Bawdon, head of communications, has worked with funded organisations and individual Justice First Fellows to capture and tell the stories of their work to a wider audience.
Grants overview

As we reach our fifth anniversary, TLEF grant funding continues to rise, year on year. We are now entering our sixth year, and continue to reflect on and adapt our approach to ensure our funding goes where it is most needed and can be most effective in achieving our aims.

-TLEF 2018 funding partners-
AB Charitable Trust
Allen & Overy
Baring Foundation
Barrow Cadbury Trust
BBC Children in Need
Burges Salmon
City Bridge Trust
Council of the Inns of Court
DAC Beachcroft
Esmée Fairbairn Foundation
Eversheds Sutherland
Gowling WLG
Hogan Lovells
Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Linklaters
Mills & Reeve
Nuffield Foundation
Paul Hamlyn Foundation
Royal Bank of Scotland
Shakespeare Martineau
Unbound Philanthropy

Figures are rounded
Objective 1

Understanding and using law

Total funding

£1,608,000

Grants

22

Average grant

£73k
Objective 1 Understanding and using law

Overview

The Foundation funds work that supports people of all ages to build broader legal knowledge and capability. If people can recognise when a problem has a law-related solution and they have the confidence to seek help, they will not miss chances to benefit from legal assistance.

We recognise that having the capability to use legal knowledge inevitably involves tackling how people interact with the legal system and how the system can, in turn, be made more accessible, efficient and effective.

June 2017 saw the horror of the Grenfell Tower fire. North Kensington Law Centre's office is close to the foot of the tower and we supported NKLC with some direct costs associated with dealing with the aftermath, helping to ensure that its office was up and running again within a day. We also invested in the longer-term creation of a response team to work on legal education, legal casework and policy work to support the people affected by the fire. Conversations have since begun with voluntary organisations and funders about how the lessons of Grenfell can be applied elsewhere; in particular, how legal education and access to lawyers can strengthen the voices of tenants living in unsafe housing and help hold landlords to account.

Digital technology continues to play an important role in this area of the programme. We have supported the development of video conference technology to deliver legal advice. Grants to organisations such as Child Poverty Action Group, Refugee Action, Family Rights Group, Relate, Mencap, RCJ Advice and Maternity Action have supported work to develop and scale approaches to help individuals understand and navigate legal processes. We are also focusing on collaborating with the health sector. The work we have funded is aimed at tackling the upstream causes of poor health, and provides a rationale for addressing health-harming social welfare legal needs (such as sub-standard housing) in health settings. On page 10, our case study looks at this work in more detail. In London, we have worked closely with the Greater London Authority on the role of legal advice in its strategy for addressing health inequality, and we will continue this partnership into next year.

We have continued to support work in parliament through funding the Legal Aid Practitioners Group to extend cross-party engagement and offer training to MPs and their staff in how to recognise and better deal with the legal needs of their constituents. We have also supported Sisters for Change and Women's Aid to engage parliamentarians and policymakers in the legislative process underway on domestic violence. Both organisations are using this to promote the involvement of survivors of domestic violence in the policy process as part of a legal education-driven approach to law making.

In collaboration with Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, we continue to support the Make Our Rights Reality programme delivered by Youth Access and partner organisations across England. This is using public legal education to teach groups of young people about their rights and to use this as the basis for wider social action.

Civil court reform looms large over all areas of the Foundation's work, particularly in relation to how we understand the impact on access to justice of developments such as the online court. We have worked with partners including UCL and Nuffield Foundation on the research dimensions, set out in more detail later in this review, and are active members of the Litigants in Person Engagement Group convened by HM Courts and Tribunal Service and chaired by Mr Justice Knowles.
Objective 1 Understanding and using law

Case study:

Health justice partnerships

Solving health-harming legal needs

UCL is conducting research into how social welfare law problems - with issues like housing, welfare benefits and debt - can damage health, and how doctors and lawyers can work together to help make people better. Fiona Bawdon explains.

The man had been in hospital for weeks and weeks, after making what his doctor described as "huge lacerations to his wrists". It was his second suicide attempt. A while earlier, he had "taken a really large overdose of medication". On going through his medical records, his GP was puzzled: there was no history of depression. It turned out that the root of the man’s despair was as much legal as medical. “He was having housing difficulties and he basically thought his life wasn’t worth living because of his situation.” What was needed to “cure” him, was not a medical intervention, but a legal one: help from a lawyer to resolve his housing situation.

A young mum, similarly, found it was a legal prescription, rather than a medical one, which was needed to cure her baby son’s asthma. After repeat visits to her GP because of the infant’s recurring rash and breathing difficulties, it became clear it was his living conditions that were making him ill. The flat where they lived had poor heating and ventilation and was rife with damp, mould and bugs. Rats ate food in the kitchen cupboards, and even the baby’s clothes and nappies. The mum had contacted her local authority umpteen times, but nothing was done. Her doctor realised the baby’s health would never improve while they lived in such poor conditions and referred her to the legal clinic based in the surgery building. A housing lawyer wrote to the council listing all the problems with the flat and demanding an urgent review; after which, the local authority agreed she should be rehoused.

Centre for Access to Justice, calls “health-harming legal needs”. These are everyday but serious problems which damage people's mental and physical health, and can be resolved by legal advice or representation, rather than a medical prescription.

"The man was suicidal because his housing difficulties made him feel his life wasn’t worth living."

They are the kind of problems that no amount of medication or medical expertise alone can fix. As in the examples above - drawn from UCL’s research funded by TLEF (see below) - this could be difficulties with housing, whether living in sub-standard accommodation or homelessness. Or, equally harmful to health might be problems to do with employment - working in unsafe conditions, harassment, or unfair dismissal; domestic violence; being wrongly refused disability benefits; or a child with special needs, not getting the support they are legally entitled to at school. Social welfare problems cause stress which affects people’s mental wellbeing, and can also have a direct impact on people's physical health: overcrowded accommodation which makes it difficult to prepare food; lack of income which prevents healthy lifestyle choices.
Prof Genn is a leading authority on the links between unmet legal need and ill health, an interest which grew out of her pioneering access to justice research. She says: “It was clear to me that one place people go to when they have legal problems is their doctor’s surgery: either because legal problems are making them ill, or they think the doctor might be able to help.” Often, people will go to their GP, because they don’t know who else to ask for help with things like filling in forms, writing letters, or dealing with benefits claims.

Prof Genn’s earlier research had shown that legal problems often come in “clusters”: people who have one legal problem tend to have several of them. It also showed that vulnerable groups are more likely to have such problems, but less likely to do anything about them; and unchecked legal problems can “trigger a cascade of crises” that create illness, or make existing illnesses worse. Prof Genn explains how crises build: “You start out with an employment problem, end up with eviction, and then family breakdown.”

She adds: “There is a clear connection between unresolved legal problems and ill health. Legal assistance is the single right that makes our other rights viable.”

In 2016, UCL’s Access to Justice Centre opened an integrated legal advice clinic at the Gutman Centre for Health and Wellbeing in Stratford, a diverse area of east London with high levels of deprivation in parts. The health centre is home to the Liberty Bridge GP practice, and accepts patients from across the borough.

The legal advice clinic is led by solicitor Rachel Knowles, and has a team of lawyers and case workers offering free legal advice on housing, welfare benefits, education and community care issues. (Law students at UCL are also offered the chance to work there, either as volunteers, or as part of their degree curriculum.) The clinic has subsequently moved premises (see below), but at the time it was based at the health centre two days a week. Patients could refer themselves to the “pop-up” clinic, or be referred by their doctors: UCL devised a referral form, where GPs can set out if a patient’s health may be being affected by a legal problem.

For Prof Genn, the launch of the integrated clinic was the realisation of a long-held ambition to locate community lawyers in health centres or GP surgeries. These are the places where people already go to and trust, which reduces the stigma and unfamiliarity that can otherwise act as a deterrent to seeking legal advice.

TLEF chief executive Matthew Smerdon has also had a long-standing interest in health justice partnerships, which stemmed from his time at Community Links, a charity in east London, which in the late 1990s and early 2000s, ran outreach advice services in more than 20 local GP surgeries. Matthew had seen how well such partnerships could work, but also how financially fragile they were, as they were funded by short-term regeneration grants, never making the transition into mainstream health budgets.

He had witnessed a pattern, repeated across the country, of health justice partnerships in one form or another springing up in response to local need, but then withering away through lack of longer...
term funding, rather than lack of demand. Matthew could see there was a need for greater coordination of effort, better communication between local projects, and collection of evidence to influence mainstream health strategy.

TLEF has funded a number of health justice partnerships since its inception (see box page 16). The launch of UCL’s integrated clinic provided the foundation with the chance to act strategically, by funding research measuring the impact of social welfare law advice on people’s health. The hope is that this evidence will be used to inform thinking, make the case for funding, and help develop sustainable models of health justice partnerships.

As Professor Jonathan Montgomery, chair of the Health Research Authority, said in November 2017, in times of austerity, health justice partnerships will have to be “robustly justified”, if they are to compete for public funding. Prof Montgomery was speaking at an international health justice workshop, funded by TLEF and chaired by Prof Genn. He went on to say that lawyers and medics need to find a “common currency” for researching and evaluating health justice partnerships, which means developing a “new research paradigm”.

