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INTRODUCTION

In this Article, we describe the creation and evaluation of a curricular intervention designed to help first-year law students develop lawyering skills while fostering their ethical and social-emotional development. We call this curricular intervention an Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program. We believe that, at the time of this writing, this was the first such program administered within the first-year curriculum of a U.S. law school.

We designed and launched this Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program in Fall 2016 within the first-year curriculum of the Indiana University Maurer School of Law. In so doing, we taught 187 first-year law students how to put into practice human-centered design thinking, perspective-taking, and professional skills to promote access to justice. While human-centered design thinking is increasingly being woven into law school curricula in upper-level project management courses to address access-to-justice problems—including at Stanford Law School, Harvard Law School, and Georgetown University Law Center1—this Access-to-Justice Service Learning
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Program was introduced within the first-year curriculum to teach students the professional skills, human-centered design thinking, and problem-solving techniques necessary to enhance access to justice for low-income members of society.

U.S. law schools are increasingly being called to train their students to become ethical members of society who address access-to-justice challenges that the public experiences when encountering and navigating the civil justice system. Millions of Americans lack meaningful access to justice and suffer from unmet legal needs. For most low-income and many middle-income people living in the United States, the inability to receive legal advice or secure legal representation renders our civil justice system inaccessible. Absent legal advice, many Americans often fail to understand that legal relief is available for the problems they encounter “at the intersection of civil law and everyday adversity” such as problems that affect human needs, including shelter, livelihood, and the care of dependents. Moreover, even when people do realize their problems are potentially addressable through law, most poor and many middle-income people are left to navigate complex procedures and bewildering bureaucracies in search of legal relief without counsel.
which only serves to compound their problems. Given the reality that many Americans are unable to defend their legal rights, wide swaths of U.S. society become vulnerable to those who, casting aside ethics and morality, have an economic incentive to engage in abuse.\(^7\) In turn, interlocking webs of social, environmental, financial, and health problems stemming from unmet legal needs\(^8\) metastasize into social, psychological, environmental, financial, and health problems that imperil human well-being.\(^9\)

This Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program was designed to help law students understand the values that guide our profession—including a commitment to the rule of law, access to justice, and public service—and to help law students empathize with those affected by the civil justice system. First-year law students learned the perspectives of affected members of the community and were matched with legal-aid partners, such as Indiana


\(^7\) See, e.g., Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Path of the Law*, 10 Harv. L. Rev. 457, 457 (1897).


\(^9\) See Sandefur, *supra* note 4, at 443 (explaining while these problems are justiciable, most Americans are unaware of existing legal aid or public benefits that may lend support); Marsha Regenstein, Joel Teitelbaum, Jessica Sharac & Ei Phyu, *National Center for Medical Legal Partnership, Medical-Legal Partnership and Health Centers: Addressing Patients’ Health-Harming Civil Legal Needs as Part of Primary Care* 1 (Feb. 2015), http://medical-legalpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Medical-Legal-Partnership-and-Health-Centers.pdf; Civil Legal Needs Study Update Committee, *supra* note 8, at 6 (explaining that poor housing conditions, lack of health insurance, substandard educational opportunities, job and food insecurity, discrimination, domestic violence, and other socio-legal problems interlock, interact, and compound to degrade physical and mental health); Sandefur, *supra* note 5, at 3 (reporting most Americans do not conceive of these problems as legal in nature); *The Need For Medical-Legal Partnership*, Miliken Institute School of Public Health at The George Washington University, http://medical-legalpartnership.org/need/.
Legal Services, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, the Neighborhood Christian Legal Clinic, and the Indianapolis Legal Aid Society. These first-year law students worked with community partners to help deliver legal services more effectively to low-income members of the community by engaging in a human-centered access-to-justice design process.

Our evaluation of the program reveals the curriculum may be promising as an intervention in the first-year curriculum within U.S. law schools. The first-year law students who took part grew not only as individuals, but by working together in teams, they also developed as future members of the legal profession.

