The Judicial Innovation Fellowship:

A Roadmap to Strengthen State, Local, Territorial, and Tribal Courts

JUDICIAL INNOVATION FELLOWSHIP

GEORGETOWN LAW

INSTITUTE FOR TECHNOLOGY LAW & POLICY

GEORGETOWN LAW

The Judicial Innovation Fellowship: A Roadmap to Strengthen State, Local, Territorial, and Tribal Courts[1]

By Jason Tashea
Published February 2023

Introduction	3
The Challenge	4
JIF Principles, Guidelines, and Resources	7
The JIF Fellowship	8
Fellowships as a Lever for Change	8
Project Opportunities	9
Recruiting Courts	11
Selecting Courts	12
Recruiting Fellows	14
Selecting Fellows	15
Design & Execution of the Fellowship	15
Open Questions	19
Conclusion	20
Appendix: Interviewees	21

1 The Judicial Innovation Fellowship (JIF) is an initiative incubated at the Justice Lab at Georgetown Law Center's Institute for Technology Law and Policy, led by Schmidt Innovation Fellow Jason Tashea and Tanina Rostain, Agnes Williams Sesquicentennial Professor of Justice Innovation. This work is supported by New Venture Fund and Pew Charitable Trusts. Fritz Family Fellow Ashwin Ramaswami provides invaluable research and support.

Introduction

"I've never had someone call me and ask how they can help us be better."
– Judge Sean Armstrong, Oregon

The Judicial Innovation Fellowship (JIF) program leverages human talent to strengthen state, local, territorial, and tribal courts. Doing so improves the public's access to justice and trains a new generation of justice technology professionals. Our fellows, who may be data scientists, designers, cybersecurity experts, user testers, or developers, will work as advisors and practitioners to provide outside bandwidth, expertise, and perspective to their host courts. A place- and project-based fellowship, JIF fellows will work on projects as a core component of their placement. Based on consultation with court partners, the projects will focus on improving court transparency, equity, and efficiency. With an eye to common pain points experienced by courts across the United States, we aim for replicable and scalable outcomes that foster positive change in our partner courts and beyond.

Not just focused on their discrete projects, JIF fellows can also help promote broader culture change. By working on their projects and deploying modern software development and design approaches, fellows can offer ideas and perspectives to their court partners on how to approach problem identification, solution design, quality assurance, and user testing. This type of culture change can lead to other benefits, like improving how a court buys technology and integrating user-centered design practices.

This document is a starting point for the JIF program's inaugural cohort. We are publishing this internal-facing document–literally the "how-to" for this program's administration–in the spirit of openness and public documentation, a principle of the JIF program. The research reflected here is informed by a literature review of court technology projects and government fellowship programs as well as 117 interviews with experts in access to justice, courts, technology, and fellowship management. As this is an emerging and evolving program, this is a living document that will be updated with lessons learned and feedback from our court partners, thought partners, and fellows.

This iterative approach is intended to build a resilient, sustainable, and scalable fellowship program. By doing so, we have the potential to make courts more dynamic and responsive to court patrons' needs, correspondingly increasing public trust and confidence in our justice system and democracy.

The Challenge

Courts across the United States are inundated with cases. Each year, 55 million Americans experience 260 million civil legal problems—including issues with eviction, consumer debt, domestic violence, veterans' benefits, disability access, and health care—with little to no support. Ninety-two percent of low-income individuals facing a legal problem receive inadequate or no legal help, a problem increasingly experienced by the middle class and exacerbated by systemic disparities. This chasm between justice problems and access to actionable information and assistance is the "justice gap." Meanwhile, an average of 630,000 people processed through criminal court sit in pretrial detention every day, a population we know very little about.

As inequality and poverty have grown over the past decades, the gap has widened. The World Justice Project, which tracks the rule of law, shows that Americans' ability to access counsel declined from 2010 to 2020. State courts have long faced accessibility and backlog challenges that have deferred, if not denied, access to justice for those who seek it. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the issue, with states around the country facing unprecedented delays of civil and criminal hearings. Meanwhile, having spent the last 15 years under austerity, courts struggle to hire talent and fund innovative projects.

This all comes at a serious human cost. In courtrooms across the U.S., people are faced with byzantine forms and legalistic language as they seek basic human needs like housing, physical safety, and freedom. Unnecessary hurdles and administrative burdens put legal remedies out of reach for those who cannot afford an attorney—called self-represented litigants (SRLs)—who make up the majority of court users today. Not just a court problem, unresolved legal issues can cause medical complications and lost wages or unemployment. Such issues cost the U.S. nearly 1.5 percent of GDP every year.

There isn't a single reason why courts are in this situation. As explained in more detail below, courts face numerous challenges that make it difficult for them to meet the needs of the public, including budget and staffing shortfalls, an unclear management structure around improving access to justice, an undeveloped or risk-averse approach to innovation and experimentation, and a lack of external options when shopping for software and vendors.

Budget and Staffing Limitations on Court Technology

For over a decade, courts have been constrained by tighter budgets, which create a drag on modernization projects and staffing. These shortfalls are particularly acute in rural and tribal courts, which likely never had sufficient IT infrastructure or staffing support before budget cuts began.

Funding limits create challenges for the development, ownership, and maintenance of access to justice and technology projects. Illustrating how anemic court budgets are, we spoke to one family court judge who lamented that they did not have the resources to purchase and manage a public printer for couples in divorce proceedings to print parenting plans. Another court official we spoke to said they were not able to expand their guided filing resources for SRLs because they couldn't maintain the existing resource library. Yet another said they simply do not have the resources for a digital payment system.

Budget constraints also hinder staffing. The consensus from court leaders was that the salaries they offer are not on par with the private sector. Many drive home the mission-driven nature of their work to entice potential employees beyond salary. Others are creating work-from-home or fully remote options to increase desirability. Even with these changes, courts struggle to hire and retain staff.

The Challenge

The lack of staffing creates knock-on effects. For example, courts with strategic plans for access-to-justice or technology work are seeing those plans put on hold due to the burden of maintaining existing projects and managing statutorily required changes. Human resources have been further sapped during the pandemic due to increased pressure on existing staff to increase virtual access to courts. In other situations, existing court staff may oppose automation, because it is seen as a threat to their current roles. This concern could be ameliorated through additional training, but the opportunity to train staff on new processes or technologies is limited, particularly in rural areas, due to the staffing shortage. This inability to educate and train jeopardizes the staff buy-in and know-how required to implement a modernization project successfully. Restrained budgets also limit the opportunity to update legacy technology systems that are written in outdated languages, like COBOL, which makes modern functionality cost- and resource-prohibitive.

Many that we spoke with indicated that even when funding does find its way into the budget for a specific project, it is usually not sustainable funding. This means that projects have enough to develop a pilot, but not enough to iterate, improve, or even cover general maintenance afterward. Unfortunately, to make up for these funding shortfalls, many courts have become reliant on fines and fees, which disproportionately harm those populations most in need of help. Providing a low- or no-cost way for courts to access technical and design talent is a quick approach to overcoming this challenge in the short term and can illustrate why court investment in this type of talent is impactful.

Cultural and Organizational Constraints that Curb Innovation and Experimentation

Courts largely struggle to adopt a culture of innovation and experimentation because their structure and temperament are built to withstand change. This temperament is reflected in court rules, procedure, and tradition. Without incentives to innovate, however, these factors become strictures that impede experimentation, hurting those without access to an attorney the most.