Spreading the word

One important and immediate benefit flowing from UCL’s international health justice workshop (see main article) was to put this issue on the Greater London Authority’s agenda in relation to mayor Sadiq Khan’s strategy for reducing health inequality in the capital.

After the November 2017 event, TLEF chief executive Matthew Smerdon was asked to speak at a GLA conference on “social prescribing”. Social prescribing is when patients are “prescribed” non-medical interventions to improve their health and wellbeing, such as joining a walking club or art class. The mayor had already identified it as an important tool for improving health in the capital and taking pressure off GPs.

After his speech at the GLA event, Matthew was approached by a link worker from a GP practice in London. She told him that she welcomed the focus on legal advice as part of any social prescription strategy. Matthew recalls: “She said, ‘The patients I get referred to me are desperate for help with benefit appeals and poor housing. These are the problems that make people suicidal, and these are the patients I can’t sign off. I send them to the local Citizens Advice, and then Citizens Advice says you need a lawyer.’”

London boasts global leaders in health justice, such as the Bromley by Bow Centre in Tower Hamlets, but the challenge for everyone is how to scale these approaches. Following the GLA meeting, TLEF got to work with the mayor’s team, legal advice providers, and UCL’s Prof Hazel Genn on trying to answer that question.

There has been encouraging progress. A subsequent GLA report makes the case for creating London-wide access to social welfare advice services through health justice partnerships. It noted that: “The Mayor’s Health Inequality Strategy is an opportunity to realise the potential of health justice partnerships as an integral part of health systems and strategies in the capital.”

TLEF has now been asked by the mayor to join a “task and finish group”, to develop the recommendations. Matthew hopes this will be a platform for future discussions with all London Clinical Commissioning Groups about the health benefits of resolving social welfare legal needs.

In public health, you are taught a lot about the social determinants of health. No one ever told me a lot of them were legal problems.
heads of the American and Australian national health justice organisations. We regularly have phone or Skype conferences, and we are trying to work together because we have shared objectives."

The long-term ambition for TLEF and UCL is the creation of a national health justice initiative to create and marshal the evidence base, gather insights into good practice, and develop sustainable models, which provide not just general advice but access to specialist legal help, where needed. Matthew says: “The aim is for the health justice sector’s voice to be heard at a strategic and policy level in health agencies, so we start to get commissioning strategies integrating legal advice services as part of their planning, and funding would flow from that. That would address the current problem of funding being sporadic, uncoordinated, fragile and short term.”

Prof Genn stresses that while work on the national initiative is still at a “very, very early stage”, the ultimate aim is to create a policy shift. “We want people in the health field to recognise that integrated services are a good way of meeting the needs of patients and improving the health of the population. That, to me, is the ultimate prize.”

All of that is, of course, some way into the future. As far as the TLEF-funded UCL research project was concerned, the immediate task was to find out how many health justice partnerships there already are. Research associate Sarah Beardon set about a mapping exercise, and identified over 380 projects where social welfare legal advice is delivered in a healthcare setting.

Centre for Access to Justice head of projects Shiva Riahi says the results were surprising and heartening. “I was really not expecting that many. I’d heard about little pockets of well-established services. To see 380 of them, just goes to show the link is a really intuitive thing, once you clock on to it.”

TLEF was also encouraged by the findings. Matthew says: “They were positive because what they show is a bottom-up sector - but one that could benefit from coordination drawing it together.” It is that coordination role that the foundation hopes a national initiative will ultimately support, which would accelerate wider development of such partnerships.

After the mapping process was complete, a bigger challenge was to develop a research methodology to measure the impact of legal advice on people’s health which was robust, but wouldn’t interfere with the running of the legal clinic. Shiva explains: “Everything was focused on how can we run this as the best possible legal service for clients, while still making sure that we are building in the methods to capture as much information as possible.” Cooperation between lawyers and researchers was key. “It was very much a balancing act between the advice team and the research team. Always a very collaborative process,” she adds.

After some inevitable trial and error, the team settled on an approach which assessed patients’ health and wellbeing when they first sought legal advice, and then at three- and six-month intervals afterwards, using a combination of self-completion surveys, plus face-to-face interviews with a sample of participants. The research also included in-depth interviews with GPs from the Liberty Bridge practice. Clinic solicitor Rachel Knowles says the research was simple and problem-free from the legal team’s point of view.
She adds: “The idea is a really good one, in terms of making yourself available to people in the community who may not realise they even have a legal problem, and that’s what’s making their life difficult.”

The final survey responses are still being collated and the research findings are yet to be finalised, but some interesting patterns have emerged so far. Sarah says: “Improvements in health are greater in those whose legal problems have been resolved, than in others whose legal problems are ongoing. People who have one legal problem tend to get better; people with multiple legal problems, their health gets worse.”

The main problems people had were to do with welfare benefits and housing. Over 80% of those surveyed said their legal problem was affecting their physical health; a similar proportion said their mental health had been affected. The research also showed how long legal problems last: around 60% were still facing difficulties after six months. The areas of most significant improvement were lower levels of stress and anxiety, and greater emotional wellbeing. Of the 55 clients responding to evaluation forms at the end of their case, 33 said they would not have sought advice if they hadn’t discovered the service through their GP; another 13 said the GP connection meant they sought help quicker than they otherwise would have done.

The extra income the lawyers secured for patients through, say, resolving benefits or employment problems, brought a range of practical benefits, including freeing up more time to take care of the family and being able to provide children with basic necessities. A dad reported that his children were no longer reluctant to go to school, now they could have a school lunch every day. The health of a new baby improved after he and his mum were rehoused in better conditions, which meant they no longer needed visits from her midwives.

The research showed legal difficulties can damage health in other ways, too: a patient refused to embark on cancer treatment because they were so stressed about their housing and welfare benefits problems, and didn’t feel they would be able to rest and recover from surgery.

The response from medics was generally positive. Some felt resolving legal problems would be more beneficial than anything they could prescribe. One said: “I’m quite sure that addressing those problems would be far more effective than what I’m trying to do as a doctor by simply upping his insulin dose.”

The hope is research evidence will be used to inform thinking, make the case for funding, and help develop sustainable models of health justice partnerships.
All of those involved agree that a prerequisite, if the health justice movement is to succeed, is collaboration between professions and specialisms which don’t usually see themselves as natural allies.

Prof Genn says there is traditionally “a natural coolness, if not suspicion” between the medical and legal profession. For some doctors, a “medico-legal partnership” brings to mind “ambulance-chasing clinical negligence lawyers”. Shiva says that when she first went to Clinical Commissioning Group meetings to spread the word about the project, the assumption was she was there to talk about personal injury cases. She says: “I felt it was interesting, that when doctors think of lawyers, that’s the first thing that comes to mind.”

Rachel hopes the success of the clinic will help to persuade any doubters. “I thought the best thing I can do is focus on creating a really good advice service and really building its reputation, so doctors will want to partner with us.”

Sometimes the issue was simply one of lack of knowledge. Shiva says: “Even the GPs who were really supportive didn’t always necessarily see where legal help could come in. It can be a training issue. Recognising the need for legal assistance is not always intuitive.”

After 18 months of running pop-up advice sessions, the legal clinic is now operating full time out of its own separate offices, also in Stratford. The move was forced on them (because the landlords wanted to rent out the space full time at NHS commercial rates), but links with the surgery are continuing.

There is a clear connection between unresolved legal problems and ill health. Legal assistance is the single right that makes our other rights viable.

The research is based on a health methodology, rather than a legal one, and Sarah’s background is in public health, not law. Sarah says it was a fascinating and eye-opening project: “In public health, you are taught a lot about the social determinants of health. No one ever told me a lot of them were legal problems, and they could be resolved through legal processes. So when I heard about this project, something just clicked. It is really interesting and worthwhile, but also a very simple idea.”

Rachel says the pop-up clinics did bring some logistical problems for the advice team, and, certainly for them, there are benefits to being permanently based in a fully functioning office. Luckily, the move coincided with completion of the research project, and has given the clinic a chance to test other types of health justice partnership.
Legal problems cause ill health but, as Prof Genn says, ill health also causes legal problems - which has long been recognised by some health charities. For example, Macmillan Cancer Support spends more than £20m a year providing early financial and employment advice to people with a cancer diagnosis. In the same spirit, the UCL clinic is now working in partnership with a dementia research project, piloting one-off legal advice, via Skype, to people with the early onset disease.

No doubt different models of health justice partnerships will emerge. For now, the challenge is to raise the profile of health justice work nationally, share successful models of integrated working, and – crucially – to gather and collate evidence of the impact they have on people’s health and wellbeing.

