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Community Legal Workers

at

Parkdale Community Legal Services

October 1977

By Katie McGovern and Frederick H. Zemans

Introduction

Since its opening in September 1971, Parkdale Community Legal Services has served as both a neighbourhood law office and as Osgoode Hall Law School’s first clinical training setting. Law students have been the primary deliverers of legal services, with a growing number of staff lawyers, articling students, and practitioners supervising the student caseload. But most law students spend only one semester at Parkdale; therefore the staff lawyers and especially the community legal workers must provide continuity within the office and serve as the conduit to the Parkdale community.

Parkdale has been a participant in the significant recent responses of the legal profession to the needs of the poor and economically less-advantaged members of Canadian society. As in other poverty law settings, staff lawyers and students initially faced the hostility and suspicion of the Parkdale community, engendered by previous negative experiences with the law and lawyers. The lay advocate (also referred to as “community legal worker”) comes from Parkdale or a similar community and generally does not face the same hostility and difference in perspective encountered by the professional.1 The community legal worker has a similar background to the community

1. See Arthurs, Taman, Williams, 21 University of Toronto Law Journal 498 (1971) for a study of the economic and family background of lawyers in Ontario.
which encourages an informal relationship with clients. This background allows the community legal worker to perceive the root causes of legal and social problems and to recognize the need to avoid creating new dependencies. Rather, the community legal worker's task is to educate and strengthen his community through his knowledge of the legal system. Parkdale's community legal worker program has attempted to develop new methods of delivering legal services by direct citizen involvement. This review provides an historical overview of the growth of lay advocacy within P.C.L.S. and assesses both its accomplishments and its problems. We take the liberty of making recommendations for continued development to the Board of Directors.

History

Parkdale Community Legal Services opened in September 1971 and was able to hire its first lay advocates by the spring of 1972. The development of "the indigenous aid" was and has remained a fundamental goal.² The January 1972 application to Local Initiatives Program³ of the Parkdale Joint Action Committee, (composed of the Parkdale Tenants' Association, the Parkdale Single Parents' Association, the Parkdale-Queen Home Improvements, and Parkdale Community Legal Services) included a request for two lay advocates to work in the law office. From the outset we aspired to

"train lay people to handle some of the legal services which were being handled by lawyers and law students; to have ongoing input from the community into the office at the staff level; and to have lay advocates involved in the office's community education program."⁴

². See the 1971 initial application for funding to the Federal Department of Health and Welfare.

³. The Federal Government's newly created Winter Works Project - Local Initiatives Program - fondly known as L.I.P.

The L.I.P. grant was ultimately approved in late February 1972 and a Committee was established to interview the applicants. A large number of persons were interviewed despite the restriction which required that applications originate only from the Parkdale community. Stan Pizans and Pat Biggs were the first members of the Parkdale lay advocacy staff.

Stan Pizans was a long-time resident who had an extended relationship with the organized Parkdale community. Stan spoke six languages, related easily to people, and had a varied work background which included union organizing, fifteen years in his own business and selling life insurance. These experiences assisted his development as a lay advocate specializing in social welfare legislation, unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation.

Pat Biggs had lived in Parkdale only a short time but had grown up in similar communities. He was in his early twenties when he began working at P.C.L.S., and he found it difficult to adjust to the office routine. The pressures of his personal life required him to resign in June 1972. The extension of the L.I.P. grant allowed Stan Pizans to continue and David Thibodeau to be hired. The hiring committee was restructured to include representatives of the constituent members of the Parkdale Joint Action Committee. Funding and interviewing delays prevented David Thibodeau from joining the Parkdale staff until July 1972, and he worked in the office only until September 1972. The fall of 1972 saw L.I.P. funding further extended; Stan Pizans was then joined by Eleanor Bro.

Eleanor Bro was a long-time resident of Parkdale. She had worked for a labour union and was active in the Parkdale Tenant's Association. Eleanor undertook a feasibility study of the community credit counselling service for Parkdale. In January, 1973, the office was structured into three areas; Eleanor became the first lay advocate in the landlord and tenant - housing group. Her experience
and continuing involvement with the Parkdale Tenant's Association proved valuable.