Those strictures take many forms, which are often derived from judicial independence and discretion principles. The principles of judicial independence and discretion are critical to an impartial judiciary. They provide judges the ability to tailor their approach on the bench, how their chambers function, and how to interpret rules and law. At the same time, they are hindrances to the development of new projects, especially those which require standardization across chambers or judicial districts.

For example, judicial discretion impacts how projects are picked and managed. Many courts do without a centralized and comprehensive approach to access-to-justice and modernization projects, because chief judges are often wary of issuing a mandate that appears to impede judicial discretion. Without a centralized approach, a single judge can stop a project. Courts that have made gains usually have a judge who worked hard to develop consensus across numerous stakeholders around a particular issue, like standardized forms, to create buy-in and move a project forward.

In opposite scenarios, a project led by a committee–with many interested parties and no clear ownership–is equally problematic. Not defining ownership creates gaps in defining success, which leaves project leaders groping in the dark, hoping they get it right. Even in a unified court jurisdiction, those states where supreme court justices are leading a top-down access-to-justice effort, we are told the justices are too removed from the problems faced by SRLs and trial-level courts to correctly identify needs and solutions. For this reason, we are told, a top-down approach that does not devote sufficient time to understanding the problem can lead to unsuccessful projects as well.

The issues created by unclear leadership can be exacerbated by a fear of failure or allowing the perfect to be the enemy of the good. Court technology departments have historically focused on internal operations and the collection of administrative data as opposed to improving public access, transparency, and innovation. When a project doesn't go well, instead of being rewarded for trying something new, they are met with indignation from the public and press, creating a negative feedback loop. In some instances, the initial failure leads to a scrapping of the project entirely and a reversion to the old system, instead of learning and growing from the challenges to develop a better, second version.

The Challenge

In other examples, a culture that is experiment-averse and concerned with public perceptions of failure turns pilots into permanent fixtures regardless of utility. Sunsetting a project is seen as a failure or an embarrassment. This creates a maintenance headache for court staff, because they get tasked with maintaining dysfunctional programs that do not improve court function or public access. This fear of ending a project also means that evaluation and post-mortems are not done with regularity, leaving courts unsure why their project didn't succeed.

Even courts that embrace experimentation are hampered by the slow adoption of human-centered design and user testing. According to our interviews, although court project owners often desire human-centered design practices, they may not have the funding or the staffing resources to do this work. In other instances, vendors make user-testing costs prohibitive. Regardless of reason, the inability to undertake user testing on public-facing projects and content leads to underperformance. Collectively, bringing outside talent with different skillsets and perspectives can help courts safely experiment with new processes.

Lack of Competition in Private Industry Court Technology Vendors

When courts do not have the internal capacity to develop or test their own software, they are reliant on vendors. If the court technology marketplace were robust and offered numerous options, the competition might yield more efficient and innovative results. The actual market, however, has very little competition and leaves courts overly reliant on a small number of vendor partners for technical support. These factors create a court technology sector that produces expensive tools and services with poor usability and little incentive for innovation.

A market controlled by so few players leaves courts at the whim of what vendors are willing to do and at what cost. One judge we spoke to told us that they asked a vendor to replicate the case management system (CMS) they built for another judicial district in their state, including forms and processes, and merely update the name of the court and relevant local information. The vendor declined to do so, which made the project cost significantly more and, as the judge stated, encouraged differences and lack of standardization between judicial districts. This has been a documented trend for over 20 years. In other states, vendors market their products as "highly customizable," which means that counties in the same state may use the same software, but it will look and act differently. We heard a similar story about a vendor reluctant or unwilling to add data fields to front-end intake interfaces and back-end databases, which forced the project owner to develop a redundant data collection system. In those cases where a vendor is willing to work on an innovative project, we understand that the vendor uses the request to create a cycle of extra fees, which makes courts reluctant to pursue modernization efforts.

In many areas of technology, application programming interfaces (APIs) allow software to "talk" to other software and share data. Open APIs with good documentation allow purchasers to plug-and-play different software, creating a more dynamic software environment. The legal field has a prominent example of this in Clio, a private company with a well-documented API that allows for easy integration by third-parties. However, when it comes to court case management providers, this is not the situation. CMS vendors are not primarily motivated to make it easier for outside companies, nonprofits, or researchers to do their work. This is a component of the "vendor lock-in" phenomenon. In rare instances, where qualified developers are allowed access to a court case management system's API, we were told it takes up to two years and $120,000 of employee time to get certified. After certification, there was little documentation available, which leaves courts and third-parties still reliant on the vendor to make changes or to run tests, which comes at yet more costs. Having outside perspectives with technical and design expertise can help courts increase internal capacity and avoid many of the traps set by technology vendors.

Budget, staffing, court culture and management, and technical issues are working against court adoption of modern technology practices and software, which hurts access-to-justice efforts. At the same time, there is a desire by court leaders around the country to proactively move past these challenges, which is why now is the appropriate time to launch a new capacity building program that brings more technical talent into courts.

JIF Principles, Guidelines, and Resources

The Judicial Innovation Fellowship is informed by principles and guidelines from the areas of court modernization, public interest technology, and data privacy and protection. These principles and guidelines promote court modernization to benefit court patrons and instill trust and confidence in the courts more broadly.

A court modernization project at its core, the JIF program incorporates the Pew Charitable Trusts' Court Modernization Framework (publication forthcoming). The framework creates a common language for modernization, its goals, and outcome measures. The framework itself is based on three core principles:

Openness: improving transparency, data, and knowledge of the legal system;

Efficiency: optimizing resources to assist litigants; and

Equity: understanding and responding to disparities to improve people's ability to assert their rights and achieve just outcomes.

Building on the commitment to transparency and openness, JIF projects aim to improve the accessibility of data held by courts, while securing those systems and protecting data subject privacy. The FAIR principles, which prioritize findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reuse, and modern data standardization concepts will inform the program's approach to data creation and accessibility. However, as the White House's Information Technology Operating Plan makes clear, an open approach to government needs to be balanced with security and privacy. Cybersecurity and privacy of sensitive information not only underlies the public trust and confidence in modernization and data work—it's also fundamental to functioning court administration. To support the security and privacy of court data, the JIF program will promote modern, standards-based cybersecurity, like what is put forward by the National Institute for Standards and Technology, and a harm-reduction approach to privacy, like the Information Systems Audit and Control Association's privacy risk management framework.

JIF itself is a default-to-open program. We will post its documentation online and make projects available through open source licenses on GitHub. Informed by Eric S. Raymond's The Cathedral and the Bazaar, we believe that an open approach helps build community, better software, and, ultimately, better courts.

Under the Pew framework, improving efficiency requires adopting a simplified, user-centered approach to court administration. When it comes to user-centered design, the OECD's criteria for people-centered design and delivery of legal and justice services, Cyd Harrell's Civic Technologist's Practice Guide, Tim Berners-Lee's Principles of Design, and Margaret Hagan's Law by Design inform these principles. Similarly, the U.S. Digital Service's Digital Services Playbook provides a roadmap on how to successfully work with users to execute a public project well.

A project is not efficient—or equitable—unless it is efficient for all court patrons. This includes individuals with a disability, those who speak a different language, racial and ethnic minorities, and patrons with varying levels of technology literacy. The National Center for Access to Justice ranks disability and language access in state courts, which provides guideposts, while 18F's guide on accessibility gives practical guidance on how to get there. Similarly, court technology needs to take procedural justice factors, like how someone feels treated by the process, into consideration. Failing to do so can have an outsized negative impact on racial and ethnic minority communities.