TLEF support for health justice partnerships

During 2018 and in previous years, TLEF has made a number of grants supporting a wide range of projects which link legal services and health. As well as providing funding, we have supported development in this area in other ways, such as developing links nationally and internationally, meeting with health charities and medical research bodies, speaking at health-justice related events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Recipient</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCL Centre for Access to Justice</td>
<td>£493,900</td>
<td>Grants made over three years, covering a range of health justice activities, including: developing research methodology to measure impact of partnerships; an international workshop; mapping existing organisations; developing a national initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Oswald’s Hospice</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
<td>Assessing and meeting legal needs of patients with life-limiting illnesses, and their carers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Action</td>
<td>£162,250</td>
<td>Working with pregnancy app provider to embed “just-in-time” legal education on maternity rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Welfare Commission for Scotland</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>Contributing to a wider project improving knowledge of legal rights among patients in hospital with mental illnesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Institute of Human Rights</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>Developing online tool for medics to ensure patients' human rights are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundswell</td>
<td>£38,000</td>
<td>Integrating legal advice into health support programme for homeless people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Law Centre</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>Research on creating health justice partnerships in Suffolk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1 Understanding and using law

#### Grants 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law / British Institute of International and Comparative Law</strong></td>
<td>£92,850</td>
<td><strong>Wales Civil Society Forum on Brexit</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supporting engagement and coordination of civil society organisations in Wales to engage in policy process arising out of decision to withdraw from EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenship Foundation</strong></td>
<td>£2,360</td>
<td><strong>Court hire fees for Bar Mock Trial</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supporting costs of running Bar Mock Trial competition in Northern Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Rights Group</strong></td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td><strong>Improving access to legal advice</strong>&lt;br&gt;Building interactive section on FRG website to increase access to legal advice for families involved in child welfare system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardiff University</strong></td>
<td>£97,613</td>
<td><strong>Wales Civil Society Forum on Brexit</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supporting engagement and coordination of civil society organisations in Wales to engage in policy process arising out of decision to withdraw from EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Advice Centre (University House)</strong></td>
<td>£71,000</td>
<td><strong>Falmouth video conference specialist legal advice project</strong>&lt;br&gt;Establishing video conference social welfare advice service in partnership with the Dracaena Centre in Falmouth and Cornwall Citizens Advice in order to increase provision of advice in these areas and to learn lessons about the remote provision of advice over video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Aid Practitioners Group</strong></td>
<td>£99,814</td>
<td><strong>Influencing legal aid policy through political engagement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Providing secretariat for the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Legal Aid, along with extending cross-party policy engagement activities and provision of direct training to MPs and parliamentary staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternity Action</strong></td>
<td>£47,500</td>
<td><strong>Delivering just-in-time information on maternity rights at work</strong>&lt;br&gt;Developing legal education on maternity rights at key stages for pregnant women at work, through collaboration with providers of mainstream pregnancy apps and other social media channels (2 grants).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Philanthropy Capital

**£200,000**
EEA citizens settled status

Contributing to Transition Advice Fund pooled grants programme to help civil society organisations engage with policy matters relating to EEA citizens, especially those in vulnerable situations, arising out of the decision to leave EU. Fund established in collaboration with Unbound Philanthropy, Paul Hamlyn Foundation and Barrow Cadbury Trust; administered by New Philanthropy Capital.

North Kensington Law Centre

**£66,788**
Grenfell Tower fire response team

Supporting creation of team to identify and address legal needs arising out of Grenfell Tower fire, particularly boosting capacity to provide immigration and housing advice and for communications activities arising out of specialist casework.

Refugee Action

**£70,828**
Asylum guides national scaling

Scaling up delivery of asylum information guides project, previously supported by TLEF; increasing ability of newly-arrived people to navigate asylum process, and feed lessons on systemic challenges into wider policy work.

Relate

**£130,000**
Separation solutions finder

Developing interactive online guided pathway to help divorcing parents become more informed about separation, and more ready to effectively resolve matters out of court. Also facilitating access to fixed fee and unbundled arrangements, if legal advice or mediation is required.

Royal Mencap Society

**£40,000**
Transforming access to justice

Developing chatbot to provide basic legal advice on social care to increase ability of care workers to understand and use law to support people with learning disabilities and their families.

Sisters For Change

**£61,734**
Domestic Violence & Abuse Act project

Carrying out range of activities to support engagement of BME women’s organisations in policy process around Domestic Abuse Bill, including educating parliamentarians and policymakers about complexities of domestic abuse with an emphasis on BME women victims.
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Transparency Project

£40,000
Family Court Reporting Watch: consolidation project
Supporting Transparency Project to develop to next stage through fundraising, reaching wider audiences and exploring collaboration, all aimed at increasing public understanding of family justice system.

UCL Centre for Access to Justice

£90,000
Future of Justice Joint Conference
Supporting an international Future of Justice Conference, in collaboration with UCL and Nuffield Foundation, focusing on technological revolution in justice systems and role of empirical research to understand change.

UK Supreme Court Arts Trust

£10,000
Educational work
Contributing to development of public legal education programme at Supreme Court.

Women’s Aid Federation of England

£70,000
Domestic Violence & Abuse Act project: law in the making
Supporting engagement of survivors of domestic violence in policy process around Domestic Abuse Bill, as part of legal education-driven approach to “live law in the making”.

Your Employment Settlement Service

£31,656
YESS online
Exploring feasibility of establishing an interactive guided pathway website for employees and employers to resolve workplace disputes.

Youth Access

£173,413
Make Our Rights Reality: year 2
Delivering national programme designed to inspire disadvantaged young people’s participation in public legal education and PLE-related social action activities to increase their own and others’ legal capability.
Objective 2
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Total funding
£2,523,000

Grants
48

Average grant
£53k
We support work that explores ways of meeting legal needs, which are sustainable and at scale. This involves funding a range of activities, including legal education, training lawyers and legal service providers, as well as strengthening the organisations in which they work.

This year, we funded work across a range of areas of law, including anti-trafficking, statelessness, public law, and social welfare legal advice, including housing, debt, welfare benefits, community care, employment, education, immigration and asylum. We have continued to fund the Youth Justice Legal Centre to develop and scale its work to establish youth justice as a specialist area of law, through training and influencing policy and regulation.

Work under this strategic objective has also seen a major focus on supporting collaboration that integrates legal education and access to legal services in places where it can bring wider benefits. TLEF and Esmée Fairbairn Foundation continue to partner with the Baring Foundation, whose Strengthening the Voluntary Sector grants programme is focusing on helping non-legal organisations use the law and human rights-based approaches. Over five years, the programme will distribute more than £4m to build collaboration between legal and non-legal organisations, through training, education and capacity building, to address a range of issues, including mental health, poverty, homelessness, disability, parenting, maternity rights and violence against women and girls.

On page 22 there is a detailed case study of how Refugee Action is using a digital approach to build communities of immigration law advisors in non-legal organisations across the UK.

TLEF supported Law Centres Network to work with the social innovation organisation Social Finance to integrate legal education and access to services within programmes addressing mental health, employment and social care. We have supported the charity Caritas Salford, which works with homeless people, Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit, and Greater Manchester Law Centre, to embed specialist legal advice workers into homelessness services, and to influence policy on tackling homelessness in Greater Manchester.

We are increasingly supporting work to strengthen organisations in the field, recognising that robust and efficient infrastructure is essential, but also that voluntary organisations traditionally find it hard to raise the funds needed for this. We have supported IT and strategy development at key infrastructure organisations, such as Law Centres Network, IPSEA (working with parents of children with special educational needs) and Public Law Project.
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Case study:

Frontline Immigration Advice Project

“We are changing the narrative about digital”

Around 500 staff and volunteers at organisations offering support to migrants have undertaken Refugee Action’s ground-breaking online immigration law training. Its aim is to increase the number of accredited advisers nationwide, to ensure more vulnerable people have access to high quality legal advice. Fiona Bawdon reports.

Immigration law is one of the few areas of legal practice where it is a criminal offence for anyone who isn’t accredited to give advice (even if the advice is accurate). Advisers must be either legally qualified and regulated, or registered with the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC). Anyone who falsely holds themselves out as qualified to advise on immigration law risks criminal prosecution; the worst offenders will go to prison.

Immigration is also an area of law where the number of people needing advice vastly outstrips the number of qualified advisers available. In some areas of the country, there are now no immigration law advisers at all (or none offering a free service). As a result, migrants are left unable to access legal support, or having to travel long distances to get it. For migrants of all kinds, building a life in the UK is contingent on securing their immigration status; most will need expert help to navigate the complexities of Home Office application processes. Without legal input, applications may be incomplete, inaccurate or delayed, leaving those who would be entitled to regularise their status, facing destitution, as they are unable to work or claim welfare support, or at risk of removal back to a country where they are not safe.

A survey by Refugee Action and NACCOM (No Accommodation Network) found that 76% of 92 organisations surveyed were finding it difficult to refer people needing immigration advice on to legal representatives; 86% said finding places to refer people was more difficult now, than it had been before the cuts introduced by the 2012 Legal Aid, Sentencing & Punishment of Offenders Act.

Even areas which had advisers available on paper, lacked them in reality, due to solicitors firms already being overwhelmed and unable to take on more work, particularly cases which were time-consuming or complex.
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"Frontline is Refugee Action’s response to the lack of accessible and good quality immigration advice for people who need it in different parts of the country."

Refugee Action says the Legal Aid Agency’s own data shows that half of asylum and immigration legal aid providers were lost between 2005 and 2018; the drop in not-for-profit providers was even higher, at 65%.

It was against this backdrop that in 2016 Refugee Action launched its Frontline Immigration Advice Project.

