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Executive Summary

This report describes an evaluation of the use of CitizenshipWorks (CW), a collection of web-based tools that support the screening of naturalization-eligible individuals and their application for citizenship through naturalization, by non-profit legal services agencies participating in the initial Pilot Year of the New Americans Campaign (NAC). Pro Bono Net and the Immigration Advocates Network, the principal developers of CW, commissioned this evaluation from The Resource for Great Programs to measure and assess the benefits derived by nonprofit naturalization application services providers and their clients through their use of the CitizenshipWorks tools.

The evaluation employed a range of methodologies to capture the most significant lessons learned as the Pilot Projects, using CW for group processing clinics and other service models, proceed from startup to steady-state operation, for immediate use in optimizing CW for use in other partnerships and other contexts in the near future. Data collection revolved around site visits by evaluators to CW Pilot Projects in three cities:

- Los Angeles, CA – to a project hosted by National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO/Los Angeles”).
- Redwood City, CA – to a project sponsored by the International Institute of the Bay Area (II Bay Area/Redwood City”).
- New York, NY, to two Pilot Projects – one hosted by City University of New York Citizenship Now! at its CUNY Express Immigration Center (“CUNY Express/New York”) and another sponsored by Asian Americans for Equality (“AAFE/New York”).

Data collection strategies consisted of the following:

- A self-administered Client Survey completed immediately after each client had used CW. A total of 349 questionnaires were completed as of this writing, including 88 by clients using a redesigned instrument that asked about the outcomes clients had achieved as a result of using CW.
- Direct observation of CW citizenship events by evaluators during site visits to a Pilot Project (see below for details regarding the site visits).
- Client focus group sessions conducted by evaluators immediately after clients had completed their applications using CW.
- Advocate, staff and volunteer focus group sessions conducted by evaluators immediately following CW events.
- Structured stakeholder interviews conducted by phone by evaluators with Pilot Project staff, volunteers, funders and CW development partners following site visits.
- Secondary information including cost data, descriptions of the projects prepared for other purposes, and comparative information about “traditional” events conducted by the organization was obtained by evaluators by request from the Pilot Projects.

1 For brevity, we will refer to CitizenshipWorks throughout this proposal as “CW,” to Pro Bono Net as “PBN,” the Immigration Advocates Network as “IAN” and to The Resource for Great Programs, Inc., as “The Resource.”

2 The Resource for Great Programs is a national corporation dedicated to providing strategic support to civil justice programs that seek to expand access to justice for low-income people. Details about The Resource may be obtained at www.GreatPrograms.org.
The major findings of the evaluation were as follows:

- CitizenshipWorks has demonstrated its feasibility for use in group processing and individual assistance models.
- CW has demonstrated that it can significantly increase efficiency and achieve higher success rates over traditional group processing and individual assistance, offering the potential for dramatically increasing the numbers of immigrants that legal services organizations can serve with existing resources of staff, volunteers, and funding.
- The major benefits of efficiency and high success rates that make CW valuable in group-processing and individual assistance applications should also be feasible to achieve in other applications not directly observed in this evaluation, such as:
  - Remote review models (for example, Catholic Charities of Charlotte, NC);
  - Walk-in immigration assistance centers (for example, CUNY Express model);
  - Kiosks in waiting rooms of legal services organizations;
  - CW access through computers in public libraries (for example, Los Angeles Public Library Citizenship Corner model).
- The CW portal offers an array of multilingual resources in addition to the advocate tools directly evaluated here that magnify the potential benefits of CW for clients, advocates and legal services organizations. These include:
  - Access to interactive screening and e-learning modules and links to relevant web-based citizenship resources.
  - A national directory of naturalization application service providers.
- By capturing the lessons gained from this pilot phase of CW implementation and incorporating them into further refinements in the CW software modules and training resources, legal services provider organizations and their funders can magnify the impacts of CW even more.

Impacts of CW on end users included the following:

- A strong majority – 98 percent or more – of CitizenshipWorks users say they found the software “easy” or “very easy” to use. Even for clients who describe themselves as “never” having used a computer, 78 percent describe the experience as “easy” or “very easy.”
- Strong majorities – more than 90 percent – of clients who use CW are able to achieve their goals; including completing their application for naturalization on the day of the citizenship event they attend. This is a much higher success rate than traditional events, at which legal services providers estimate approximately 50 to 60 percent of applicants walk away with their applications completed.
- Citizenship events with CW are less chaotic and stressful than traditional, paper-based events, enabling clients to finish more quickly.
- CW enables applicants to work on their citizenship applications in their native language, promoting better understanding of the citizenship process and a greater sense of empowerment.
- Positive outcomes were reported by the overwhelming majority of respondents in the Client Survey. These included understanding the naturalization process better (96 percent), receiving good information for immediate use (96 percent), feeling empowered by completing some steps oneself (91 percent) and having a good experience over-
Impacts of CW on advocates included the following:

- It is important for clients to have access to assistance while using CW if they need it. The assistance provided by Pilot Project staff and volunteers includes use of the computer (for example, answering a user’s question about how to view a previously completed screen) as well as substantive assistance regarding the naturalization process (for example, helping an applicant use her passport to find travel dates outside the U.S.). This assistance can be provided by relatively unskilled staff or volunteers, or even family members having modest computer skills who accompany an applicant to help them operate the computer.

- Because of the efficiency provided by CW, much less staff or volunteer time per client is required to assist clients with CW compared with traditional group-processing or individual assistance models.

- Assistance is especially crucial with clients having very low language literacy, who have difficulty reading the information presented on the computer screen and therefore have low ability to use the computer without assistance. For this reason, CW models that assume unassisted use of CW, such as self-operation in a library or a home computer, will not likely be successful for low-literacy users.

- Client age and experience with computers are correlated with ease of using CW; however, even seniors and inexperienced computer users can succeed with assistance from volunteers, due to the capacity of CW to serve as an expert system providing the “helpers” with the substantive citizenship information they need to effectively assist clients through the eligibility screening and N-400 application steps.

**Impacts of CW on advocates included the following:**

- CW provides a great benefit for advocates who are relatively unfamiliar with citizenship practice – for example, volunteer lawyers or law student interns who assist applicants during a citizenship event or at a walk-in assistance center. For them, CW serves as an expert system – a tool providing access to the information they need in order to efficiently and effectively assist clients through many of the steps in the application process while at the same time providing structure and guidance that guarantees a level of quality control that a traditional paper-based workshop cannot.

- CW also offers great benefits for advocates who are highly skilled in the naturalization process. Foremost is the role CW can play in allowing legal services organizations to deploy relatively unskilled volunteers to handle many of the routine steps in the naturalization process, thereby freeing up highly experienced advocates for the work that most requires their expertise.

- Another major benefit for advocates lies in CW’s enabling clients to engage in the citizenship process in their native language. With CW, applicants can do much of the work on their own, with small amounts of help from relatively unskilled volunteers, rather than requiring intensive one-on-one assistance from a highly skilled advocate serving as translator, interviewer and administrative assistant, as well as legal expert.

- Another benefit for advocates is the superior legibility of documents printed from CW, compared with paper forms completed by hand. The greater legibility enhances communication, efficiency, and – some advocates believe – the likelihood of approval of client applications.
• Advocates’ reactions are mixed regarding the level of trust they have in CW as a tool for flagging serious pitfalls a client faces in the citizenship process. In interviews and focus groups, some advocates expressed a preference for traditional, one-on-one interaction with clients using paper forms, rather than relying on the screening print-out from CW based on the information entered by the applicant in CW (though none of these observations was based on examples of deficiencies in CW screenings observed during the Pilots). Other advocates expressed a belief that CW is more thorough and consistent than one-on-one screening by volunteers and is, therefore, more reliable. An approach for comparing advocates’ level of trust in CW screening versus traditional, one-on-one processing will be outlined in a supplemental memorandum as a follow-up to this evaluation.

• The “Events” feature added in September 2012 dramatically enhances ease of use and efficiency of CW. Prior to introduction of the Events feature, clients and advocates who participated in group processing events reported they sometimes found using CW inefficient to use, due to lack of a way to save the client’s data and return later to make corrections and print out forms. The Events feature represents a breakthrough that significantly enhances the feasibility of CW as an efficiency-enhancing tool for naturalization events.

Impact of CW on legal services organizations included the following:

• CW has the potential to significantly increase the numbers of clients that a legal services provider organization can process with its existing resources of staff, volunteers, facilities and budget.

• To achieve the full potential of CW, attention must be paid to adjusting and aligning the service delivery model of legal services organizations to achieve integration of the CW technology into the overall design and flow of an organization’s events, not simply appending a CW workshop onto an event designed around traditional, paper-based processes.

• Some of those interviewed for the evaluation believe that CW will deliver its greatest benefits when it is deployed strategically and collaboratively by coalitions of legal services funders and provider organizations to serve entire regions, rather than piecemeal by individual organizations. Several organizations working together, with each contributing its unique core capacities, can create a synergy beyond the capabilities of the individual partners – for example, some organizations have the capacity to turn out large numbers of applicants, but lack other ingredients such as a large pool of volunteers or access to highly trained legal advocates. CW opens up new possibilities for combining the capacities of organizations across a region in ways that can dramatically increase the numbers of people having access to naturalization services.

• CW has already changed the roles of some providers in the interest of more fully exploiting the opportunities made possible by CW. For example, NALEO/Los Angeles is shifting away from its role as the primary host for large-scale citizenship events toward being the sparkplug for a network of partners, in which NALEO applies its core capacity of recruiting and deploying large numbers of volunteers for the benefit of a growing network of partner organizations – including some that do not have in-house legal capacity, such as libraries and community colleges – that will host CW events at their locations throughout the community.

Impact of CW on pilot communities included the following:

• In its pilot phase, CW demonstrated its basic feasibility and significant potential within the organizations that have tested it. Measurable impacts of CW on elements of the larger community, such as employers, schools and other institutions directly affected by the citizenship status of immigrants have not yet fully occurred.
• That said, there are preliminary indications of the ultimate impact of CW can have as a key element of a larger strategy for increasing the numbers of immigrants who are able to achieve citizen status. For example, CUNY Express is applying CW to enhance services at a walk-in center in the core of a densely-populated immigrant community in New York City. Its success will ultimately have a direct impact on employers, schools, and the large urban university community of which CUNY Express is an integral part.

• Among the outcomes of CW envisioned by legal services providers, funders and development partners with whom we spoke in the evaluation are the following:
  – Extension of services to hard-to-reach communities – such as culturally or linguistically isolated immigrants (using Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese or other specific-language versions of CW) and rural communities (using a remote assistance CW model).
  – Extension of service in urban areas, using strategic partnerships of legal services providers with institutions such as libraries, and community colleges.
  – Extension of service to employed immigrants, using strategic partnerships with prominent employers of immigrants such as restaurants, hotels, landscaping firms and agribusinesses.

Lessons about innovation through technology were as follows:

• The pilot phase of CW implementation has already delivered some obvious benefits – for example, the opportunity to process more applicants with existing resources – that will serve as powerful drivers of adoption in the next phase.

• Moreover, the pilot phase has produced a wealth of knowledge about best practices among the Pilot Projects which, when captured and replicated, will greatly enhance the prospects for success for advocates and organizations that deploy CW in the near future.