Parkdale's funding application in 1970 to the Department of National Health and Welfare indicated that the project would hire a staff social worker. Joan Williams, a recent graduate of the University of Toronto School of Social Work, was employed from July 1st, 1971 to June 30th, 1972. Joan's contribution was lessened by virtue of her being the only social worker in an office staffed by lawyers and law students who had little understanding of the role to be played by a social worker. After Ms. Williams' resignation, a committee of staff lawyers, law students and community members was established to recruit another social worker. After advertising extensively, interviewing numerous applicants and considering the job definition of the social worker, the committee recommended that a community organizer rather than a case worker be hired. A public Office Meeting of October 12th, 1972 decided that Parkdale should hire two Parkdale residents as community organizers to fill the position of the professional social worker.

The committee appointed to implement this decision recommended to the Office Meeting of December 11th, 1972 the hiring of Liz Zingraff and Patti Palmer, who were both Parkdale residents and had had previous community work experience. Liz had participated in the establishment and operation of a Day Care Centre and Patti had

5. During the summer of 1972, the role of the social worker at Parkdale was considered by a committee chaired by Laurie Grant [law student] and composed of Lina Chartrand [community member], Terry Hunter [articling student], Elizabeth Trotsha [community member] and Fred Zemans [director].

6. The committee was composed of Mary Hogan [articling student at the time], Mary Cornish [law student at the time], Stan Pizans and two community residents - one representing the organized community and one a Parkdale client.
been on the staff of Digger House, a treatment centre for young people with drug problems. Liz became the new lay advocate for the consumer group and continued Eleanor Bro's work on creating a credit counselling service, while Patti worked in the new Employment Standards group which was initiated to direct more of the office's attention to the unorganized worker.

By the fall of 1972 it was determined that the staff positions could no longer be funded through L.I.P. Community legal workers could no longer be dependent on the indefinite and sporadic funding but rather must be incorporated into the office budget and receive the salaries and benefits of permanent staff members. From November 1, 1972, the lay advocates were incorporated into the office budget and funded through grants from the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Justice, the City of Toronto, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the Atkinson Foundation. 1972 was a landmark year in the development of Parkdale's paralegal program. It quickly changed from a solely professional staff to one comprising four full-time lay advocates who were involved in all aspects of the office's operation. This is reflected in the 1972 Parkdale Annual Report:

"The commitment not only to hire lay advocates, but to ensure that they are an active and viable part of the office should have important long term effects on the success of the office as a community legal service."

Patti Palmer was with the office for only three months; Liz Zingraff worked at Parkdale until the end of January 1974. Liz developed a significant, if at times frustrating, role in the Consumer group. Liz Zingraff organized a Consumer group (E.P.I.C.) and did a fair amount of credit counselling. The frustration of organizing and the desire to continue her work in pottery lured Liz away from Parkdale. During the summer of 1973 the office again assessed the role of paraprofessionals at Parkdale. Jerry Morgan, an English L.L.M. student who worked at Parkdale during the 1972-1973 academic year prepared an excellent position paper for the office on the role of lay advocates.
as community educators. The "Morgan Paper" was adopted by the Office Steering Committee during the summer of 1973, and the Committee decided that a fourth lay advocate should be hired to work solely on community education. When Eleanor Bro left in July 1973, another search committee was formed to hire two new lay advocates to work on community education and in the landlord and tenant group. The committee spent a considerable amount of time interviewing various candidates and recommended the hiring of Chérie Smith (to work in the landlord and tenant group) and Susan Rowland (as the community educator). Susan filled the community education role only from September 1973 to January 1974.

This brief overview indicates that Parkdale's initial attempts at hiring and using lay advocates was fraught with frustrations and disappointments. An earlier review of the paraprofessional program at Parkdale in February 1974 makes the following comments:

"1. Our paraprofessional program has not been our finest hour.
2. We have attempted to find roles for non-legal staff but do not provide them with the necessary training programs and supervision to allow them to function within a predominantly legal environment.
3. We have not recognized the high degree of tensions and frustration that non-lawyers experience functioning within an unstructured and continuously changing setting such as Parkdale Community Legal Services.
4. We have asked two and only more recently, three lawyers, to be responsible for the supervision of a growing caseload; the education of at least eighteen law students; as well as two articling students; not to mention the administration and fund raising for the office. The staff lawyers were, in addition, expected to mount a training program and supervise four lay advocates. Is it any wonder that lay advocacy training programs tended either to be taken over by law students, articling students or be left to the lay advocates themselves?

