



**Court Navigator Pilot Project:
Year 1 Program Evaluation**

August 14, 2018



**UNIVERSITY OF
BALTIMORE**

College of Public Affairs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team offers deep thanks to the following individuals without whom this effort would not have been possible:

- The remarkable University of Baltimore students who participated in the Court Navigator pilot project, for providing important services in our community;
- Mr. Daniel Brover and Ms. Bria Lee, University of Baltimore students and Court Navigators, for volunteering to conduct data collection and analysis to support this evaluation;
- Dr. Rebecca Sandefur, American Bar Foundation Faculty Fellow and Associate Professor at the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, and Dr. Thomas Clarke, Vice President of Research & Technology with the National Center for State Courts, for your willingness to discuss evaluation approaches for Court Navigator programs;
- Mr. Emanwel Turnbull, Attorney with the Holland Law Firm P.C. and adjunct professor with the University of Baltimore, for supporting of the Court Navigator pilot project; and
- Dr. Michele Cotton, Associate Professor in the Division of Legal, Ethical and Historical studies at the University of Baltimore, for being the driving force behind the implementation of the Court Navigator pilot project in Baltimore City.

ABOUT THE EVALUATION TEAM

Stephanie Dolamore, DPA, MNPM

Dr. Stephanie Dolamore is a Research Analyst with the Schaefer Center for Public Policy, the applied research and public service division of the University of Baltimore's College of Public Affairs. Stephanie's research skills span both quantitative and qualitative domains. She has conducted program evaluations, case studies, as well as strategic planning and organizational culture analyses involving focus groups, interviews, archival analysis, surveys, and large-scale statistical analyses on national data sets. Stephanie's work has been published in academic, peer-reviewed journals and she has presented at national and international conferences. At the Schaefer Center, Stephanie is involved with primary data collection through surveys, interviews, and focus groups. She conducts project management duties, data analysis, and report writing for the Schaefer Center's clients. Before coming to the Schaefer Center, Stephanie worked with faculty across the College of Public Affairs on research of the nonprofit sector in Baltimore City. Her previous work experience includes conducting program evaluation at the University of Maryland, College Park as well as several nonprofit organizations in South Florida. Stephanie teaches American Government at the University of Baltimore's School of Public and International Affairs. She holds a Doctor of Public Administration and Master of Nonprofit Management.

Mariglynn Edlins, PhD, MPA

Dr. Mariglynn Edlins is an Assistant Professor in the School of Health and Human Services, part of the College of Public Affairs at the University of Baltimore. Mariglynn has a remarkable track record of innovative research on interactions between individuals and public servants. Recent projects include documenting the immigration pathway for unaccompanied children and an exploration of email communication by Baltimore City residents and public servants in the days following the unrest in 2015. She has conducted policy evaluations and case studies involving focus groups, interviews, archival analysis, and surveys. Mariglynn's work has been published in academic, peer-reviewed journals and she has presented at national and international conferences. Mariglynn teaches courses for undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Baltimore. She also has a professional background working in social services serving vulnerable populations. Mariglynn holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Administration and Public Policy and a Master of Public Administration.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Evaluation Overview	2
Findings	2
Findings from Surveys: Goals of the Project	2
Findings from Court Records: Roles of the Navigators	9
Findings from Discussions: Context of the Project	11
Conclusions	12
References	14
Appendix 1: Survey Instrument for Student Navigators.....	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Student Characteristics of Court Navigator Participants (n=36).....	3
Table 2: Providing Tenants with Helpful Information (n=36)	5
Table 3: Providing Tenants with Sufficient Support (n=36).....	5
Table 4: Assisting the Court in Helping to Handle Cases More Efficiently (n=36)	5
Table 5: Assisting the Court in Helping to Handle Cases More Justly (n=36)	5
Table 6: Providing Tenants with Meaningful Assistance (n=36).....	8
Table 7: Identifying Tenants' Feelings (n=36).....	8
Table 8: Connecting with the Feelings of Tenants (n=36)	8
Table 9: Taking Action Based Upon Tenants' Feelings (n=35).....	8
Table 10: Services Provided by Court Navigators	9
Table 11: Case Outcomes in Pilot Project.....	10