Consistent with improving equity, the JIF program must ensure that it does not entrench existing inequalities. Researchers have concluded that the access-to-justice crisis, as well as mass incarceration, are reflective of larger trends in society, including economic and racial inequality. To that end, vetting potential projects needs to ensure existing systems of inequality are not entrenched by proposed solutions. To aid in this, the Partnership Technology Toolkit and Sasha Costanza-Chock's Design Justice provide frameworks to assess potential projects and avoid perpetuating existing bias and inequality.

Collectively, these principles and guidelines undergirding court modernization, public interest technology, and data privacy and protection inform a thoughtful and intentional approach to the JIF program.

The JIF Fellowship

The problems faced by courts are urgent, and the opportunity for transformational impact has never been higher. Drawing on successful fellowship models in the executive and legislative branches, the Judicial Innovation Fellowship is a one-year, project-based fellowship for technologists, cybersecurity experts, data scientists, and designers in America's state, local, territorial, and tribal courts. Partnering with forward thinking courts, the program will help scope projects and source talent to make promising ideas a reality. Focused on court infrastructure, we can improve outcomes in both criminal and civil justice. Criteria for projects will include the potential to transform the experience of litigants, simplify court operations, produce transparency, increase just outcomes, and scale across other courts. The injection of design and digital expertise across a range of carefully chosen court sites will not only prompt the emergence of scalable models and replicable best practices, it can also aid culture change within courts themselves. This two-pronged impact can create a multiplier effect that will build a more open, efficient, and equitable justice system.

Fellowships as a Lever for Change

Bringing technology and design professionals into government has demonstrated impact in executive and legislative branches at local and national levels. Code for America, Coding it Forward, the Presidential Innovation Fellows, and TechCongress, among many others, have been placing technical professionals in government as a lever for change for over a decade. These fellows provide increased bandwidth, expertise, and a new perspective in public organizations looking to improve internal function and public services. Fellows accomplish this not only by working on technical projects, like standardizing siloed public datasets, but by also being advisors to their host agencies. Their engagement can foster organizational culture change, like building human-centered design capability into an agency's processes.

At its highest potential, the JIF program is about leveraging human talent to strengthen the judicial branch, improve access to justice, and train a new generation of justice technology professionals. Building on the lessons of other programs, our fellows will work as advisors and practitioners to provide outside bandwidth, expertise, and perspective to their host courts. A place- and project-based fellowship, JIFs will work on projects as a core component of their placement. By working on their projects and deploying modern software development and design approaches, they can bring new ideas and perspectives to their court partners on how to approach problem identification, solution design, quality assurance, and user testing. This type of culture change can lead to other benefits, like improving how a court buys technology and integrating user-centered practices.

Talent as a lever for change can also create a flywheel effect across judicial systems. There are common pain points across courts, and a leading assumption of the JIF program is that targeted solutions can be built with replicability and scalability in mind. If this assumption proves correct, fellow projects not only help their partner courts, but also develop code for core functionality that can be deployed by other courts.

The Fellowship

By helping courts build safe, secure, and supported court technology that improves equity, efficiency, and transparency, we are able to use talent to improve public trust and confidence in our courts.

Project Opportunities

There is an endless universe of court data, technology, and design projects. This is especially true after all of the pandemic-era changes. To focus the universe of potential projects and leverage the fellows' skills and limited time for the greatest impact, we identified three main criteria for picking project areas. Each project JIF undertakes needs to: improve the public's access to justice, address a problem common across courts, and be interesting to potential fellows.

Assessing the impact a project has on access to justice is a challenge. However, we can help meet this goal by taking projects that are built around the needs of litigants, and not merely digitizing a process for the sake of digitization. Specifically, we are focused on improving transparency, equity, and efficiency for those litigants and the courts themselves. Second, our theory of change is that there are common pain points across courts, and that these issues can be targeted and solutions built with replicability and scalability in mind. The last factor requires us to take into consideration what potential fellows will find enticing, such as whether it aligns with a fellow's values, has been scoped appropriately, and leverages the fellows' skills while still providing a growth opportunity.

With these three criteria in mind, we heard from courts around the country about common pain points. Below are five potential project areas for the JIF pilot. This section defines project areas without being overly prescriptive, which provides us multiple benefits: (1) It lets us focus on representative problems and develop solutions with core functionality that can be applied in multiple jurisdictions; (2) By focusing on common problems, it allows us to show that success in one court can look like success in any court, which is critical to showing proof of concept; and (3) By not being overly prescriptive, courts can propose projects that they are interested in, which lets us meet courts where they are at and it helps promote long-term sustainability of the fellows' work. The example project ideas listed in each thematic area are meant as possibilities, not a menu of finite options.

Data Infrastructure & Interoperability. The state of court data is one of messy inaccessibility. In both criminal and civil courts, important data, like the status of legal representation and intermediate and long-term case outcomes, simply don't exist.[2] In many courts, the PDF is the main data unit, leaving granular data uncaptured. Where courts have begun to digitize and create new information systems, they are often siloed, which makes the data piecemeal and inaccessible. There is a general lack of standardization, which devalues the utility of the data. In other instances, data is overwritten, especially in criminal courts, when there is one field for an outcome and multiple, simultaneously correct answers, like "diversion" and "case dismissed." In many jurisdictions, data is manually entered, as opposed to automating data pulls from arrest affidavits and court filings, which creates errors. At the same time, courts lack data governance frameworks that would help responsibly manage the data they do have or hope to collect.

There is broad interest in sharing court data to create insights, inform policy, and make the business case for access-to-justice work. On the technical side, the National Center for State Courts has developed an open data standard, and work is being done to develop open source APIs with Apache Camel, OASIS, and SALI standards.[3] Similarly, the JIF program could help hasten the adoption of universal court citations to decrease private sector control of court information. Getting courts to implement open, well documented APIs can ease the workload of staff and make data requests routine.

2 The Civil Justice Data Gap, Tanina Rostain and Amy O'Hara, forthcoming.

3 Further reading: Data Governance Policy Guide, National Center for State Courts, 2019; Improving Court Statistics By Exploring the Shape of Data, National Center for State Courts, 2021; The Power and Problem of Criminal Justice Data, Measures for Justice, 2021; Measuring Civil Justice for All, American Academy of Arts & Sciences, 2021; Civil Justice Data Commons Governance Model, Georgetown Law, 2011.

The Fellowship

The JIF program has the opportunity to build on this momentum in numerous ways depending on the maturity of the court's data posture. For courts starting out on their data journey, a fellow could assess what data a court has, where it lives, and what state it's in before making a series of recommendations and prototypes on how to thoughtfully and incrementally move forward. For courts with a more mature data system, we can work with them to develop data dictionaries, which are used to define and show relationships of data. For states that have adopted Clean Slate laws, we can provide support for program implementation to improve automated access to expungement. We can implement open, well-documented APIs to improve internal, interagency, and public data sharing. For example, an API between courts and a state's food stamp administrator could be used to quickly means-check litigants, as opposed to requiring SRLs to fill out and court staff to review extensive fee waiver forms. Similarly, pretrial proceedings could take less time if data sharing were made possible between courts, defenders, police, and prosecutors, which would hasten a public defender determination and release. In tribal courts, the Tribal Law and Order Act requires a record of certain criminal proceedings, such as an audio or digital recording, to be maintained for appeal. This is a need across many tribal courts and could be an early, replicable win. While working on these technical projects, fellows also have an opportunity to help courts think about their data governance policies, which, at the moment, is usually nothing more than statutory requirements. As a limiting factor, court technology vendors have the potential to make this work difficult by limiting interoperability of existing systems.