Refugee Action’s Carolina Albuerne says: “Frontline is our response to the lack of accessible and good quality immigration advice for people who need it in different parts of the country.”

The scheme is premised on the belief that it is a false economy to restrict access to early advice: people who are unable to present their best possible case at the outset (because they didn’t have legal advice), will often go on to appeal if their application is refused, which is a more complex and costly process, both financially and in terms of the toll on the individual. Frontline aims to equip charities and support groups which are already working closely with migrants to be able to add legal advice to their menu of services.

Since its launch, Frontline has trained staff and volunteers at 150 different organisations working with vulnerable migrants across the whole of the UK. Carolina, who is Refugee Action’s good practice and partnership manager, describes the scale of the project: “We are working in Northern Ireland, in Scotland, England and Wales; all of the immigration dispersal areas within England. We’ve got six Citizens Advice on the programme; we’ve got Law Centres; we’ve got disability organisations; we’ve got, of course, women’s organisations; organisations working with young people – and we even have organisations that focus around teaching English as a second language. We are also working with homelessness organisations and organisations working with EU migrants only.”

Many of these are charities which had long wanted to be able to provide legal advice, but who found the registration process too onerous to undertake. Carolina says: “Becoming registered with OISC can be impractical, very daunting, for organisations. It’s quite resource intensive.”

Her colleague, James Conyers, Frontline’s student support manager, agrees that such caution was understandable. He likens the OISC training to “doing an A-level in a week – only you are thinking at a higher level than you are for A-level”. It is not, he adds, “remotely for the faint-hearted”.

Refugee Action’s challenge with Frontline, therefore, was to create a training programme for people with no legal background, which delivered complex information in suitably digestible chunks, and which was a high enough standard to prepare students to pass OISC’s exacting accreditation process.

The resulting programme, offered free, covers OISC levels 1 and 2 (see page 27), and is done over five days. All training is online, including by live webinars, which are recorded so they can be watched again in students’ own time. The course material (“pages and pages and pages,” according to Carolina) is broken down into modules, with quizzes and other activities. It also includes advice on how to revise, and on how to craft a good written answer.

James says, on average, around five Frontline students a month are passing the accreditation, and there is always excitement in the Refugee Action office each time they are alerted to a new one.

Once students are accredited and have begun advising, Frontline’s support continues in the form of regularly updated revision modules, and one-to-one coaching and consultancy from James, who is OISC level 3 accredited. There is a steady flow of inquiries (three had come in the day before we met), which suggests students find this back up useful. Even if James doesn’t know the answer instantly, his long experience means he knows where to look for it, he says.

“One of the problems with immigration law is that it is getting progressively more and more complicated. We have court judgments where judges say they can’t understand it, that it is byzantine,” he says.

Frontline’s response to having to build a course based on constantly shifting sands is to teach not just the law but problem-solving skills, so students learn how to find the latest information. Content on its web platform is constantly updated, and so also provides a valuable resource."
Refugee Support Devon

Refugee Support Devon is a small charity in Exeter offering a wide range of support to migrants – ranging from befriending, to English language classes, to food grown on its community allotment. More recently, thanks to the Frontline project, it has been able to add legal advice to the services it can offer.

RSD casework coordinator Nelida Montes de Oca, says her organisation had previously looked at becoming OISC registered but had “been intimidated by the whole process and didn’t know where to start”. When RSD heard about the Frontline scheme, they jumped at the chance. She and three volunteers have now completed the training and are accredited to give level 1 advice.

It was, she says, one of her first experiences of online training. “I wasn’t really sure what to expect, but everything worked fine at both ends. There was a lot of information, but the pace of training was good. There was enough time to ask questions. It was a very, very good experience.”

The training has enabled RSD to introduce a weekly, two-hour, legal clinic, with one or two clients being seen each time. The scheme is still in its earliest stages, and to date around a dozen people have been seen. That may seem relatively modest, but that is 12 people (or families) being given potentially life-changing advice and support, who might otherwise have been turned away empty handed. With the closest legal aid immigration solicitor many miles away in Plymouth, previously the only options for RSD were to try to refer people to its busy local Citizens Advice or, if an individual had money to pay, to one of the handful of local law firms still doing immigration work.

Nelida has also been able to share the knowledge she gained from Frontline more widely. “I was asked to give a short presentation to foster parents that are supporting asylum seeking children in Devon, just to give them an idea of the asylum process. It was very helpful having that training, and I based my talk on some of the course materials.”

She adds: “Realistically, without the help of Refugee Action, it would have been very difficult for us to go through this process. They have been very helpful and it is also great to know that if we have a question about cases, we can email them and get a response.”

There was a lot of information, but the pace of training was good. It was a very, very positive experience.
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What TLEF does really well is you are very interested in digital, and I have to say this project has allowed us to be really transformative.

Any project this innovative was bound to bump up against issues as it evolves, and Frontline is no exception. After it had been running for a while, Refugee Action noted a drop off in the numbers of students going on to become advisers, compared with the numbers embarking on the training.

Refugee Action realised that, as well as focusing on meeting the needs of students, they also needed to work more closely with the organisations. A new post of partnership development manager was created, which was filled by Fiona Cameron, who came to the role with a wealth of experience in the immigration sector. One of Fiona's first tasks was to talk to organisations to understand why, despite putting people through the Frontline course, they hadn’t gone on to become OISC registered, and so were still unable to give immigration advice.

Inevitably, the hurdles to registration some organisations faced were far outside Refugee Action’s capability to resolve (hoped for funding failing to materialise; disruption caused by the Grenfell Fire). For others, however, with encouragement from Fiona and a more step-by-step approach, they could be supported to go on to successfully register. Fiona says: “We want to make sure people are serious about it. We are mapping the process, so when organisations are thinking of applying to Frontline, they will be able to see this is what we do for you as an organisation.”

A collaborative approach to funding

The Frontline project was launched in 2016, with funding from the Future Advice Fund. The fund was a collaborative grants programme, instigated by the Baring Foundation, Comic Relief; Diana Memorial Fund (now closed); and Unbound Philanthropy; with TLEF joining the programme and leading it from 2014. The programme was a response to funding cuts in the advice sector, providing grants and consultancy support.

Frontline was initially supported by a £50,000 Future Advice grant. Following the closure of that grants programme, Frontline moved on to be supported by TLEF’s main grants programme, with additional funding from Paul Hamlyn Foundation and Unbound Philanthropy.

In a separate but complementary grant, TLEF is also funding Refugee Action to develop and scale a series of guides, giving legal advice to newly arrived asylum-seekers, to help them navigate through the asylum process.
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Brushstrokes Community Project

Last year, Brushstrokes, a charity based in Smethwick, West Midlands, supported 1,200 migrants from 78 different nationalities. It offers a mix of English language, advocacy and other services, including practical support, such as baby packs for new mothers. Project manager David Newall says: “What sets us apart locally is we deliver those services in a holistic way, so people can dip in and out, and that we do proactive outreach. We go out and find individuals, we don’t just wait for them to come to us.”

Brushstrokes was already offering immigration law advice, thanks to the dedication of a long-term volunteer solicitor, who offers a weekly clinic, which is invariably oversubscribed (so much so that Brushstrokes had to limit to 20 the number of clients he sees each time). Given the demand and Brushstrokes’ belief in offering a holistic service, David was keen to increase its immigration law capacity, but could see no way of doing so.

“The work is unfunded. We don’t have a paid immigration adviser. We don’t have money to send people on expensive training courses.”

A chance meeting with a Refugee Action staff member, who told him about the Frontline scheme, changed all of that. “It was a great opportunity for us.”

The plan is to use the Frontline training to supplement the work of the volunteer, and increase the number and location of advice sessions it offers. That would reduce the risk of referral fatigue and the need for clients to travel long distances to get advice. “There are asylum seekers dispersed all over a wide area and it’s quite difficult for some of them to navigate several buses to get to us. Obviously, if you are destitute, you have to walk, anyway.”

To date, two staff members and one volunteer have completed the training; two more staff and another volunteer are about to start the course. One of the staff members who did the training has subsequently left Brushstrokes, but David is philosophical about the departure: some people will inevitably move on but, as his ex-colleague has joined another OISC-registered organisation, the Frontline training has still created a win for the sector overall.

With support from Frontline, Brushstrokes is now OISC registered and passed its first audit. David says registration will be helpful for securing additional funding, and being part of the project meant it could share with other organisations what it learned from the experience of being audited.

He hopes this will lead to some kind of broader local network or support base to reduce the isolation of immigration law advisers working in non-legal organisations. He adds: “I think there’s a lot of learning and good practice from this project that could be used to support newer organisations that are working with EU migrants, particularly in terms of the impact of Brexit.”
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“So now we have developed action plans, and sign offs, so the organisation is formally saying, ‘Yes. We understand we have a commitment to you, as well as your having one to us.’”

Carolina says Frontline’s ethos now is to support students and organisations equally. “We have a belief that if we don’t do it this way, the advisers will not be supported and therefore the investment in support and training would not be sustainable.”

Frontline’s next challenge is strengthening its post-accreditation support. James says there are particular pressures on advisers based in non-legal organisations, where law-related issues are only a small aspect of the work.

