

Report on the Administrative Justice Virtual Hub UKAJI Phase 1 2014-17:

Achievements and Challenges

In December 2017 the UK Administrative Justice Institute (UKAJI) reached the end of its first phase, which began in September 2014 with funding from the Nuffield Foundation. Since the start of 2018, with support from the University of Essex School of Law, UKAJI has continued to support and grow the administrative justice research community with our online hub (blog, resources and links) as well as to undertake active research engagement.

This Report sets out what our original objectives were and summarises the key achievements in relation to these objectives, the challenges we faced, and what we have learned.

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	2
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS	2
ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES	7
1. LINKING POLICY, PRACTICE AND RESEARCH COMMUNITIES	7
STAKEHOLDER MAPPING: WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO	7
STAKEHOLDER MAPPING: WHAT WE DID	7
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT LINKING POLICY, PRACTICE AND RESEARCH COMMUNITIES	16
SUSTAINABILITY: WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO	16
SUSTAINABILITY: WHAT WE DID	17
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY	17
2. DEVELOPING A COORDINATED RESEARCH AGENDA	19
A RESEARCH AGENDA: WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO	19
A RESEARCH AGENDA: WHAT WE DID	20
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT COORDINATING A RESEARCH AGENDA	24
3. IDENTIFYING AND TACKLING CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS	26
CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS: WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO	26
CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS: WHAT WE DID	26
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT IDENTIFYING AND TACKLING CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS	29
CONCLUSION	30
ANNEX – UKAJI MEMBERS 2014-2017	32

BACKGROUND

UKAJI was funded by the Nuffield Foundation as a hub to help kickstart the expansion of empirical research on administrative justice. The primary aim was to develop a network of those involved and interested in research concerning the operation of different administrative justice mechanisms, with the goal of encouraging good early decision-making, improving efficiency and effectiveness, and ensuring access to justice and just outcomes. Specifically, UKAJI set out to:

- link policy, practice and research communities
- develop a coordinated research agenda
- identify and tackle capacity constraints

UKAJI in its first phase (2014-17) comprised a core team, a wider core team, an Advisory Board and an Expert Group. The core team, based at the University of Essex, consisted for much of that period of a Principal Investigator (0.1FTE), two Senior Research Fellows (0.2FTE) and a part-time administrator (there was an additional co-researcher 0.1 FTE until September 2016). This funded core team worked with a wider cross-disciplinary team, mostly composed of academics based at universities across the UK, and an expert group. These bodies were unfunded and relied heavily on people's goodwill and enthusiasm for the issues. The Advisory Board was set up jointly with Nuffield and UKAJI. It was chaired by Lucy Scott-Moncrieff and included experts in government, ombuds and the advice sector drawn from across the UK.

In developing a research agenda, UKAJI produced a [Research Roadmap](#) setting out the opportunities, challenges, needs and priorities for research in administrative justice over the next five years. The Research Roadmap is a standalone paper that resulted from a six-month consultation with all groups of stakeholders. It was launched in draft at the University of Essex in December 2017 and published on UKAJI's website in February 2018.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

Administrative justice concerns the treatment of people by public bodies and those working on their behalf. As such it concerns matters extending beyond those associated with the operation of the traditional justice system (courts and tribunals). In particular administrative justice encompasses also initial policy development and decision-making, legal consciousness within the

administration, and non-judicial redress mechanisms. Administrative justice has unique characteristics that daily affect most individuals across a broad spectrum of matters, often concerning fundamental needs such as the provision of social services, education, and asylum. It has at its heart a power imbalance between individuals and public authorities and large private-sector enterprises.

Given these considerations, one of the key findings of the UKAJI project has been that administrative justice cannot be understood solely in institutional terms as a branch of the justice system. Rather, it also needs to be envisioned as an overarching (or permeating) set of values and principles that have distinctive characteristics and implications for how people engage with, and seek redress against, government. Values and principles such as accountability, transparency, fairness and human rights have relevance across the various justice systems, but they have particular bite in relation to administrative justice in part because so much of administrative justice is about how government actually treats people. Because administrative justice cannot be visualised simply as an institutional pillar of the UK justice system, it is misleading to consider it as a Cinderella in the shadows of its cousins civil, family and the ever-larger criminal justice strands. This way of understanding administrative justice fails to capture its importance as the primary arena for handling conflicts between individuals and those exercising public powers.

In the context of this report, several main implications flow from this. There is no single institutional framework for providing administrative justice and there is no single administrative justice system. Rather, there is a highly fragmented patchwork of agencies and processes concerned with providing administrative justice. While the main institutional framework of administrative justice consists of tribunals, ombuds and courts, these institutions do not comprise the sole territory of administrative justice. This has important implications for researchers, not least because it highlights the need for care in identifying the scope and focus of research. It also raises important practical questions about the agencies to be approached and availability of data to be studied.

Oversight of administrative justice

Since the abolition of the Administrative Justice and Tribunals Council (AJTC) there has been no body with statutory responsibility for oversight of administrative justice across the UK, or resources to undertake this important role. The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) established the

Administrative Justice Forum (AJF) as a body of experts to advise the MoJ, but the AJF was not equipped to fill the gap left by the AJTC, and its role ended in 2017. More recently, the Administrative Justice Council (AJC) has been formed under aegis of JUSTICE as an independent oversight body chaired by Sir Ernest Ryder, the Senior President of Tribunals. The AJC has established an expert academic panel and will take an interest in research needs across administrative justice. This is a welcome initiative but it remains to be seen whether the AJC will have the ability to identify and develop effective strategies for addressing research needs across this broad and complex territory. We return to these matters below.

Responses to UKAJI's consultation paper on a research agenda strongly supported the need for a body to oversee and coordinate research in administrative justice. In particular, many respondents mentioned the vacuum created by the abolition of the AJTC, emphasising the need for an independent body specifically focused on administrative justice within the justice system in its widest sense. The role of such a body was seen by many respondents as wider than that of the AJTC, with a stronger emphasis on research. On the other hand, one respondent noted that a 'restyled administrative justice body should be grounded in service delivery' rather than academic research:

'Of course, the important role that research plays should be recognised but an oversight body should be directed toward coordination and strategic improvement of AJ as a fundamental tenet of a civilised society.'

There was also recognition that the field is a very broad one and thus difficult for a single body to coordinate – and that perhaps a 'layering' approach through interest groups would be more feasible to address the broad reach needed.

There was general agreement about the activities for an independent body that we set out in our consultation paper. 'Broad perspective, networking and data retrieval' is an example of a comment on the key activities needed. Another respondent noted the need for such a body 'to support early-career researchers and to coordinate and support research projects'. Another identified 'the need for cross-jurisdictional approaches, and to pay attention to the needs of those (the great majority) who are not accessing legal remedy'.

One comment highlights a key challenge that UKAJI has faced: aside from funding, time is a scarce resource not only for researchers but for policy-makers and others who want to engage in coordinated research activity. This respondent noted that having additional coordination responsibilities tacked onto policy-makers' jobs makes it hard to be effective. He also noted that a body taking an independent coordinating role 'should be given space to iterate and adapt to find the best structure and operation'. A related issue is the limited capacity within government to make use of research evidence, primarily because of pressures on time.