User Testing and Prototyping. Multiple court staffers told us that testing new content and products was out of reach due to a cost imposed by a vendor or staffing shortages. Many others were not considering user testing as a part of their project plan at all, because of a lack of knowhow or funding. Without user testing, it's hard to know if a project is living up to its potential and how to make thoughtful updates. User testing is also a way to understand if an online tool or service is meeting accessibility standards. Usability issues impact court administration and public-facing technologies, like forms, online dispute resolution, and self-help resources.

Efiling exemplifies the need for user testing in public-facing court tech. Currently, 42 states allow self-represented litigants to efile. However, the consensus is that current efiling portals are not user-friendly, especially for SRLs.[4] Common issues include efile portals that are not mobile-friendly and do not communicate with public-facing court databases. Making matters worse, efiling software was developed for lawyers, meaning that it often does not provide users with accessible, plain language. Compounding this issue, efiling is routinely not integrated with self-help services that could offset the shortcomings of the efile system itself. At least one court we are aware of uses email for efiling, after which court staff print out the documents to be processed. The majority of states also lack support for fee waiver filing, non-English language access, and accessibility tools, like screen readers used by the visually impaired. Collectively, these shortcomings increase the number of rejected filings, which delays justice for the litigant and causes more work for court clerks.

Having a dedicated UI/UX fellow in courts could level up in-development and existing access-to-justice work, including efiling. For courts early in the tool development process, the fellow could help courts go through the discovery phase, conduct user interviews, and create prototypes and draft requirements for a user-centered project. For courts with existing products, a fellow could test content and tools, conduct interviews, and recommend updates to improve the court service. This could also include accessibility audits. In either situation, the fellow can develop user testing protocols, some of the most accessible skills for non-technical people to learn.

4 Further reading: Self-Represented eFiling: Surveying the Accessible Implementations, National Center for State Courts, 2022; Improving the eFile Experience for Self-Represented Litigants in Illinois, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, 2022; Principles and Best Practices For Access-Friendly Court Electronic Filing, Legal Services Corporation, 2013; Filing Fairness Project, Stanford University, 2022.

The Fellowship

This creates a playbook for the partner court, which can be generalized and adopted by other courts.[5] For fellows, this work would balance the competing needs of court staff and the public, making it an engaging design challenge.

White Labeling and Open Sourcing Existing Court Software. Better funded courts around the country are building their own software to improve court function, public access, and fair outcomes. Much of this work is done in spite of vendors who promise more expensive, less functional alternatives. For example, the Minnesota courts developed MyMNConservator to track and audit nearly $1 billion dollars in assets covered by conservatorship in the state. Fixing a problem common in state courts, five other states attempted to take Minnesota's code and tailor it to their needs. It did not go well. Since the project was built for the Minnesota system, other courts had to pull out the Minnesota rules and definitions baked into the code before they could build for their own needs. This slowed or derailed adoption of the software in all five states. Other court leaders have similarly developed universally needed software for their judicial district and want to give the code away, but the hurdles for adoption are too high.

We can build the interstitial layer needed for handoffs of existing court software to be successful. By taking existing court code, our fellows can sandbox it, pull out the jurisdiction-specific code, make features modular, do a security audit, and release the final code publicly in a white-labeled format. Doing so could foster increased sharing, collaboration, and adoption of open source court software, while decreasing costs for courts.

Calendaring & Scheduling. While criminal courts have been testing text message reminders for years as a tool to decrease failures to appear, notifications and online- or SMS-based scheduling and rescheduling have yet to be broadly adopted by civil courts. This is in part because of a lack of standardization in scheduling practices across courts in a judicial district, among other limitations. Many courts are excited about making scheduling easier for administrative and usability purposes, especially for unrepresented parties that need child care or struggle to get time off of work. A project focused on this issue could work with a court to build a robust system with incremental wins, like notifications, creating feedback loops with court patrons, and allowing for rescheduling via text.

Cybersecurity. Court cybersecurity and court patron privacy is an access-to-justice issue. When courts fall victim to a ransomware attack or mistakenly make public certain data, people with protective orders can have their addresses leaked; sealed eviction and arrest information may be made public; and people, including minors, can have other sensitive information, like medical and mental health records, published online. This information, individually or aggregated, can cause direct harm to these data subjects, who are often already marginalized. To mature their data security, courts need help developing cybersecurity emergency plans, doing tabletop exercises to prepare for a breach, with penetration testing, creating a governing policy, defining and enforcing permissions, and developing vulnerability disclosure policies and setting up bug bounty programs. With so much need, fellows could be engaged on multiple projects, each building off of each other.

Recruiting Courts

Regardless of project type, there are a number of considerations that are relevant to successfully recruiting courts to partner with JIF, including how we articulate our value proposition and engage with courts.

The JIF program offers numerous benefits to courts. These include increased staffing, expertise, and monetary support for innovation projects, all of which meet court needs as discussed in previous sections. Our fel-

5 Further reading: A collection of tools to bring human-centered design into your project, 18F, last accessed 2022; Participatory designs for access to justice, Daedalus, 2019; Civic User Testing Group as a New Model for UX Testing, Digital Skills Development, and Community Engagement in Civic Tech, the CUT Group, 2019.

The Fellowship

lows will develop a defined project and provide perspective on project management, user testing, and technology policy issues. Additionally, JIF is able to shoulder some of the risk for the courts, which should alleviate any fear they may have when undertaking a new or bold project.

While many courts may not see improving access to justice as a part of their mission, it will be important to make clear that access-to-justice projects are court efficiency projects. Every process or technology improvement that helps an SRL file correctly, complete service, or show up on time to the right courtroom is one less headache for court clerks and judges themselves. This approach helps us meet our goals of improving public trust and confidence in the courts and improving court administration.

When it comes to tribal courts, they must be approached with humility. The importance of tribal sovereignty–and the tribal court's role in upholding sovereignty–cannot be overstated as a key point of respect and engagement. In each case, the JIF program will center a tribe's overall social, legal, and economic situation, as well as viewing all work with tribal courts in the critical context of misdeeds perpetrated by the U.S. and state governments.

From a practical point of view, the application process needs to balance simplicity with due diligence to ensure that more resource-starved courts, those that need the most help, will be able to apply. There will be a webinar for interested courts before we open the application process to explain the program and answer questions.

Selecting Courts

For the pilot, we aim to work with a cross-section of courts, including an urban or suburban court with a high volume of cases, a rural or tribal court where distance is a limiting factor, and a territorial court. This diversity will help us understand how our program works in a variety of court settings and allow us to have impact in various communities.

Projects should be placed in offices that have the power to implement the proposed project, such as court clerk or administrative offices, self-help centers, IT departments, or statewide offices, like an access to justice commission. Projects should not be housed in individual judges' chambers, because doing so runs the risk of fixing problems only that judge is experiencing, limiting the replicability and scalability of the work. We will not work with federal courts because their litigants and case types do not reflect the populations we seek to serve.