• The case for adopting an innovation must be based on real benefits and not be oversold. For CW, a case for adoption – likely to be well received by the vast majority of advocates, based on the feedback we received – is as a tool that enables organizations to make more effective use of volunteers, interns and other helpers lacking detailed knowledge of the naturalization process, thereby freeing up their most highly experienced advocates to focus on situations where they can do the most good, such as legal reviews and difficult citizenship cases. Another case can be made that the CW tools can directly make advocates’ work with individual clients more efficient and effective. Our interviews and focus groups indicated this argument is less compelling to some advocates who have tried CW and yet continue to prefer using their own tools developed over years of practice for providing one-on-one assistance to clients.

• The devil is in the details. Glitches in roll-out can create a bad vibe among users that hampers implementation down the road. It is critical to continue to provide up-front support for implementation, including good training for staff and volunteers in advance of the first events, and to have adequate IT support on hand to handle the inevitable hardware and software problems that will occur.
Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, we recommend the following:

1. Continuing attention to ongoing improvements in CW that increase its utility and ease of use. Opportunities identified through focus groups and interviews for the evaluation include:

   • Creating additional “Learn More” screens to better define terms of art pertaining to the naturalization process and/or provide examples to illustrate terms such as “government benefits” that have different meanings for people with experience in cultures outside the U.S.

   • If possible, adding a capability to use relevant data entered in the Eligibility Screening Module to populate the equivalent fields in the N-400 Application Module, thereby eliminating the need for users to re-enter data in the latter module.

   • Where possible, making sure data that is used as inputs to formulas within CW (such as dates) are entered with pull-down menus rather than entered into an open text field.

   • Finalizing implementation of the “Events” feature, allowing users to save data and retrieve it later to make corrections before printing out final versions of the forms.

   • Ongoing improvement of the language translation used in the Chinese version, to ensure it is as simple, accurate and clear as possible.

2. Continued development and improvements in the resources available to legal services organizations for use in training staff and volunteers in basic use of CW. This would help to address the need we observed for better training in use of CW, including hands-on experience in use of the software well in advance of staff or volunteers being required to assist clients in a citizenship event. Opportunities include:

   • Providing better visibility on the CW website for existing resources such as the user guide (available in the Advocate Resource Library, which can be found in the “About” section of the CW website);

   • Marketing new training resources that are currently in development, such as e-learning modules for use in “on demand” trainings for staff and volunteers of legal services providers.

3. Continue to explore among development partners ways of capturing and replicating the successes of the Pilot Projects, such as: expanding “train the trainer” events; funding “Super Users” of CW specifically to train and support networks of legal services providers; hosting CW workshops piggy-backed with national conferences, such as the Immigrant Integration Conference; and/or launching an Internet-based CW blog or use of social media tools (for example, Facebook) for exchange of troubleshooting tips and best-practice information.

4. Convening a discussion among major funders regarding funding strategies that can effectively foster the high degree of collaboration among legal services providers needed to achieve the greatest potential impact from investments in CW. Funders and national development partners with whom we spoke stressed the importance of collaboration in achieving these impacts, but at the same time acknowledged the difficulties of collaboration in the environment of competition and resource scarcity in which most legal services providers serving the low-income population operate. This is a challenge that deserves the fullest attention and creativity of the funder community.
5. Deploying CW in a strategic mix of group-processing events, individual assistance, walk-in centers and other models in the near future to dramatically ramp up the numbers of applicants that achieve citizenship. The successes that could be gained quickly would make a strong case for further investments in this technology to dramatically expand access to citizenship services throughout the country.

6. Continued solicitation of feedback from users, advocates, organizations and community leaders through ongoing evaluation activities. Opportunities for obtaining further insights through evaluation include the following:

- A follow-up survey of advocates, aimed at measuring their level of trust in the CW eligibility screening tool versus traditional paper-based methods in terms of efficacy for flagging issues requiring advice from a legal expert before proceeding with an application for citizenship.
- A controlled comparison of CW screening versus traditional, paper-based screening that measures the incidence of false positives and false negatives flagged by each method.
- A detailed, quantitative comparison of resources (staff, volunteers, facilities and funding) required for processing applicants applying various CW models (including group processing, individual assistance, and remote assistance) with the traditional, non-CW models that are in use.
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I. Introduction and Background

A. OVERVIEW

This report describes an evaluation of specific web-based tools available through the CitizenshipWorks (CW) website (www.citizenshipworks.org) that support the screening of naturalization-eligible individuals and their application for citizenship through naturalization.

The CW website provides access to online information, resources, and interactive self-help tools on citizenship and naturalization for low- and moderate-income immigrants and the nonprofit legal services organizations that serve them. (Please refer to the box, “Overview of CitizenshipWorks” on the next page for a more detailed description of the CW website.)

Pro Bono Net and the Immigration Advocates Network, the principal developers of CW, commissioned this evaluation from The Resource for Great Programs to measure and assess the benefits derived by nonprofit naturalization application services providers and their clients through their use of specific tools available from the CitizenshipWorks website, including the publically available citizenship eligibility screening and the password-protected “advocates” area designed to help nonprofit agencies integrate CW into their legal services delivery.3

Under the auspices of the New Americans Campaign (NAC), these tools are being piloted with project partners and legal services organizations in eight cities: Los Angeles and San Jose (CA), Houston and Dallas (TX), Detroit, Miami, New York City, and Charlotte (NC).

---

3 Please refer to “Overview of CitizenshipWorks” for further description of the specific CW tools on which this evaluation was focused.
Overview of CitizenshipWorks

CitizenshipWorks (www.citizenshipworks.org) is a website containing a collection of web-based tools that support the screening of naturalization-eligible individuals and their application for citizenship through naturalization. Pro Bono Net (www.probono.net) and the Immigration Advocates Network (www.immigrationadvocates.org) are the principal developers of CitizenshipWorks.

The CW website provides access to online information, resources, and interactive self-help tools on citizenship and naturalization for low and moderate-income immigrants and the nonprofit legal services organizations that serve them.

In addition to providing citizenship resources directly to the public, the CW website includes a password-protected “advocates” area to help nonprofit agencies integrate the CW tools into their legal services delivery. For some programs, this may simply mean referring clients to the CW website as a resource for applying for citizenship on a self-help basis. For others, this will mean integrating these online tools and resources into their existing services delivery, including preparing clients for direct representation, group processing, or supporting pro bono attorneys and volunteer programs. The CW tools for clients and advocates are being piloted with legal services organizations in San Jose, Los Angeles, Miami, Detroit, Houston, Dallas, Charlotte, and New York.

The CW website includes two components:

1. **Public Portal (for clients):** The public portal contains five areas: 1) an avatar-based, interactive citizenship screening interview that guides users through a list of questions to determine eligibility and raise “red flags” or potential problems, consequences, and solutions in their applications, which can be used as a screening and readiness tool by applicants, advocates, and providers to make the process more efficient.

In a computer program, an “avatar” is an image or icon representing the user. The avatar in CitizenshipWorks depicts the user and an interviewer proceeding down a path through 11 sets of questions and ending at an image of a courthouse.
and effective; 2) a self-paced, interactive overview of the naturalization process: 3) a self-paced, interactive overview of the naturalization tests, including sample questions and tips on how to prepare; 4) a national directory of naturalization application service providers, and 5) “know your rights” resources and links to relevant web-based citizenship resources. The public resources are currently available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese. The public portal also integrates social media tools, such as Facebook and Twitter.

2. Advocate Portal (for organizations): The advocate portal contains two tools: 1) an intake interview for use in group processing settings, which guides users through a list of questions to determine eligibility and raise “red flags” or potential problems, consequences, and solutions in their applications that will produce a short document that advocates can use to quickly screen for eligibility; and 2) an avatar-based, interactive citizenship application interview, which guides users through a list of questions to complete the N-400 and produce a PDF version of the N-400 that applicants can submit to USCIS. Both tools are also available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese. All resources in the advocate portal require a password in order to access them.

These pilots are testing the use of the CitizenshipWorks tools in a variety of contexts, including: group processing workshops; civics/ESL (English as a Second Language) courses; mobile law clinics in rural settings; and the use of webcams and online document sharing to facilitate legal reviews by offsite attorneys.5

The evaluation sought to capture the most significant lessons learned as the Pilot Projects proceed from startup to steady-state operation, for immediate use in optimizing CW for use in other partnerships and other contexts in the near future. The findings will be applied for several crucial purposes:

1. Generating insights about how the CW model – and the metrics developed for this evaluation – can advance the goals of the larger, multi-year national effort underway to significantly increase the number of naturalized individuals in the United States;

2. Assessing “what is working” in the Pilot Projects and examining “what can be changed or added” to improve performance and maximize the benefits of CW, before roll-out to more locations and more partners; and

3. Documenting the impacts of CW on end users, advocates, organizations and communities, for use in assessing the business case for further expansion and growth in the pool of future CW partners.

5 In this proposal, we refer to all eight partnerships in the first year as “the Pilot Projects.”
B. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was designed to provide immediate insights for the CW development team and its partners to guide efforts to optimize application of the CW tools “on the fly,” i.e., as new CW features are deployed in the variety of contexts being tested by the Pilot Projects. The specific tools that were evaluated in this study consisted of the Eligibility Screening Module and the N-400 Application Module.

Evaluation site visits were scheduled to take place just a few months after CW deployment, allowing time for Pilot Project staff to develop insights regarding the benefits of CW, as well as to work out implementation issues and identify any major challenges that remain to be addressed.6

The impact of CW on three categories of stakeholders was assessed:

• Clients
• Advocates and organizations
• The Community

The evaluation was conducted in four steps:

Step One: Identify the outcomes of greatest interest to stakeholders. For example, for clients a primary outcome is successfully filing an N-400 Application for Naturalization at the end of a citizenship event. For advocates, an important outcome is spotting and resolving all issues that might delay or block a client’s success at achieving citizenship.

Step Two: Identify measures for assessing each outcome, and design robust and practical strategies for collecting the data. For example, one approach for measuring client outcomes identified in the stakeholder/outcomes matrix was to ask the following series of questions in a paper Client Survey administered at the end of each CW event:

1) Which of the following did you achieve today?

Please check a box (Yes, No, or I don’t know) for ALL of the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I understood the naturalization process better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I received good information I was able to use right away.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I achieved what I came to the workshop for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I was able to complete my application for naturalization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I felt empowered by completing some steps by myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I had a positive experience overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 An exception to the “a few months after CW deployment” scheduling was the timing of an evaluation site visit to the Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE) pilot project in New York City. In this case, an opportunity arose to observe the first event using the Asian/Pacific Islander (API) language version of CW with Chinese language applicants. Because this was the first experience with this version of CW, the AAFE site visit should be regarded as a preliminary case study, not a full evaluation.
The full array of data collection strategies that were used consisted of the following:

- **For assessing impacts on clients:**
  - A self-administered Client Survey was completed immediately after each client had used CW.
  - Citizenship events were observed by evaluators during each site visit to a Pilot Project (see below for details regarding the site visits).
  - Client focus groups were administered during site visits by evaluators immediately after a group of clients had completed their applications.
  - Evaluators conducted structured interviews with Pilot Project staff, interns and volunteers, while on site and also by telephone after site visits.

- **For assessing impacts on advocates and organizations:**
  - Structured interviews were held with staff and volunteers associated with Pilot Projects, during and shortly after site visits.
  - Focus groups were conducted with volunteers at the Los Angeles (NALEO) and Redwood City/II Bay Pilot Project sites and with volunteers and staff at the New York (CUNY Express and AAFE) Pilot Project sites.
  - Evaluators observed CW events during site visits, took notes, and collected examples of forms and materials used.
  - Secondary information was provided by Pilot Projects at the evaluators’ request, such as cost data, descriptions of the projects prepared for other purposes, and comparative information about “traditional” events conducted by the organization.