“If you imagine a person working in a law firm, after their training, they would be seeing cases on a day to day basis, and be able to ask their colleagues for help. The people we are training have none of that support network and often they are not seeing the work day to day.”

Carolina says: “Training on its own isn’t enough; getting them to the assessment isn’t enough. We have all these people who are advising on legal matters for the first time, so it is about creating communities of practice, both online and in person”.

On average, around five Frontline students a month are passing the accreditation and there is always excitement in the Refugee Action office when they are alerted to a new one.

OISC

The Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner is an executive, non-departmental public body, sponsored by the Home Office, which regulates immigration advisers. (Solicitors, barristers, and certified legal executives do not need OISC accreditation before giving immigration advice.)

OISC publishes a code of standards, and maintains a register of regulated advisers. It carries out audits, and newly registered organisations are generally audited in their first year, to identify any problems early on. OISC also takes enforcement action against unregistered advisers, and its website includes a number of accounts of rogue advisers who have been prosecuted and even imprisoned for falsely claiming to be accredited.

OISC offers three levels of accreditation: broadly, level 1 covers basic immigration or asylum advice (the latter does not involve an exam; students can register on completing the course, provided their organisation is registered); level 2 covers more complex casework; level 3 covers appeals.

The Frontline training covers levels 1 and 2. It is run over five days, plus “significant home study”, according to James Conyers. The pass mark is relatively high – 65% (compared with 40% for other law-related exams). Pass rates vary from month to month, fluctuating between as low as 18% to over 50%, or more usually somewhere in between.
### Grants 2018

#### Access to Justice Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access to Justice Foundation | £66,103 | Litigant in Person Network
- Developing Litigant in Person Network, an online resource that gathers and disseminates information on access to justice for litigants in person; bringing together voluntary organisations, legal services agencies, HM Courts and Tribunal Service, universities, pro bono organisations and judiciary. |

#### Advice Services Alliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advice Services Alliance | £49,498 | Peer Review Online Platform (PROP)
- Scoping study and pilot to establish independent peer review online process for legal advice services, including developing training programme and assessment process (2 grants). |

#### Amnesty International UK & Amnesty International UK Charitable Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amnesty International UK & Amnesty International UK Charitable Trust | £104,504 | Capacity building with civil society organisations in Scotland on implications of Brexit
- Equipping civil society organisations in Scotland to engage with political and legal process arising out of decision to withdraw from EU. |

#### British and Irish Legal Information Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| British and Irish Legal Information Institute | £55,800 | Future-proofing BAILII
- Supporting BAILII to work with Social Finance consultants to produce sustainable business plan, including analysis of users and other stakeholders; potential for generating income; and policy environment. |

#### Child Poverty Action Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Child Poverty Action Group | £186,043 | Ask CPAG Online: access to justice through technology for social security claimants
- Developing CPAG’s digital services for advisers, including resources to navigate social security system and expansion of online content in Ask CPAG Online, introducing guided pathways and automated production of letters to challenge decisions; publishing online versions of CPAG’s Welfare Benefits and Tax Credits Handbook and Welfare Rights Bulletin. |

#### Children’s Law Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Children’s Law Centre | £40,000 | Children’s access to services and legal protections in post-Brexit Northern Ireland.
- Expanding work to map the potential impact of Brexit on children’s rights, by developing work with academic partners and NGOs. |

#### Community Foundation for Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland Human Rights Fund)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Foundation for Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland Human Rights Fund) | £150,000 | Civil society participation in Brexit process
- Informing and seeking to coordinate civil society organisations to participate in the legal and constitutional processes arising out of decision to withdraw from EU. |
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- **Fair Trials**
  - £47,539
  - **Addressing IT needs**
  - Supporting review of Fair Trials’ IT systems; devising and implementing upgrade, to promote efficient working and increase capacity to support vulnerable people engaged in criminal justice system (2 grants).

- **Hansard Society**
  - £91,188
  - **Understanding delegated legislation for Brexit and beyond**
  - Delivering training and outreach activities to NGOs to increase understanding of delegated legislation process arising out of withdrawal from EU.

- **Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Racial Equality**
  - £19,855
  - **Health justice partnership in Suffolk**
  - Improving understanding of how social prescribing in health settings can increase access to social welfare legal advice in Suffolk and secure positive health outcomes.

- **Fylde Coast Advice and Legal Centre**
  - £30,000
  - **Development and growth**
  - Supporting development and growth of Fylde Coast Advice and Legal Centre so as to ensure greater capacity to meet local legal needs, (funded in partnership with AB Charitable Trust).

- **Island Rights Initiative**
  - £10,000
  - **Mapping UK responsibility for human rights in British Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories**
  - Mapping constitutional arrangements between UK and its Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories in terms of international human rights obligations; supporting subsequent evidence-based policy engagement.

- **Greater Manchester Law Centre**
  - £80,000
  - **Legal solutions to homelessness and destitution in Greater Manchester**
  - Supporting a partnership between Greater Manchester Law Centre, Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit, and Cornerstones (a project of Salford Diocese’s charity Caritas), to address legal needs of homeless people, and to work with Greater Manchester council to ensure inclusion of specialist legal advice in its homelessness and destitution strategy.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie Project</td>
<td>£19,380</td>
<td>Pilot: Exploring feasibility of developing and implementing Jeanie Project - a partnership between law firm Scott-Moncrieff &amp; Associates and IT developer Riverview; exploring model for advice triage and brokerage aimed at increasing access to social welfare legal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just for Kids Law</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>Youth Justice Legal Centre: Supporting ongoing development of YJLC as centre of excellence on youth justice in England and Wales; policy work to ensure youth justice becomes a legal specialism; running a website providing comprehensive information, legal resources and best practice guides; delivering training for lawyers and non-legal professionals working with children; providing free specialist advice for children, youth offending teams, judiciary and lawyers to improve standards of legal representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just:</td>
<td>£74,409</td>
<td>Access to justice through automated transcripts: proof of concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Centres Network</td>
<td>£48,250</td>
<td>Collaboration with Social Finance: Supporting LCN’s collaboration with Social Finance consultancy to develop a sustainable model for integrating work that identifies and resolves unmet legal needs into Social Finance’s health and social care platforms (2 grants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>Administrative Justice Council: Supporting secretariat of newly-created advisory body on administrative justice: bringing together senior representatives of judiciary, civil service, government, ombudsmen and end-user organisations, to improve decisions, complaints-handling, and appeals across areas of administrative justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£178,800</td>
<td>Law Centres 2020 digital vision: Creating 5-year digital strategy for LCN, examining how digital operations and infrastructure of Law Centres can best support effective services for clients and promote organisational efficiency and sustainability; rolling out upgrade to ensure readiness for online courts, and collection of robust data on advice needs, and impact of Law Centres’ work (2 grants).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Law Centre NI

£84,466
Law and policy
Supporting LCNI’s policy advocacy work to help it engage effectively and strategically with civil justice law and policy developments in NI.

Law Society of Scotland

£8,200
Scottish legal system post-Brexit
Carrying out a study into how leaving EU will affect Scottish law.

Legal Action Group

£16,340
Digital expansion project
Supporting implementation of LAG’s digital-first publishing strategy.

Legal Advice Centre

(University House)

£80,020
Legal expenses insurance project
Scaling up advice sector’s awareness and use of legal expenses insurance as source of income for advice services: collaborating with LexisNexis, and direct engagement with insurance and finance sectors.

Legal Aid Practitioners Group

£11,387
Introduction to legal aid training
Developing and delivering training programme to give trainee solicitors, paralegals and other practitioners an introduction to legal aid, in order to promote best use of legal aid scheme to help clients and to sustain legal practices.

LegalVoice

£69,600
Online resource portal
Developing LegalVoice website into an online resource portal, hosting guidance, templates, policies and procedures, best practice and other information critical to not-for-profit and SME legal aid and advice providers; providing webinars and conferences to give platform for innovation and discussion across sector.

MedConfidential

£15,000
Data processing, AI, and rule of law
Carrying out a study on relevance and application of rule of law principles to government use of artificial intelligence and data processing.

Merseyside Law Centre

£72,000
Increasing efficiency and financial stability
Supporting development and growth of Merseyside Law Centre so as to ensure greater capacity to meet local legal needs (funded in partnership with AB Charitable Trust.)