There are competing opinions about whether a unified court system or a decentralized court system is the best place for JIF fellows. Unified court systems can provide top-down leadership that will improve the scalability of projects if they are successful within that state. Meanwhile, others contend that a decentralized system grants greater latitude for experimentation by local judicial districts, which may make it easier to get a project approved and started. Whether a court is unified or decentralized should not be dispositive for an application, but merely a factor considered.

Similarly, tribal courts come in different models: traditional, western adversarial, and a hybrid of the two. Further, some are more mature and have been operating longer, while others are still developing their legal code. For tribes that do not have their own justice system, the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs operates the Court of Indian Offenses ("CFR Courts") on behalf of the tribe. Some of these types of courts may be less appropriate for the goals and processes of the JIF program. For example, traditional courts, which are built on tribal customs, may lack commonality with other courts, making it difficult to develop a replicable project. Further, many tribal courts, like rural state courts, lack technical infrastructure in their communities, making certain interventions, like those that rely on broadband access, impractical.[6]

Each potential partner's tech stack needs to be considered. Specifically, whether or not a court uses Tyler Technologies' Odyssey case management system or something else. Odyssey is the most widely used court CMS in the U.S. To work with a Tyler jurisdiction success-

6 Building Capacity for Tribal Justice Solutions, Center for Court Innovation, 2021.

The Fellowship

fully would give us a roadmap and potentially a module that could work with other Tyler jurisdictions. However, as noted in section II, the need to productively work with private vendors in a short timeframe and within budget may prove a limiting factor. By contrast, a court using a homegrown CMS may require a technical solution that is hard to scale or replicate elsewhere. Further, we do not want to favor one company over another with our work or entrench inefficient practices from the private sector.

When it comes to the projects, their success relies on people, process, and the technology itself. Based on conversations with people who have created similar technologists-in-government fellowships and grantmakers in the justice innovation space, certain factors should be considered when picking a project site beyond the project itself. The application should assess the following five factors:

Executive buy-in. A project needs buy-in from a top-level executive. This may be a state supreme court justice, a chief judge, an administrative director, or a director of IT (or a combination). These people have the authority, access to resources, passion about the program, and are willing to open doors or bring departments together for the success of the project. We want their signature on the MOU and court letterhead showing support for the project and a fellow.

Managerial support. Each proposal needs to identify a manager who is close to leadership and wants to take on the day-to-day oversight of the project and the fellow. This person will act like a sherpa, showing the fellow through the weeds and traps of the court's bureaucracy and politics. A strong person in this role can help a fellow get up to speed and integrate into the office. Ideally, they can translate between court needs and technology, but not all courts may have that person. This person can double as the project owner after project handoff.

Problem definition. It is important that the court and its partners have identified a problem they want to fix and begun to think through potential solutions and hurdles. The court, potentially with outside partners, completing this legwork helps de-risk our potential partnership and shows interest and existing commitment to the project.

Flexibility. A partner that starts with an overly prescriptive solution and unwillingness for flexibility is a red flag. We look for partners that understand that space needs to be left for scoping, the discovery process, and input from the fellow. This is particularly important during our first few years when court partners will be our co-designers as we experiment with this fellowship model and find ways to improve it

.

Playing well with others. Access-to-justice and court modernization projects succeed when all the stakeholders are at the table and want the project to work. Knowing who is involved in a project helps us understand the ecosystem the project exists in and lets us know where potential pitfalls may exist. Where partners are named, we may solicit letters of support from non-court partners to help us understand how collaborative the court is.

Working with promising court proposals will likely be an iterative process.[7] A collaborative scoping process, one that clearly identifies the problem and potential solution, can help build trust early between the JIF program and court. This should include breaking up the year-long project into smaller, incremental deliverables. This will help get the fellow started quickly, establish the program's value, and act as a hedge against a project failing entirely if a fellow leaves during their fellowship. At the same time, it was recommended that scoping should be left broad enough to allow the fellow to define the project and make it their own, but structured enough to give the fellow firm ground to start on.

7 We may also consider follow up questions, including: What deliverables is the court looking for? How are they defined? How does the court measure success? What project dependencies does this project have? Which are out of the court's control? If those dependencies include court rules, is the court willing to engage in rulemaking or temporary rule suspension in support of the project? What is the court's maintenance and sustainability plan? What is a project the court has done in the past that they think is innovative? What access to justice work is the court already undertaking? (This question helps vet for culture fit.) Is the court willing to have the project's code posted online and are they open to third-party research and evaluation, including data sharing? Will the court accept a fellow with a criminal history and paid for by another organization? (A part of our DEI strategy is to include those people with technical skills with previous court contact.) How will the court welcome the fellow?

The Fellowship

When it comes to application review, the first round should be triaged based on the five factors listed above by JIF staff. The second round should be vetted by experts in access-to-justice, technology, and court administration. For the strongest candidates, we may consider, dependent on funding, in-person site visits.

Once final courts are selected, we will share our memorandum of understanding for their executive to sign off on. The MOU should include clauses about accepting a fellow; the scope of work developed during the application process (attached as an appendix); the court's commitment to data sharing; the court's commitment to research and evaluation into the project and fellow placement; the court's commitment to quarterly review calls; the court's commitment to DEI; and, of course, the court's commitment to access-to-justice and prioritizing the needs of the public. Where projects touch on existing court technology, we will want the court's technology vendor as a signatory.

Recruiting Fellows

Fellows are the lifeblood of the JIF program. To successfully recruit fellows, we need to cast a wide net that targets diverse applicants through direct and jargon-free communication.

We will need to work hard to share our opportunity widely so that we generate a diverse applicant pool. Georgetown University Law Center is a trusted name in the legal, justice, and tech policy sectors. To build on the Georgetown brand with a focus on technology professionals rather than lawyers, we need to partner with trusted names and organizations in technology to increase interest from potential fellows. We should plan on a two-month promotional push in the lead up to application's opening, including cold outreach on LinkedIn. We will run a webinar for interested applicants right before opening up the application period.

Incorporating diverse voices is a key component on our path to success as we work to improve access to justice in state, local, territorial, and tribal courts, which disproportionately impacts people from marginalized ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups. To ensure equitable outcomes, the JIF program will partner with organizations that diversify the talent pipeline, like Dream Corps, Launch Code, and University of Maryland, Baltimore County—which is the country's strongest pipeline of Black graduates in science, technology, engineering, and math—and promote the opportunity through tech affinity groups, like Black Girls Code, Latinas in Tech, and POCIT. We will also explore partnerships with other technologists-in-government programs, including at Georgetown, to find strong applicants that were not able to be placed, plus post in online communities like Tech Jobs for Good.

Being a new program, we will need to promote the JIF opportunity before opening the application process. We will also likely need to be proactive in sourcing and use LinkedIn to reach out to promising candidates. Last, if funding is available, we should use diversity referral awards, like TechCongress does, to incentivize referrals of diverse candidates that ultimately join the program as a fellow.

There are also ways to position our recruitment outreach that increases the likelihood that someone will apply to be a fellow. Research indicates that mission-driven "change the system" recruitment language is more successful than "change yourself" or "join the movement" messaging when recruiting younger people into government. The "change the system" rhetoric was particularly impactful on the application rates of "cisgender female, gender nonconforming, trans and non-binary applicants." Tailored to JIF's goals, the mission-driven language should be specific to what the program wants to accomplish. For example, the focus on the direct human impact of the fellowship—such as helping survivors of domestic violence obtain restraining orders or assisting people facing an eviction—strengthens the pitch.