7. This committee was composed of David Cornfield, Mary Speers and Stan Pizans from the office and Jeff Piker, Rod Layman and Solomon Goldin from the Parkdale community.
Recommendations:

1. That Parkdale Community Legal Services continue to have a paraprofessional program.

2. That the roles of these paraprofessionals be closely defined prior to hiring.

3. That a staff lawyer be hired whose prime responsibility would be to supervise and educate and advise the lay advocates.

4. That each group within the office have one lay advocate who is working on caseload attached to the group.

5. The office should have at least two community development lay advocates. It is imperative that there be a team of community organizers that are working out of the office. This type of solitary work requires tremendous support and therefore suggest the team approach.

6. That a community education lay advocate be hired as the second community organizer. Hopefully the individual hired for this role would use community education as the basis for strengthening existing community groups and assisting in the creation of new groups within the Parkdale community.

7. Funding for at least a three year period be obtained to underwrite this program to give it sufficient time to develop and prove itself."

At the culmination of the 1974 evaluation of lay advocates, the director was authorized to initiate discussions with the Donner Canadian Foundation to obtain funds for a community education and paralegal training program designed to allow the office to hire a staff lawyer and community educator to coordinate and develop these aspects of the program. In December 1974, a grant was obtained from the Donner Canadian Foundation for a three year period that specifically designated community education and lay advocacy training. Bob Roth, a graduate of the first Osgoode semester at Parkdale was hired as the lawyer responsible for initiating the community education program and for coordinating the lay advocacy training program.

The Lay Advocacy Training Program 1975:

There have been several excellent reports written on the Lay
Advocacy Training Program held during the spring of 1975. The program was an important experiment if not a total success. It encountered numerous problems, not the least of which was timing: It was started immediately after the arrival of both Ron Ellis as the new director and Bob Roth. Neither had any previous experience in community education. L.I.P., in rather typical fashion, did not advise P.C.L.S. until the last week in January 1975 that its funding application had been accepted and that the lay advocacy training program was to commence not later than the 17th of February 1975. This left little time to set the goals for the trainees or to plan the training program. Despite the magnitude of the task the office, to its credit, undertook the challenge under extremely difficult circumstances.

The selection of candidates proved to be a difficult problem and is worthy of attention in this report. The office reflected on the previous training attempts and the difficulty which lay advocates had in finding positions where they could use their skills. It was decided that for the 1975 training program, community organizations should be advised of the L.I.P. grant and be asked to recommend a candidate, preferably associated with their group, with the hope of training such persons to return to the organization at the conclusion of the six month course.

The terms of the L.I.P. grant required that all persons hired must have been unemployed and that all hiring be done through the auspices of the local manpower office. Despite this limitation of potential candidates, two distinct groups of individuals applied for the jobs. There were those who had post-secondary education, with some experience in community work, who did not live in the Parkdale area but who were seeking "community related" work. The second group tended to be from Parkdale with little prior experience and

9. See reports of Marilou McPhedran, Lay Advocacy at Parkdale Community Legal Services, August 1975, and Bob Roth, Lay Advocacy Training Program Report.
10. Supra, McPhedran states that: "A lay advocate training program of this magnitude had never been attempted in Canada."
11. Supra, McPhedran report pp.8-10 for a more detailed analysis.
who wished to learn on the job. The selection process required that
course. 12

The Director and the former Director favoured a selection pro­
cedure which took into consideration each applicant's potential and
the relative benefit in terms of personal development from the training
program experience which each applicant was likely to receive. The
choice was not to be made on the basis of the potential for a candidate's
success in the training program, but rather on the basis of his in­
herent or natural capabilities and the likelihood that the training pro­
gram would hone those capabilities to the benefit of the community and
the individual.

This decision is considered in Bob Roth's report on the Lay
Advocacy Training Program:

"However, as we later learned, our own lack of
structure, and role definitions in particular,
at this early stage, clearly influenced our
selection process. It is now apparent that it is
next to impossible to train a person to become
a community organizer. Had we decided at that
stage to use the six months to develop four
community organizers, I suspect that we would
have opted for the experienced candidates, who
would have added their own dimension of personal
experience to the program. As it was, we had
decided to develop a program which emphasized
lay advocacy, but which included insight into
community organizing, and as such, we resorted
to our primary concern -- to develop a resource
base of community people." 13

The program evaluations stress that in spite of a range of ex­
perience and duration the factors which apparently determined an
advocate's success in the program were individual strengths, personality
and a temperament which lent itself to paralegal work. The evaluators
agreed that the most valuable individual characteristics were

12. The interviewing for these positions was done by Bob Roth, lawyer,
Lina Chartrand, coordinator, Marilou P. Pchedran, law student, Stan
Pizans and Nelson Clarke, lay advocates.