- **For assessing impacts on communities:**
  - Structured interviews were held with staff and volunteers associated with Pilot Projects.
  - Structured interviews were held with national stakeholders.
C. SITE VISITS TO THREE CITIES

The evaluators conducted site visits to three cities hosting CW Pilot Projects:

- Los Angeles, CA (NALEO)
- Redwood City, CA (II Bay Area)
- New York, NY (Two Pilot Projects – CUNY Express and AAFE)

1. Los Angeles; May 31, 2012: National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO)

The box on below provides the highlights of this site visit. On-site work included interviews with Pilot Project staff and observation of a citizenship event in which CW was used in a medium-scale “group processing” model. During the event, we conducted focus groups with clients immediately after they completed their N-400 applications using CW. Client Surveys were collected from clients who had participated in the event. On the same afternoon, we conducted a focus group with non-attorney volunteers. In the days following the site visit, we conducted structured telephone interviews with attorney volunteers.

OVERVIEW: LOS ANGELES PILOT SITE VISIT

- **Pilot Project Sponsor:** National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO), Los Angeles, California

- **Dates of the Site Visit:** May 31 (evening) through June 2, 2012

- **Resource site visitors**
  - Ken Smith
  - Kelly Thayer

- **Pilot project staff contacted**
  - Lizette Escobedo, National Director for Civic Engagement
  - Miguel Huitzil, Program Coordinator
  - Anna Raygoza, Volunteer Coordinator
  - Elisa Sequeira, CW Pilot Project Coordinator
  - Elizabeth Urena, Intern (focus group recorder)
  - Fabiola X, Intern (focus group interpreter)

- **Timeline of On-Site Activities**
  - **May 31 evening:** Attended NALEO training for volunteers
  - **June 1 daytime:**
    - 10am – 5 pm: Interviews with NALEO staff

- **June 2 daytime:**
  - 10am -3pm: Attended CW workshop for clients
  - Noon – 1 pm: Conducted focus group with CW clients
  - 3 – 4 pm: Conducted focus group with non-attorney volunteers
2. Redwood City, California; August 13-14, 2012: International Institute of the Bay Area

The box below summarizes this site visit. On-site work included interviews with Pilot Project staff and observation of a citizenship event in which CW was used in a small “group processing” model in which wireless “hot spots” were used to connect eight laptops with the Internet and with printers in the room. During the event, we conducted a focus group with clients immediately after they completed their N-400 applications using CW. Client Surveys were collected from clients who had participated in the event. In the days following the site visit, we conducted structured telephone interviews with attorney volunteers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERVIEW: REDWOOD CITY (CA) PILOT SITE VISIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pilot Project Sponsor: International Institute of the Bay Area (II Bay Area), Redwood City, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dates of the Site Visit: August 13-14, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource site visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ken Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kelly Thayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pilot project staff contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sheryl Muñoz-Bergman, Director of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maria Barraza-Calderón, Citizenship Program and Administrative Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Becky Bogyo, Immigration Caseworker/Accredited Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Juan Arias, Summer Intern and CW Workshop Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Melissa Garay, Summer Intern and CW Workshop Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline of On-Site Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- August 13 daytime:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10am – 5 pm: Interviews with II Bay Area staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- August 14 daytime:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8 am -1 pm: Attended CW workshop for clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 pm – 3 pm: Conducted interviews and focus group with CW clients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. New York City, NY

(a) Sept. 26, 2012: Asian Americans for Equality

This site visit was conducted on September 26, 2012, to the Pilot Project being operated by Asian Americans for Equality in downtown Manhattan’s Chinatown district.

During the event, we attended a CW training event for volunteers, observed and timed clients and volunteers using the CW tools, conducted a focus group with clients immediately after they used CW to complete their N-400 applications, and held a focus group with advocates. An overview of the site visit is provided in the box on page 9.

---

7 Because this was the first experience with this version of CW, the AAFE site visit should be regarded as a preliminary case study, not a full evaluation.
The AAFE site visit marked the first-ever use of CW’s new translation into simplified Chinese, which is an example of Pro Bono Net and IAN continuing to rapidly evolve the CW tools during the ongoing evaluation.

### OVERVIEW: NEW YORK CITY ASIAN AMERICANS FOR EQUALITY PILOT SITE VISIT

- **Pilot Project Sponsor:** Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE)
- **Location:** AAFE Community Development Fund, 111 Division Street, New York, NY
- **Date of the Site Visit:** Sept. 26, 2012.
- **The Resource’s Site Visitors:**
  - Ken Smith & Kelly Thayer.
- **Pilot Project Staff Contacted:**
  - Siu Kwan Chan, AAFE Managing Director of Programs, was the top official participating and making decisions throughout the workshop.
  - Peter Gee, AAFE Director of Housing & Community Services, coordinated on-site activities for the CW workshop.
  - Jannie Lai, AAFE Immigration Program Manager, ran CW and inputted answers while interviewing a client.
  - Winnie Fung, AAFE Citizenship and Immigration Counselor (BIA accredited representative), ran CW and inputted answers while interviewing a client.
  - Jin Xiu Chen, AAFE Program Associate, ran CW and inputted answers while interviewing a client and while interviewing two additional clients, a married couple who spoke Fujianese.
- **Timeline of On-Site Activities:**
  - 9 a.m.: Met staff; set up.
  - 9:30 a.m.: Attended Tony Lu’s CW training for volunteers.
  - 10 a.m.: Observed and timed clients and volunteers using CW.
  - 1 p.m.: Conducted client focus group.
  - 2 p.m.: Conducted advocate focus group.
  - 4 p.m.: Concluded.

(b) Sept. 27, 2012: CUNY Citizenship Now!

This site visit was conducted on September 27, 2012, to the Pilot Project being operated by CUNY Citizenship Now! at its CUNY Express Immigration Center (CUNY Express) in the Washington Heights section of northern Manhattan in New York City. See the text box on page 10 for an overview of the site visit.

The site visit exposed us to CUNY Citizenship Now’s evolving model for conducting a naturalization workshop at CUNY Express in which clients by appointment use the CW application tools on desktop computers situated in an open lobby, somewhat akin to self-help kiosks.
The CUNY Express site visit marked the first-ever use of CW’s new “Events” feature. That feature allows for saving and editing of N-400 applications, which CUNY Express staff found useful during the legal review process. The enhancement to CW provides an example of Pro Bono Net and IAN responding to continuous feedback gleaned during the on-going evaluation to rapidly evolve the CW tools.

OVERVIEW: NEW YORK CITY CUNY CITIZENSHIP NOW! PILOT SITE VISIT

- **Pilot Project Sponsor:** CUNY Citizenship Now!

- **Location:** CUNY Express Immigration Center, New York City.

- **Date of the Site Visit:** Sept. 27, 2012.

- **The Resource’s Site Visitors:**
  - Ken Smith & Kelly Thayer.

- **Pilot Project Staff Contacted:**
  - Andrés Lemons, Directing Attorney, provided legal review of CW eligibility interviews and N-400 applications.
  - Myriam Rodriguez, Paralegal, completed client fee waiver applications.
  - Natalia Navas, Volunteer Coordinator, organized more than a dozen volunteers who received their first CW exposure and training that day.
  - Julissa Lorenzo ran the registration desk.
  - Penelope de Castro, assisted clients generally and with CW.
  - Melissa Mannis, assisted many CW clients.

- **Timeline of On-Site Activities:**
  - 9 a.m.: Met staff; set up.
  - 9:30 a.m.: Attended Tony Lu’s CW training for volunteers.
  - 10 a.m.: Observed and timed clients and volunteers using CW.
  - 12:30 p.m.: Conducted client focus group.
  - 1:30 p.m.: Interviewed three volunteers.
  - 4 p.m.: Conducted advocate focus group.
  - 5 p.m.: Concluded.

- **Timeline of Follow-up Activities:**
  - Oct. 2: Interviewed James McGovern, Deputy Director, CUNY Citizenship Now!
  - Oct. 4: Interviewed Allan Wernick, Director, CUNY Citizenship Now!
II. Stakeholders

The following are categories of people and organizations that potentially benefit from the success of the CW program:

a) **Clients** – immigrants who use CW in their naturalization process.

b) **Advocates** – who assist immigrants

c) **Legal service provider organizations** – serving immigrants – for example:
   - Ethnic-based organizations – e.g., AAFE, APALC
   - Organizations serving agricultural workers
   - Mission-based organizations – e.g., National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) (mission is to increase the civic engagement of Latinos and other immigrants)
   - Faith-based organizations – e.g., Catholics, Evangelicals, Lutherans

d) **Funders** – Of the legal service provider organizations, and of the CW program – e.g., Carnegie Corporation, the Knight Foundation, Open Society Foundations, Silicon Valley Community Foundation and the Grove Foundation.

e) **Business groups** – for example, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, whose interests include sustaining the important role immigrants play in the economy.

f) **CitizenshipWorks development partners** – Pro Bono Net and the Immigration Advocates Network.
III. Results

Below we summarize our findings regarding the following broad areas outlined in the evaluation design:

- Impacts of CitizenshipWorks on end users;
- Impacts on advocates and legal services organizations; and
- Impacts on the community.

We also offer some insights the evaluation produced regarding the following broader strategic implications of CW raised in the evaluation design:

- How innovations in technology can be introduced and applied effectively in civil justice programs.
- How process re-engineering can be used to improve not only the CW software itself but the way in which it is applied, so as to produce better results for users and other stakeholders.
- How evaluation can be used as a strategic tool for optimizing program performance.

A. IMPACTS OF CW ON END USERS

Exhibit 1 on the next two pages summarizes our findings about the impacts of CW on end users. The following are highlights:8

1. Vast differences exist in users’ patterns of usage of, and comfort with, technology.

   - The Client Survey found that one out of four applicants at CW events had never used computers.9 The percentage of non-computer users is higher among immigrant populations served by some Pilot Projects. Pilot project staff indicated that comfort with computers is especially low among older immigrants and those having very low levels of education, which for some legal service providers comprise significant segments of the client population. This perception was consistent with the Client Survey results – see further information on page 15.

---

8 This section reports selected findings from the Client Survey. While tabulations were prepared on all variables in the survey, only those correlations that we deemed to be programmatically significant are reported here.