What type of body, and how it would be funded, is explored in more detail in our [Research Roadmap](#), where we set out the responses we received to our consultation.

Findings from UKAJI Phase 1

It is important to remember that UKAJI in its first phase was a specific project - a three-year experiment to explore the issues, the people, and the research, identifying what research exists and what needs to be done. As researchers, we have reached conclusions based on the evidence gathered during these past three years. These conclusions are described more fully in our Research Roadmap. There are also more general conclusions that we set out here. The project has demonstrated that:

- Many of the most challenging research questions associated with administrative justice are concerned with how various aspects of the system interact with each other, including, for example, how mandatory reviews of initial decision-making affect tribunal outcomes and how increases in the costs of using tribunals affect the use of alternative mechanisms of redress. **Lessons drawn from one part of the system are also often important for other parts.** Such factors point to the value of a body able to take an overarching view of research needs relating to administrative justice in the UK.
- There is a need to build links between the governments of the countries that make up the UK in relation to administrative justice issues. The nature of these relationships is evolving, and **respective governments have identified distinct priorities and values in relation to administrative justice**, as responsibility for administering some social security benefits and tribunals is devolved. Wales, for example, is developing a unique approach to administrative justice and has established a Justice Commission for Wales. In Scotland, an emphasis on embedding human rights principles into administration reflects a departure

from the Westminster approach. It is important to make links between the governments that they cannot easily make themselves and to share lessons as the administrative justice system develops across UK jurisdictions.

'I've found UKAJI's work to be extremely valuable, in particular your role centralising information and research across what is a very broad and complex area. It's also been really useful to see commentary and analysis that cuts across jurisdictions, and considers the process as a whole. This, I think, is a great example of how academic research and communication adds value for government departments. Finally, UKAJI's project on scoping the admin justice data held by gov't and others could help with – much needed - data improvement and sharing across the piece.'

*Cris Coxon, Civil and Administrative Justice Research,
Analytical Services, Ministry of Justice*

- Practitioners and policy-makers across the administrative justice system and across the jurisdictions of the UK **recognise the importance of improving evidence-based understandings of the use, operation and effect of administrative justice systems**. While the value of sound evidence is now acknowledged, government departments and public bodies are often unable to undertake or commission research as a consequence of reductions in budgets and decreased staffing. These factors increase incentives for departments such as the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) to reach out to a body such as UKAJI, which is able to link up with a range of academic researchers to foster research that will be both academically rewarding and of value to the department. Capacity constraints are evident here, and it is not always easy to bring the right people together. However, there has been an evident willingness across the range of stakeholders, government departments and public bodies, practitioners, the advice sector, and academics to engage in our work by contributing to our seminars and workshops and engaging in dialogue about research needs and priorities.
- Improvements in the available evidence can be achieved by changes within administrative systems, for example by altering what and how data is collected and recorded. However, **gaps in knowledge and the need for improved information gathering and recording are often identified only as a result of independent scrutiny or academic research**. For

example, the degree to which judicial review litigation was concentrated on London and the southeast only became evident as a consequence of independent empirical research. This was a vital piece of information which raised central issues about variations in the ability of populations across the country to access this key element of the justice system. It led to greater awareness amongst the judiciary and in time informed the regionalisation of judicial review. Such work also helped increase awareness of the need to know more about the demographic characteristics of those who use the administrative justice system. There is a continuing need for better data on this matter.

ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

1. Linking policy, practice and research communities

Stakeholder mapping: What we said we would do

Stakeholder mapping of key groups covering England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland: Working with the Administrative Justice Forum, the Advisory Committee in Scotland and the Committee on Administrative Justice and Tribunals Wales, as well as groups such as the Ombudsman Association, ...[we] ... will identify those with interests in using, commissioning or facilitating research on administrative justice.

Stakeholder mapping: What we did

- We developed, organically and in collaboration with our wider core team of experts, a ‘map’ of key stakeholders. These include our **‘internal’ stakeholders** – our Wider Core Team and Advisory Board in particular – with whom we met regularly. Engagement with our Wider Core Team and Advisory Board generated a number of tangible developments. For example, two members of our core team developed a research project on mandatory reconsideration as a result of discussions within our wider core team, and through our Advisory Board key links were made with government departments.
- The map also includes **‘external’ stakeholders**, representing a range of individuals and organisations including academic research centres, the advice sector, legal practitioners, government policy-makers, ombuds and others. We identified appropriate mechanisms for reaching different groups of our ‘external’ stakeholders – for example, through face-to-face interdisciplinary seminars held in collaboration with other universities; through online

interaction via Twitter and our blog; through individual meetings with government departments and NGOs; through attendance at key conferences.

Among the stakeholder groups we have worked with are the devolved administrations; practitioners, including legal advisers and complaints handlers; and policy makers within government.

Devolved administrations

Being a UK-wide body has its challenges for a small team. However, we found our engagement to be welcomed and it yielded promising results. We explored jurisdictional issues in stakeholder meetings in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. From these meetings, we identified research needs and priorities related to the devolution of administrative justice.

Examples of our work with devolved administrations:

- In October 2015 we combined our wider core team meeting with a seminar for stakeholders in **Northern Ireland**, hosted by the Northern Ireland Public Services Ombudsman. The seminar attracted involvement from the Department of Justice, the NI Human Rights Commission, the advice sector, and a number of academic researchers, among others. The seminar helped identify priority areas for achievable research in administrative justice in Northern Ireland and established contacts that will be of value in relation to such matters as access to data. This work informed our development of a coordinated research agenda in our Roadmap.
- Our work in **Wales** and **Scotland** has been similarly fruitful and has revealed very distinct values and principles underlying the approach to administrative justice by the Scottish Government and Welsh Assembly. For example, at a UKAJI seminar in Edinburgh in October 2016, speakers from the government, tribunals service, advice sector, and others explored together the values which the Scottish Government is keen to have as a basis for the administration of social security benefits and appeals mechanisms transferring from the Westminster Government. The seminar demonstrated that UKAJI is able to bring together a range of voices, that otherwise may not meet, to contribute to current policy and access to justice developments. Once again, the meeting provided an opportunity to

identify routes for accessing key data relevant for future research; for example, contact with Citizens Advice Scotland offers potential opportunity to collaborate on work in relation to users and access to administrative justice.

Practitioners

We have been actively involved in developing links with practitioners, including legal and advice practitioners and those who work at the face of administrative justice mechanisms.

Examples of our work with practitioners:

- At the annual Ombudsman Association conference in 2015, we presented a workshop to identify research priorities among the ombuds community. This allowed us to build links with practitioners who work in an arena in which there is much useful research but a need to collate research findings and disseminate them to a wider non-specialist audience. A summary of the workshop appears on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2015/05/22/report-from-the-ombudsman-association-conference/>
- We participated in a new initiative set up by the Ombudsman Association: a research seminar designed to identify what research is currently being done on ombuds and complaint handlers. We gave a presentation on the role of UKAJI in working with practitioners to identify research priorities. This initiative arose from the workshop we presented at the 2015 annual conference of the Ombudsman Association.
- We also work with practitioner communities in public law by, for example, participating in Public Law Project's (PLP) Judicial Review conferences and the Public Law Solicitors (PULSA) roundtable meetings.