When it comes to fostering a diverse applicant pool, research indicates that avoiding jargon, including only essential qualifications in job postings, and personalizing outreach with an appropriate messenger all help. To keep the applicant pool diverse and engaged, the application process should have as few steps as possible, reduce administrative burden, and use language in communications that evokes belonging and reaffirms the program's values. Last, we want to be able to articulate how we help fellows transition from the fellowship to their next job. We need to come up with opportunities, like networking events with potential employers, to help de-risk the fellowship for interested applicants and ensure they stay in the justice technology space.

The Fellowship

Selecting Fellows

Selecting a talented, diverse set of inaugural fellows will be fundamental to the success of the program. To that end, we will vet for key attributes through an objective and transparent process.

There are five factors, beyond technical ability, used by other programs that can inform how we select for the strongest pool of fellows.

Bridge Building. We're looking for people who not only get along with non-techies, but will build bridges with colleagues by finding opportunities to ask questions and learn from career civil servants. In trade, the right candidate will also be able to impart lessons on their colleagues in non-judgmental ways. They can be bold, but we don't want them to be disruptive.

Public Service Motivation. We are building a new workforce in the justice sector, and the JIF opportunity should be for people who want to be in justice technology and public service for the long haul. We should ask about their motivations for public service, what they think their contributions will be, and what they would take away from it.

Determination and Grit. After the excitement of the initial placement wears off and reality sets in, numerous fellowship leaders and past fellows referred to the valley of despair. We were told to look for examples of how a candidate worked through similar moments in their past. At its core, we're looking for evidence of perseverance.

Humility. The technology field is not generally self-selecting for humility, yet, as a trait, it will be invaluable for JIFs navigating their projects. The best candidates know how to put ego aside for the good of the mission, they bring a collaborative spirit, and they know success isn't about them—it's about the public and the institution.

Justice System & Community Experience. People that have gone through a divorce, small claims case, or criminal trial, either as a litigant or third party, hold a wealth of knowledge. These attributes should be embraced by our program. Similarly, we want to prioritize candidates from the communities that court partners serve. Fellow familiarity with courts and the local community will help lower the learning curve, provide extra support, and increase the chance of a relationship beyond the fellowship year.

To assess fellowship applications with equity in mind, blind applications and a review panel of experts with a structured rubric should be used. Results from panel members can then be weighted and averaged. A similar approach should be used for the interviews themselves, which should be structured with a clear rubric that is universally applied.

For those that pass the first interview, we should consider giving them a take-home assignment that takes less than a few hours to complete. This could be a technical or written assignment, depending on what we feel the need to vet for. A technical take-home will test the applicant's capacity to do the work associated with the fellowship. A written take-home should ask about something outside of their knowledge, for example, "How should courts improve hearing date notification and rescheduling?" This lets us test whether the candidate has basic knowledge of the court system, like who participates in a trial, it tests for design and systems thinking, and provides insight into how they problem-solve in an unfamiliar environment.

For final interviews and decisions, there are two potential approaches: JIF administrators make the final determination and placement, or we provide the court partner with the names of two or three top candidates that they interview and make the final determination on. Keeping the court involved in this process continues to build the relationship we have with them and increases their ownership of the fellowship. One detraction is that the court partners may move at a slower pace, which could jeopardize applicant retention.

Design & Execution of the Fellowship

Running a successful fellowship requires five components: training, cohort community building, feedback loops, program metrics, and documentation.

TRAINING

We will host a five-day training for fellows in Washington, D.C. the week before they start their placement. This is a short period of time, which we will need to use eco-

The Fellowship

nomically to introduce them to court functions, access to justice, and how to successfully work in a government agency. It is also the biggest opportunity to build intra-cohort relationships, which can act as ballast during the fellowship.

The training should be a mix of lecture, discussion, experiential, and social opportunities. Collectively, this is a lot for five days and we were warned against wall-to-wall programming during the week. We should give them time to breathe, socialize, and have unstructured moments to reflect and otherwise situate themselves.

When it comes to subject matter teachings, fellows from other technologists-in-government programs indicated that the lectures on how government works were vague and not helpful, because each fellow was going into a different agency to work on a separate project. We will likely face similar challenges as we train up fellows headed to different jurisdictions. That said, primers on the difference between civil and criminal cases, the lifecycle of a lawsuit, and the operations of a court—including its IT—should all be introduced that week.

Past fellows reported that "how to" lessons were very helpful, especially if they were paired with handouts and quick reference sheets they could use through the course of their fellowship.[8] Topics in this genre included, how to organize a meeting within government, how to write a memo, how to assess power dynamics in a public institution, how to build trust with government partners, and how to plan for the hand off of a project.[9] A survey of incoming fellows will help define need. Reinforcing cultural competence and humility will be foundational to this training. To complement the lectures and discussions, we should attend court as observers. This will drive home the application of what is being taught in the training.

Setting expectations will be an important component for this week-long training. Numerous fellows and fellowship administrators said it is important to weave inspiration for this work through the training, but also to set realistic expectations. We should not support the notion that fellows will fundamentally alter the course of the justice system through their project. Instead, their work should be framed as running a leg in a much longer relay toward more just court systems. Further, some of the fellows may be coming to government for the first time, which has a different set of standards, expectations, and timelines. If that is the case, the training can help transition them toward mission-driven work and how success is defined in courts.

A space also needs to be created to talk about expectations related to the emotions of the fellowship. At times the work will be overwhelming, frustrating, and fellows will feel defeated. Similarly, working in courts may be traumatizing to some. Hearing about violence and hardship will impact fellows differently. We can provide warnings and tools to help navigate negative experiences.[10] This is why time for reflection should be incorporated into the training. To help fellows think about expectations, they can write a letter to themselves at the end of the training about what they hope the year will be and what they think they can realistically accomplish. This makes expectation-setting concrete for each fellow.

Not limited to five days in D.C., training opportunities will be ongoing throughout the fellowship, which is discussed further below.

---

8 Potential Speakers: Nick Sinai (hacking government, Cyd Harrell (civic design), David Eaves (Win-Lose Negotiations), Jennifer Anastasoff (about the ups and downs of the fellowship), Tiffani Ashley Bell (real-talk fellowship experience). Potential reading list: Hack Your Bureaucracy, Nitze and Sinai, 2022; Civic Technologist's Practice Guide, Harrell, 2020; Digital Services Playbook, The US Digital Service, 2020; Transitioning from private to public sector: Lessons learned from those who experienced it, Chisnell, 2021; Payday Lenders are Big Winners in Utah's Chatroom Justice Program, Feathers, 2022; America's Lawyerless Courts, Carpenter, Mark, Shanahan, and Steinberg, 2022; The Trial, Kafka, 1925.

9 Code for America developed a document for fellows when entering a new city, which touches on many of the soft skills discussed in this section. Entering A New City

10 Code for America also documented the emotional arc of their fellowship. Fellowship (emotional) Arc

The Fellowship

COHORT COMMUNITY BUILDING

Both directors of similar programs and past fellows themselves echoed the value of cohort community building. As one former Code for America fellow put it, "Government is so hard to do anything in, you need people you can rely on professionally and emotionally."[11] To successfully build this support, it must start early–at training or before–and continue throughout the duration of the fellowship.

The value of a strong cohort community is multifaceted. Ultimately, these are the people that the fellows come to rely on for feedback regarding both technical and professional aspects of their fellowship. If their bond is tight, even across dispersed locations and projects, then they are better positioned to manage frustrations and challenges.