Court Navigator Pilot Project: Year 1 Program Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research has established that 6,000-7,000 households in Baltimore City are evicted annually for not paying rent as a result of proceedings in “Rent Court” (Pasciuti & Cotton, 2015, p. iv). This same research has documented that the tenants who engage in this legal system operate with “undeniable knowledge deficits” and face “systemic obstacles that minimize their voices and participation” (Pasciuti & Cotton, 2015, p. iv). As a result, tenants face insurmountable legal odds against landlords, even when pursuing legitimate litigation over considerable code violations such as roof leaks, no heating, or rodent infestations (Donovan & Marbella, 2017).

One solution to combating the inequality faced by tenants in Rent Court is to provide access to timely legal support in the form of non-lawyer assistance. Modelled after a program in New York City, the University of Baltimore began a Court Navigator pilot project in August 2017. Court Navigators are undergraduate and graduate students who receive training on how the court works and help “navigate” unrepresented individuals through the court processes. In particular, the Court Navigator pilot project focused on “helping tenants who are suing landlords for failure to repair unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions such as lack of heat or hot water, leaks and mold, and vermin infestation” (Cotton, 2017, p. 1). Notable accomplishments from the first year have been detailed in local press, such as articles appearing in the Baltimore Sun (Donovan, 2018) and the University of Baltimore Magazine (Novash, 2017).

During the first year of the project, pro-bono evaluation services were obtained from two researchers at the University of Baltimore. Following work done on a program evaluation of a similar program in New York City (Sandefur & Clarke, 2015), the evaluation plan for the initial program year was to document the goals, roles, and contexts in which the Court Navigator pilot project operates. Using a three-part methodology, the evaluation collected data through formal surveys as well as informal discussion groups and reviews of court records. The Year 1 Program Evaluation found:

- **Goals of the project:** The Court Navigators reported feeling prepared across the technical and intrapersonal goals of the program. Many also felt these goals were important for Court Navigators to have in general. However, some of the program goals warrant additional investigation as the project moves into the next stages.
- **Roles of the Navigators:** In looking at the court records, the types of assistance provided, and outcomes of the cases, findings suggest the role of Court Navigators is to provide assistance while remaining flexible given the variety of outcomes possible. Future training of the project should emphasize these areas.
- **Context of the project:** During the first year, the challenges surrounding the pilot project included building rapport with courthouse staff, managing cases over time, emotional labor to support tenants, and having the right technical knowledge. Future stages of the project will have to strategically tackle these areas to build sustainability.

EVALUATION OVERVIEW

The evaluation for Year 1 of the Court Navigators pilot project focused on documenting the goals, roles, and contexts in which the project operates. These three objectives were developed by consulting the program evaluation of a similar program in New York City. These objectives are defined as (adapted from Sandefur & Clarke, 2015, p. 6):

1. Goals: Identify specific goals of the innovation;
2. Roles: Describe the role as designed; and
3. Context: Map the contexts of service delivery and production

Using pro-bono evaluation services of two researchers, the evaluation made use of three different forms of data collection.¹ The first was a formal survey conducted using an online platform to solicit information from Court Navigators on their perspectives of the different goals of the project. The second was an informal review of court records for a convenience sample of case in the pilot project to understand the roles of Court Navigators. And the third were reviews of notes taken from informal discussion groups, conducted as part of the University of Baltimore course, in which content was analyzed to identify the contexts in which the project operates.

FINDINGS

The following section presented the findings from the three data collection methodologies utilized for this evaluation. The findings from the surveys of Court Navigators will be used to explore the goals of the project, or the first objective of the Year 1 evaluation. The findings from the court records will be reviewed to present the roles of the Court Navigators, or the second objective of the Year 1 evaluation. Lastly, the findings from the discussion groups will be presented to articulate the context in which the project operates, or the third objective of the evaluation.