Policy-makers

UKAJI was involved with the Administrative Justice Forum from November 2014 until its abolition in early 2017 and contributed to the Forum's discussions of key priorities. UKAJI has, for example, been able to share our expertise on the value of empirical evidence in the context of judicial review reform with members, which include government policy-makers.

Examples of our work with policy-makers:

We hold regular meetings with researchers and analysts at MoJ and HMCTS about the department's research needs and have contributed to articulating the MoJ's evidence strategy. We are engaged in on-going discussions on a project to map tribunal data.

'What do we know and what do we need to know' events

We have hosted seminars designed to bring together lawyers, advisers, academics and decision-makers for information exchange and discussion. This work has fostered significant links between researchers and policy makers and across government departments including for example engagement between UKAJI and the MoJ.

Examples of our 'what we know and need to know' seminars:

- In March 2016, we initiated activities timed to link with concerns expressed by the Administrative Justice Forum and others about **the lack of DWP data on mandatory reconsideration** and the call for evidence for the Social Security Advisory Committee's consultation on decision-making and mandatory reconsideration. We held, jointly with LSE's Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE), a cross-disciplinary seminar on research on benefit sanctions and inequalities. This seminar triggered new connections among multidisciplinary colleagues and was a welcome opportunity to explore the issue of benefit sanctions from a wide range of perspectives. A write-up of the seminar, with links to presentations and a bibliography of related research, appears on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2016/04/19/report-from-our-seminar-on-benefit-sanctions-and-inequalities/>. Linked with this, we published a response to the Social Security Advisory Committee consultation, and we published a blog post about new research on mandatory reconsideration by the National Association of Welfare Rights Advisers, which attracted a record number of views.
- In May 2016, we held a seminar, hosted by the University of Manchester, on **'Initial Decision-making by Government Departments'** (including internal review and mandatory reconsideration, focusing on immigration, social security and homelessness). The seminar brought together various government policy-makers who have a shared interest in the process of internal review but often work in silos, without much sharing of practices, as well as legal practitioners and academic researchers. This eclectic combination of stakeholders led to valuable discussions in the seminar and to personal connections that

make future collaboration possible. A write-up appears on the blog at

<https://ukaji.org/2016/05/30/seminar-on-initial-decision-making-internal-review-and-administrative-justice/>

- In January 2017 we held a workshop at King's College London on **research on users' perspectives on administrative justice**. The workshop was chaired by Professors Genevra Richardson (King's College London) and Maurice Sunkin (University of Essex). It was attended by a range of researchers, representatives of advice and advocacy organisations, users, legal practitioners and government policy-makers. Martin Partington, former Law Commissioner and member of the Council on Tribunals, presented a brief overview of how the users' perspective has been at the heart of tribunal policy for many years, noting the historical emphasis on empathy, listening, as well as developing judges' 'enabling roles'. He noted that despite the above, there is a dearth of studies that examine whether the steps taken to facilitate the user experience have been in any sense effective. A write-up appears on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2017/02/15/researching-users-perspectives-report-from-a-ukaji-workshop/>.
- In October 2017, we co-hosted, with the University of Glasgow, a launch of a UKAJI research report on '**Scotland's Model Complaint Handling Procedures**'. This report, produced by UKAJI wider team group members Professor Tom Mullen and Dr Chris Gill of the University of Glasgow, was launched at the University of Glasgow on 26 October 2017. The report presents the findings of a project commissioned by UKAJI involving small-scale exploratory case study research into Scotland's newly simplified public services complaints handling and reporting landscape. The research describes the changes that have taken place and provides an initial analysis of newly available complaints data. The launch event brought together public-sector providers, local authorities, ombuds, and researchers to explore the potential benefits of recent changes and will advance administrative justice research by investigating how this data might be used in future research. A summary of the research report appears on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2017/10/26/research-into-scotlands-new-arrangements-for-public-service-complaint-handling/>
- In December 2017, UKAJI supported, with HMCTS, a seminar on **Mental Health Review Tribunals**. The seminar, organised by Nicola Glover-Thomas, Professor of Medical Law at the University of Manchester, brought together policy-makers, tribunal judges, health and

social care workers, academics, and members of charities and NGOs to discuss issues concerning the development and operation of aspects of the mental health tribunal system. The seminar participants considered how the system currently operates; the challenges facing the system and the increasing demand and its implications; and the future direction of the mental health tribunals system. The aims were to identify what works well within the mental health tribunals system and what the key tensions are; and to inform a research report that both reports on the seminar discussions and frames recommendations to enhance the mental health tribunal system. A report summarising the findings from the project and seminar is on our blog at

<https://ukaji.org/2018/02/08/mental-health-tribunals-examining-current-practice-rising-caseloads-and-next-steps/>

- In January/February 2018, UKAJI co-hosted, with JUSTICE and the Ombudsman Association, a seminar on the **draft Public Services Ombudsman Bill in London**. The seminar explored the draft legislation for reform of the public services ombud schemes and the implications of that reform being put on hold. Invited attendees included the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman, Local Government Ombudsman, parliamentarians, and researchers; UKAJI also commissioned a review of research on public-sector ombuds, which was published in advance of the seminar on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2018/01/30/what-do-we-know-and-what-do-we-need-to-know-a-review-of-research-on-public-sector-ombuds/>.

A summary of the seminar is also available on our blog at

<https://ukaji.org/2018/02/24/seminar-report-complaints-about-public-services-where-next-for-the-ombud/>.

Conferences

In addition to our own engagement events, we have regularly attended research engagement meetings, conferences and seminars organised by others. We have found that there is much research on administrative justice topics including that undertaken by those who do not identify their work as being concerned with administrative justice as such. These events enabled us to develop our interdisciplinary links and resources including attracting potential blog contributors and submissions to our unique Register of Current Research, which provides an opportunity for early career researchers and others to showcase their current projects.

Examples of our work on major conferences involving stakeholders:

- Socio-Legal Studies Association annual conferences, in Lancaster (April 2016) and in Newcastle (April 2017)
- Ombudsman Association annual conferences (most recently May 2018)
- International conference on Human Rights and Ombudsmen, in Belfast (May 2016)
- International workshop on ombuds research, in Onati, Spain (June 2017)
- Hart Legal Workshop, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (July 2017)

Developing resources as part of the network

In addition to stakeholder activities, we have worked to develop the UKAJI website as a research resource. The resources we developed include: the blog, with regular contributions on current research and developments; ‘What do we know and need to know?’ initiatives on research evidence; and a database (updated twice yearly) of live research projects as a showcase of current work.