9 Source: Client Survey. Twenty-five percent of the 261 clients participating in 12 CW events who had responded to the “old” instrument (introduced prior to this evaluation) indicated they had “never” used computers. Nine percent of the 88 clients who, as of this writing, had responded to this question on the “new” instrument developed for this evaluation indicated they had never used computers. Note that the Client Survey covered only people who had actually used CW in a naturalization event, and therefore did not reflect that segment of the applicant population that had been screened out by pilot program staff as not having sufficient experience or comfort level with computers to use CW.
### EXHIBIT 1: IMPACTS OF CITIZENSHIPWORKS ON END USERS

#### FINDINGS

#### IMPACTS ON END USERS

**1. Users’ Patterns of usage of, and Comfort with, Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Vast differences exist in clients’ comfort with computers.</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
<th>Legal Services Organizations</th>
<th>CW Development Partners</th>
<th>Observation by The Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Some clients balk at participating when hearing they will have to use a computer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Clients who have never used computers can use CW, but need significant help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Clients sometimes bring family members who can help them use the computer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. CW enables volunteers with little naturalization expertise to help clients efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Enhancement of CW’s “Learn More” features will enable many computer-comfortable clients to use CW with little or no help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Many clients have leapfrogged over computers to newer technologies (e.g., smart phones).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Users’ Experiences With CW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Overall, the client experience with CW in events was very positive.</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
<th>Legal Services Organizations</th>
<th>CW Development Partners</th>
<th>Observation by The Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. With assistance, most clients don’t have major problems using the CW software.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The CW workshop model can be much less stressful for applicants than the traditional, large-scale workshop model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Assistance from volunteers or staff is important for success using CW, especially for low-literacy clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The “Events” feature added in September 2012 dramatically improves the client experience as well as enhancing efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Better materials for training volunteers would be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Some way of transferring data from the eligibility module to the application module would be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hardware problems have created significant difficulties for some clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Exhibit 1 continued on next page...*
### Exhibit 1: Impacts of CitizenshipWorks on End Users, Continued

#### IMPACTS ON END USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR FINDINGS, By Stakeholders Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINDINGS</strong></td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Users’ Perceptions of How CW Fits Into the Naturalization Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. CW provides a step-by-step tutorial on the requirements of citizenship.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Specific improvements in CW would help clients better navigate the naturalization process.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Users’ Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The vast majority of CW users complete the naturalization application process on the day of a CW event.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clients report they have access to information they need about the naturalization process.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Clients report they have a good experience.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Clients report feeling empowered by doing some of the work themselves.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Procedural obstacles in the application process are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Substantive pitfalls in the application process (e.g., answers that could attract negative scrutiny) are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Clients are well prepared for their interviews.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Clients can work on their applications in their native language.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Opportunities were suggested for improvements through “Learn More” features containing definitions of key terms, etc.
2. In the II Bay Area model, serious problems occurred with maintaining the Internet connection with the wireless hot-spots that were tested. We observed one case in which the client’s data were lost and her N-400 application had to be completely redone by a volunteer, extending the time the client had to spend at the workshop.
3. Some advocates that we interviewed expressed the opinion that the CW screening tool is less effective than their organization’s screening handout that clients complete by hand. The advocates said that, in their opinion, presenting all the screening questions in a compact list is less “intimidating” for clients and acts as a useful aid and prompt for advocates during the review. They believe that the likelihood of missing significant issues is less when advocates interact one-on-one with clients than when clients complete some or all of the screening questions themselves using CW.

- **Applicants without computer experience may require encouragement and support to use CW.**
  
Pilot Project staff at Redwood City/II Bay Area had difficulty finding enough willing applicants to populate the CW workstations. This would appear to limit the scope of CW’s applicability, yet the experience of another Pilot Project indicates the limitation is not large. The Los Angeles/NALEO project – which offers CW-only workshops rather than providing a choice between CW and traditional paper-based assistance – said that while some clients were surprised to find they would be using a computer in the application process, most adjusted quickly and were able to successfully navigate the CW process, with some help from volunteers.10

---

10 Staff preconceptions about clients’ capacity to use technology likely could affect success at encouraging clients to use CW. Some II Bay Area staff assumed only clients who expressed comfort with using computers should be directed to the CW workstations. At another site, specifically NALEO/Los Angeles, staff presumed that ALL clients should be encouraged to use the computer, and most did, ultimately with good results and high satisfaction.
• Nearly all users with any computer experience at all find CW easy to use, and the majority - more than 75 percent - of users who have never used a computer found it easy to use. Exhibit 2 below summarizes the Client Survey responses regarding the ease of using CW as a function of experience with computers. For even the group reporting having “never” used a computer, 78 percent found CW to be “easy” or “very easy” to use. For other groups, the percentage finding CW “easy” or “very easy” to use was 98 percent or higher.

EXHIBIT 2: IMPACT OF COMPUTER EXPERIENCE ON EASE OF USING CW

How Easy Was It to Use the Computer Today?
Percent of Responses by Frequency of Computer Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Computer Use</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Very Hard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never used a computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a computer at least once per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a computer at least once per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a computer at least once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a computer at least once per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Clients who do not consider themselves computer-savvy can successfully use CW with some assistance. Once any initial reluctance to use the computer is overcome, most applicants can complete the process using CW, with some assistance from staff and/or family members. NALEO/Los Angeles encourages applicants to bring along a computer-literate family member, such as a niece or grandson, to help operate the computer. As a result, and because CW is so easy to use, many users who lacked computer experience have been able to successfully navigate the process on their own or with a small amount of assistance from staff or volunteers. This assistance sometimes involves use of the computer (for example, answering a user’s question about how to view a previously completed screen), or substantive assistance regarding the naturalization process (for example, helping an applicant use her passport to find travel dates outside the U.S.).

• Impact of age: People under 50 were more likely to find CW easy to use. Exhibit 3 below summarizes the Client Survey responses regarding the ease of using CW as a function of users’ age. Among users under 50 years of age, 98 percent or more reported finding CW “easy” or “very easy” to use. For users ages 50 or older, 78 percent or more found CW “easy” or “very easy” to use.11

11 281 applicants answered this question on the Client Survey; 24 of whom were of ages 50 or older. Only one respondent was 80 or older; s/he found CW “very easy” to use.
EXHIBIT 3: IMPACT OF USERS’ AGE ON EASE OF USING CW

- **CW enables volunteers with little naturalization expertise to help clients efficiently and effectively.** This was one of the biggest benefits of CW that we heard in focus group sessions and interviews with staff and volunteers. Several factors contribute to this result:
  - CW is easy to use. Eighty-six percent of those responding to the Client Survey found the process to be “easy” or “very easy.” This was verified by many of the applicants who participated in our focus groups, who reported they had “no problems” navigating the program.\(^\text{12}\)
  - CW provides context-sensitive information. CW serves as an “expert system” that volunteers can refer to throughout a citizenship event, reducing the amount of training needed to bring volunteers up to a level where they can successfully help applicants.
  - CW leads the applicant step-by-step through the process. This ensures that all of the information needed for eligibility screening and populating the N-400 application will be entered.
  - CW reduces the burden of translation by presenting information and questions in the applicant’s native language. Spanish and English versions were available at the beginning of the CW program. A Chinese version of CW was launched in September 2012, and a Vietnamese version was piloted in October 2012.

- **Enhancement of CW’s “Learn more” features will enable more applicants to use CW with little or no help.** Seventy percent of CW users indicated they received help in using the program. It is likely that this percentage will drop as more context-sensitive help is added to CW, further enhancing the efficiencies achieved through the use of the CW tools. Participants in our focus groups found the context-sensitive “Learn More” feature to be helpful and powerful, and they suggested additional places where this feature could be enhanced.

\(^{12}\) Using a mouse to navigate the screens is a difficulty experienced by people who never have used a computer, making it likely that a touch screen interface could greatly expand the segment of the immigrant population that potentially could use CW.
2. Users’ experiences with CitizenshipWorks: Overall, very positive. As summarized in Exhibit 1, we found many positive aspects of the user experience, as well as some opportunities for further improvement of CW. The following are some examples:

- **With assistance, most clients don’t have major problems using the CW software.** It was clear from the Client Survey and from client focus groups completed immediately after clients had finished their applications that most clients did not find use of the computer to be a major hurdle once they had overcome some initial surprise and received assistance from volunteers when they had questions [see above]. Eighty-three percent of the Client Survey respondents indicated they had not experienced any problems using the CW system.

- **The CW workshop model can be much less stressful than the traditional, large-scale workshop model.** Staff and volunteers at the Los Angeles/NALEO Pilot Project cited several reasons for this observation:
  - **Applicants perform much of the work on their own.** In a CW event, applicants work at computers with occasional help from staff, volunteers or family members.
  - **Fewer people are involved.** In a traditional event, the ratio of staff or volunteers to applicants is approximately one-to-one, so an event with 50 applicants involves approximately 100 people – plus family members of the applicants.\(^{13}\) With CW, the ratio of staff or volunteers is closer to 10-20 staff or volunteers per 50 applicants, resulting in a total of 60-70 people, plus family members for a 50-applicant event.
  - **There is much less noise and activity at a CW event.** Rather than a din of conversation, a CW event is characterized by applicants and their helpers working quietly at computers, or speaking one-on-one with advocates at legal review or final review stations.
  - **Queues of applicants are relatively short.** At a traditional event, applicants spend much of their time in queues waiting to be helped by a staff member or volunteer. At a CW event, once applicants have finished their work with the computer they can be accommodated relatively quickly at the next station.

- **Staff or volunteer assistance is important to CW’s success.**\(^{14}\) As with any legal services delivery model, CW’s benefit to clients is enhanced through assistance from well-trained volunteers who can offer just the right amount of help needed depending on the client’s background, computer and language literacy, level of preparation, and other factors. Seventy percent of the respondents to the Client Survey indicated they had received help in using the computer during their CW event. The Los Angeles/NALEO Pilot Project provided one roving volunteer for each 4-5 users in the events we observed, a ratio that seemed to work well. Our observation, reinforced by focus groups, indicated that clients received a combination of substantive information about the naturalization process as well as technical assistance with operation of the computer.

- **Assistance is crucial with low-literacy clients.** Some level of reading comprehension is essential for applicants to navigate CW without extensive help. Low-literacy applicants can benefit from CW, but only with assistance from someone who can read the screens and communicate with them in their native language. CW can potentially be of benefit to low-literacy applicants if volunteers, interns or family members are available to assist and translate for the applicant. This has important implications for service models that assume CW would be self-administered – such as in a library or on a home computer via the Internet.

---

\(^{13}\) Applicants often bring their children, spouses or family members to help them as translators/interpreters.

\(^{14}\) Assistance is important for all service delivery, and CW does not eliminate the need for help but makes it more efficient to deliver. For example, Los Angeles/NALEO reports that it deploys one volunteer per 4-5 applicants at a CW event and one volunteer per 1-3 applicants at a traditional event. Moreover, as indicated on page 21, CW reduces the skill and knowledge required of volunteers to provide this assistance.
The “Events” feature introduced in September 2012 dramatically improves the client experience, as well as enhancing efficiency. Prior to launch of the Events feature at the New York/CUNY Express event we attended, it was not feasible for applicants to save their data and return to it at a later time (for example, after legal review) to make corrections. Pilot Projects had found this to be a serious shortcoming, because many applicants make errors or are unable to enter crucial data (for example, dates of trips outside the U.S.) in their first pass through CW. Pilot Projects had compensated by making “white-out” corrections in the PDF printouts from CW, a process they found inefficient and frustrating.

The Events feature allows applicants to enter their data quickly, leaving blank those fields for which they lack sufficient information, then to save their data and finish after they have discussed their situation with an advocate. New York/CUNY staff members who had experienced CW events prior to launch of the Events feature were ecstatic over the improvement it made.

Better materials for training volunteers would be beneficial. Many of the CW screens require interpretation from volunteers, making the outcomes for applicants dependent on the experience and substantive knowledge of the volunteers. While the “Learn More” feature reduces the amount of substantive knowledge required of volunteers, our observation was that better volunteer training would significantly enhance results. Pilot program staff indicated they would like more training materials to enhance the efficiency and consistency of volunteer training. We would endorse this request.