FINDINGS FROM SURVEYS: GOALS OF THE PROJECT

Surveys were completed by student participants in the Court Navigator's pilot project. There were two rounds of surveys, with the first distribution being conducted in the Fall 2017 semester and the second in the Spring 2018 semester. Survey invitations were sent via email in the last four weeks of the semester and students completed the survey online using a non-identifying link through Qualtrics. In total, 52 students were invited to participate in the survey and 69% (n=36) of students participated in the survey.

¹ Generally speaking, program evaluations activities are exempt from review by Institutional Review Boards as they do not constitute rigorous research activities. However, given the nature of the survey, the protocol was submitted and ruled exempt to the University of Baltimore's Institutional Review Board.

Student Characteristics of Court Navigator Participants

The first question on the survey sought to understand non-identifying information about the type of students participating in the Court Navigator pilot project. See Table 1. The majority of the students who responded had been at the University for “1-2 years” (36%, n=13) or “2-3 years” (33%, n=12). Given an environment of limited resources, this survey question provides insight into who might be best for targeted participation in the Court Navigator’s pilot project moving forward.

Table 1: Student Characteristics of Court Navigator Participants (n=36)

How many years at UB?	Number of Responses
Less than 1 year	7
1-2 years	13
2-3 years	12
3-4 years	4
Total	36

Court Navigator Perceptions of the Importance and Preparation of Technical Goals

The remaining questions on the survey asked students about their perceptions across several technical and intrapersonal goals. For each area, students were asked to report on the perceived importance of this goal for Court Navigators, as well as the perceived preparation they had for achieving this goal as a Court Navigator. This section will discuss the technical goals and the following section will discuss the intrapersonal goals.²

The survey asked students about the importance and preparation of four different technical goals:

- (1) Providing tenants with helpful information;
- (2) Providing tenants with sufficient support;
- (3) Assisting the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently; and
- (4) Assisting the court in helping to handle cases more justly

The results for these survey questions are presented in Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5. Looking across these tables, there are several patterns that emerge. First, an overwhelming majority of students report each of the technical goals as being a “very important” trait for Court Navigators. Responses for “very important” range from 69% (n=25) to 100% (n=36). While there are differences in the distribution of responses for those technical goal areas related to tenants (Table 2 and Table 3) versus the courts (Table 4 and Table 5), students overwhelmingly reported each of these goal areas to be important.

² While the findings are being presented a discrete sections of technical and intrapersonal goals, the survey did not make this distinction. Please see *Appendix 1: Survey Instrument for Student Navigators* for more information.

The second pattern that emerges is that a majority of students also report being “very prepared” or “prepared” for each of the four technical goals. While this pattern is also strong, it is a more variable distribution regarding the preparation levels of students compared to the perceived importance levels (discussed above). For instance, student responses for “very prepared” range from 14% (n=5) to 42% (n=15) and for “prepared” from 47% (n=17) to 69% (n=25). For these responses, there again are differences in the distribution of responses for those technical goal areas related to tenants (Table 2 and Table 3) versus the courts (Table 4 and Table 5).

The technical goal areas that warrant additional consideration during future iterations of this project are those with a distribution where the importance responses do not line up with the preparation responses. For instance, 94% (n=34) of students reported “being able to assist the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently” as “very important” (69%, n=25) or “important” (25%, n=9). However, 25% (n=9) of students also reported being “somewhat prepared” to assist the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently. This technical goal area suggests that that more work may be needed to clarify for student participants how their role supports courts in being more efficient.

the rest of this page is intentionally blank

Survey Responses on the Importance versus Preparation of Technical Goals

Table 2: Providing Tenants with Helpful Information (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	42%	47%	11%		100%
Important					
Minimally important					
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	42%	47%	11%		100%