Migrants Resource Centre

£40,000
Statelessness training and awareness project
Raising awareness, educating and improving capacity relating to the UK’s statelessness determination procedure to ensure greater access to assistance and advice. Activities include developing online course, delivering webinars and training for legal practitioners and support organisations, hosting a conference, expanding and updating online tool for stateless people, and contributing to media articles and research.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>£80,092</td>
<td>Ensuring a human rights-compliant Brexit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertaking research and monitoring to examine human rights implications of decision to leave EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kensington Law Centre</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>Financial information and systems audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting FW Beringer consultants to carry out financial information and systems audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Bono Community</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>Accredited volunteer training and placement scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding relationships with universities to provide volunteer and training programmes to increase provision and quality of free social welfare legal advice; to embed commitment to pro bono and knowledge of social welfare law into mainstream legal education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Law Centre</td>
<td>£45,500</td>
<td>Legal aid housing and business development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building on earlier work supported by TLEF to establish a Law Centre in Suffolk, by supporting SLC to strengthen its sustainability through employing a housing solicitor and wider business development activities to diversify funding streams and ensure greater capacity to meet local legal needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Bono Community</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>Accredited volunteer training and placement scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding relationships with universities to provide volunteer and training programmes to increase provision and quality of free social welfare legal advice; to embed commitment to pro bono and knowledge of social welfare law into mainstream legal education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law Project</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>Organisational consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting external consultancy input to help PLP plan for next phase of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Charities Coalition</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>Community portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing new customer relationship management system and website to provide education, best practice and legal guidance to small charities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL Centre for Access to Justice</td>
<td>£382,400</td>
<td>UK National Initiative for Health Justice Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting activities to address health-harming legal needs by integrating health and legal services, including conducting and promoting research, advocating to policymakers and funders, and promoting best practice (3 grants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlock Democracy</td>
<td>£94,375</td>
<td>European Union (Withdrawal) Bill: coordinating civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting civil society organisations to engage with parliamentarians and government officials in policymaking process arising out of leaving EU, focusing on promoting open and accountable law-making and respect for devolved nature of UK constitution, and ensuring rights and standards are maintained (2 grants).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Supporting next generation of lawyers

Total funding

£1,534,000

Grants

21

Average grant

£73k
Overview

We want to ensure that careers in law at all levels remain an attractive option, and that the profile of the profession reflects the diversity of the general population. We believe that supporting the next generation of skilled and committed lawyers is essential to ensuring that law fulfils the role set out in our vision.

In 2018, the number of the Foundation’s Justice First Fellows passed 50, a significant milestone. The scheme is increasingly recognised as a route into the profession for aspiring social justice lawyers. One of the regular highlights of the Foundation’s year is the first time we bring together our new intake of Fellows and hear why they were inspired to join the profession. We witness their passion, drive, expertise and commitment. For a number of them, their inspiration came from their own personal experience of the life-changing impact that social welfare law can have.

We continue our collaboration with BBC Children in Need and City Bridge Trust, which have both co-funded six Fellows with us, whose work is focused on child law, and on strengthening the advice sector in London, respectively. We have worked with BBC Children in Need to appoint a learning partner to reflect on the work of our child law Justice First Fellows to help us understand how resolving legal problems contributes to wider positive outcomes for children. Material from this work will be published and disseminated, and we plan to hold a learning event for children’s organisations in 2019.

Two cohorts of Fellows have now qualified as solicitors and we are excited to see how their careers continue to develop. Most Fellows have been offered posts as solicitors in the host organisation where they did their training. Other Fellows have moved, variously, to other social welfare specialist organisations, to the courts service, a trades union, or to work as legal specialists in non-legal organisations. We are also learning about how best to support Fellows after their time on the scheme.

We are delighted with our partnership with Young Legal Aid Lawyers. This year, Katy Watts, a Justice First Fellow and now qualified solicitor at Public Law Project, worked with YLAL and PLP to hold a conference called “The Fight for Social Justice: Young Lawyers Making Change,” hosted by BPP Law School.

In April this year, we held our first learning exchange visit to New York City with graduates from the first cohort of Fellows, who are now 18 months post-qualification. The exchange was supported by Unbound Philanthropy and the Social Change Initiative, coordinated by the Center for Court Innovation, and led by Shauneen Lambe, barrister and co-founder of youth justice charity Just for Kids Law.

The central theme of an itinerary packed with visits to inspiring organisations was the law as a tool for communities and movements seeking social change.

We are grateful to BPP University for its continued support of the JFF scheme, through providing free places for Fellows on its professional skills course.

We have continued to engage with the Solicitors Regulation Authority on plans for reform to solicitor training and the introduction of the Solicitors Qualifying Examination. The reform offers potential scope to re-structure the training and activities of the Justice First Fellowship, and we will work with organisations in the field on adapting our scheme. We also remain interested in the take up of legal apprenticeships and, linked to the SRA initiative, will seek to bring forward further work on this in the next year.

We have continued to support the Pathways to Law programme, in partnership with the Sutton Trust. The scheme was launched in 2007 to encourage and support young people from less advantaged backgrounds to consider a career in the law. It is now managed by the Sutton Trust and this current phase is aiming to recruit 1,800 students over four years and to expand the number of universities taking part and of organisations offering work experience.
**Case study:**

**RCJ Advice**

“After getting the court order, she said she finally felt safe”

Fiona Bawdon reports on how a Justice First Fellow’s project helped RCJ Advice in central London secure £1.1m funding to ensure more domestic violence victims nationwide can get legal protection.

When Alexandria Lowry began her Justice First Fellowship project at RCJ Advice, her aim was to offer a service to domestic violence victims in the London area, ensuring they had the specialist legal advice they needed. In the first eight months, or so, Alex advised around 50 violence victims, who would otherwise not have been able to get help, as well as continuing her legal training and other family work at the agency.

However, in a development neither she nor her colleagues would have predicted, thanks in part to Alex’s one woman project, many, many times that number of domestic violence victims throughout England, are set to have access to legal advice which could potentially save lives.

The project that Alex ran, together with the strong working relationships RCJ Advice had with women’s organisations such as Rights of Women (RoW), led to a series of conversations, which sparked an idea, which is now set to become a reality. Earlier this year, RCJ Advice was awarded £1.1m from the government’s Tampon Tax Fund, to set up (in conjunction with RoW), a ground-breaking domestic violence legal advice scheme: Finding Legal Options for Women Survivors – or Flows, for short. The project involves partnering with a host of key nationwide networks, and it is expected to be a game-changer in increasing the number of domestic violence victims who have access to legal advice.

Alex is one of 15 Justice First Fellows whose training contracts were funded by TLEF last year (see box). As part of their Fellowship, as well as their legal training, Fellows are expected to set up and run their own access to justice project. Alex’s project was a family consultancy service, aimed at domestic violence victims who would otherwise go un-helped - not because the law can’t help them, but because the cost of legal advice is beyond their reach. Too often, women who are denied legal aid under the means test, are left with nowhere to turn because they can’t afford to pay the costs of obtaining a court order against their abuser.

RCJ Advice has long specialised in family law, and a large proportion of this work relates to domestic violence. Director Alison Lamb says the idea for a dedicated service for women ineligible for legal aid, was in response to a well-recognised gap in legal provision, where some victims needing an urgent injunction are left without the protection that could have kept them and their families safe. Alex already had experience of obtaining non-molestation orders from her previous work as a family paralegal, so it seemed an obvious fit.

The service would be on a modest scale, but for those Alex was able to help, it would make a huge difference to their lives. Alex set up a dedicated phone number and email address, so she could be contacted direct if refugees had a client needing urgent help. The clients could come to her office or, if they were unable or unwilling to do that, she would go to wherever they felt safest. As well as offering a service to provide emergency injunctions, Alex could also help with less urgent, but still vitally important issues, such as disputes over access to children.
A feature of the family consultancy project was it entailed observing at close hand the impressive work of independent domestic violence advocates – or “IDVAs” – in supporting violence victims. Alex says: “The work they do is amazing. They provide vital handholding and support, and they really do give a lot of comfort to women.” However, both Alex and the advocates she was working with began to realise there was a way the role of the IDVAs could be made even more effective.

Alex describes a recent case where a pregnant 16-year old needed an injunction against the father of her child. The girl’s young age meant her legal aid application was assessed on her parents’ income, but they were estranged from their daughter and unwilling to pay her legal fees. Her case was urgent because her ex-partner, who was much older and had been violent earlier in her pregnancy, was about to be released from detention. He had been in touch to say as soon as he was let out, he would be coming for her and the baby. Without the service offered by Alex, it is unclear how this young mother-to-be would have obtained the legal help she needed.

Alex recounts what happened after she got the call: “I went to meet her at the refuge. Went to court with her the next day and got her a non-molestation order. I then went to the return hearing with her as well." Alex was able to secure a year-long order stopping the teenager’s ex-partner from approaching her. “So that’s in place now and it just gave her peace of mind. She was eight months pregnant by then, and she said to me that she now felt she could finally enjoy her pregnancy, because now she felt safe. I thought that was so lovely.”

The police assumed she would get legal aid. When she didn’t, they appeared to have run out of suggestions.
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As well as having access to legal advice, participating agencies will be trained in how to use RCJ Advice's award-winning CourtNav online application tool. Workers will be guided through filling in a non-molestation order application form, and these along with supporting statements will be checked by Flows solicitors before being submitted to the court.

Women eligible for legal aid, will be directed to local "buddy firms"; those living in advice deserts will be linked with lawyers who can help. The scheme is also aiming to recruit two family lawyers, who will be posted in agencies in areas where there is currently no local legal provision.

Flows partners include Refuge, Women’s Aid, Personal Support Unit, as well as Citizens Advice, some local authorities, and lawyers’ groups. The police have also expressed an interest.

It has been a whirlwind and a huge accolade for RCJ Advice and Alex, personally (who was still only a trainee at the time). Alex says: “Getting the funding from TLEF to become a Justice First Fellow, and then having the opportunity to do work like this has been incredible.”

Alex explains: “One of the first IDVAs who came to court was saying how impressed she was with the advice I was able to give.” Accompanying a woman to court, to help her feel safe, and give moral support, is often a key part of their role; IDVAs do not, however, generally receive any legal training.