13. Supra, Roth, p. 10.
inquisitiveness, determination and aggressiveness. The variations in development of the trainees seemed due to differences in individual personalities and innate abilities rather than to education or previous training. Although two had university experience, one of these was seen as the least successful. One of the trainees with little formal education had a great deal of difficulty in understanding the written materials and in expressing himself. Roth's conclusions are worthy of our consideration:

"The L.I.P. program was a learning experience which was not confined to the trainees. The strengths and limitations of P.C.L.S. as a training site and as a source of trainers were severely tested. I think we passed the test, but did not achieve honors. That is to be expected on a first endeavour. I wish to highlight an area which must receive much thought for future programs, and that is the question of future employment of the trainees. That this question has great significance is demonstrated by the fact that Dalhousie University, a leader in the training of lay advocates, is abandoning the field due to an inability of trainees to find related job opportunities, following training programs. If Osler's adoption, the problem may resolve itself. However, in the interim, the insecurity and lack of focus created by the question of "training for what?" pose serious problems. Perhaps, future programs should only be undertaken on the basis that existing organizations will employ trainees. Perhaps feasibility studies on the availability of future funding should be undertaken prior to the commencement of a program. Too much thought, energy, resource and concern go into a training program to be satisfied with one out of our trainees utilizing their gained skills and knowledge on the completion of the program. Even though we do not hold out the promise of employment of the trainees, surely we have a duty to ensure that the program does not raise false hopes and expectations of future career opportunities.

14. The four trainees selected had no previous experience as counsellors, lay advocates or community organizers.

15. Supra, Roth, p. 12.

16. The Osler Task Force on Legal Aid.
A training program is a major undertaking. As such it needs major support from everybody in the office. Thus, ideally, in the planning stages of future programs, all permanent staff and students should be involved. Assuredly, the training of lay advocates at P.C.L.S. is evolving - it is still very much in a formative stage and is amenable to changes in orientation.

A second lay advocate/community worker training program was undertaken by the office from December 1, 1975 to June 25, 1976. Eleanor Bro, former Parkdale lay advocate, was hired specifically to supervise this training program. The threshold decision made was to have the trainees chosen by, and if possible, be the representatives of Parkdale community groups. The program was designed to provide persons who were involved in the community with a knowledge of Workmen's Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, Social Security and Family Law. This initial decision that the 1976 program would train lay advocate/community workers was a significant departure from previous training programs. It required community groups to both choose the trainees and participate in the training. Trainees were to attend classes in the morning at Parkdale and assume a caseload and organize and convey their knowledge to the membership of the organization in the afternoon and if necessary in the evenings. This combined training and field placement was educational and an administrative challenge to Parkdale and the sponsoring groups.

The sponsoring groups for the 1976 program were: INCA (Istituto Nazionale Confederale di Assistenza), the Union of Injured Workers, and Parkdale Women's Group. Each group was unique and was involved in casework and community organizing to a greater or lesser extent. The choice of individual candidates was left in the main to the sponsoring groups, with the trainee, the sponsor and Parkdale often having quite different expectations of the program. Definition of tasks and supervision was not forthcoming to the extent expected by at least two of the sponsors, which led to considerable frustration on the part
of the students and Eleanor Bro. The program faced the additional
tension of L.I.P. funding which had proved to be an unsatisfactory
basis for Parkdale's earlier training and hiring of lay advocates.
The short term aspect of L.I.P. militated against a commitment to
the training process both by the sponsoring groups and the trainees.
The program was viewed as a stop-gap alternative to U.I.C. and
welfare and not an entry into full-time employment.

In her final report of August 1976 Eleanor Bro stated that
the program hoped to include the following components:

A) 1. interviewing skills
   2. skills for dealing with the bureaucracy
   3. interpretation of statutes
   4. preparation and presentation of cases

B) 1. a look at the history, spirit or intent of the
   legislation -- is its administration compatible with
   or contradictory to this intent?

   2. Research into the administrative structure and
      financial structure of the agency -- the source of
      funding? -- how the money is disbursed? -- how the
      money is invested, and where?

   3. How many recipients of a particular scheme? How
      denial of benefits affected other income supplement
      programmes? What type of legislation would provide
      real social security -- short term and long term?