Past fellows indicate that removing the professional pressures of the fellowship and allowing the cohort to bond socially was important. For some, this happened through karaoke, for others it was organized game nights. Regardless of venue, the goal is to create familiarity outside of work, but also vulnerability, which makes it easier for fellows to communicate.

The creation of laptop stickers, jackets, or ties and scarves to give to fellows to reinforce cohort identity and program brand should also be considered.

FEEDBACK LOOPS

To improve the program, opportunities for structured and unstructured feedback for fellows and courts and with the larger community and public will be important.

Internally, fellow and court partner feedback will be critical. There will be weekly standup meetings for fellows. This is an opportunity for fellows to share successes, war stories, and promote cohort cohesion. Through this process, we can also learn what extra educational sessions could help support fellows in their work. Exit interviews for fellows and sites will happen at the end of each engagement.

We will also want to create public-facing feedback loops that will help with improved recognition and interest. A newsletter could go out to fellows, court partners, funders, and others supporting the project to instill a sense of community and keep our work at the top of partners' minds. Finding ways to celebrate court wins, such as placing local media stories, can build positive reinforcement.

Many of the technologists-in-government fellowships use previous fellows as mentors, who are an invaluable resource. Being a pilot, JIF has no previous class of fellows to rely on. Yet to help fellows transition into this work, mentorship needs to be provided, particularly because we aspire to hire people who diverge from the technologist archetype. As we bring in a diverse cohort, having mentors with similar lived experiences can also be a resource if a fellow faces a difficult work environment. As well, we need to recruit technical mentors to support the fellows and provide opportunities for professional development.

PROGRAM METRICS

For the first year, our chief goal is to do no harm. Beyond that, it was recommended that our first-year metrics should be simple. In the long term, a challenge we will face is developing metrics that are impact, and not just output, oriented.[12]

For fellows, we want to know:

- Demographics
- Would they recommend the experience, why or why not?
- Longer term: Did they stay in justice technology, in government? If so, doing what?

---

11 Interview with Sophia Dengo.

12 There are examples from the Presidential Innovation Fellows and Code for America's goal metrics and success measures.

The Fellowship

For courts, we want to know:

- Would they apply for a fellow again, why or why not?
- What was the impact (qualitatively and quantitatively) of the project? Demographics of users?
- What was the impact on the culture of the agency? For example, is the court considering the adoption of a new process or approach to their internal work? Has the court created or redefined an existing position to institutionalize the skills of the fellow? Has the court made new technical investments on account of the fellow's work?

For projects, we want to know:

- Did the project advance its goals?
- Is the project sustainable after the fellowship?
- Is the project replicable or scalable outside of the partner court?

DOCUMENTATION AND REFLECTION

Openness is a chief tenet of the JIF program. Not only will our projects reflect this value, but so will our internal processes. In all possible instances, the code and documentation written by JIFs will be hosted in public GitHub repositories and released under permissive or open source licenses. This is both an accountability mechanism for the program and its fellows, but also an opportunity to foster an open and collaborative approach to court modernization.

We should partner with academic or other evaluators to assess the impact of individual projects and the program generally and provide opportunities for improvement. By the end of the pilot, the JIF program will produce an "after-action" report that assesses its strengths and weaknesses. This will incorporate feedback from court partners and fellows. The report will also be a complement to this document, providing insights and recommendations for improvement in forthcoming years.

Open Questions

This research indicates a need for further strategic planning to promote scalable growth and sustainability of the JIF program. Those areas for future consideration include:

Sustainability. We do not expect to rely solely on philanthropy to maintain the JIF program. To create a more sustainable program, there are four potential paths to consider: 1. Courts pay for or offset the cost of a fellow (Code for America and the Presidential Innovation Fellows provide models); 2. Congress allocates program funding (the US Digital Corps and the Legal Services Corporation provide models); 3. Promising projects are spunout as startups that take private investment and JIF is an equity holder (Code for America provides a model); and 4. We partner with technology companies that provide paid sabbaticals to their employees to become JIF fellows for one-to-two years (this would be a new model for this type of program).

Fellow Transitions. The pilot is focused on building the best possible fellowship year for the fellows and courts. We need to figure out how we help fellows after our program. Doing so can bolster our recruitment processes and help us meet our goal of maturing the justice technology sector.[13] Can we promote the creation of "paths to permanence," where fellows are hired on by a court after the fellowship? Can we create private industry, nonprofit, and other civic technology connections to help fellows transition into a full-time career in justice technology? What are other ways that we can help fellows transition after the fellowship, like networking, talks from industry leaders, and career development?

Model Policy and Rules. We are currently focused on the development of technology projects that improve access to justice. As noted, these projects depend on the rules and processes of the courts themselves. During the pilot, we need to keep track of where policies, rules, and governance—especially when it comes to data—come into conflict with our projects. If we see common issues, creating model rules or policies would be a logical place for expansion that supports our core mission.

Tech Fellowship Toolkit. Having spoken with dozens of people who have helped build and administer technologist fellowship programs in government, it's clear that many core processes across programs are similar. To assist the growth of these programs, a toolkit should be developed that helps programs like this get off the ground. Going further, is it worth considering an organization that runs the back office for all of these programs to diminish redundancy and promote scaling?[14]

13 For example, Theory & Principle, a legal technology company, indicated that fellows like ours are their ideal hires.

14 Something like this is being developed for federal agencies by the Day One Project.

Conclusion

We are embarking on an audacious project. As articulated above, the challenges are many and well known. However, successful programs in other branches of government show a sustainable path forward. By working with forward-thinking courts on focused projects that are equitable, efficient, and open, we have the potential to improve how Americans go to court.

Appendix: Interviewees

Unless cited in the report, no idea or section is attributed to an interviewee or their organization. Interviews occurred over video or voice call or email between May and December 2022. Each entry is cited by name, relevant title, and organization. An asterisk indicates that person participated in the December 2022 convening to test the design of the program.

Access-to-Justice and Court Experts

Roberto Adelardi, Chief Information Officer, Florida Courts.

Julian Alder, Director of Innovation & Strategy, Center for Court Innovation.

Katherine Alteneder, Senior Strategic Advisor, Self-Represented Litigation Network.*

Hon. Sean Armstrong, Judge, Oregon Judicial Department.

Hon. Jennifer Bailey, Administrative Judge, Florida Courts.

Dave Beyers, Director, Arizona Supreme Court.

Tom Boyd, State Court Administrator, Michigan Supreme Court.

Bob Bullock, Senior Counsel for Office of Access to Justice, US Department of Justice.

Geoff Burkhart, Executive Director, Texas Indigent Defense Commission.

Matthew Burnett, Senior Program Officer, American Bar Association.

Stacy Butler, Director of Innovation for Justice, University of Arizona School of Law.

Ryan Carty, Member, Oregon State Family Law Advisory Committee.

Abhijeet Chavan, former-Senior Executive Advisor, Tyler Technologies.

Casey Chiappetta, Principal Associate of Civil Legal System Modernization, Pew Charitable Trusts.*

Colleen Chien, Professor, Santa Clara University School of Law.

David Colarusso, Director of the Legal Innovation & Technology Lab, Suffolk Law School.*

Chad Cornelius, Chief Information Officer, Nebraska Judicial Branch.