The Article will proceed as follows: In Part I, we will situate the curricular intervention by introducing the three apprenticeships implicit in legal education and theorized by the Carnegie Foundation’s 2007 report, as well as the rise of experiential pedagogies in law schools more generally. In Part II, we will describe human-centered civil justice design and human-centered design thinking in technologies that address access-to-justice barriers. In Part III, we will describe the creation of the program, including the ways in which we backward designed the program from the law school’s J.D. learning outcomes, and forward designed the program to address the cognitive, emotional, and experiential bottlenecks law students experience in the first-year curriculum. In Part IV, we will discuss the results of an empirical analysis of the program that harnesses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data and uses results from the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE).

---

I. **THE THREE APPRENTICESHIPS IN LEGAL EDUCATION AND THE RISE OF EXPERIENTIAL ACCESS-TO-JUSTICE PROGRAMS**

We begin by situating the development of the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program with findings of the Carnegie Foundation’s 2007 report,\(^\text{14}\) which underscore the need to train students in skills and practice while fostering their social-emotional skills and nurturing their ethical values and professional identities. We describe how these findings prompted the American Bar Association (ABA) to develop a new standard requiring U.S. law schools to provide experiential courses and credits within their curriculums. Finally, we describe the more recent trend in which law schools have begun weaving experiential credit with course offerings that promote access to justice.

A. **The Three Apprenticeships Implicit in Legal Education**

The Carnegie Foundation’s 2007 study on legal education, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law*, is a seminal report on the state of legal education within U.S. law schools.\(^\text{15}\) In particular, the 2007 Carnegie Report evaluated the extent to which law schools are sufficiently socializing and acculturating law students in the three apprenticeships implicit within legal education: (1) the *cognitive apprenticeship*, which relates to learning how to think like a lawyer in the context of relevant subject matter; (2) the *skills and practice apprenticeship*, which relates to developing the ability to engage in the skills or practices of legal professionals; and (3) the *ethical apprenticeship*, which relates to developing a professional identity and the ethical values of legal professionals who successfully navigate the relationship between personal and professional values, roles and responsibilities, and ways of being an engaged citizen in


\(^{15}\) See generally id.
the world. Law students must traverse each of these three implicit apprenticeships when developing into lawyers, and when reflecting on their professional roles. The central message in the 2007 Carnegie Report and the contemporaneously published *Best Practices for Legal Education* is that legal education must be broadened beyond the Socratic case-law to teach legal doctrine so as to better integrate the teaching of skills, practices, and values while giving greater attention to instruction in professionalism.

Regarding the cognitive apprenticeship—teaching law students to think like lawyers—the 2007 Carnegie Report found that law schools are successfully imparting knowledge relevant to the cognitive dimension of lawyering. That is, law schools are successfully teaching law students how to think like lawyers and how to interpret and apply rules to solve legal problems. To do this, legal educators are largely using the case-law-dialogue and Socratic methods, particularly in the first year. These methods teach law students legal literacy and enhance critical-thinking skills—teaching students, for example, how to analyze cases and apply rules—as well as how to evaluate arguments, how to synthesize across decisions, and how to structure legal arguments within cases and briefs.

Yet, the 2007 Carnegie Report also concluded that these teaching techniques do not effectively impart practice-oriented skills or ethical values, nor do they socialize law students into their budding professional identities. Legal socialization within law schools is the process by which law students develop their social and professional identities and form conceptions of what it means to think, feel, and behave like a lawyer. Research on legal socialization illuminates the “intense and transformative impact of legal education on students’

---

18 See id. at 186–88.
19 See id. at 5; see generally Elizabeth Mertz, *The Language of Law School: Learning to “Think Like a Lawyer”* (2007).
understandings of what it means to be a lawyer.”20 Relatedly, research on professional identity formation examines the formation of lawyers’ self-concepts and the tension between their responsibilities to serve clients and the public.