Some way of transferring data from the eligibility module to the application module would address a shortcoming identified by clients. In client focus groups, this issue was often raised in response to our question to clients about suggestions for improving the CW process. They thought the client experience (as well as the efficiency of the process) could be improved by passing to the N-400 application module information—such as basic client data—that had already been entered in the eligibility screening step.

Hardware problems have created significant difficulties for some clients. The difficulties experienced by the Redwood City/II Bay Area Pilot Project with the wireless hot-spot method of accessing the Internet offered an extreme case of how an innovation that seeks to make things easier can actually make the situation worse if the technology does not work as expected. Staff reported it was not uncommon for an applicant to lose her data due to a dropped Internet connection and have to start the N-400 application over from scratch.

3. Improving the naturalization experience: CW provides useful information to clients about the naturalization process.

CW provides a systematic, step-by-step tutorial on the requirements of citizenship. The “Learn More” screens offer context-sensitive details, such as definitions of citizenship terms with which applicants might not be familiar.

---

15 This was a temporary shortcoming arising from challenges in adapting LawHelp Interactive (LHI) — the core technology behind CW — in a way that protects client privacy and confidentiality under conditions in which CW is envisioned to be used, such as a largescale citizenship workshop staffed by lawyers and non-lawyer volunteers from an array of sponsoring organizations. The “Events” feature introduced in September 2012 addresses those issues.

16 Corrections are often needed at paper-based events as well. Volunteers (as well as staff) frequently make mistakes and rely on “white-out” to correct them. However, people had expected the CW software to streamline the process by allowing mistakes to be corrected before final printing. When we asked, “Do you have any suggestions for improving CW,” the most common answer was, “Make it so we don’t have to use whiteout.” With the addition of the Events feature, CW addressed that source of frustration.

17 The II Bay Area/Redwood City experience illustrates what can happen if the appropriate equipment and infrastructure is not in place. The decision to use cellular data hotspots to run a workshop proved to be risky, and at the current state of this technology, not advisable. The CW tools require a steady, consistent Internet data connection.
• **Specific improvements in CW would help clients better navigate the naturalization process.** As CW is developed further, and especially as the “Learn More” feature is expanded to additional steps, the amount of help needed by clients in navigating the process may be reduced.

• **The e-learning modules available on the CW website can further enhance this benefit of CW.** While not tested in the Pilot Projects we studied or part of this evaluation, CW’s web-based e-learning modules on naturalization eligibility and test requirements potentially could be incorporated both in the workshop setting and as pre-workshop activities for applicants to further expand their understanding of the naturalization process.

4. **Users’ outcomes: the vast majority of clients achieve their goals using CW.** As indicated in Exhibit 4 below, more than 90 percent of applicants who responded to the Client Survey indicated they achieved positive outcomes — especially their overall goal: completing their application for naturalization on the day of the citizenship event (outcome “d” below). Our interviews with Pilot Project staff at NALEO/Los Angeles indicated that success rates with the CW model are appreciably higher than with the traditional, large-scale workshop model — 75 to 90 percent with CW and 50 to 60 percent with the traditional model.

**EXHIBIT 4: OUTCOMES REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS TO THE CLIENT SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the Following Did You Achieve Today?</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I understand the naturalization process better.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I received good information I was able to use right away.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I achieved what I came to the workshop for.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I was able to complete my application for naturalization.</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I felt empowered by completing some steps by myself.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I had a positive experience overall.</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 Outcomes achieved by CW users were assessed using the “New” version of the Client Survey that was designed and implemented specifically for this evaluation. As of this writing, a total of 88 CW users from five pilot projects had responded to this version of the survey.
B. IMPACTS OF CW ON ADVOCATES

Exhibit 5 on the next page summarizes our findings about the impacts of CW on advocates. The following are highlights:

1. Ease of implementation: The “Events” feature has made CW easy for advocates to use.
   
   • Advocates are able to use the CW tools successfully. Feedback – both from interviews and from focus groups – indicates that volunteers are able to navigate the CW screens and produce printed documents without significant problems.
   
   • Overall, the non-lawyer advocates’ response to CW is very positive. Most of the non-lawyer advocates with whom we spoke indicated that for them CW provides effective tools for helping clients. A minority opinion was that CW takes longer to administer than the traditional, paper-based approach, and might be more intimidating to clients than a more personal, one-on-one conversation with an advocate – see next item, below.
   
   • The “Events” feature added in September 2012 dramatically enhances ease of use and efficiency. As indicated previously, the Events feature allows applicants to enter their data quickly, leaving blank those fields for which they lack sufficient information, then to save their data and finish after they have discussed their situation with an advocate. Based on interviews and focus groups we had conducted up to this point, we observed that the Events feature was a major breakthrough that makes CW easier for applicants to use and more efficient for the advocates to help them.
   
   • Strong on-site IT support for running the software is crucial for success of CW. We observed confusion from both volunteers and clients when things went wrong and CW had to be re-started. Also, some volunteers did not know how to perform some fairly basic functions in CW, such as going back to slides that had been viewed previously. Since the event is highly dependent on CW, it is important to have good IT support on hand to handle hardware issues. Also, training of volunteers in basic operation of the software is essential. At the same time, relatively modest improvements in the CW software in the near future will make operation of CW less dependent on volunteer knowledge and training as well as more user-friendly for clients.
   
   • Some CW screens could be improved. Several suggestions, provided to the development partners, were made by clients, advocates and volunteers in interviews and focus groups.
## EXHIBIT 5: IMPACTS OF CITIZENSHIPWORKS ON ADVOCATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR FINDINGS, By Stakeholders Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACTS ON ADVOCATES</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ease With Which Advocates are Able to Implement CW</td>
<td>Client Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The “Events” feature added in September 2012 dramatically enhances ease of use and efficiency.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Advocates are able to use the CW tools successfully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Overall, the non-lawyer advocates’ response to CW is very positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The lawyer advocates’ response to CW is mixed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Strong on-site IT support for running the software is crucial for success of CW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Some CW screens could be improved - made clearer, less confusing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes for Advocates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Clients using CW are prepared for the naturalization process.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clients using CW have a better understanding of the process.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fewer highly skilled volunteers are needed per client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. CW enhances efficiency by engaging clients in their native language.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. CW enhances efficiency by providing more legible documents.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Advocates’ reactions are mixed regarding their trust in CW for flagging important issues for discussion with the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Volunteer and staff advocates that we interviewed were split over whether or not the CW screening tool is more or less effective than traditional, paper-based screening processes. Some advocates believe that presenting all the screening questions in a compact list is less “intimidating” for clients and acts as a useful aid and prompt for advocates during the review. Others believe that CW is better, by enforcing a more systematic and thorough review of all eligibility factors than traditional, paper-based processes - especially when those assisting clients are volunteers who do not have extensive knowledge of the naturalization process.

Note 2: Given the dependence of the entire workshop on the smooth functioning of CW, good on-site IT support is crucial to ensure that the hardware and software is working seamlessly. Volunteers were observed to be confused when things went awry requiring CW to be restarted or about how to help users to go back to screens that had previously been viewed.

Note 3: The consensus of staff and volunteers is that CW saves time if the people assisting applicants are volunteers without extensive experience and knowledge of the naturalization process, because fewer volunteers are needed to assist applicants than with traditional events where volunteers work one-on-one with applicants. Highly experienced advocates, however, feel they can serve applicants faster using traditional methods than if required to go screen-by-screen through CW with the applicant.
2. Outcomes for Advocates: CW provides effective tools for helping clients.

**WHAT THE ADVOCATES SAY ABOUT CW**

**CW’s screening tool is more effective for screening than a paper form.**
- “CW walks the client systematically through the whole process.”
- “Some clients find it easier to be honest with a computer than speaking with a volunteer.”
- CW’s screening quickly flags ineligibility.
- “CW immediately flagged a client who was ineligible, saving a lot of time for her and for us.”

**CW speeds legal review.**
- “I estimate that CW-generated documents are 30 percent quicker to review than hand-completed documents… because they are more legible and can be edited.”
- “As a reviewer it’s nice and neat to have the CW screening document and application typed and printed out, versus handwritten.”
- “The CW-produced documents are… easy to read and straightforward. That’s definitely a plus.”

**Counter-point:** Some advocates believe CW produces less effective screening than the traditional “paper” method.
- “Using a computer makes it harder to develop rapport and interrupts the flow of the conversation.”
- “I get clues about questions I need to ask by reading the notes that the client has written on the [paper] checklist.”
- “I think going through 80 questions on the computer is intimidating to clients, compared with a one-page [paper] handout with 20 questions.”

- **Clients using CW are prepared for the naturalization process.** Staff and volunteer advocates reported in focus groups and interviews that the experience of stepping through the CW screens, and reviewing “Learn More” screens when questions arose, provided better preparation for clients than a typical traditional workshop.

- **Clients using CW have a better understanding of the process.** Staff and volunteer advocates affirmed this result in focus groups, echoing the finding of the Client Survey that most clients (96 percent) felt they understood the naturalization process better as a result of using CW.

- **Fewer highly skilled volunteers are needed per client.** The combination of having substantive information about the citizenship process immediately accessible through CW and having access to the automated document assembly features of CW makes it possible for less-skilled volunteers to handle many of the functions for which only highly skilled lawyers or accredited representatives would ordinarily be required using a traditional citizenship process.
• **CW enhances efficiency by engaging clients in their native language.** All the Pilot Projects we visited acknowledged that a major benefit of CW is enabling clients to perform more of the steps in the application process themselves, greatly reducing the need for one-on-one assistance. Moreover, it enables volunteers with only moderate knowledge of the naturalization process to assist applicants by working through the CW questions and using the “Learn More” screens as needed to address questions about specific elements of the process.

• **CW enhances efficiency by providing more legible documents.** Some Pilot Project advocates expressed the opinion a major benefit of CW was enabling them to read the screening documents and printed N-400 forms produced by CW more easily than the paper documents completed by hand.

• **Trust in CW: Advocates’ reactions are mixed.** Some of the lawyers we interviewed indicated they trust CW and feel they can rely on the output from the screening tool to flag important issues for discussion with the applicant. Others indicated they do not feel the output from the CW screening module is sufficient, and expressed a preference for the traditional workshops where there is more lawyer interaction with applicants.

For example, two advocates that we interviewed after a site visit expressed the opinion that the CW screening tool was less effective than their organization’s 25-question, one-page screening handout that clients complete by hand. The advocates said that presenting all the screening questions in a compact list on a handout is less “intimidating” for clients. Moreover, they believe that by reviewing the handout and the client’s handwritten notes, cross-outs, and questions written in the margins, advocates have more clues as to the client’s responses to the questions, serving as prompts to touch on a wider range of issues during the legal review than they do with the clients who have used CW, for whom there is simply a screening print-out.

That said, most of the advocates we interviewed said that the CW-produced screening document is much easier to read and review than is a document that a client completes by hand. One of the advocates recommended that the CW be changed so that its screening document prints out the entire list of screening questions, and not just a CW-generated list of only the flagged items.
C. IMPACTS OF CW ON LEGAL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

Exhibit 6 on the next page summarizes our findings about the impacts of CW on end users. The following are highlights:

1. Ease of implementation: CW is working well.

- **CW provides benefits for advocates and organizations.** Feedback from the volunteer focus group and from interviews with staff and advocates indicated that, even after a relatively short period of use, the following benefits are already being achieved:
  - Opportunities are provided to serve more people with available resources.
  - Opportunities are provided for productive collaborations.
  - Capacity of organizations to effectively use technology is expanded.
  - Services to hard-to-reach target populations are expanded.
  - Existing capacities are leveraged to offer more & better services.