Table 3: Providing Tenants with Sufficient Support (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	36%	44%	6%		86%
Important	3%	6%	6%		14%
Minimally important					
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	39%	50%	11%		100%

Table 4: Assisting the Court in Helping to Handle Cases More Efficiently (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	14%	42%	14%		69%
Important		17%	6%	3%	25%
Minimally important			6%		6%
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	14%	58%	25%	3%	100%

Table 5: Assisting the Court in Helping to Handle Cases More Justly (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	14%	47%	6%	3%	69%
Important		19%	3%		22%
Minimally important		3%		6%	8%
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	14%	69%	8%	8%	100%

Court Navigator Perceptions of the Importance and Preparation of Intrapersonal Goals

The survey also asked students about their perceptions of across several intrapersonal goals. As with the technical goals, for each intrapersonal area, students were asked to report on the perceived importance of this goal for Court Navigators, as well as the perceived preparation they had for achieving this goal as a Court Navigator. The survey asked students about the importance and preparation of four different intrapersonal goals:

- (1) Providing tenants with meaningful assistance;
- (2) Identifying tenants' feelings;
- (3) Connecting with the feelings of tenants; and
- (4) Taking action based upon tenants' feelings

The results for these survey questions are presented in Table 6, Table 7, Table 8, and Table 9. Looking across these tables, two patterns emerge. The first is that “providing tenants with meaningful assistance” presents with a different response pattern than the three other intrapersonal goal areas (see Table 6). All the students who participated in this survey reported this goal area as being important (1005, n=36) **and** a large majority (86%, n=31) felt “very prepared” or “prepared” for this goal area.

The second pattern is that the remaining three intrapersonal goal areas present with a more variable importance/preparation response pattern (see Table 7, Table 8, and Table 9). Overall, the majority of students (75% to 95%, n=27-34) report high importance for “identifying tenants' feelings”, “connecting with the feelings of tenants”, and “taking action based upon tenants' feelings”. Within these three areas, responses patterns varied between “very important” and “important”, an indication of the value of these intrapersonal goal areas to the students. For “identifying tenants' feelings” and “connecting with the feelings of tenants” more students reported these as “very important” than “important” for Court Navigators (see Table 7 and Table 8). However, for “taking action based upon tenants' feelings”, more students reported this as “important” than “very important” (see Table 9).

A similar response pattern emerges around preparation for these three intrapersonal goal areas. As a whole, the majority of students (69% to 80%, n=24-29) report high preparation for “identifying tenants' feelings”, “connecting with the feelings of tenants” and “taking action based upon tenants' feelings” as Court Navigators. Within these three areas, responses patterns varied between “very prepared” and “prepared”, a reflection of what was learned in Court Navigator training and from life experience of the students. For “identifying tenants' feelings” and “connecting with the feelings of tenants” more students reported being “very prepared” than “prepared” (see Table 7 and Table 8). However, for “taking action based upon tenants' feelings”, more students responded as “prepared” than “very prepared” (see Table 9). Interestingly, the number of students who reported being “very prepared” (25%, n=9) for “taking action based upon tenants' feelings” is the same as the number of students who reported being “somewhat prepared” (25%, n=9).

The intrapersonal goal areas that warrant additional consideration during future iterations of the Court Navigator pilot project are the three areas that reflect handling tenant feelings. While the training for many legal advocacy programs emphasizes the technical skills needed for volunteers, these programs should not neglect to discuss and provide resources on how to best interact with other individuals. Given both the historical inequalities that exist in legal systems (Rothstein, 2017), plus declining levels of empathy in college age individuals in the United States (Konrath, O'Brien, & Hsing, 2011), intentionally including these skills in the University of Baltimore Court Navigator's pilot project is imperative. The inclusion of how to identify, connect with, and respond to the feelings of others improves the interactions between Court Navigators and tenants seeking help, and as a consequence, translates into success for the project more broadly.