Alison adds that what Alex was finding matched the experience of valuable frontline initiatives, such as Citizens Advice’s Ask Re project, which aims to identify hidden victims of domestic abuse. Once victims are identified under the scheme, agencies are then reliant on building links with external organisations to take the cases, and even to find out if clients qualify for legal aid. There was, says Alison an increasingly clear consensus about the legal advice gap for a wide range of frontline workers.

And so, the idea for Flows, was born, resulting in a grant application being submitted to the Tampon Tax Fund just before Christmas 2017.

Under the Flows scheme, frontline domestic violence workers at 850 different organisations will get access to legal advice, an online discussion forum, and tools, so they can either help women needing legal advice directly, or, if necessary, easily refer them elsewhere.

The funding covers the creation of a Flows team: a Flows lead; a dedicated solicitor, which will be Alex’s post for the next two years; two paralegals (who will be available to frontline workers via phone or email); and a co-ordinator. RoW staff are delivering the online discussion forum, where workers can share experiences and expertise.

Non-molestation orders

A non-molestation order is a type of injunction available under the 1996 Family Law Act to protect victims of domestic violence and their children from a partner or ex-partner. An order covers violence and threats of violence, and also pestering and harassment, such as by sending nuisance text messages. An order can be made for a specified period of time, or until the court makes another order. They are civil orders, so have a civil standard of proof, which makes them easier to obtain, but breach of a non-molestation order is a criminal offence and abusers can be immediately arrested by police. Non-molestation orders are widely seen as an effective deterrent and as an important tool for protecting abuse victims.
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Marianne’s story

“...”

She literally held my hand throughout the whole thing

Marianne, 30, has a job in administration she enjoys, and three school-age children, who keep her busy. Her oldest is studying for his GCSEs; the middle one recently started at secondary school; while the “baby”, still has a few more years left at primary school.

Marianne is estranged from the children’s father, following years of serious physical and sexual abuse, including attacking her on the street and trying to run her over. The abuse has taken a terrible toll, but it was a long time before she sought help.

When she did, Marianne recalls that the police were sympathetic, but could offer limited practical help. She was assigned a domestic violence intervention officer, but the panic alarm they gave her brought little reassurance. “Knowing how violent he is and the fact he has actually threatened to take my life and my children’s lives, I knew the alarm wouldn’t be enough.”

When her ex-partner took to standing outside her house night after night police told her there was nothing they could do without proof. She was advised to take a photo of him out there, but she was too scared to even attempt to do so.

An officer suggested she take her children and go to a hotel, but that was beyond her financial means. As a family of four, staying with friends was not an option either, and she was worried about disrupting her eldest’s GCSE studies. “They would have had to do their homework on the floor, and it just wasn’t practical.” The council said they would rehouse her, but nothing seemed to happen.

Marianne was advised to see a family lawyer to get a non-molestation order, but her legal aid application was refused. “They turned me down because they said I earned a lot of money, but I didn’t. I don’t receive any benefits. I don’t get any help with my three boys - and I also have debts to pay.” The police and other agencies had assumed she would get legal aid. When she didn’t, they appeared to have run out of suggestions. Things got so bad Marianne was scared to go to work, and even thought about ending her own life.

It was then she was referred to see Alex Lowry at RCJ Advice, whose Justice First Fellowship family consultancy project was designed with exactly the likes of Marianne in mind: women who need legal intervention to keep themselves and their families safe, but who don’t qualify for legal aid, and can’t afford the cost of obtaining a non-molestation order.

It was then she was referred to see Alex Lowry at RCJ Advice, whose Justice First Fellowship family consultancy project was designed with exactly the likes of Marianne in mind: women who need legal intervention to keep themselves and their families safe, but who don’t qualify for legal aid, and can’t afford the cost of obtaining a non-molestation order.

Marianne was advised to see a family lawyer to get a non-molestation order, but her legal aid application was refused. “They turned me down because they said I earned a lot of money, but I didn’t. I don’t receive any benefits. I don’t get any help with my three boys - and I also have debts to pay.” The police and other agencies had assumed she would get legal aid. When she didn’t, they appeared to have run out of suggestions. Things got so bad Marianne was scared to go to work, and even thought about ending her own life.

It was then she was referred to see Alex Lowry at RCJ Advice, whose Justice First Fellowship family consultancy project was designed with exactly the likes of Marianne in mind: women who need legal intervention to keep themselves and their families safe, but who don’t qualify for legal aid, and can’t afford the cost of obtaining a non-molestation order.

Marianne was advised to see a family lawyer to get a non-molestation order, but her legal aid application was refused. “They turned me down because they said I earned a lot of money, but I didn’t. I don’t receive any benefits. I don’t get any help with my three boys - and I also have debts to pay.” The police and other agencies had assumed she would get legal aid. When she didn’t, they appeared to have run out of suggestions. Things got so bad Marianne was scared to go to work, and even thought about ending her own life.

It was then she was referred to see Alex Lowry at RCJ Advice, whose Justice First Fellowship family consultancy project was designed with exactly the likes of Marianne in mind: women who need legal intervention to keep themselves and their families safe, but who don’t qualify for legal aid, and can’t afford the cost of obtaining a non-molestation order.

At first Marianne found it hard to talk in detail about the abuse, but Alex explained the judge needed to understand why the order was important. “She was very warm, and there was no judgment involved at all. I was going through so much, it was hard to let everything out. I had been going through this for so many years, and when I reached out for help, no one was able to help me, but Alex.”

Alex filled in the forms and went with Marianne to court. “She told me not to worry, and she will speak on my behalf.”

As well as keeping her ex-partner away from the road where she lives, the order also bars him from approaching her children’s school. He can be arrested on sight if he breaches its terms, and the police also now have her numbers on high priority, so would know to react quickly. The order lasts for a year and Alex told her to come back if she needs an extension. Marianne says she now has peace of mind and can already see the difference in her sons.

Marianne says Alex made sure she understood all the options and how the order worked. “She explained everything to the point where I was able to explain it to my parents. I was able to explain it to my colleagues. I was able to explain it to the school. It was extremely nice having her there. She was literally holding my hand through the whole thing.” Alex even set her up with a PO box address so she and her ex can be in communication about the children.

She adds that the service went beyond her expectations. “People tend to look at you and say, why would you stick around in an abusive situation? But Alex didn’t. There was no judgment in her tone. No judgment in her look. No judgment at all. All she involved at all. I was going through so much, it was hard to let everything out. I had been going through this for so many years, and when I reached out for help, no one was able to help me, but Alex.”

Alex filled in the forms and went with Marianne to court. “She told me not to worry, and she will speak on my behalf.”

As well as keeping her ex-partner away from the road where she lives, the order also bars him from approaching her children’s school. He can be arrested on sight if he breaches its terms, and the police also now have her numbers on high priority, so would know to react quickly. The order lasts for a year and Alex told her to come back if she needs an extension. Marianne says she now has peace of mind and can already see the difference in her sons.

Marianne says Alex made sure she understood all the options and how the order worked. “She explained everything to the point where I was able to explain it to my parents. I was able to explain it to my colleagues. I was able to explain it to the school. It was extremely nice having her there. She was literally holding my hand through the whole thing.” Alex even set her up with a PO box address so she and her ex can be in communication about the children.

She adds that the service went beyond her expectations. “People tend to look at you and say, why would you stick around in an abusive situation? But Alex didn’t. There was no judgment in her tone. No judgment in her look. No judgment at all. All she wanted to do was help me.”
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Grants 2018

Council of the Inns of Court

£20,000

Bar Professional Training Course market analysis project

Supporting further work to examine the feasibility of providing a flexible and accessible pathway to Bar qualification.

Frank Longford Charitable Trust (Longford Trust)

£30,000

Patrick Pakenham Awards

Supporting Patrick Pakenham Awards (part of Longford Scholarships), offering financial and specialist mentoring support to young prisoners and ex-prisoners who wish to study law at university.

Justice First Fellowship

£1,227,625

Hosting a Justice First Fellow trainee solicitor or barrister

Action in the Community (The Speakeasy); Avon & Bristol Law Centre; Bar Pro Bono Unit; Bhatt Murphy; Child Poverty Action Group; Conroys Solicitors; Ealing Law Centre; Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit; JustRight Scotland; Merseyside Law Centre; North East Law Centre; Prisoners' Advice Service; Public Law Project; Release; Southwark Law Centre; Spire Barristers; Suffolk Law Centre; Turpin & Miller (18 grants).

Sutton Trust

£256,670

Pathways to Law - phase 4 (year 3)

Supporting Phase 4 of Pathways to Law programme which works to inspire and support academically-able students from non-privileged backgrounds interested in a career in law.
Grant-making

In 2018, TLEF appointed its first head of programme support, Rachael Takens-Milne. Here, she explains why we see building strong and supportive relationships with grantees and the sector more widely as a vital part of our work.

One of the Foundation’s core values is to foster engaged and supportive relationships with organisations in the sector and with those that go on to receive our funding. We welcome conversations with organisations who have prospective ideas and invite early expressions of interest. We are devoting more staff capacity to supporting this pipeline of applications and to building strong connections with grantees, so that we learn more from what we fund and are able to offer additional support when it is needed.