- **Success rates can be significantly higher with CW than traditional workshops as measured by percent of workshop attendees who complete their applications.** Our interviews with Pilot Project staff indicated that success rates with the CW model are appreciably higher than with the traditional, large-scale workshop model – 75 to 90 percent with CW and 50 to 60 percent with the traditional model.

- **CW reduces the number of volunteers (both lawyers and non-lawyers) that are required to assist applicants.** The experience of the NALEO/Los Angeles Pilot Project has been that fewer volunteers are needed with CW. For group-processing events, NALEO deploys one volunteer for every four or five applicants – compared with traditional, large-scale events where one volunteer for every one or two applicants is the norm. Thus, CW can greatly reduce the number of volunteers needed, and thus the burden of volunteer recruitment, retention, training and supervision.

- **With CW, events can be calmer and less stressful for staff and volunteers than are traditional, large-scale events.** NALEO/Los Angeles staff members report that, as a result, it is easier to recruit volunteers for events using CW than for traditional workshops.

- **CW has changed the role of some providers.** NALEO/Los Angeles reports that CW has shifted the organization’s role from being the primary producer for events toward being a trainer and supporter to a network of partners. This promises to enable NALEO to ramp up its capacity to help many more applicants by expanding its network of partner organizations. Similar leveraging opportunities may exist in other organizations as well through the use of CW.
## EXHIBIT 6: IMPACTS OF CITIZENSHIPWORKS ON LEGAL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR FINDINGS, By Stakeholders Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACTS ON LEGAL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ease with which Organizations Are Able to Implement CW</td>
<td>Client Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. CW provides benefits for advocates and organizations.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Success rates are higher with CW than traditional workshops as measured by percent of workshop attendees who complete their applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. CW reduces the number of volunteers (both lawyers and non-lawyers) that are required to assist applicants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. With CW, events can be calmer and less stressful for staff and volunteers than are traditional, large-scale events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. With CW, it is easier to recruit volunteers than with traditional workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. CW has shifted the role of some providers from being the primary producer for events toward being trainers and supporters to a network of partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. There is push-back from some applicants and volunteers who fear computers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Better CW training packets for volunteers would be a big help for sponsoring organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Outcomes for Organizations

| A. Opportunities are provided to serve more people with available resources. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| B. Opportunities are provided for productive collaborations. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| C. Capacity to effectively use technology is expanded. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| D. Services to hard-to-reach target populations are expanded. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| E. Existing capacities are leveraged to offer more & better services. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| F. Joint funding opportunities with collaboration partners are created. |  • |  |  |  |  |
| G. Requirements of funders for innovation, collaboration, etc., are met. |  • |  |  |  |  |

**Note 1:** An exception was found at II Bay Area in Redwood City, where problems with hardware (laptops connected to the Internet via wireless hot spots) plagued efforts at applying CW throughout the first year of the pilot project. Program leaders acknowledged that “we have not found the sweet spot for CW,” but are optimistic about the future of CW once the right combination of hardware, software, facilities and process design are found.

**Note 2:** The consensus of advocates we interviewed is that CW saves time if the people assisting applicants are volunteers without extensive experience and knowledge of the naturalization process, because fewer volunteers are needed to assist applicants than with traditional events where volunteers work one-on-one with applicants. Highly experienced advocates, however, feel they can serve applicants faster using traditional methods than if required to go screen-by-screen through CW with the applicant.
• **There is push-back from some volunteers who fear computers.** Not all volunteers are crazy about technology. Some have refused to participate in events using CW. This is an issue for the organizations that rely heavily on volunteers to address, either through training or through assignment of roles such that a computer-phobic volunteer is not asked to staff the CW operation. Moreover, we would point out that this impact might be offset to some extent by the attraction to CW that other volunteers who like working with computers might feel.

• **Better CW training packets or e-learning modules for volunteers would be a big help for sponsoring organizations.** These could foster a more systematic training experience for volunteers, improving effectiveness and efficiency in the overall operation.

2. **Outcomes for organizations: CW provides opportunities to serve more people with available resources.**

• **Opportunities are provided for productive collaborations.** For example:
  - CW has created new possibilities for collaboration that the NALEO/Los Angeles Pilot Project is vigorously exploiting, such as partnerships with public libraries and major employers of immigrants.
  - The II Bay Area Pilot Project has collaborated with community colleges to offer CW events using the colleges’ computer labs as facilities.

• **Capacity to effectively use technology is expanded.** For some of the Pilot Projects, the CW initiative provides a first experience in applying technology to improve services to clients. It presents challenges not only in using technology in a narrow sense but also in re-arranging traditional service delivery systems to exploit new capabilities. As one regional funder put it, “CW affects how organizations use and think about technology... is it located at the place where it’s accessible, where there is capacity to do group processing? It’s where the partnership comes in – funnel people to where the capacity is. For example, you can have this mobile lab on the coast; if you’re a smaller organization, it’s about knowing where you can refer people, to where they have capacity.”

• **Services to hard-to-reach target populations are expanded.** For example:
  - NALEO/Los Angeles is exploring extension of service to rural communities in the Inland Empire region of California using a remote assistance model.
  - CUNY Express/New York staff members envision using CW to promote extension of service in the highly urbanized New York City area, using strategic partnerships with libraries and other naturalization service providers.
  - Catholic Social Services of Charlotte (NC) is testing a model in which CW-guided assistance is provided by a non-expert located in a remote rural area in partnership with a naturalization expert located in an urban area and reviewing documents exchanged electronically.

• **Existing capacities are leveraged to offer more & better services.** Many examples of this outcome were seen; for example, NALEO/Los Angeles is leveraging its phone/computer lab, which is used during the week as an immigration hotline, to offer CW events on weekends. This project is also leveraging its core capacity of volunteer recruitment and training, to support an expanding network of partners in offering CW events throughout the Los Angeles metropolitan region.
D. IMPACTS OF CW ON THE PILOT COMMUNITIES

In its initial pilot phase, CW has demonstrated its basic feasibility and significant potential within the organizations that have tested it. The impacts on elements of the larger community, such as employers, schools and other institutions directly affected by the citizenship status of immigrants have not been thoroughly evaluated.

That said, some indications of the impact CW will ultimately have as a means of expanding access to naturalization services, and ultimately increasing the numbers of immigrants who are able to naturalize are apparent. For example, CUNY Express is applying CW to enhance services at a walk-in center in the core of a densely-populated immigrant community in New York City; its success will ultimately impact employers, schools, and the large urban university community of which CUNY Express is an integral part. CW-based remote assistance models being explored by NALEO/Los Angeles and Catholic Social Services/Charlotte (NC) could extend access to naturalization services to very large numbers of immigrants located in small communities and rural areas across America.

Exhibit 7 on the next page summarizes our findings about the impacts of CW on pilot communities. The following are highlights:

1. Facilitation of Collaboration Among Naturalization Partners across the Community

- CW has created new possibilities for collaboration among immigrant service providers. For example, NALEO/Los Angeles envisions using CW to promote extension of service to employed immigrants, using strategic partnerships with firms that need employees with security clearances (and thus need citizenship). The program is vigorously exploiting such possibilities, and sees its role shifting toward training and support to its network of partners rather than being the primary producer for events.

- Effective collaboration leverages the benefits of CW. The synergies made possible through collaboration among networks of partners, in addition to the impacts of individual efforts of legal services organizations, was a major theme we heard in interviews with funders and CW development partners. For example, a regional funder in the San Francisco Bay Area envisions a major opportunity applying CW within the context of an existing immigration initiative among 25 funders in the Bay Area, having 15-plus legal service providers in San Mateo County alone, and many more in the six-county Bay Area. The key, he says, is finding effective models for using CW, then replicating and widely disseminating them across legal service providers in the region. “As a funder, you’d like to have people work together to increase the total impact. It’s badly needed,” he says. But he acknowledges it is not easy: “People are working a lot just to provide the best service they can. It’s hard [for them] to reach out... [They are] in competition for funds...You need trust...to develop as a system. Now it’s about a 6-7 on a scale of 10. We’ve been really pushing it for the past four years.”
**EXHIBIT 7: IMPACTS OF CITIZENSHIPWORKS ON PILOT COMMUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACTS ON PILOT COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR FINDINGS, By Stakeholders Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Facilitation of Collaboration Among Naturalization Community Partners

- **A.** CW has created new possibilities for collaboration among immigrant service providers.

- **B.** CW will be most effective when service providers and funders work together.

- **C.** CW has demonstrated its basic feasibility and significant potential. Now, some leaders believe, the emphasis needs to be on marketing and expansion.

### 2. Expansion of Services to Hard-to-Reach Communities

- **A.** CW can promote extension of service to specific language groups - for example, Chinese speakers - by enabling users to work on applications in own languages.

- **B.** CW can promote extension of service to rural communities using a remote assistance model.

- **C.** CW can promote extension of service in urban areas, using strategic partnership with libraries and naturalization service providers.

- **D.** CW can promote extension of service to employed immigrants, in partnerships with employers of immigrants, such as restaurants, hotels, landscaping firms, and agribusinesses.

### 3. Outcomes Envisioned for Communities

- **A.** More community residents will become naturalized citizens.

- **B.** Positive impacts on the local economy will be evident.

- **C.** Positive impacts on the local workforce will evident.

- **D.** Positive impacts on the local school system are evident.

- **E.** Access to reliable, affordable citizenship assistance in the community is expanded.

### 4. Additional Observations of Leaders

- **A.** There is a tension among CW funders between testing new approaches and processing more people.

- **B.** Much higher volumes of clients will need to be processed in the future, and the CW technology holds the key.
• **CW has demonstrated its basic feasibility and significant potential.** Some leaders believe CW is ready for rollout, with emphasis on marketing and expansion. One of the funders we interviewed expressed the following thoughts regarding a strategy for going forward:

  - **Prioritize getting CW going in more locations, guided by the lessons of the pilot projects.** The funder felt that a group-processing model would wherein two staff and three or four volunteers can handle about 20 people at a CW event, rather than a 1-1 ratio of assistants to applicants under a traditional, paper-based application model, is a promising direction for CW.
  
  - **Line up “super users” such as existing Pilot Projects to teach other organizations how to use CW.** The funder said this was a discussion underway among the CW development partners in the San Francisco Bay area.
  
  - **Change is difficult.** “It’s hard to get legal services organizations to change. It’s hard to get the hardware in place and maintained. But the opportunity and potential is clear,” he said.

### 2. Expansion of Services to Hard-to-Reach Communities

In its first year of implementation, CW has been tested in mainstream applications such as group processing events and assistance to individual applicants in offices of the Pilot Projects, with emphasis on Spanish speakers, by far the largest group of immigrants. Once the pilot phase is completed and problems identified during initial implementation are addressed, funders and development partners envision additional benefits to be achieved, such as the following:

- CW promotes extension of service to other, specific language groups – for example, Chinese and Vietnamese speakers – by enabling immigrants to work on citizenship applications in their own languages.

- CW promotes extension of service to rural communities using a remote assistance model.

- CW promotes extension of service in urban areas, using strategic partnerships of legal services providers with institutions such as libraries, community colleges, and other naturalization service providers.

- CW can promote extension of service to employed immigrants, using strategic partnerships with employers of immigrants, such as restaurants, hotels, landscaping firms and agribusinesses, firms that need employees with security clearances (and thus need citizenship), etc.