There is qualitative evidence from open ended survey responses from students that supports the need for these goal areas to be part of the Court Navigator training. For instance, several students discuss how their experience revealed that tenants were "stressed", "confused", "being treated unfairly", and "needed help". These statements suggest that interacting with a tenant requires first an acknowledgement of what is occurring on a personal level followed by an acknowledgement of what is occurring on a legal level. As one participant notes regarding what they learned by participating in the pilot project:

Personally, I learned how to better approach, assist and communicate with various types of people in different situations. I also learned how to adapt to the needs of my clients and that no two cases are alike.

In considering the goals of the project moving forward, an emphasis should rightly remain on providing the technical skills to be successful while also cultivating an understanding of how to work with people in difficult circumstances.

the rest of this page is intentionally blank

Survey Responses on the Importance versus Preparation of Intrapersonal Goals

Table 6: Providing Tenants with Meaningful Assistance (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	42%	44%	11%	3%	100%
Important					
Minimally important					
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	42%	44%	11%	3%	100%

Table 7: Identifying Tenants' Feelings (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	31%	11%	11%	3%	56%
Important	25%	8%	3%	3%	39%
Minimally important	3%	3%			6%
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	58%	22%	14%	6%	100%

Table 8: Connecting with the Feelings of Tenants (n=36)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	25%	19%	3%	3%	50%
Important	28%	14%	3%		44%
Minimally important	3%			3%	6%
Not at all important					
Total Preparation	56%	33%	6%	6%	100%

Table 9: Taking Action Based Upon Tenants' Feelings (n=35)

Importance for Navigators	Preparation of Navigators				Total Importance
	Very prepared	Prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not at all prepared	
Very important	11%	8%	3%		22%
Important	14%	25%	11%		53%
Minimally important		11%	3%	3%	17%
Not at all important			8%		8%
Total Preparation	25%	44%	25%	3%	100%

FINDINGS FROM COURT RECORDS: ROLES OF THE NAVIGATORS

As part of this evaluation, data were also collected from a convenience sample of court records related to tenants who had been served by Court Navigators during the pilot year. These records were compiled along with project notes about the services provided to the tenants. These data provide detail on the outcome of the case as well as the services provided by the pilot project. In total, 136 case records were collected by student volunteers and reviewed by the research team. Of these, 84 cases included a disclosure signed by tenants and are reported here.

A summary of the assistance provided by Court Navigators using written materials for the sampled cases is provided in Table 10. Important to note, this table does not include answering questions or helping tenants prepare for hearing. The notes recorded suggest that there are six possible types of assistance with written materials that a tenant can receive, such as reviewing the inspection report, the rent escrow form, or the tip sheet (a resource document created as part of the project). Of the cases sampled, 39% (n=33) received help with the rent escrow form and another 29% (n=24) received help with the tip sheet and the rent escrow form. In addition to receiving assistance, some case did not receive any assistance involving written materials that was documented. This occurred for 24% (n=20) of the cases. Overall, the finding suggests that Court Navigators most often support tenants in completing rent escrow petition forms.

Table 10: Services Provided by Court Navigators

Assistance Provided by Court Navigators	Count of Cases	Percentage of Cases
Advised tenant to seek help from public justice	1	1%
Inspection checklist	1	1%
Multiple: Rent escrow and inspection checklist	2	2%
Multiple: Tip sheet and rent escrow form	24	29%
None	20	24%
Rent escrow form	33	39%
Tip sheet	3	4%
Total	84	100%

In addition to the types of assistance provided by Court Navigators, the cases reviewed included outcome[s] for each case. These are listed in Table 11 with the results sorted in alphabetical order by the type of case outcome. As this table demonstrates, there is a wide variety of case outcomes within the sample. While some of this is attributable to how case information is filed it also demonstrates that the role of the Court Navigator is to be adaptable to a variety of situations and outcomes. In this sense, the training documents for the Court Navigator pilot project accurately notes that, *“Your main task most of the time is to listen and to respond to the tenant with information, assistance, and support.”*