Gipsy Escobar, Director of Product Strategy, Measures for Justice.*

Adelle Fontanet-Torres, Direct of Tribal Justice Exchange, Center for Court Innovation.

Hon. Robert Friday, Judge, Minnesota Judicial Branch.

Melanie Fritzsche, Tribal Justice Exchange, Center for Court Innovation.

Eduardo Gonzalez, Program Officer, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Marcia Good, Executive Director for the Office of Tribal Justice, US Department of Justice.

Lisa Goodwin, Manager of Organizational Development, Office of the Circuit Court Clerk of DuPage County, Illinois.

Scott Griffith, Chief of Planning and Court Services, Vermont Judiciary.

Margaret Hagan, Director of the Legal Design Lab, Stanford Law School.

Cyd Harrell, former-Service Design Lead, Judicial Council of California.*

Danielle Hirsch, Interim Court Services Director, National Center for State Courts.

Hon. Lauren Holland, Senior Judge, Oregon Judicial Department.

Silas Horst, Campaign Manager, Responsible Business Initiative for Justice.

Sarah Hoskinson, Director of Access to Justice, Kansas Judicial Branch.

Dan Jackson, Executive Director of the NuLawLab, Northeastern University School of Law.

Claudia Johnson, Program Manager, LawHelp Interactive.

Melissa Kantola, Manager of the Self-Represented Litigant Program, Minnesota Judicial Branch.*

Rochelle Klempner, Assistant Deputy Counsel at the Office of Court Administration, New York State Unified Court System.

Emily LaGratta, Principal, LaGratta Consulting.

Karen Lash, Policy Consultant, Lash Consulting.

John Levi, Board Chair, Legal Services Corporation.

Michael Lissner, Executive Director, Free Law Project.

Jack Madans, former-Digital Services Principal, California Judicial Council.

Carlos Manjarrez, former-Chief Data Officer, Legal Services Corporation.

Maya Markovich, Executive Director, Justice Technology Association.

Stacey Marz, Administrative Director, Alaska State Court System.

Mary McClymont, former-President, Public Welfare Foundation.

James McMillan, Principal Court Technology Consultant, National Center for State Courts.

Samira Nazem, Principal Court Management Consultant, National Center for State Courts.

Nikole Nelson, Executive Director, Alaska Legal Services.

Mark O'Brien, Executive Director, Pro Bono Net.*

Snorri Ogata, Chief Information Officer, Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County.

Pam Ortiz, Director of Access to Justice, Maryland Judiciary.*

Nathanael Player, Director of the Self-Help Center and Utah State Law Library, Utah State Courts.*

Keith Porcaro, Director of Digital Governance Design Studio, Duke Law School.

Victor Quintanilla, Professor, Indiana University Maurer School of Law.

Glenn Rawdon, Program Counsel, Legal Services Corporation.

Damien Riehl, VP of Litigation Workflow and Analytics Content, Fastcase.

Salvador Reynoso, Managing Attorney, Superior Court of San Bernardino County.*

Erika Rickard, Project Director of Civil Legal System Modernization, Pew Charitable Trusts.

Diane Robinson, Principal Court Research Associate, National Center for State Courts.

Ruth Rosenthal, Senior Manager of Public Safety Performance Project, Pew Charitable Trusts.

Michelle Russell, Principal Associate of Public Safety Performance Project, Pew Charitable Trusts.

Rudolfo Sanchez, Executive Director, DNA-People's Legal Services.

Liz Schiller, Staff Director, Virginia Access to Justice Commission.

Hon. Scott Schlegel, District Court Judge, Louisiana Judiciary.

Kristen Sonday, CEO, Paladin.

Alison Spanner, Director, Access to Justice & Strategic Planning, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts.

Michele Statz, Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota Medical School.

Quinten Steenhuis, Practitioner in Residence, Suffolk Law School.

Joseph Stephens, Chief Public Defender, Concho Valley Public Defender's Office, Texas.

Lonni Summers, Senior Court Management Consultant, National Center for State Courts.*

Kim Swain, County Clerk, Pinellas County, Florida.

Sema Taheri, Director of Research & Strategic Initiatives, Measures for Justice.

Ken Hwee Tan, Chief Transformation and Innovation Officer, Supreme Court of Singapore.

Hon. Gwendolyn Topping, Associate Judge, Red Cliff Tribal Court.*

Alia Toran-Burrell, Associate Program Director for Clear My Record, Code for America.

David Udell, Executive Director of the National Center for Access to Justice, Fordham Law School.

Darcy White, Senior Officer of Civil Legal System Modernization, Pew Charitable Trusts.*

Alexander Joseph Woon Wei-Ming, former-Deputy Director, Office of Transformation and Innovation, Supreme Court of Singapore.

Bob Wessels, Executive Committee Member, National Association of Presiding Judges and Executive Court Officers.

Zach Zarnow, Principal Court Management Consultant, National Center for State Courts.

Government, Technology, and Fellowship Experts

Nisha Anand, CEO, The Dream Corps.

Jennifer Anastasoff, Executive Director, Tech Talent Project.

Nicole Bradick, CEO, Theory & Principle.

Jack Cable, former-Technology Policy Fellow, TechCongress.

George Chewning, former-Presidential Innovation Fellow, US Federal Government.*

Betsy Cooper, Founding Director, AspenTech Policy Hub.

Jeff Cox, Director of Content, UniCourt.

LaMar Davis, Director, Institute of Extended Learning, University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

Sophia Dengo, former-Fellow, Code for America.

Rachel Dodell, Executive Director, Coding it Forward.

John Paul Farmer, former-Senior Advisor for Innovation, The White House.

Elizabeth Grossman, Principal, Athena Civic Consulting.*

Eddie Hartwig, former-Administrator, The US Digital Service.

Allison Hutchings, former-fellow, TechCongress.

Batul Joffrey, Associate, Kapor Capital.

Rick Klau, former-CTO, State of California.

Chris Kuang, Co-Founder, US Digital Corps.*

Marissa Levine, Director of Events and Community Partnerships, White House Presidential Innovation Fellows.

Jonathan Lipman, Associate Product Manager, Schmidt Futures.

Janos Marton, Vice President for Political Strategy, The Dream Corps.

Hashim Mteuzi, Program Director of Civic Tech Partnerships and Fellowships, Code for America.

Travis Moore, Executive Director, TechCongress.*

Lynn Overmann, Senior Advisor for Delivery, The White House.

Jennifer Pahlka, Founder, Code for America.

Christine Routzahn, Director of the Career Center, University of Maryland Baltimore County.

Ceantel Rubin, Vice President of Fellow Recruitment, FUSE Corps.

Hannah Safford, Associate Director of Science Policy, Federation of American Scientists.

Faith Savaiano, Associate Director of Social Innovation, Federation of American Scientists.

Joshua Schoop, Principal Director of Technology and Innovation, Federation of American Scientists.

Haley Shoaf, VP of Impact, Launch Code.

Nick Sinai, former-Deputy Chief Technology Officer, The White House.

Maeve Skelly, Policy Associate for Technology and Innovation, Federation of American Scientists.

Robert Sofman, former-Chief Program Officer, Code for America.

James Weinberg, Executive Director, FUSE Corps.

Scott Weiss, former-Presidential Innovation Fellow, US Federal Government.

Miguel Willis, Executive Director, ATJ Tech Fellows.*

Cori Zarek, Deputy Administrator, US Digital Service.*

Nikki Zeichner, former-Fellow, Code for America.