   4. How do we use the knowledge gained from what is
      listed above in order to organize?

The final report of the program indicates that not all aspects of this
ambitious plan were covered nor was the seven months sufficient time to
deal with these substantive areas. It was also observed that there was
a "lack of consistency in using outside resource people, and lack of
commitment of office resources to the program. But considerable
experience was accumulated from this difficult and significant ex-
perimenetal program.

The Present Situation:

The authors were asked by the Parkdale Board of Governors at
its December 1976 meeting to undertake a review of the office's community legal workers. To attempt to fulfill this mandate we have met with the community legal workers both collectively and individually during the past six months of 1977. We initially met with all the community legal workers to discuss their work within the office and how the review would be most beneficial to them. They each provided us with a written job description and agreed that we should meet them individually. Unfortunately, the interviewing extended over a longer period of time than anticipated and we did not have our final meeting with most of the community legal workers until June 27th, 1977 when we presented our thoughts and recommendations to them. We subsequently discussed these recommendations with the director and staff lawyers.

The Community Legal Workers of 1977:

Following is a brief discussion of each of the six community legal workers employed by Parkdale Community Legal Services during the spring of 1977.

1. *Maire Bradshaw* - Maire has worked at Parkdale since August 1976 at a salary of $10,000 per year. She received her diploma in social services from Ryerson Polytechnical Institute in 1973. Her training at Parkdale has been informal and has been obtained by reading various Acts, discussing cases with Stan Pizans and attending student training sessions. She has divided her time between case work and community education and is developing her expertise in both areas. At the time of the review she was supervising four community education projects, all related to unemployment insurance and administrative tribunals. In addition to Maire's community education projects, she has served on the office committee and was convening the office evaluation project.

Maire does not have a supervising lawyer for her caseload and any supervision she receives is generally from Stan Pizans at her instigation. She is continuing her education at Ryerson and hopes to obtain a degree in social services. Maire recognizes that it will
take her at least two years to become competent and confident in her job. Maire has developed as a community legal worker at Parkdale and is an effective advocate. We are concerned that she has not been given sufficient case work and that her job description is imprecise. We would recommend that Maire be given more direction; that her caseload responsibilities be increased; and that she work more closely with the Immigration and Consumer group. This will allow her to have a closer relationship with a staff lawyer with whom a team approach to her case work and community development could evolve. Maire's effectiveness can be expanded by a close relationship with this group, its staff lawyer, articling student and law students.

2. **Lina Chartrand** - Lina has been active in the Parkdale community and involved with Parkdale Community Legal Services for many years. She had extensive experience with the Parkdale Tenant's Association, The Ontario Anti-Poverty Organization, the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations as well as a Parkdale Community Legal Services board member. She was employed by the office on February 1st, 1975 on a L.I.P. grant to coordinate the lay advocate training program in cooperation with Robert Roth. On April 1st, 1975 she became a member of the permanent staff as a community legal worker working with Bob Roth on community education activities. Lina originally was paid $140 per week on L.I.P., and on becoming a permanent staff member was paid $10,000 per year. In the fall of 1975 her salary was increased to $11,500. At the time of our review, Lina spent approximately 10% of her time on caseload; 35% on community education; 35% on community development and 20% on office administration. Lina enjoys being a community legal worker and hopes to continue as such at either Parkdale or another community setting for a number of years. Lina feels that despite her informal training she has personally grown and developed her organizing skills while at Parkdale and that these skills will be transferrable to another job setting. Lina is an effective organizer and educator who would like to do more extensive educational work amongst the students and staff of the office. She emphasized to us the need for the office to better integrate its multifaceted activities.
Lina has been active within Action on Legal Aid and during the last year it absorbed approximately 50% of her time. She attends A.L.A. meetings as both a representative of Parkdale and as leader of A.L.A. As the office made Lina's time available, she has fulfilled important organizing and conference planning roles for A.L.A. She was instrumental in setting up the tenant advocacy workshop for fifteen community workers across Metropolitan Toronto convened by P.C.L.S. during the spring of 1977. In May 1977 Lina dropped her workload to one-half time and was assigned as special liaison person to the Board of Governors. Lina is, in our opinion, a highly successful community legal worker with very well developed leadership and organizing skills whose talents and abilities should be used more effectively within P.C.L.S. and specifically in implementing the recommendations of this report. As well, Lina should be given greater programming and caseload responsibility within the landlord and tenant group if she returns to P.C.L.S. on a full-time basis.