Table 11: Case Outcomes in Pilot Project

Case Outcome (alphabetical order)	Count of Cases
Action for escrow dismissed	5
Case dismissed- Certified mail returned, unclaimed, and unable to forward	1
Case dismissed- Multiple postponements	3
Case dismissed- Ren court case dismissed with prejudice	1
Case on going	1
Complaint dismissed by court	2
Condemned- Tenant moving out tomorrow. Landlord acted timely.	1
Court denied postponement request- no documentation	1
Dismissal entered	1
Escrow disbursement to tenant \$600	1
Escrow dismissed	2
Escrow dismissed- Agreement of parties and appeal waived	1
Escrow dismissed- Escrow vacated; Amount due not paid	1
Escrow dismissed- Failure to fund account as ordered	5
Escrow dismissed- Landlord failed to appear	2
Escrow dismissed- Lease terminated as of 10/20/17,\$1,000	1
Escrow dismissed- No violations found	1
Escrow dismissed- Paid into escrow	2
Escrow dismissed- Parties failed to appear	4
Escrow dismissed- Put Rent Court case back into Rent Court	1
Escrow dismissed- Tenant failed to appear	5
Escrow dismissed- Tenant have moved from property	1
Escrow dismissed- two months are abated	1
Escrow dismissed- Vacated amount due was not paid	1
Escrow established- Amount due to account \$2800	1
Escrow terminated- Disbursed to Landlord; Repairs done	2
Escrow terminated- Disbursement \$400.00 to tenant	1
Escrow terminated- Disbursement of \$850 to Landlord	1
Fund escrow- Money from program paying has not come	1
JIFL by default \$1,375.00	1
Landlord and tenant present- 11 violations, 1 L/H/S	1
Landlord and tenant present- permit issued granted	1
Landlord claims property was not condemned	1
No landlord tenant relationship with inspector property	1
None	1
Not applicable	19
Not registered, Lease terminated appeal bond \$2900.00	1
Notice of dismissal	4
Notice of outcome of motion filed	1
Plan amending notice of voluntary dismissal	1
Rent due & unpaid \$2,835.00	1
Grand Total	84

FINDINGS FROM DISCUSSIONS: CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

This evaluation also reviewed notes taken during informal discussion sessions as part of the Court Navigators pilot project. The project operated in conjunction with a for-credit, university course and enrolled students completed several assignments for their grade. One of the assignments was to attend two discussion sessions, led by another student, to share about their experiences and provide feedback on the project. A total of eight sessions were held each semester of the project and notes for each session were reviewed by the research team. Generally speaking, the same topics were covered in all of the discussion groups (challenges, recommendations, and advice for other navigators). However, the structure of these sessions was informal and, as a result, caution should be used when generalizing the results outlined below.

Despite these limitations, the discussions provided a robust set of observations from the perspective of the navigators about the context in which the project operates. Though the discussions included commentary that is useful to review regarding programmatic details of the Court Navigator pilot project (e.g., reflections on the training materials), the analysis conducted here aimed to understand the context in which the project operates. This aligns with third objective of this evaluation: to understand the environment in which the Court Navigator pilot project functions.

Across the discussion group notes, students described the variety of challenges encountered by Court Navigators. One of the challenges that frequently appears in the discussions are those that arise from building rapport with courthouse staff (i.e., judges, bailiffs, clerks, or attorneys). Discussion groups held earlier in the semester note that getting courthouse staff to recognize and respond to the pilot project was an obstacle to finding tenants to assist. Later groups discussed how they responded to this by making regular introductions to staff or speaking in a friendly way with anyone in the vicinity. Others also mentioned dressing professionally and wearing their university identification cards, in addition to Court Navigator identification, to appear more legitimate. Comments from later discussion groups suggest these efforts were paying off. One discussion group stated:

“Overall, the program is going well. The tenants seem happy and appreciative of assistance. Navigators are starting to feel some Court Clerks are legitimizing them when they’re waved over to help a tenant.”