In this regard, U.S. law schools offer courses on professional responsibility that teach students about the “law of lawyering,” derived from the Model Rules of Professional Conduct,21 yet many professional-responsibility courses are not designed to impart the wider ethical values and responsibilities central to navigating the world as a legal professional in the problem spaces within which they will practice. For example, while the Model Rules of Professional Conduct set forth the aspiration that lawyers will serve both as officers of the legal system and as public citizens who have a special responsibility for the quality of justice, a large body of research reveals that much of the acculturation within law schools may actually threaten these values and ideals.22

---


In one example of the ethical narrowing that legal socialization and professional-identity formation can cause,\(^\text{23}\) John Bliss contrasted studies of front-stage dynamics of law school classrooms with students’ backstage experiences of the professional role within their ongoing processes of self-construction. Bliss also sought to determine how law students engage in role distancing, that is, the process by which law students distance their personal values from their professional identities.\(^\text{24}\) Examining role distancing in the context of “public interest drift,” Bliss showed that law students drift away from public-interest career commitments throughout law school\(^\text{25}\) and found that students learn to eschew moral, political, and other contextual aspects by engaging in case analysis.\(^\text{26}\) Bliss attributes role distancing to professional bifurcation, the separation of personal values from clients’ interests to foster zealous advocacy on behalf of clients irrespective of the clients’ causes.\(^\text{27}\)

Relatedly, the 2007 Carnegie Report attributes aspects of this troubling socialization to law school pedagogy, particularly the emphasis on “the procedural and systematic” and the case method of teaching.\(^\text{28}\) For example, the study found that “most law schools emphasize the priority of analytic thinking, in which students learn to categorize and discuss persons and events in highly generalized terms.”\(^\text{29}\) At the same time, law students are encouraged to discard “facts” that do not have legal significance.\(^\text{30}\) “Students discover that to ‘think like a lawyer’ means redefining messy situations of actual or potential conflict as opportunities for advancing a

\(^{23}\) I will leave for another day a more extensive discussion of these phenomena.

\(^{24}\) See generally Bliss, supra note 20; GRANFIELD, supra note 22; Robert Granfield, Cynicism and the Law: The Emergence of Legal Consciousness in Law School, 25 J. SOC. PHIL. 188 (1994).

\(^{25}\) See Bliss, supra note 20, at 861.

\(^{26}\) Id.; see also GRANFIELD, supra note 22, at 36–50; GRANFIELD, supra note 22, at 188.

\(^ {27}\) Bliss, supra note 20, at 862.

\(^{28}\) SULLIVAN ET AL., supra note 14, at 4–5.

\(^ {29}\) Id.

\(^ {30}\) Id. at 5–6.
client’s cause through legal argument before a judge or through negotiation.”31 Professors frequently discard arguments based on “social needs or matters of justice” as falling outside the “legal landscape.”32 In the process, students lose sight of how their moral and personal values can be integrated into their legal practices. In short, “students are told to set aside their desire for justice” and not let social justice-oriented concerns “cloud their legal analyses.”33

In sum, the 2007 Carnegie Report found that by focusing primarily on the Socratic method, legal educators had diluted the transmission of the other two apprenticeships: lawyering skills and ethical and socio-emotional skills. That is, law schools were not successfully imparting an appreciation of professional roles or the relationship of personal and professional values, nor were they helping law students derive meaning from the work they do.

**B. Experiential Education and Access to Justice**

As a result of the 2007 Carnegie Report, the ABA adopted a rule that requires law schools affirmatively to provide experiential courses and credit. The 2016–2017 ABA Revised Standards breathed life into experiential learning by requiring law schools to develop graduation standards by which students must complete at least six credits of experiential learning within a simulation course, clinic, or field placement. The ABA now also requires law schools to establish learning outcomes that prepare students for admission to the bar and for effective, ethical, and responsible participation as members of the legal profession.34

In this Section, we describe the growing trend in which law schools are now coupling the ABA’s experiential education requirement with programs that engage law students in experiences and programs that

31 Id. at 6.
32 Id.
33 Id.
serve low-income members of society, which foster law students’ appreciation of the importance of promoting access to justice.