3. Nelson Clarke - Nelson was hired in August 1974 on a temporary basis and permanently on January 1st, 1975. While working on a part-time basis he was paid at the rate of $7,000 per annum and as of January 1st, 1975 his salary was fixed at $10,000 and has been increased during the last two years to its present level of $12,650. Nelson has extensive organizational, political and administrative experience. Nelson's training has also been relatively informal and self-initiated while at Parkdale. He has attended a number of workshops on landlord and tenant law and rent review. The knowledge and experience that he has acquired have been obtained in the course of his case work and community development activities. Nelson's work is primarily devoted to community education, community development and to office administration. Like Lina, Nelson has been actively involved with Action on Legal Aid both on behalf of Parkdale Community Legal Services and in a leadership role. In response to our career goals inquiry Nelson indicated that his time distribution is, caseload - 10%, community education - 20%, community development (including work with Action on Legal Aid) - 40%, and office administration - 30%.
Nelson indicated:

"I've been a radical, social activist for over forty years, and still am. I find a place for myself in this setting. Although I suppose something might happen to change my present perspective but I would think in terms of staying here another three years and then retiring."

Nelson is involved in community development through Action on Legal Aid, Parkdale Tenants' Association and the office administration. Nelson plays an important role in Parkdale's internal administration, and within the Board of Directors, and in the newly formed staff union. He has provided substantial leadership within the office in the last several years. An issue which must be considered is whether Nelson should be freed of some of his office management responsibilities so that his impressive talents can be expended on community development projects within Parkdale.

4. Jane E. Parkinson - Jane was originally hired on March 1st, 1975 as a lay advocate trainee in the six month training programme funded through L.I.P. At the conclusion of the training program she was hired as a permanent staff member on August 18th, 1975. Jane is the only community legal worker who has completed a formal training program either within Parkdale or from a community college. Despite this heavy investment in training, Jane was having the most difficulty in defining her role within the office during the period of our review. Jane has suffered from lack of direction and supervision. She was assigned to the Family Law Group for nearly two years to do both case work and community education. She clearly needed leadership and encouragement in both areas. However it is only recently that such assistance has been forthcoming from staff lawyers or senior community legal workers. Jane has perceived herself as a second-class member of the Family group with a minimal claim on the time of her designated supervisor, the Family group staff lawyer. We are concerned that the

18. See earlier detailed analysis of this program.
office allowed this situation to continue for an inordinate period of time. If Jane was unable to relate to the staff lawyer in the Family group then it was her supervisor's responsibility to see that she obtained the requisite assistance and leadership. As we indicated earlier, community legal workers must learn and develop their skills on the job. Such a learning process is most successful focused in close supervisory relationship in which the community legal worker has the trust and respect of her staff lawyer. If no such relationship exists, and the community legal worker perceives that her supervision is not a priority to her supervisor, her development is thwarted. When P.C.L.S. decided not to have a staff lawyer responsible solely for the training of community legal workers and community education, it was understood that each staff lawyer would assume responsibility for part of these tasks as set out in Bob Roth's job description. We feel that the staff lawyers have fallen back into pre-Bob Roth behaviour, leaving community education and community legal worker training as an end-of-the-day priority. Unfortunately when the day is as long and pressure-filled as a Parkdale day, the end of the day often never arrives.

Jane's difficult sojourn in the office requires us to assess the training, supervision and role definition of community legal workers at Parkdale. It is only in the months of May and June 1977, at the instigation of Hugh, Jane and Zoya, that these issues have been addressed and an attempt has been made to determine whether Jane should be doing case work; whether she should be doing community organizing; and if so, in what areas.

As Jane is involved in both case work and community development we would suggest that she be jointly supervised by the coordinator of community legal workers and her staff lawyer. By supervision we refer to on-the-job training which requires a thorough discussion of all Jane's cases and projects at least twice a month when several hours are allocated to quiet, reflective discussion. Ideally, such supervision should be given to all community legal workers, but we particularly emphasize
it for Jane (and Marie) as less-experienced community legal workers. If their staff lawyer does not have the time or the inclination for such supervision then either the Director or the Associate Director must assume this task. We reiterate, from previous office discussions of paralegal personnel, that new community legal workers should not be hired until their role(s) within the office are clarified and their supervisor understands and is prepared to assume his crucial responsibility to a new community legal worker.