### 3. Outcomes for Communities

As the numbers of applicants for citizenship that can be processed using CW increase, the following outcomes for immigrant communities are envisioned by funders and development partners:

- More community residents will become naturalized citizens.

- Positive impacts on the local economy will be evident.

- Positive impacts on the local workforce will become evident.

- Positive impacts on the local school system will be evident.

- Access to reliable, affordable citizenship assistance in the community will be expanded.

For these outcomes to be achieved, the funders and development partners we interviewed had the following observations:

- **There is a tension among CW funders between testing new approaches and processing more people.** “There’s been a real outward recognition among funders about the role that technology can play. On the other hand, there’s a push [among funders] to process more people too.”
• Much higher volumes of clients will need to be processed in the future, and the CW technology holds the key. Pilot Project leaders and development partners are aware of a much higher latent demand for citizenship services among low-income immigrants than existing non-profit service providers can possibly meet using traditional, paper-based processing methods. For example, AAFE/New York City staff members estimate that there are more than one million Asians and Pacific Islanders in the greater New York City area, approximately 20 percent of whom are not legal permanent residents. Most of these are low-income immigrants, and many of them are elderly people with low levels of education. At a time in the future when immigration reform moves forward, service providers will need to be ready with much more efficient, technology-based systems to handle the demand. And, some leaders believe, CW offers the key.

E. LESSONS ABOUT INNOVATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

Exhibit 8 on the next page summarizes our findings about insights the CW pilot phase has provided for informing this and future innovations involving technology. The following are highlights:

1. Insights about Innovation

• Some funders see strategic opportunities in CW for advancing their mission, and are considering a variety of new models for deploying CW. One funder suggests that CW does not replace the traditional model but potentially expands the set of models that can be deployed to accommodate different situations. The key is collaboration and joint planning to build an effective network among service providers across the entire community.

• An important challenge is getting beyond the inevitable problems that accompany the initial launch of an innovation. A common experience reported by all the Pilot Projects we visited was a tendency for difficulties encountered during the roll-out of CW to overshadow the potential benefits to come; and in the short term, to reinforce some players’ preference for the status quo. Some of the immediate difficulties included push-back from clients and volunteers who lacked experience with computers, software that lacked functionality normally taken for granted (such as the ability for staff at organizations to have access to client’s data), and computer hardware (such as wireless hot-spots) that did not function as expected. In the short term, these negatively impacted the experience for clients and staff alike, although organizations that addressed these initial challenges were able ultimately to realize significant benefits from the innovation.

• It is important to acknowledge and address up-front negative attitudes about technology when implementing an innovation. The following are some of the human factors that were apparent in the CW pilot phase which can serve to help or to hinder success with technology-based innovation into an organization:
  - Previous experiences in the organization with innovation – successful or unsuccessful?
  - Comfort level with technology – high or low?
  - General attitude toward change – receptive or resistant?
  - Amount of preparation and support for the innovation – high or low?

• In the NALEO/Los Angeles Pilot Project, these factors appear to have been managed successfully. The project was functioning at a very high level at the time of our visit. This offers a best-practice model with many opportunities for replication at other Pilot Projects.
### EXHIBIT 8: OTHER INSIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR FINDINGS, By Stakeholders Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER INSIGHTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Insights About Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Some funders see strategic opportunities in CW for advancing their mission, and are considering a variety of new models for deploying CW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. An important challenge is getting beyond the inevitable problems that accompany the initial launch of an innovation.</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. It is important to acknowledge and address upfront negative attitudes about technology when implementing an innovation.</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. In the NALEO/Los Angeles pilot project, these factors appear to have been managed successfully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. About Implementation of Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Obvious benefits (for example, the opportunity to process more applicants with existing resources) are powerful drivers of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Many clients have leapfrogged over computers to newer technologies (e.g., smart phones), making new models for deploying CW potentially feasible.</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The requirement for computer access places limitations on the kinds of facilities where CW citizenship events can take place.</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The devil is in the details. Glitches in roll-out can create a bad vibe among users that could hamper implementation down the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. With technology comes dependence. Events that use CW can go awry when problems arise - for example, the Internet or network goes down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. An important lesson of the pilot phase of CW is that implementation should be preceded by careful preparation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. CW can potentially help legal service providers prepare for USCIS transformation to electronic filing down the road.</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. About Evaluation as a Tool for Improving Program Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Legal service providers can significantly improve their performance through continual self-assessment and system refinement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. About Implementation of Technology

- **Obvious benefits (for example, the opportunity to process more applicants with existing resources) are powerful drivers of implementation.** The NALEO/Los Angeles Pilot Project sees CW as a key to multiplying by many times the numbers of applicants the program and its partners can process annually. This has provided strong motivation for overcoming the inevitable obstacles these organizations have encountered in their efforts to apply the CW tools.

- **Many clients have leapfrogged over computers to newer technologies (e.g., smart phones), making new models for deploying CW potentially feasible.** Over 35 percent of the CW users responding to the Client Survey indicated they access the Internet using their “cell phone, iPad or other wireless device.” This was exceeded only by the percentage indicating they access the Internet “at home” (84 percent), and much higher than the next most frequent category, “at work” (21 percent). This finding is important for future innovations currently under discussion, such as smart phone applications enabling CW users to prepare for their civics exam.\(^\text{19}\)

- **The requirement for computer access places limitations on the kinds of facilities where CW citizenship events using the group-processing model can take place.** Facilities must include not only access to computers, printers and the Internet, but also must provide space for applicants to meet with advocates and move smoothly through the several stages of the application process. NALEO/Los Angeles and CUNY Express/New York City have been successful, in part, to their having obtained facilities meeting all the requirements for conducting events fully exploiting the CW technology. II Bay Area/Redwood City has had only limited success with the facilities it has, up to now, been borrowing from the community center in which it is housed, and is still working to find the right combination of computer access and space for carrying out the other essential steps in the application process.

- **The requirement for a reliable Internet connection affects the range of models that can be deployed.** The challenges experienced by the II Bay Area/Redwood City project with cellular wireless hotspots and a lack of IT support illustrate the importance of having reliable access to high-speed Internet service and on-site IT staffing.

- **The devil is in the details.** Glitches in roll-out can create a bad vibe among users, which hampers implementation down the road. This was evident in the II Bay Area pilot, where difficulties with the hardware had obscured benefits of CW and made some people we interviewed nervous about further attempts to deploy this innovation. At the AAFE/New York City pilot, much of the focus group discussion centered on confusion that perceived shortcomings in the Simplified Chinese translation of CW caused for some applicants and volunteers.

- **With technology comes dependence.** Events that use CW can go awry when problems arise - for example, the Internet or network goes down. We saw this not only in the II Bay Area/Redwood City site visit (with wireless hot-spots) but also at other Pilot Projects when problems arose – for example, at NALEO/Los Angeles when a computer froze and had to be re-booted. For this reason, our recommendations include making sure that IT support is available at events where CW is being used, and that back-up equipment is on hand to ensure that critical functions such as printing out documents can proceed without delay.

\(^{19}\) The total responses to this question on the Client Survey exceeded 100 percent because respondents were asked to indicate “all that apply” rather than to select the primary mode of accessing the Internet.
• An important lesson of the pilot phase of CW is that implementation should be preceded by careful preparation. This includes thorough training of staff and volunteers, IT resources on hand at initial events, and heads-up to project staff, volunteers and applicants who are involved in the initial roll-out that opening-night glitches are to be anticipated.

• CW can potentially help legal service providers prepare for United States Citizenship and Immigration Services’ transformation to electronic filing down the road.

3. About Evaluation as a Tool for Improving Program Performance

• Legal service providers can significantly improve their performance through continual self-assessment and system refinement. The NALEO/Los Angeles Pilot Project staff reported that they routinely meet after each citizenship event and debrief what has worked and what changes or additions would make the next event work more efficiently and effectively. This is a best practice that precedes implementation of CW and likely is responsible for NALEO’s success with integration of CW into its processing model.
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

The feedback gathered from the evaluation to date makes it clear that CW is an important innovation showing great promise for achieving most of the results for which the sponsors are hoping.

Some highlights of our findings to date are as follows:

- Several Pilot Project leaders are excited about the potential that CW has demonstrated thus far, especially its capacity for leveraging their organizations’ existing core capacities to expand services to immigrants by 30 to 50 percent or more with existing resources of staff, volunteers and facilities.

- One Pilot Project – NALEO – is deploying CW especially effectively and using self-evaluation as a tool for continually improving its use of this innovation. It offers a best practice model with many opportunities for replication by other organizations seeking to deploy CW.

- All the Pilot Projects we visited, including II Bay Area/Redwood City, CUNY Citizenship Now/New York City, and AAFE/New York City, have contributed important ideas and insights that, taken as a whole, provide a solid foundation of experience that can inform expansion of the CW tools by networks of implementation partners throughout the country in the immediate future.

- Many opportunities for further improvements have emerged as a result of the pilot phase that will make CW even more efficient and effective. These include:
  - Broad-based enhancements such as the capacity to transfer client data from the Eligibility Screening Module to the N-400 Application Module;
  - Specific, section-by-section improvements based on feedback from the focus groups and interviews with users, volunteers, and staff conducted in connection with this evaluation; and
  - Continued introduction of additional, language-specific versions of CW, such as the Chinese and Vietnamese versions that were launched in Fall 2012.

Further suggestions for improvements in CW and in the overall service delivery vehicles of which it is a key component are provided in the conclusions and recommendations below.

A. CONCLUSIONS

1. CW has demonstrated its feasibility and immediate potential for enabling legal services provider organizations to significantly expand the numbers of immigrants they can serve with existing resources of staff, volunteers, and funding.

2. The vast majority – more than 90 percent – of clients who use CW achieve their goals; including completing their application for naturalization on the day of the citizenship event they attend. This is much higher than traditional events, at which Pilot Project staff estimate only 50 to 60 percent of applicants walk away with their applications completed.

3. With more resources, and with the benefit of the lessons gained from this pilot phase of CW implementation, legal services provider organizations and their funders can multiply their impacts even more.
4. CitizenshipWorks has the potential to facilitate collaboration and maximize naturalization resources. Through CW, legal services providers and other organizations and institutions, such as schools, libraries and social service providers, can work together, with each partner playing a role that enables it to deploy its unique core capacities within a network of partners that collectively has a big impact on access to citizenship services across an entire region.

5. Funders can help promote expansion of citizenship services by applying incentives that reward collaboration and discourage the competition for funding that traditionally has made collaboration difficult among providers having overlapping service areas and missions.

6. The vast majority of users find CW easy to use, even those who have only minimal experience with computers, assuming that adequate assistance is available from staff or volunteers (a ratio of one roving “helper” per four or five applicants has proven successful) – not only to help applicants navigate the CW screens but also to assist with substantive questions that applicants have about the citizenship process.

7. Even for users who have never used computers, CW can make the citizenship application process more efficient, by serving as an expert system enabling volunteers or interns with little substantive knowledge about the citizenship process to help the applicants navigate the CW screens and print out their forms for review by legal experts. This “helper” role can even be played by relatives of the applicant who have the ability to assist with operating the computer and reading the CW screens.

8. User literacy is a much more important factor than comfort level with computers. The group having the greatest difficulty with CW consists of applicants having little or no reading comprehension and thus limited capacity to work on the computer on their own. This category of users would not be candidates for CW models requiring unassisted operation of CW, such as self-administration at a library or on a home computer.