In addition, students mentioned the difficulty that arises in managing communication among the Court Navigators regarding services for the same client over time. In the current structure of the pilot project, Court Navigators participate for a few hours and then leave, being replaced by a new group of Court Navigators. A client who comes on Monday and Wednesday, may be helped by different Court Navigators. However, a centralized mechanism for collecting and sharing what services have been provided to the tenant has not yet been formalized in the pilot project. As a result, students remarked on the need for a management system that can be a central repository. For instance, one discussion group noted:

“There isn’t a clear procedure for how to handle an ongoing case. Some navigators come back during hours they aren’t scheduled to continue assisting a tenant; while other navigators leave notes for the next navigator.”

Beyond programmatic challenges, discussion groups also highlighted the intrapersonal obstacles encountered by Court Navigators. There was commentary on dealing with “uncomfortable situations” such as heightened emotions, mental illness, harassment, or intoxication when interacting with tenants. There was additional commentary that suggested it was easy it is to become emotionally involved in a case when working with tenants. Altogether, this suggests that the project operates in an environment that involves a significant amount of *emotional labor* on the part of Court Navigators. While rewarding, this type of work is also requires self-reflection and self-care to be sustainable (see Guy, Newman, & Mastracci, 2008). Consider, for example, how one group noted:

“All navigators feel like they are helping tenants and have had a positive response from tenants. Some feel they are providing more emotional support to tenants than actual paperwork/process assistance.”

Lastly, discussion groups noted that there were challenges related to having a sufficient grasp of the technical skills needed to help tenants. Across all the discussion groups, there were requests for more training and suggestions for expanding the training to cover more topics and in more detail. Specific requests include adding information on appeals, fee waivers, and motions. Related, many discussion groups noted a need to better understand other on-site services available in the court house to create referrals for tenants, such as free legal assistance or rental assistance from the eviction prevention office.

CONCLUSIONS

This report contains the results of an evaluation conducted for the first year of the Court Navigator pilot project. This evaluation relied on pro-bono services were obtained from two researchers at the University of Baltimore. Utilizing suggestions from a program evaluation of a similar program in New York City (Sandefur & Clarke, 2015), this evaluation plan set out to document the goals, roles, and contexts in which the Court Navigator pilot project operates. Using a three-part methodology, the evaluation collection data through formal surveys as well as informal discussion groups and reviews of court records.

In regard to the goals of the project, the Year 1 program evaluation conducted a survey of the students participating in the Court Navigators pilot project. Findings show that the participants reported feeling prepared across the four technical and four intrapersonal goals of the project. This is a strong reflection on the training students received as part of the project. Many participants also report that the technical and intrapersonal goals were important for Court Navigators to have in general. However, some of the program goals warrant additional

investigation as the project moves into the next stages. For instance, students reported the technical goal of “being able to assist the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently” as highly important but did not rate their preparation in line with other goal areas. This same incongruence in responses can be seen for intrapersonal goals that reflect responding to tenants’ feelings. Future iterations of training for Court Navigators should intentionally cover these domains.

In addition to the goals of the project, this evaluation also considered the roles of the Court Navigators during the pilot year. For this, the evaluation conducted a review of court records, the types of assistance provided, and outcomes of the cases which were supported by a Court Navigator. The findings from this review suggest the role of Court Navigators is to provide assistance while remaining flexible given the variety of outcomes possible. Indeed, the training curriculum already states that “*Your main task most of the time is to listen and to respond to the tenant with information, assistance, and support.*” Future training and planning for the project should further emphasize these areas for Court Navigators as it sets realistic expectations for students as well as stakeholders of the project.

The final area that was explored in this evaluation was the context of the project. Data were reviewed from discussion sessions held during the fall and spring semesters which contain student reflections on the project. These discussions provided rich observations from the perspective of the Court Navigators about the context in which the project operates. The findings point to several challenges surrounding the pilot project that included building rapport with court house staff, managing cases over time, emotional labor to support with tenants, and having the right technical knowledge. As the project evolves into the next stages, strategic consideration will be needed to tackle these areas to build sustainability.