Examples of our work on resources:

Rapid response: We have developed ‘rapid response’ work in a number of different ways and on a range of topics of immediate importance where UKAJI could inform thinking. Taking a proactive rather than reactive approach, we have grouped these initiatives under the banner of ***What do we know and need to know?*** Among these initiatives on the blog are those timed to link with current developments – for example:

- We explored the main parties’ positions on administrative justice issues in advance of the **General Election** in May 2015.
- We commissioned a researcher to produce a ‘What do we know and need to know?’ review of research on **indefinite detention in immigration** timed to link to a parliamentary debate in September 2015.
- We commissioned a review of the research on **public-sector ombuds** in 2017 as part of a series of blog posts and seminar on the draft legislation to reform the public services ombudsman in England.

Blog: Since it was established in October 2014 as our primary forum for exchange of ideas and communication, the UKAJI blog has published nearly 300 blog posts from academic researchers, government policy makers, lawyers, dispute resolution specialists and users of the administrative justice system. The blog has gained recognition as a unique space for disseminating information about research and developments, sharing research interests, announcing job vacancies and

conference calls for papers and generally bringing important issues to the attention of the communities we work with.

'Since its inception in 2014, the UK Administrative Justice Institute (UKAJI) has quickly established itself as a focal point for multidisciplinary research in the field of administrative justice. UKAJI is already playing an invaluable role in bringing together those who work in the field of administrative justice in a range of academic and non-academic capacities and across relevant disciplines. The Institute has been particularly effective in terms of building its profile through the use of its website and social media, and has established itself as an outstanding resource for those, like me, whose research interests include or touch upon administrative justice. The field of administrative justice is characterised by, among other things, its disparate character, both in terms of the size and complexity of the institutional landscape and the range of disciplinary perspectives from which the activity and interaction of administrative justice institutions can fruitfully be examined. Against that background, UKAJI's role as a hub for research in this area is particularly valuable.'

Professor Mark Elliott, Professor of Public Law, University of Cambridge

The blog has attracted a following of more 2,200 subscribers. This is linked to our activity on Twitter, where our profile has grown to 1,450 followers. We also have profiles on LinkedIn and Facebook to reach a range of audiences, including law students. The UKAJI blog and Twitter have been included on the list of top Twitter and blogs for law students for on Professor Mark Elliott's *Public Law for Everyone* for both 2015-16 and 2016-17. Feedback has been very positive; among the comments we've received about the usefulness of UKAJI's website are:

'...the accessibility of the UKAJI materials has been helpful (referring students to a website and blogs rather than books and journals seems to go down well). The collection of a range of interrelated materials allows students to get a broader sense of context and to start navigating towards their personal interests, with different pathways available depending on what issue they want to explore.'

Topics range from the search for the holy grail of online justice in courts and tribunals; parking appeals; the EU ADR Directive and its implications for administrative justice; using research for strategic litigation; and how policymakers can access academic research and vice versa. In addition to our monthly [What's New update on developments in administrative justice](#):

- We produced a guide to **using UKAJI’s website as a research resource** (<https://ukaji.org/2017/03/31/using-ukajis-website-as-a-research-resource/>)
- We bring our readers’ attention to recent research on administrative justice through **research summaries** we publish in the Resources section (<https://ukaji.org/summaries-of-research/>) and in blog posts. These have included, among others, the Low Commission’s work on the economic value of social welfare advice; users’ expectations of public-sector and private-sector ombuds; research on the Traffic Penalty Tribunal; a review of SEN dispute resolution; and a summary of the Bach Commission final report.
- We publish **themed series** of blog posts, such as a series on the draft Public Services Ombudsman Bill (<https://ukaji.org/2017/02/02/no-end-of-searching-a-comment-on-the-draft-public-service-ombudsman-bill-2016/>), featuring commentary from a number of perspectives including that of the user.
- Other resources include our **What is Administrative Justice?** section, which contains a discussion paper we produced to help identify the scope and range of administrative justice, as well as links to the **mapping work** that has been done in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. We also have links to other research project websites.
- Our most-viewed post attracted nearly 2,000 views in March 2016. This was a piece on administrative justice concerns about the DWP’s **mandatory reconsideration** of benefit decisions, and it highlighted recent research by the National Association of Welfare Rights Advisers (NAWRA) (<https://ukaji.org/2016/03/21/administrative-justice-concerns-about-mandatory-reconsideration/>).

‘The UKAJI website is my ‘go to’ place when I want to find out more about administrative justice policy and practice. The information there is always contemporary, covers a wide range of issues, and helpfully tells you who is doing what in AJ-related research. The UKAJI blogs are informative and contextualised, and UKAJI Twitter keeps me both connected and up to date.’

Carolyn Hirst, UK ‘pracademic’ and Independent Researcher

What we have learned about linking policy, practice and research communities

Our ambitions have been high: to establish a new UK-wide hub and network; build our profile; develop a unique forum for exchange of ideas, information and research; create a database of researchers and research; and produce resources of value to researchers. It has become clear that work to build UKAJI's profile through in-person attendance at UK-wide events is challenging given the limited capacity of our core team.

- **Fully using our Expert Group.** The Expert Group was formed of academic researchers, practitioners and other experts from across the UK. Many people have given up their time, without remuneration, to help develop UKAJI's network. We were mindful of the pressures people are under and that, as one comment we received explained, it can be difficult to squeeze UKAJI in around the edges of the 'normal' academic week. However, it is clear that we could have done more to make use of the Expert Group by, for example, more clearly identifying their roles and our expectations, and more could have been achieved with greater resources to enable more travel to meetings and more frequent engagement.
- **Developing the website as an active blog and resource is time consuming.** This meant we did not have capacity to produce the number of research reviews of particular topics that we had proposed, nor have we finalised the e-library resource of published research on administrative justice. We have learned that keeping the blog active requires an awareness of current research and developments and commissioning articles; they do not spontaneously appear. Also, while UKAJI has established a strong 'virtual' online presence, it is clear that, despite being time consuming and resource intensive, 'real world' engagements are key to developing UKAJI's profile and effectiveness.
- It has become apparent that although our blog subscriber list has grown, **the blog does not reach some key members of the administrative justice community**; some are not active users of online resources, and others are not yet aware of our existence. We have also learned that even our subscribers do not generally engage in online discussion via our blog.

Sustainability: What we said we would do

Membership organisation: UKAJI will be established, as an on-line membership organisation linking stakeholders, both nationally and internationally, and working cooperatively with other organisations and networks. ... By year 3 UKAJI will be sustained by funding from membership

subscriptions, income from training courses and conferences, and advertising on the UKAJI website/blog.