While legal educators have called for skills-based training since the 1930s,35 it was largely in the 1960s and 1970s that law schools began developing clinical programs that trained law students in both lawyering skills and socio-emotional and ethical skills.36 In recent years, law schools have developed other means of transmitting lawyering skills and these public-spirited values, including externships that place law students off campus with judges, public defenders, and public-interest firms. In addition, legal writing and research courses have expanded to provide instruction on skills beyond simply legal writing, including professional skills such as interviewing, counseling, negotiation, and problem solving.

Within legal education, one can categorize how law schools have designed and fielded programs that combine the need for experiential education imparting professional, social, and ethical skills with programs that enable law students to provide access to justice for low-income members of society. In this regard, we have developed a two-dimensional map, or topography, placing different levels of community-engaged learning on a vertical axis or dimension. Some law schools have designed programs whereby students work directly with low-income clients, such as legal clinics that provide direct client services to indigent clients needing assistance with family law or landlord-tenant issues. Other law schools have designed programs whereby students work or consult with community partners, including legal-aid organizations, that themselves serve members of the community. And finally, some law schools have developed programs whereby law students formulate

---

36 Adopting and Adapting: Clinical Legal Education and Access to Justice in China, 120 HARV. L. REV. 2134, 2136 (2007) (explaining that when the clinical movement began in the 1960s and 1970s, it was supported by organizations, such as the Council on Legal Education and Professional Responsibility (CLEPR), with funding from NGOs such as the Ford Foundation).
policy that would have a public-policy effect of promoting access to justice, if adopted by the relevant policy makers and rule makers.

Community-engaged learning is a mode of learning and teaching that seeks to solve community-based problems while developing professional skills, which provides a framework that can be used to categorize pedagogies that enable students to serve members of the public who lack meaningful access to justice. This framework has four key elements constitutive of the practice: rigorous learning, engagement with the community, reflection, and assessment. The key to community-engaged learning is addressing a civic issue—the access-to-justice gap—a public problem that needs to be addressed with civic skills, knowledge, and values. By addressing civic issues, students learn from community members involved with those issues and identify, acknowledge, and harness assets present within the community.

On the horizontal dimension, we list examples of pedagogy or programs that enable each of these levels of community-engaged learning to be designed and fielded: clinics, courses, pro bono programs, and externships. While this is a non-exhaustive list, the taxonomy may serve as a heuristic to locate the ways in which law schools are developing experiential programs within their curriculum to address access-to-justice problems in society.

---

38 See id.
39 Id.
40 See id.
41 See id.
Historically, many law schools did not require experiential education; however, in 2010, the ABA began requiring law schools to provide students at least one credit hour of experiential education. In 2014, the requirement was increased to at least six credit hours per student.

Legal clinics create opportunities for students to assume the role of a lawyer and to represent actual clients under the supervision of an attorney employed by the law school. Legal clinics vary widely in practice area, from transactional drafting for local businesses to family-dispute mediation, for example.

Experiential education courses “integrate...theory and practice by combining academic inquiry with actual experience,” and typically employ simulated practice experiences in which the faculty member provides a set of facts and circumstances that resembles an experience similar to a lawyer advising or representing a client. For example, many law schools offer courses that culminate in a mock appellate argument or a mock trial.

The ABA strongly recommends that students engage in pro bono programs, stating that such programs help students develop professionalism as well as an understanding of a lawyer’s responsibility to the

---

43 Id. at 55.
44 Id. at 20–21.
45 See id. at 17.
46 Id. at 20.
47 Id. at 20–21.
community.\textsuperscript{48} The ABA’s standing committee on pro bono and public service promulgated model rules, including ABA Model Rule 6.1, which recommends that every lawyer should strive to provide at least fifty hours of pro bono legal services per year because every lawyer has a responsibility to provide legal services to those without the means to pay.\textsuperscript{49} Law schools seek to facilitate this goal through pro bono programs, which provide students opportunities without compensation or academic credit to provide legal representation, under faculty supervision, to persons with limited means or to organizations that support the needs of persons of limited means.\textsuperscript{50}