In addition to the recommendations mentioned above regarding the goals, roles, and context of the project, consideration is needed to provide on-going evaluation support for the Court Navigators pilot project. Sandefur and Clarke (2015) note that the evaluation for legal assistance programs should expand from the roles, goals, and context to evaluating the appropriateness and efficacy of the program with the eventual goal of assessing program sustainability. All of these efforts are essential for the evolution of the pilot project but require the investment of resources to support such an evaluation. Given the documented success of similar programs, and national momentum to evaluate legal assistance programs, stakeholders for the Court Navigator pilot project with the University of Baltimore should lend support to evaluation efforts.

REFERENCES

- Cotton, M. (2017). *Overview of the Court Navigator Pilot Project*. Baltimore, MD: University of Baltimore.
- Donovan, D. (2018, January 4). Baltimore court expands tenant aid in housing cases - Baltimore Sun. Retrieved July 27, 2018, from <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/investigations/bs-md-rent-court-navigators-20171221-story.html>
- Donovan, D., & Marbella, J. (2017, April 26). Dismissed: Tenants lose, landlords win in Baltimore's rent court. *The Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from <http://data.baltimoresun.com/news/dismissed/>
- Guy, M. E., Newman, M. A., & Mastracci, S. H. (2008). *Emotional labor: Putting the service in public service*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(2), 180–198.
- Novash, P. (2017). UB Navigators Are Making A Difference. *University of Baltimore Magazine*, (Fall 2017). Retrieved from <http://www.ubalt.edu/ubmag/issue140/web-extras/navigator-webextra.cfm#.W2iasFUzphF>
- Pasciuti, D., & Cotton, M. (2015). *Justice diverted: How renters are processed in the Baltimore City Rent Court*. Public Justice Center. Retrieved from <http://www.abell.org/publications/justice-diverted-how-renters-are-processed-baltimore-city-rent-court>
- Rothstein, R. (2017). *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* (1 edition). New York, NY: Liveright.
- Sandefur, R., & Clarke, T. (2015). *Increasing access to justice through expanded "Roles Beyond Lawyers": Preliminary evaluation and classification frameworks*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.americanbarfoundation.org/uploads/cms/documents/rbl_evaluation_and_program_design_frameworks_4_12_15.pdf

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT NAVIGATORS

Court Navigators Survey

This survey is intended to collect responses on your perspective of the Court Navigator training and service learning program at the University of Baltimore. Your responses will be shared with an evaluation team but anonymously, without any identifying information. Please share honestly and openly.

This survey contains 10 questions and should take less than 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for your thoughtful responses.

Please indicate the number of years you have been at UB.

- Less than 1
- 1-2 years
- 2-3 years
- 3-4 years
- 4+ years

In your opinion, how important is it for Navigators to:

- provide tenants with helpful information?
- assist the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently?
- identify tenants' feelings?
- provide tenants with meaningful assistance?

Response options: Very important, Important, Minimally important, Not at all important

In your opinion, how important is it for Navigators to:

- assist the court in helping to handle cases more justly?
- connect with the feelings of tenants?
- provide tenants with sufficient support?
- take action based upon tenants' feelings?

Response options: Very important, Important, Minimally important, Not at all important

Have you completed any hours as a navigator at the court house?

- Yes
- No

Skip logic: if Yes, next set of questions. If no, end of survey.

From your experience, how prepared were you to:

- provide tenants with helpful information?
- assist the court in helping to handle cases more efficiently?
- identify tenants' feelings?
- provide tenants with meaningful assistance?

Response options: Very prepared, Prepared, Somewhat prepared, Not at all prepared

From your experience, how prepared were you to:

- assist the court in helping to handle cases more justly?
- connect with the feelings of tenants?
- provide tenants with sufficient support?
- take action based upon tenants' feelings?

Response options: Very prepared, Prepared, Somewhat prepared, Not at all prepared

End of Survey