We aim to increasingly use our funding to support organisations to strengthen their infrastructure; we recognise that this area is difficult to fund, but is essential if objectives are to be met and organisations made sustainable. Further, we are conscious that making grants is just one way in which we can offer support. In addition to funding projects, we have supported organisations to work with consultants and to access training and events; we also offer direct input from TLEF staff on broader organisational development, including financial management, practice management, organisational restructuring, communications, IT infrastructure development, digital tools and collaboration. We have also convened groups of funders, where we have organisations in common.

We seek to bring grantees together and would like to do this more where grants are covering similar issues and useful lessons can be shared. We have begun to develop a more thematic approach to certain areas of work. As well as thinking strategically about developments in IT and research, we have consciously made connected grants under the policy strand and around health justice. In this way, we hope to increase the impact of the work, to bring additional resource and expertise to examine complex problems, to capture and share learning, and be better positioned to scale ideas that work.

As we entered our sixth year, one of our first tasks was to conduct a survey of the organisations we fund, asking for their feedback on our performance as a grant-maker. The answers were anonymous, and, once the results are analysed, we will use the findings to help us understand what we are doing well and could do more of, and what we could do differently.

We aim to increasingly use our funding to support organisations to strengthen their infrastructure.
In response, this year, the governors of the Foundation agreed to scope the development of a research centre that would develop a strategic and long-term response to this challenge in the areas of civil and administrative law. This has uncovered considerable enthusiasm across the range of stakeholders consulted, including representatives from key funders, academia, the judiciary, evidence intermediaries, sector organisations and government. It has also involved international collaboration with global leaders, such as the Access to Justice Lab at Harvard University. This has informed three functions that would form the structure of a work programme.

1. Conduct and commission primary quantitative research, with the aim of building an evidence base of effective interventions that help people access the civil and administrative justice system and secure just outcomes in relation to their civil and administrative justice problems.

2. Advocate for the collection, publication and linking of administrative and civil justice system data with other sources of administrative data in order to:
   - better understand the impact of interactions with the civil and administrative justice system on wider social outcomes (eg health, employment, integration); and
   - improve understanding of individual pathways into the civil and administrative justice system, in order to identify opportunities to intervene earlier.

3. Build capacity to undertake robust interdisciplinary research into the civil and administrative justice system through:
   - developing a fellowship scheme for researchers, in partnership with the Access to Justice Lab at Harvard;
   - designing and delivering training courses on the use of quantitative methods in civil and administrative justice system research;
   - growing the pool of funders interested in this field.

In May 2018, the Foundation jointly held, with Nuffield Foundation and UCL Laws, an international conference, “The Future of Justice: Harnessing the power of empirical research.” The conference brought together an audience of over 100 academics, judges, policymakers and funders. It represented the culmination of over a year of work that aimed to influence the development of the data architecture around the courts transformation programme.

At the conference, Susan Acland-Hood, chief executive of HM Courts and Tribunal Service, committed for the first time to collecting data on the new online court processes, and making it available for researchers. Next year, we will be working with HMCTS to put this into practice and will bring forward recommendations to our governors for establishing the research centre. This feels like an important and exciting time, with the Foundation acting with others as part of a nascent global network of researchers and academics developing this agenda.
Exploring the role of information technology remains an important strand of activity running across all our strategic objectives. We know how challenging it is for organisations in the sector to invest in IT infrastructure, and yet developments such as the digitisation of courts and government digital services becoming the norm in interaction between citizens and government, makes this even more imperative.

This year, the Foundation has supported the development and use of information technology in the following areas:

- **IT infrastructure** – Since 2017, the Foundation has been helping Law Centres Network to upgrade the IT systems of its members in order to move to cloud-based systems, increase workplace efficiency, and be able to interact with government and other public bodies’ digital services. We have also helped other key sector organisations, such as Legal Action Group, Bar Pro Bono Unit, and Free Representation Unit, to scope IT development and digitisation. We have found that the most useful initial step is to fund scoping work, and to provide expert IT consultancy, alongside a grant to support organisations.

- **Online delivery of advice** – Grants have supported organisations to experiment with advice delivery through websites, guided pathways, apps, and films to learn about or to navigate legal processes. The Foundation has also encountered growing interest among organisations in developing chatbots, which have considerable potential.

- **Video links** – Currently in its infancy in the advice sector, but well developed and used in the corporate sector, advice over video enables remote provision, which has considerable scope for reaching people living in advice deserts, and for supporting the contributions of volunteers. The Foundation has funded the pilot phase of two projects, one linking University House in Bethnal Green in east London, and the Dracaena Centre in Falmouth, Cornwall, and a second supporting Avon and Bristol Law Centre to reach into the south-west of England.

- **Training** – This has been explored through developing models for training via webinars and online e-learning, as well as supporting access to legal information for small charities.

2018 saw us continue to support projects which harness the power of technology for legal education and to increase access to justice. Alan Humphreys, deputy chief executive and secretary to the governors, explains our approach.

Overall, it is unlikely that anything the Foundation wants to achieve through the use of IT is technologically difficult, but we recognise our role in supporting the sector to explore and harness the opportunities. As the writer William Gibson put it: “The future is already here, it’s just not very evenly distributed.”

We know how challenging it is for organisations in the sector to invest in IT infrastructure, yet developments like digitisation of courts are making this imperative.
Law-making presents a legal education opportunity, both in relation to the participation of non-government actors, as well as parliamentarians and policymakers, where interaction enables both sides to learn about, and improve, the principles, practices and drafting of law. Furthermore, improved law-making can increase the ease with which people affected by legislation can secure their rights and protections.

This recognition of the value of civil society’s engaging with law-making underpins TLEF’s work on Brexit, where our grants support specialist expertise in civil society to engage constructively with policymakers and parliamentarians across all parties. Much grantee activity in the last year focused on the passage of the EU Withdrawal Bill through parliament. The EU (Withdrawal) Act became law on 26 June 2018, and in effect provides that most types of retained EU law have the status of delegated legislation in the UK, and can be changed by delegated legislation made by ministers. The Act not only creates within UK law new categories of law that are retained EU law, but also creates new parliamentary procedures for the delegated legislation that will amend retained EU law. Consequently, the EU (Withdrawal) Act can be understood as a mini-constitution for law-making in the UK in the context of Brexit.

Grantees identified and raised technical legal questions and put forward constructive proposals for the EU (Withdrawal) Bill. For example, Public Law Project focused on the risk of legal uncertainty in relation to “exit day” under the Bill; the Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law provided technical analysis and proposals on the legal status of retained EU law; Liberty highlighted questions about the nature and status of legal rights and protections from EU law in UK law post-exit.

In the devolved nations, the Foundation’s grantees coordinated civil society engagement with Brexit policy. For example, the Human Rights Consortium Northern Ireland highlighted the potential impact of Brexit on human rights in the province, particularly in relation to the Belfast Good Friday Agreement. The Human Rights Consortium Scotland worked with the Scottish Universities Legal Network on Europe to produce technical legal analysis to improve understanding of policy proposals and consequences.

Consistent with the Foundation’s approach to policy, we also made two grants to support informed engagement with the government’s proposed Domestic Violence Bill. The bill has cross-party support and the grants will support organisations that work with people who have experienced domestic violence to engage with the law-making process so that their experience informs the new legislation.
Communications

Fiona Bawdon, head of comms, explains why legal skills and good communications should go hand in hand, with each having a role to play in amplifying the work of civil society organisations.

Rights groups in the US describe communications as being “the tip of the spear”. Although not a silver bullet, they see communications – the art of being able to share your message in a way that is powerful and helpful to what you are trying to achieve – as a key weapon in their armoury.

The Foundation also sees communications as being an important tool for social justice organisations and those working to improve legal education and increase access to justice. In our view, legal skills and good communications are complementary to each other, with each having their own role to play in amplifying the work of civil society organisations.

During the last year, TLEF continued to offer communications support to the organisations we fund and, in particular, to the Justice First Fellows. All of the Fellows are given communications training as part of the Fellowship programme, as we aim to equip them at an early stage with skills that they can build on throughout their careers. As potential leaders of the social welfare law profession, Fellows will have a vital role to play in shaping its future, and being effective commentators and influencers – as well as excellent lawyers – will be essential for that.

This year saw our communications consultant, legal affairs journalist and campaigner Fiona Bawdon, formally join our team (on a part time basis) as head of communications. As we reach the fifth year since the Foundation was created and focus on the next five years, one of Fiona’s key tasks will be to develop a communications strategy, that will enable us to make the most of our resources, to support the sector and enhance its communications capacity.

We encourage organisations to think about whether their grant applications should include an element for funding communications support.

We envisage that this will include offering bespoke coaching and training for key individuals and organisations; as well as consultancy to provide support at key times, such as during strategic litigation. Informal discussions with grantees show there is an appetite for greater access to communications support.

We also continue to encourage applicants to think about whether their application should include an element for funding communications support, and urge grantees to contact us with comms-related queries.
## Financial summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£m 2018</th>
<th>£m 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Fund</strong></td>
<td>259.3</td>
<td>253.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and donations</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grants</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to prior year grants</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant-making and research</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment management</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>