9. There is room for CW to become even more efficient as a tool for volunteers through further development of the “Learn More” features and improvements in navigation aids such as tabs that would enable users to more easily move from section to section.

10. The ability that CW provides for users to engage the citizenship process in their native language is one of the most significant benefits of the CW tools. Not only does this feature empower immigrants to do much of the work themselves and participate more fully in the process, it also greatly enhances overall efficiency by allowing relatively unskilled volunteers to perform roles previously requiring scarce, highly skilled legal experts, releasing those players to focus their attention on legal reviews where their expertise is most crucial.

11. The “Events” feature introduced in September 2012 dramatically improves the client experience and enhances the efficiency of CW as a tool for assisting citizenship applicants.

12. Mixed models in which a traditional, paper-driven system operates in parallel with a CW-driven process serving more computer-savvy applicants have thus far proven to be less efficient than events designed specifically around CW. The complexities of administering two systems simultaneously having different facility and staffing requirements have largely offset any efficiencies gained as a result of having a CW workshop available during an otherwise traditional event. Given the success that some Pilot Projects have had using volunteers to assist applicants having little or no computer experience, it would seem preferable to conduct events designed specifically for CW and use traditional processing only in situations – such as particularly difficult cases – for which the advantages of one-on-one assistance by a legal expert justify the extra resources that are required.

---

20 A prominent example is the II Bay Area/Redwood City pilot.
13. While advocates generally agreed that CW is an efficient tool for relatively inexperienced staff and volunteers, there was less of a consensus regarding the efficiency of CW versus paper-based tools for highly skilled naturalization advocates. Some experienced advocates believe CW increases their efficiency by as much as 30 percent, while others think it is quicker to apply paper checklists and other tools than to step through the CW screens.21 The latter belief implies that the CW tools may not hold as much potential for an organization that relies primarily on highly skilled staff advocates for service delivery.22 However, even a primarily staff advocate organization could benefit from CW by partnering with another organization that can supply trained volunteers or interns for CW events, thereby creating a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.

14. Traditional, large-scale events can offer benefits to their sponsors, such as visibility in the community, which may justify their continuation even after a CW-based process takes over as the primary method of offering citizenship services. Some of the organizations we visited are planning to offer traditional events in the future but to do so less frequently—for example, quarterly or semi-annually rather than monthly.

**CW FEATURES THAT ENHANCE ADVOCATES’ EFFICIENCY**

The evaluation showed that some experienced advocates believe they can screen for eligibility more quickly with paper-based tools than by using CW. IAN/PBN developers agree where cases are simple and the applicant does not have many addresses, jobs, trips abroad, or criminal issues. However, for the frequent cases having those complications, CW may have an efficiency edge. The reasons:

- **The CW tool automatically sorts events by date.** Dates of residences, jobs and trips are sorted by reverse chronological order, obviating the need to manually sort them.

- **The CW tool automatically calculates key eligibility factors.** These include the number of days each trip abroad lasts, as well as the total number of days the person has spent outside of the country in the last five years from the date of the application. Those calculations can save a lot of time for an advocate.

- **The CW tool automatically generates an addendum.** Unless advocates are using a commercial forms program like LawLogix™, they will have to manually type and format an addendum in a word processing program, or hand-write one.

More importantly, the HotDocs™ advocate version of the N-400 template, which has been available since the Events feature launched, is functionally equivalent to the USCIS N-400 PDF in terms of data entry, but incorporates the sorting, calculations and automatic addendum feature of the CW eligibility module.

---

21 This perception likely would be reduced if improvements could be made in the ease of skipping from one section to another through the addition of section tabs, as suggested by one CUNY Express/New York staff member.

22 This appeared to be the conclusion of AAFE/New York City, an organization in which most services are provided by highly experienced legal advocates applying a very intensive, one-on-one service model.
15. The essential ingredients for successful application of CW in a group-processing model include:

- Access to a pool of volunteers or interns who can assist clients with navigation of CW in their native language and printing out completed documents;
- Hands-on training of staff and volunteers in the use of CW prior to, and ideally on a separate day well in advance of, their involvement in a CW event;
- Pre-screening of applicants to determine their comfort level with computers and especially their reading and language skill levels, so they can be provided with the level of assistance they need to apply CW successfully.
- Access to suitable facilities, including space for interviewing clients and conducting legal reviews, as well as access to a sufficient number of computers and printers with reliable access to the Internet to handle the numbers of applicants who are expected.
- A process layout that anticipates the number of applicants to be processed and allocates space, workstations and staffing in sufficient amounts to ensure an orderly flow of applicants through the process.
- Adequate IT support staff on hand to deal with hardware and software issues quickly, before they can interfere with the orderly progress of applicants through their application process.
- Advertisement of the naturalization event, including dissemination of information via partner groups. Information should include a checklist for how the client should prepare and a worksheet for entering dates and other details needed in naturalization process. Advertisement should include the fact that the event will involve some very simple entry of information into a computer, and encourage applicants to bring a friend or relative along to help with computer use if applicants are unable to operate a computer on their own.
- Applicants should also be encouraged to visit the CW website and use the e-learning modules to become informed about the naturalization process. (The forthcoming mobile application will also include a customizable checklist of documents to gather in preparation).
- Food before and during the CW event to sustain the staff and volunteers.
- A debriefing session after the CW event to discuss what worked and what parts of the process could be strengthened.
- Integration of lessons learned into future CW events.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The case for adopting CW must be based on real benefits and not be oversold. For CW, the strongest case for adoption is as a tool that has proven to be effective for volunteers, interns and other helpers lacking detailed knowledge of the naturalization process, thereby freeing up the most highly experienced advocates to focus on situations where they can do the most good: legal reviews and difficult citizenship cases. Accordingly, in introducing CW to advocates and legal services providers, we recommend acknowledging up-front that the software is not intended to replace skilled lawyers, but rather to provide them with the additional support they need to be most effective at achieving their mission.

2. We believe that proper framing of CW in outreach efforts and initial presentations to legal services organizations is a key to having advocates and organizations embrace CW as a positive innovation. CW should not be “sold” primarily as a tool that will directly improve the efficiency of highly skilled advocates. Our interviews and focus
groups with advocates showed clearly that even after giving CW a trial, many advocates strongly believe their own paper-based checklists and instruments to be more efficient and effective than CW for working one-on-one with clients. The efficiencies of CW lie primarily in its integration into an overall system, not as a replacement for the personal toolkit developed over years of practice by a highly experienced advocate.

3. We recommend continuing attention to improvement in the CW modules. Opportunities identified by the evaluation include:

- Creating additional “Learn More” screens to better define terms of art pertaining to the naturalization process and/or provide examples to illustrate terms such as “government benefits” that have different meanings for people with experience in cultures outside the U.S.
- If possible, adding a capability to use relevant data entered in the Eligibility Screening Module to populate the equivalent fields in the N-400 Application Module, thereby eliminating the need for users to re-enter data in the latter module.
- Making sure all data that is used as inputs to formulas within CW (such as dates) are entered with pull-down menus rather than entered by hand.23
- Finalizing implementation of the “Events” feature, allowing users to save data and retrieve it later to make corrections before printing out final versions of the forms.
- Implement specific, step-by-step improvements identified during focus groups and provided to the principal developers.
- Continuing improvement of the language translation used in the Chinese version, to ensure it is as simple, accurate and clear as possible.

4. The changes should be tested with focus groups of volunteers who have applied CW in citizenship workshops, to make sure that a “second pair of eyes” has been applied in reviewing the changes that have been made.

5. It would be highly beneficial for the CW developers to continue improving the resources available to legal services organizations for use in training staff and volunteers in basic use of CW. This would help to address the need we observed for better training in use of CW, including hands-on experience in use of the software well in advance of staff or volunteers being required to assist clients in a citizenship event. Opportunities include:

- Providing better visibility on the CW website for existing resources such as the user guide (available in the Advocate Resource Library, which can be found in the “About” section of the CW website).
- Marketing new training resources that are being developed, including e-learning modules for use in “on demand” trainings for staff and volunteers of legal services providers.

6. The Pilot Projects have individually developed a variety of effective methods for applying CW as well as workarounds for addressing specific challenges they have encountered. It would be useful for the development partners to explore ways of capturing and replicating the successes of the Pilot Projects, potentially including any or all of the following:

- “Train the trainer” events in strategic locations such as the San Francisco Bay Area, where coalitions of legal services providers and funders serve large populations of immigrants.

---

23 Dates that are entered by hand have caused numerous errors in eligibility screening forms, because of culture-specific variations in the order in which days, months and years appear in dates. These errors are compounded by the use within CW of calculation formulas for translating dates into figures such as days absent from the United States.
“Super users” of CW funded specifically to train and support networks of legal services providers in effectively replicating successful methods of applying CW.

- CW workshops piggy-backed with national conferences such as the National Immigrant Integration Conference.
- An Internet-based CW blog or use of social media tools (for example, Facebook) for exchange of troubleshooting tips and best-practice information.

7. We would recommend convening a discussion among major funders regarding funding strategies that can most strongly encourage the kinds and amounts of collaboration among legal services providers that are needed to significantly impact progress toward the goal of expanding access to citizenship services through changes in the service delivery approach. Funders and national development partners with whom we spoke stressed the importance of collaboration among service providers, and at the same time acknowledged the difficulties of achieving it in the environment of competition and resource scarcity in which most legal services providers serving the low-income population operate. This is a challenge that deserves the fullest attention and creativity of the funder community, if the vision of using CW as the key to a breakthrough in access to citizenship services is to be realized.

8. Some funders and development partners with whom we spoke feel a sense of urgency and see an opportunity for using CW to dramatically ramp up the numbers of applicants that achieve citizenship in the next few years, employing the group-processing model. Based on its current state of development, we believe that the successes that could be gained quickly would make a strong case for further investments in this technology to dramatically expand access to citizenship services throughout the country.
For additional information about CitizenshipWorks or this report, please email support@citizenshipworks.org or contact one of the organizations listed below.

ABOUT THE IMMIGRATION ADVOCATES NETWORK

The Immigration Advocates Network (IAN) is a collaborative effort of leading immigrants’ rights organizations designed to increase access to justice for low-income immigrants and strengthen the capacity of organizations serving them. IAN promotes more effective and efficient communication, collaboration, and services among immigration advocates and organizations by providing free, easily accessible and comprehensive online resources and tools. To learn more, visit www.immigrationadvocates.org.

ABOUT PRO BONO NET

Pro Bono Net is a national nonprofit that increases access to justice by transforming the way underserved communities obtain legal help. Through innovative uses of technology and collaboration, Pro Bono Net empowers those who serve to make a difference and those in need to improve their lives. To learn more, visit www.probono.net.

ABOUT THE NEW AMERICANS CAMPAIGN

The New Americans Campaign is a groundbreaking national network of legal-service providers, faith-based organizations, businesses, foundations and community leaders that is paving a better road to citizenship. It is modernizing and streamlining access to naturalization services, so that greater numbers of legally qualified permanent residents take the critical step to becoming American citizens. To learn more, visit www.newamericanscampaign.org.

ABOUT THE RESOURCE FOR GREAT PROGRAMS

The Resource for Great Programs is a national corporation dedicated to providing strategic support to civil justice programs that seek to expand access to justice for low-income people. For more information, visit www.greatprograms.org.
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