5. **Stan Pizans** - Stan is one of the original community legal workers and presently the employee with the longest association with Parkdale. Stan's salary has risen from $80 per week under L.I.P. to $15,960 per year. His previous work experience and ability to speak six languages have assisted him in developing his present expertise and reputation. He is well-known and respected in the community, and has created a caseload of nearly 100 cases with five to ten new inquiries per day. Stan only opened one file from each of his ten initial interviews; he is presently handling about forty active files. His caseload breaks down into 40% U.I.; 50% Workmen's Compensation and 10% Welfare - all of which are from the Parkdale area. Stan has been largely self-taught in the particular areas of law in which he works. He has never sought or needed close supervision of his cases. He has used staff lawyers (particularly the present and previous Director) when he perceived that he needed their assistance. Stan has, in fact, become an important resource person within the office. At the beginning of each semester he spends approximately 25% of his time supervising and assisting students. This drops off to approximately an hour a day during the remainder of the term. Similarly, other staff lawyers and community legal workers come to Stan when they have problems with difficult cases in his areas of expertise. Stan Pizans has been and is the presence of the community within the office and he continues to press for a closer relationship between the office and its community.

6. **Zoya Stevenson** - Zoya was originally hired on April 15, 1975 under the L.I.P. grant for lay advocacy training to assist Lina Chartrand. She was hired on permanent staff on August 14, 1975 at $8,900 per year.
and is presently receiving $10,896. Zoya has two years of Arts and Sciences at the University of Toronto where she specialized in Women's Studies and History. Zoya's previous work experience as a reporter and organizer has assisted her adaptation to various roles at Parkdale. She has gradually assumed greater responsibility for the office community education program; currently she is chairman of the Community Education Management Group, which requires her to initiate and coordinate staff and student community education projects.

Zoya has grown in her self-confidence and recognizes that community legal education is a slow and often frustrating process. She has been encouraged by the new community education format introduced in January 1977 pursuant to which each community legal worker supervises several law students in a community education project. The higher commitment to community education within Parkdale flows from the support Zoya has received from the community legal worker's group and the Director. 35% of Zoya's time is spent on developing funding applications, providing backup for community education projects and sitting on various office committees; 65% of her time is spent directly on community education and community development.

Zoya has made a significant contribution to the office. With more supervision from senior staff and a more specific definition of her role, her effectiveness might well be increased. She should be relieved of her various secretarial responsibilities.
An Overview:

Parkdale has come a long way in its development of effective staff role for community legal workers. We have wavered between having minimal staff lawyer input into the training and supervision of community legal workers and having a full-time staff lawyer directing community education and the training of community legal workers. The pendulum has again swung to the position of limited staff/lawyer involvement in the supervision of our community legal workers. Our review of the work of the community legal workers at Parkdale was exciting and in some ways frustrating. We were delighted to find that a certain stability had developed amongst the existing community legal workers and that five of the six community legal workers had been with the office for at least two years. This continuity in itself is a very important step forward from the situation several years ago when Stan Pizans was the only constant factor in the community legal worker spectrum (with Nelson Clarke adding knowledge and experience in community organizing). Despite the encouragement that we draw from this stability in staff, we must reiterate the issue raised in previous Parkdale reports on the para-professional -- the need for greater role definition and supervision of community legal workers. We are not convinced that the mere formal assignment of a community legal worker to a specific group in the office is an imperative, but we recommend that the job descriptions of the community legal workers be re-examined to provide for the fuller utilization of their legal and community education skills. We suggest that an ongoing monitoring and evaluation program of the community legal workers be instituted by the office, and that a coordinator of community legal workers be appointed by the Board of Directors.

The coordinator of community legal workers should be a community legal worker whose role would be to ensure that community legal workers are being effectively trained and supervised and that they are fulfilling their responsibilities within the office and the community. The coordinator of community legal workers should be responsible to the Director of the office to ensure total commitment to continued growth of the community legal workers program. Parkdale remains at the frontier of developments in Canada in the use of paralegals in a poverty setting. The office must direct its attention to the possibility of community legal workers assuming a
greater responsibility for caseload, particularly if students are going to either be required to carry lighter caseloads or, potentially, be placed in other clinical settings.