Sustainability: What we did

- We worked with an expert consultant on sustainability issues and on developing possible models for UKAJI Mark II. During year 2, the UKAJI team, the Advisory Board and the Nuffield Foundation developed a better understanding of the future organisational possibilities.
- We explored the strengths and weaknesses of four possible funding and income models and presented a paper on these to the Advisory Board. The models ranged from a relatively small membership association to an academic unit within a university to a high-profile, stand-alone independent body and, finally, a primarily online entity actively promoting empirical research and championing administrative justice values. The overall conclusion was that most organisations rely on a combination of funding from income-generating activities, sponsorship, research income, and possibly membership fees. Overall there was a preference for seeking to establish a future UKAJI as a university-based centre with funding from a range of sources.
- We obtained £5,000 funding from the University of Essex Enterprise Fund to assess revenue-generating options for UKAJI. We carried out this work in Summer 2015, with the assistance of the Public Law Project (PLP), which has successful experience of generating revenue from conferences and training. PLP's ability to maintain an income stream from such activities is only possible from its many years of developing relationships and conducting casework. Indeed, the profitable annual conference event was developed over several years with a dedicated, externally funded events organiser, and is supported by law firms and other bodies who wish to be associated with the organisation.

What we have learned about sustainability

- **Membership organisation:** It became clear that it would impracticable to launch UKAJI as a membership organisation, at least in the short term. Our ethos has been to make our resources available to all and to reach as wide an audience as possible, given the extensive reach of administrative justice and the need to be inclusive of individuals who are often referred to as 'users' of the system and its mechanisms. Therefore, to date our focus has

been on building an open and accessible organisation by increasing our profile and community rather than establishing membership structures and seeking income from subscriptions.

- **Income from training courses and conferences:** UKAJI is still developing its profile, and it is unlikely to be able to attract the level of sponsorship that an organisation such as PLP can, after 27 years of existence. We explored possible revenue from training, but found that even for a well-established body such as PLP, whose trainers are high-profile lawyers providing their services for free, training has never contributed more than around 15-18% to their overall annual income. It relies on a mosaic of funding from conference and training fees, corporate sponsorship, and casework.
- Our main conclusions were that developing our profile and product will involve **events that initially at least are unlikely to generate any income**. They are about having conversations with stakeholders in the research, practice, government and other policy-making communities; building relationships; and testing a specific product with specific audiences. An organisation will probably need to invest resources in developing a training programme over several years, often at a loss or with grant/sponsorship support specifically to develop such a programme, a product, and relationships with partners and sponsors.
- **Advertising on the UKAJI blog/website:** As with membership fees, whether or not to seek an income stream from advertising raises important questions for the integrity and values of the organisation. In any case, it would be unlikely to generate sufficient income in itself.
- **Fees for consultancy on funding applications:** We have been called upon to advise on developing research ideas, on funding sources and applications (see below) and have considered whether UKAJI might take a more formal role in offering research consultancy and brokering research teams in exchange for a fee. We considered whether one mechanism of funding UKAJI's input could be through a 'no win no fee' type arrangement – in other words, UKAJI would provide consultancy on a proposal for funding for research, on the basis that the application includes a budget item for future UKAJI consultancy on the project. Such an arrangement would raise issues for UKAJI as an institute within a UK university and also for funders. We would need to discuss how any sums could be received by the University and subsequently made available for UKAJI use, what top slicing/administrative fee the University would levy on receiving the sum, and what ethics

approval processes we/UKAJI would need to engage in. Unless the sums involved were reasonably large (perhaps £1,000+), the administration involved might not be cost-effective. We would also have to explore with funders whether they would be prepared to adopt this innovative approach to funding consultancy on research applications.

- **Funding an independent research body:** In our consultation paper we asked for views on how an independent body with oversight and coordination responsibilities for research in administrative justice should be funded. Several respondents suggested that it is the role of the government to fund a body such as UKAJI, not least because the benefits of providing a focus on evidence, on ‘what works’, are enjoyed by the administrative bodies and government departments. Examples of such comments are ‘Such a body should be at least partly funded by Central Government (as administrative justice outcomes will benefit)’ and ‘We’d see this ideally as a state function (as it effectively has been in the past)’. There are, however, inherent tensions in having government as the sole funder for a body whose primary focus is to encourage research into the workings of the administration. Other respondents expressed concerns that any such body should not be ‘owned’ by government or a government department or even majority funded by it.
- **Carrying out substantive work and capacity building at the same time as exploring and securing a sustainable future for UKAJI has been difficult.** With hindsight, a better model perhaps would have been that taken by the Nuffield Foundation in relation to developing a family justice research hub – i.e. to have an initial scoping phase to identify the appropriate type of organisation, the potential stakeholders, and priority tasks and to separate out the substantive work as a distinct and later strand of work. This is valuable learning.

2. Developing a coordinated research agenda

A research agenda: What we said we would do

Development of the research agenda: To be undertaken across the three years of funding. ... The final agenda will be disseminated in year 3.

Searchable database of researchers: This database of researchers, maintained by UKAJI, will be developed over the three years of funding to include researchers across relevant disciplines in the UK and internationally.... the database will “capture and identify early and mid-career researchers from a range of disciplines”.

Review of national and international research: *Building on the AJTC's Developing Administrative Justice Research (2008) and modelled on the work by Partington et al (2007) the hub will provide a review of the current research literature on administrative justice in the UK*

Scoping workshops with the practice and policy communities: *The mapping and review work will assist the hub to identify researchers and possible research gaps. To further develop a coordinated research agenda, with the advice of the Foundation's steering group, the hub will host scoping workshops.*

Pilot work: *As well as pilot work on data use (see above) the hub will consider further pilots including a case study of the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman's (SPS) Complaints Standards Authority (CSA)*

A research agenda: What we did

Development of a research agenda: Over our first three years we scoped, consulted on, and launched our [Research Roadmap](#). This has been developed as an organic resource outlining the research environment, including the opportunities and challenges; identifying the research needs and gaps; and proposing priority areas for research and actions. To ensure the priorities reflect the concerns identified in our consultation, we used an iterative process to shape the roadmap. In May 2017, we held a seminar with **researchers to explore our draft research roadmap**. This was held at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and was attended by prominent researchers active in administrative justice. Following the workshop, we revised the draft for consultation with the UKAJI Advisory Board, and we shared the paper at the Hart Legal workshop in July. We consulted with a range of stakeholders via our blog, Twitter, SurveyMonkey, phone calls and meetings, and by circulating the consultation document by email and via partner organisations such as the Litigants in Person Network.

Key learning points from this aspect of our work are:

- **that a fresh approach is required to research across administrative justice.** In particular, while there is a rich and varied body of research, **a more proactive and coordinated approach to research planning** is needed in order to ensure that:
 - the **value of research is fully recognised**, including its potential contribution to peoples' trust in, and understanding of, public decision-making and systems of redress. Research may help improve efficiency and save costs to the taxpayer, but the worth of research clearly extends beyond its contribution to efficiency, cost saving and 'business' value;

- limited research resources, including funding for research, are **targeted at priority research needs**;
- a **holistic approach can be taken to research** so that evidence-based learning occurs across jurisdictions and systems, a factor of particular importance given the developments in Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland, as well as in particular sectors of administrative justice;
- **research can throw light on the effectiveness of whole systems** so that, for example, a better understanding is obtained of the implications of changes to one part of the system for other parts of the system;
- **interested parties, including academic researchers, practitioners, user groups and officials have greater opportunity to engage with each other** to improve dialogue and to achieve greater mutual understanding;
- **a forum exists to address challenges facing independent researchers**, including barriers to gaining access to relevant decision-makers and data;
- **research, including piloting and robust evaluation, is built into system design, planning and reform as a matter of routine.**

Among the problems we identified are:

- **Lack of coordination of research** leads to gaps in evidence, lack of awareness of evidence, and failure to use evidence to improve outcomes in initial decision-making, complaints and appeals. It also inhibits opportunities to share and apply learning across the administrative justice landscape.
- **Research may be insufficiently grounded in the 'real world'** by not reflecting people's actual experience, leading to a failure to deliver findings of clear relevance to policy and processes.
- **Data needed for research is often unavailable or inaccessible**, and existing data is not being used, thus limiting understanding of what works and what does not.

Our consultation activities led us to identify three areas of research priority: information, new technologies, and people:

- **Information:** There is a need for better information and a need to make better use of existing information on the use, operation and outcomes of the systems that deliver administrative justice. While a large volume of data is collected by advice groups such as Citizens' Advice, by government departments, ombuds, and courts and tribunals, there is no overall picture of what information does and does not exist. Even within government it may be unclear what information is available and whether it exists in a form that can be used by internal government analysts, let alone independent researchers.
- **New technologies:** While many of the opportunities and risks presented by new technologies are likely to be common to other aspects of the justice system, some are particular to administrative justice, not least because this is the point at which people directly experience government. So, for example, it is here that concerns about the so-called digital divide and the ability of people, including the most vulnerable, to navigate online systems in complex areas such as social security are likely to be most apparent. It is also in areas such as social security that automated decisions may have the greatest potential to save costs and streamline processes. However, past experience has highlighted the vulnerabilities of computer-based mass systems. Issues such as the development of automated decision-making and new forms of dispute resolution; how data is collected, managed and used; the relationships between the state and powerful private-sector organisations (such as GAFA: Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon) illustrate that new technologies potentially offer considerable opportunities, including for researchers, but they also raise serious ethical issues. These factors point to the need for particular attention to be paid to the implications of new technologies for administrative justice not only in relation to matters of process, such as whether systems are user friendly, but also in relation to the quality of outcomes.
- **People:** How do people access, experience and engage with the administrative justice systems, and why do people not engage, sometimes to their detriment? This includes the availability or non-availability of advice and support, the various barriers people face, and their experience of procedures such as mediation and different forms of hearing (paper, oral, and online). There is also a need to improve understandings of how administrative justice systems (and reforms) impact on different groups: who may gain in the process and who may lose, and what is the cumulative effect of this? Furthermore, while it is

important to understand more about the experience of people who access the system as users (and those who do not access the system), there is also a need for research on decision-makers across administrative justice, including those responsible for initial decision-making, those undertaking administrative reviews, and tribunal decision-makers. There is also a continuing need to develop work on the value of feedback and how organisations can learn from mistakes.

Examples of our work on developing a research agenda:

- **Scoping workshops with the practice and policy communities:** We have held a number of scoping workshops, as outlined above under Objective 1, linking policy, practice and research communities. These have included scoping workshops in Scotland (hosted by Glasgow University) and Northern Ireland (hosted by the Northern Ireland Public Services Ombudsman) to explore research priorities for policy-makers and practitioners in those jurisdictions, as well as participating in a workshop on administrative justice concerns in Wales (hosted by Bangor University). We have engaged with the ombuds and public law practitioner communities at conferences, roundtables and seminars, again as outlined above.
- **Contributing to a healthy research environment:** UKAJI has contributed to the evidence strategy developed by MoJ (and reflected in its Areas of Research Interest, May 2018) and has contributed to the brief on customer insight research being commissioned by HMCTS. However, government departments cannot expect to benefit from expert services that are not sustainably costed; after all, funders and universities also operate within, often increasingly, tight financial constraints. UKAJI has explored a potential role to play in helping government departments to contribute to a healthy research environment by, for example, providing researchers with access to data via an established body such as UKAJI.
- **Research resources:** We have produced **annotated bibliographies** of specific keyword topics, including one on *benefit sanctions and inequalities* and one on *users' perspectives*. We also carried out two pilots to explore different ways to produce research reviews on a specific topic. Our pilot on *'internal review'* led us to conclude that even producing research reviews by topic areas was not possible within our existing resources. Our second pilot was more fruitful and involved a collaborative effort to produce a *review of research*

on ombuds, working with a team including academics and practitioners. We presented a draft of this at a workshop we ran for the Ombudsman Association conference in March 2015. The feedback we received was that it would be useful as a resource but more work would be needed to develop the review. Research resources have been published on our website, including mapping projects commissioned by UKAJI (<https://ukaji.org/resources-and-e-library/researcher-resources/>) and summaries of research (<https://ukaji.org/summaries-of-research/>).

- **Pilot work on data:** We commissioned work scoping the availability of administrative data in order to help identify what data exists, what is accessible, and what gaps exist. The report, focusing on **social security and benefits data**, was published in March 2018 as a gitbook, an updatable resource for researchers and others, and is available on our website (<https://ukaji.org/2018/03/08/lessons-learnt-administrative-justice-data-scoping-report/>).
- We also commissioned pilot work on **public-sector complaints data**, led by Tom Mullen and Chris Gill of the University of Glasgow. In October 2017 we launched the report, and a summary of the findings is available on our blog (<https://ukaji.org/2017/10/26/research-into-scotlands-new-arrangements-for-public-service-complaint-handling/>).
- **Mapping:** We commissioned a report mapping the **digitalisation of tribunals**, by Joe Tomlinson of the University of Sheffield and Robert Thomas of the University of Manchester, which was published by the Public Law Project in April 2018 and is available on our website (<https://ukaji.org/2018/04/09/new-report-the-digitalisation-of-tribunals/>). We also commissioned work by Carolyn Hirst on mapping **health redress bodies across the UK** (<https://ukaji.org/2018/03/29/mapping-the-bodies-involved-in-health-redress-in-the-united-kingdom/>).

What we have learned about coordinating a research agenda

There are activities in which we have been less successful than we had hoped. These include:

- **Review of national and international research:** Early in the project, due to resource constraints, with the Nuffield Foundation it was decided that we would focus on the UK. There is much valuable research in other jurisdictions and considerable potential for comparative learning and future initiatives should take advantage of this.