We recommend that, in order to integrate the community legal workers into the mainstream of the office and to ensure that the staff lawyers work closely with their community legal workers, the Director be made responsible for the training and work allocation of the community legal workers. The continuing development of community legal workers at Parkdale is of such significance that it requires the personal involvement of the Director. The Director is in a unique position to provide leadership and to ensure that staff lawyers and law students are using the resources of the community legal workers.

We reiterate our previously articulated concern with respect to training of community legal workers. Staff development is an essential ingredient in the continuing development of an effective community legal program. Community legal workers must continue their education and their knowledge must be transmitted to the community. Not only should the community legal workers continue to develop their legal knowledge but, where possible, their community development skills should be sharpened. We recommend that both the senior community legal worker and the Director be responsible for staff development.

In the recent submission of Community Legal Workers to the Professional Organizations Committee of Ontario, it is stated that community legal workers have a "better knowledge of the relevant bureaucracy, more expertise in the relevant legislation and skills which are more suitable to informal administrative hearings." We concur with the general thrust of these remarks, but they reinforce our hope that the office will set a higher commitment to developing the legal knowledge and negotiating skills of its community legal workers. If we are to hold out the community legal workers as sophisticated individuals who are as competent, and in some instances more competent, than lawyers to handle a broad range of poverty problems, we must be able to legitimate these claims. Parkdale has nurtured the concept of the specialist; but perhaps the community legal worker should be developing expertise in areas beyond landlord and tenant
and welfare law - areas such as employment standards, representation in small claims court and consumer law problems. We must aspire to provide the community with the same quality of representation by community legal workers as by law students and staff lawyers.

We are also concerned with the amount of time the community legal workers expend on committees and inter-office politics. We question whether our budget is being used effectively and whether Parkdale's services can be improved through a streamlining of administration. Too often the rhetoric of community service has clouded discussions of ways to improve case service. The evolution of the community legal workers' skills has been stultified at the lowest level, and the assumption of more sophisticated legal tasks - perhaps ultimately the representation of clients in chambers or open court - has not been encouraged. We recommend that the community legal workers handling casework upgrade their legal expertise on a continuing basis and specifically that they be encouraged to accumulate a sophisticated knowledge of poverty law.

During the summer of 1977, the Family Group met on a number of occasions to discuss the role of their community legal worker. The role definition for this community legal worker has posed a problem for the office for a long time and we would hope that the initiative demonstrated by Jane, Zoya and Hugh will soon come to fruition. The legitimate role for a community legal worker in this area must be clarified; if it cannot be, her time and energy should be allocated to an area of greater effectiveness.

There was a growing consensus that the organization of community legal workers into specialization groups should be examined and a more flexible structure be considered. Flexibility and accountability, coupled with ongoing monitoring and evaluation of their work by a senior community legal worker and staff lawyer, are essential. The development of the role and the prestige of community legal workers at Parkdale is important to the continued success of community legal services in this jurisdiction and throughout Canada. The authors were divided as to the emphasis that should be placed on caseloads. Zemans feels that if Parkdale is to ever consider terminating the Osgoode educational component, community legal workers must
be capable of handling a higher percentage of the caseload. McGovern does not accept the need for community legal workers to take on a greater proportion of the caseload. McGovern did concur in the opinion that community legal workers are expending too much time on internal meetings and not enough time on the caseload and community education.

There is a need for the Board to recognize that community legal workers are required to assume considerable responsibility. They should be provided with support structures comparable to those of other professionals. Their time will then be used more effectively and creatively. We would emphasize the need for improved support services so that community legal workers will be better able to fulfill the demands and expectations placed upon them.

Conclusion:

Community legal workers are now a significant component of the operation of P.C.L.S. They are making an important contribution to both the development of the office and to the community legal worker movement in Ontario. We express concern that the community legal workers are not used effectively as they might be and that a gap has developed between the professional staff and the community legal workers. It is necessary to re-examine and re-establish joint responsibility for greater coordination of the community legal work. We therefore make four recommendations:

(1) That the new Director of P.C.L.S. should appoint a "Senior or Coordinating" community legal worker to be responsible for community legal workers' training and development.

(2) That the new director should be responsible to the Board of Directors for community legal worker programs and specifically for their training and development.

(3) That a three day retreat for all full-time office staff should take place as soon as possible at which time the community legal workers' roles, training, and development would be discussed in the context of setting future priorities for the office.
(4) That an ongoing staff development program be instituted for the community legal workers as well as for the professional staff, and that the office should collectively participate in this staff development program.