- **Research reviews:** We have explored different approaches to carrying out reviews of research on administrative justice, including using a template based on the *Partington et al* anthology of tribunals research (2007) and considering a ‘state of the art’ overview of research. We came up against severe time capacity constraints with this area of work. The scope and range are very broad, as evidenced by our list of keywords and topic areas which we produced in March 2015 as part of our *What is administrative justice?* discussion paper. We consulted with our wider core team on the keywords and thereafter adopted them for our search mechanism for our blog.
- **Work with funders:** Recognising that funding is central to feasibility of research, we consulted with active and potential funders to explore research priorities. We contacted 12 funders and had valuable follow-up discussions with several. One of our findings is that many funders do not consider themselves to be operating in the area of administrative justice although they work, for example, on issues related to poverty or exclusion – which we consider key aspects of administrative justice in relation to social security and benefits, discrimination, health, education, housing, and other key areas. One funder said that they do not fund ‘policy-driven research’; another that ‘administrative justice isn’t an area we provide support in’. These views, combined with resource constraints within funding bodies, make it difficult to make inroads with funders other than the ones who are well-known to researchers of administrative justice. They also point to the need to get beyond the term ‘administrative justice’ to the key underpinning issues which are often concerned with how people experience public authorities when they are forced to seek assistance or have complaints about decisions.
- **Researcher resources:** A repository of research reports in electronic form would be particularly useful in order to preserve access to archived reports that are no longer accessible online. However, in exploring this option, we have become aware that there is a great deal of work to be done in terms of copyright permissions and scanning hard copy. This is a task we are still considering.

3. Identifying and tackling capacity constraints

Capacity constraints: What we said we would do

Expanding the disciplinary base: *[we] will seek to increase the profile of administrative justice beyond socio-legal studies*

Inter-disciplinary workshops on administrative justice: *Two (day-long) workshops will bring together researchers in disciplines such as economics, management, politics, psychology, public administration, sociology and social policy.*

Information and data: *That policy makers need better information on the system has been noted. However, the availability of information also affects the type of research that may be undertaken, and the attractiveness of this area to those in 'new' disciplines, such those who work with Big Data. [We] will explore the amenability of existing datasets to secondary analysis from an administrative justice angle. With the Data Research Service (Essex), [we] will identify data to be collected such as those relating to complaint and dispute handling by local government and business (eg subject areas, responses and outcomes). Preliminary work will also be undertaken to model potential research and analysis on these matters. [We] will explore with Understanding Society, the potential for exploiting the resource for understanding the issues around administrative justice, recognising the constraints of questionnaire space within this multi-disciplinary study.*

Training on data analysis, combination and linkage: *[We]... will work with centres such as ISER and the Data Research Service (Essex) to develop training on data analysis and data combination and linkage relevant to administrative justice research with a view to developing a sustainable programme of training, e.g. as part of the Essex Summer School on Quantitative Methods Research Methods and /or under the auspices of the UKAJI.*

Engaging early career researchers: *Developing ways to engage early career researchers (ECRs) across disciplines will be an important priority Working initially with ... linked universities ...[we] will explore the most fruitful ways to engage this group on a sustainable basis.*

Programme of early career conferences and UKAJI Bursaries: *To stimulate the engagement of ECRs and research students ...[we]... will host or co-host conferences directed at these groups focusing on opportunities for research on administrative justice and covering substantive research and methods issues.*

Capacity constraints: What we did

We have developed a number of cross-disciplinary initiatives, including, for example, attracting non-law contributors to the blog such as work by Urban Studies academic David Webster

analysing statistics on benefit sanctions, and a contribution from Nick Hillman, Director of the Higher Education Policy Institute, on evidence-based policy. Unsurprisingly, issues surrounding access to, and quality of, data that is available for analysis are of great interest to researchers from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, including social policy experts and economists.

Examples of our work on identifying and tackling capacity constraints:

- **Searchable database of researchers:** We have created and published a database of [Live Research Projects](#) on administrative justice. This searchable database was updated twice a year and published on a dedicated section of the UKAJI website. Alongside the register we published commissioned in-depth project profiles. Together the register and profiles provide a snapshot of what administrative justice research is being done in the UK and particularly the work of early career researchers. With resource the research register would develop as an important resource in three separate databases with links to reports: on work that has been undertaken and published, on current research in progress, and on other resources valuable to researchers such as policy and consultation papers, forming a historical and current archive.
- **Encouraging and assisting development of research:** Through advice and guidance, UKAJI supported individual researchers developing proposals and/or seeking input on methodology. Among the research projects on which we have provided support are:
 - Advice on methodology, analysis and reporting to an independent researcher commissioned by Hackney Community Law Centre and Hackney Migrant Centre on a study of migrant families – mainly single mothers with small children – who are not entitled to welfare benefits and rely on support from their local authority under Section 17 Children Act 1989.
 - Input on research commissioned by the PLP evaluating the Mandatory Telephone Gateway for access to legal advice and legal aid.
 - Advice on a draft questionnaire and survey techniques to an independent researcher researching the use of mediation in the Court of Protection.
 - Support on research design and data sources for a funding proposal from an academic researcher developing a project on judicial review and other legal

challenges to ombuds, which will include a database of such challenges as a resource for the research and practitioner communities.

- Knowledge exchange with a researcher conducting comparative research on mediation in public law.
- **Engaging early career researchers (ECR):**
 - In September 2017 UKAJI co-hosted an extremely successful workshop for early career researchers (ECRs) and funders, in conjunction with the University of Sheffield. Eight ECRs presented papers to an audience of senior academics, tribunal judiciary, and civil servants from HMCTS. It is a pleasure to report that the **UKAJI New Voices in Administrative Justice prize was awarded to Dr Zach Richards** (Keele University) for his paper on legal consciousness and administrative justice - stories from the Australian Refugee Review Tribunal. The prize is aimed at encouraging early career researchers whose work contributes to a wider understanding of administrative justice, and the prize winner received a certificate and £320. The judges awarding the prize were Caroline Hunter (University of York), Nick O'Brien (University of Liverpool and Mental Health /Review Tribunal judge) and Peter Cane (University of Cambridge). We would like to record our thanks to the judges and to Joe Tomlinson for his work making this such a successful event. The event confirms our impression that administrative justice is attracting the interests of ECRs who are doing exciting and important work. The ECR network established in connection with the event will provide a valuable point of contact for ECRs and those considering working in this field. Several papers from the workshop will be published in a themed edition of the *Journal of Social Security Law*. A summary of the workshop is on our blog at <https://ukaji.org/2017/10/30/ukaji-new-voices-workshop-report/>
- **Making contacts across disciplines:** At the SLSA conferences we have brought the work of UKAJI to the attention of researchers including ECRs who were presenting in streams other than administrative justice. Following the conference we contacted many researchers to invite participation in the Current Research Register and, as a result, we have published profiles of research being carried out across disciplines, including geography and linguistics.

What we have learned about identifying and tackling capacity constraints

- **Expanding the disciplinary base:** The success of our collaboration with CASE shows that cross-disciplinary dialogue can be extremely fruitful and stimulating, especially in identifying themes and issues that non-lawyers in particular may not associate with the term ‘administrative justice’. It also presents difficulties.
- Our work with CASE illustrated that there is **already significant work being undertaken of pertinence to administrative justice**. One challenge is how to identify relevant work and potential collaborations and draw lessons from that work.
- There is a **need to break down barriers in relation to way the field is understood** in order to help explain administrative justice to a wider audience. A key point here is that academics do not need to be lawyers in order to work on matters that concern administrative justice. On the contrary: often lawyers, while experts in understanding rules and formal processes, lack the skills necessary to explore key questions to do with why systems are designed as they are, how systems are used, how they work, and what impacts they have on people and policy. Seen from these perspectives, questions concerning administrative justice are of potential importance to a wide range of researchers.
- Shifting long-established academic practices takes time, and it has to be recognised that **any changes in approach to cross-disciplinary research collaborations are likely be organic** and non-linear.

With these matters in mind, during the final year of the project, we continued to build on the contacts established, and, together with our expert and wider core team, to make further links with non-lawyer experts whose work has bearing on administrative justice issues. UKAJI will continue to provide occasions for interested experts and researchers to share their work by way of publishing it via UKAJI channels and, where possible (subject to resource constraints), introducing our work at non-law events.

Access to data and data scoping: Having access to appropriate data sets is a fundamental issue for researchers. Economists in particular have stressed the need for such information. It is evident, however, that clarity about the existence and availability of data, including consistent data that

enables comparisons across systems, is not only a concern for academics. Government departments are also aware of the need to improve the availability of data. In this context we have been working, and continue to work, on approaches to address these needs.

'UKAJI is extremely useful to get a broader idea of what kind of research is currently being done in the UK. I have used it to:

- find out potential contacts for Belgian colleagues looking for links in the UK*
- gain information on engagement*
- stay updated about the progress of the research of some colleagues*
- to help me map the field in my mind*

UKAJI is really important because it offers more than random individual posting by individual researchers on various public law blogs. It seeks to make more hidden issues and research come to my attention.'

Dr Yseult Marique, Senior Lecturer, School of Law, University of Essex

CONCLUSION

We are proud of the contributions UKAJI has been able to make, particularly to developing a community of those with interest in research on administrative justice and in providing resources for researchers and research users. UKAJI's first phase highlighted some very real challenges facing researchers in this area, not least those concerning access to data and funding of research. What is clear, however, is the shared enthusiasm for identifying research priorities and working together to develop a healthy and robust research environment for this most important of areas.

In our **Research Roadmap** we explore some of the challenges facing researchers in greater detail. We also set out in a table the key outcomes to be achieved to meet research needs, the actions required and the actors who are likely to be best placed to help secure their delivery. In setting out these actions we hope to encourage a collaborative initiative that involves coordinated planning and making use of funding opportunities to improve the quality of research, with the ultimate shared aim of improving the quality of justice.

It is to be hoped that newly established AJC will be able to contribute to this collaborative approach to the identification and pursuit of research. We hope that UKAJI will continue to assist the AJC and particularly its academic panel, and that some of the key lessons of our experience will be of value. These include that research priorities should take account of the wider aspects of administrative justice – what we have referred to as the values and principles that should underpin the resolution of disputes between people and public authorities – and that priorities should not have an exclusively narrow institutional focus on courts and tribunals or on a limited range of ‘justice’ issues associated with civil, family or criminal justice. UKAJI's work has highlighted the continuing, and growing, need to further understand the distinctive characteristics of administrative justice as the key space within which people engage with government.

Annex – UKAJI members 2014-2017

During our phase 1 (2014-17) UKAJI had a Core Team with day-to-day responsibility for UKAJI's activities, a Wider Core Team from across the UK, an Expert Group and an Advisory Board.

Core team (based at the University of Essex School of Law):

Maurice Sunkin (principal investigator), Professor of Public Law and Socio Legal Studies, University of Essex – principal investigator, leading and coordinating the whole project.

Margaret Doyle, Senior Research Fellow, University of Essex – managing blog and website and working with the core team across the UKAJI project.

Varda Bondy, Senior Research Fellow, University of Essex, formerly Director of Research, Public Law Project – working on establishing and developing links with stakeholders communities, reviewing research, and mapping researchers.

Andrew Le Sueur, Executive Dean, Humanities, and Professor of Constitutional Justice, University of Essex (co-investigator until September 2016) – leading on establishing, developing and sustaining UKAJI.

Jane Parsons, Administrative Assistant, University of Essex, working with the core team across the UKAJI project (May-Dec 2017).

Sally Barrs, Administrative Assistant, University of Essex, working with the core team across the UKAJI project (May 2016-April 2017).

Specific projects:

Kakia Chatsiou, Research Officer, Catalyst Project, Department of Government, University of Essex – researching administrative data sources.

Joanna Dawson, Senior Researcher, House of Commons Library – producing UKAJI's 'What's New in administrative justice' monthly updates.

Wider core team:

Ray Burningham, formerly Chief Executive, Administrative Justice and Tribunals Council, currently adviser to Welsh Government on Administrative Justice

Christian Gill, Lecturer in Administrative Justice, Queen Margaret University and University of Glasgow

Grainne McKeever, Reader in Law and Director, Ulster University Law Clinic

Tom Mullen, Professor of Law, University of Glasgow

Lucinda Platt, Professor of Social Policy, LSE

Steve Pudney, Professor of Econometrics, Health Economics and Decision Science, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield

Vania Sena, Professor of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Director of the ESRC Business and Local Government Data Research Centre, University of Essex

Robert Thomas, Professor of Public Law, University of Manchester

Joe Tomlinson, Lecturer in Public Law, University of Sheffield, and Research Director, Public Law Project

Expert Group:

Gordon Anthony, Professor of Public Law, Queen's University, Belfast

Trevor Buck, Professor of Socio-legal Studies, De Montfort University

Gavin Drewry, Emeritus Professor of Public Administration, Royal Holloway, London

Tim Hatton, Professor of Economics, Essex

Simon Halliday, Professor of Socio-legal Studies, York

John Hills, Professor of Social Policy, LSE, Director of the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE)

Penny Letts OBE, formerly member of the AJTC

Dr Yseult Marique, Lecturer in Law, University of Essex, administrative justice issues in France and Belgium

Judge Alison McKenna, Principal judge, First-tier tribunal (Charity)

Morag McDermont, Professor of Socio-Legal Studies, Bristol

Linda Mulcahy, Professor of Law, LSE

Sarah Nason, Lecturer in Law, Bangor

Ellie Palmer, Emeritus Professor of Law, member of Human Rights Centre, Essex

Dr Tim Rakow, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, King's College London

Roy Sainsbury, Professor, Social Policy Research Unit, York

Richard Thomas CBE, formerly Chair of AJTC and Information Commissioner

Advisory Board:

Lucy Scott-Moncrieff (Chair of Advisory Board), Director, Scott-Moncrieff & Associates LLP;
Commissioner, Judicial Appointments Commission

Jodi Berg, Chair, Administrative Justice Forum

Bob Chapman, Chair, National Advice Network Wales; Member of the Low Commission

Dr Jane Martin, Local Government Ombudsman; Vice Chair, Ombudsman Association

Sarah O'Neill, legal and consumer policy expert, former member of the Scottish Tribunals and
Administrative Justice Advisory Committee

Professor Genevra Richardson, School of Law, King's College, London

Sir Ernest Ryder, Senior President of Tribunals

Kevin Sadler, Interim Chief Executive, HM Courts & Tribunals Service

John Sheridan, Digital Director, The National Archives

Professor Maurice Sunkin, project leader (in attendance)

Teresa Williams, Director of Social Research & Policy, Nuffield Foundation