Legal externships, which allow students to earn credit in legal practice settings external to the law school, provide yet another avenue for students to gain practical experience.\textsuperscript{51}

Still other law schools have combined various features of experiential learning programs and have created unique opportunities for students. To illustrate, this Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program was embedded within the first-year curriculum as a module within a civil procedure course in Fall 2016, and as module within a legal professions course in Spring 2018. The Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program asked students to partner with legal aid and social-service providers in Central and Southern Indiana to develop human-centered design strategies to meet the needs of these community partners and to expand access to justice in the communities they serve. Combining features of coursework and pro bono programs, this program was particularly well suited for first-year students and helped to cultivate, early in students’ legal careers, the value and necessity of working with existing stakeholders to create solutions to the access-to-justice problem.

\textsuperscript{50} Jones, \textit{supra} note 42, at 19–20.
\textsuperscript{51} Id. at 18.
Similarly, Georgia State University College of Law has a Center for Access to Justice, which conducts interdisciplinary research with other Georgia State departments to identify and address barriers to access to justice.\textsuperscript{52} Stanford Law School’s Legal Design Lab also takes an interdisciplinary approach to developing human-centered design to create solutions for access to legal services, focusing on technology-based solutions.\textsuperscript{53} Fordham Law School’s Access to Justice Initiative combines coursework, direct service, scholarship, research, and advocacy toward increasing access to justice in New York.\textsuperscript{54} Finally, students at Harvard Law School’s A2J Lab help conduct randomized control trials to determine what solutions work best to increase access to justice; the lab then provides this information to stakeholders for implementation.\textsuperscript{55}

II. HUMAN-CENTERED CIVIL JUSTICE DESIGN AND ACCESS-TO-JUSTICE

A. Human-Centered Civil Justice Design

Human-centered civil justice design\textsuperscript{56} is rooted in human experiences with the processes, systems, people, and environments encountered while navigating the civil justice system.\textsuperscript{57} The approach focuses on human beings:
their interactions with one another within the civil justice system; their experiences with the processes, systems, and environments they encounter when navigating the civil justice system; and how these experiences interact with the entangled web of hardships and legal adversities they face in the everyday. Civil justice designers investigate how humans respond to features of the civil justice system in particular contexts. This information serves as the basis for predicting the probable effects of design alternatives and for proposing system design recommendations. When applying this approach, civil justice designers empathize and immerse themselves with intended beneficiaries and stakeholders (for example, parties, lawyers, judges, and members of the public) through observation and interviews to uncover their needs and experiences. The designers then determine stakeholders’ interests and goals before narrowing and identifying the problems to be solved. These designers ideate and brainstorm a range of human-centered solutions before winnowing them down based on feasibility and financial viability.

Human-centered civil justice design synthesizes insights and practices from two interdisciplinary strands: human-centered design thinking and dispute system design. Human-centered design thinking provides a framework that allows designers to deeply understand the people that they seek to serve when creating solutions stemming from the community’s needs. The approach is bottom-up, rather than top-down, and begins with the premise that the people who confront problems are the

---


58 See Karl N. Llewellyn, Some Realism About Realism—Responding to Dean Pound, 44 Harv. L. Rev. 1222, 1237 (1931) (“The belief in the worthwhileness of grouping cases and legal situations into narrower categories than has been the practices in the past. This is connected with the distrust of verbally simple rules—which so often cover dissimilar and non-simple fact situations.”).

59 See Quintanilla, supra note 56, at 756–58.

60 See Brown & Katz, supra note 57, at 39–40; IDEO.org, supra note 57, at 9; Brest et al., supra note 57, at 3; Brown, supra note 57, at 86.
ones who hold the key to answering them. Designers closely observe how people behave; how features and cues within environments affect thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (that is, psychological experiences); and the meaning people make from the environments and the processes they encounter.

The approach integrates and reconciles three overlapping criteria: desirability (i.e., stakeholders’ needs and aspirations), feasibility (i.e., technologically possible within the foreseeable future), and viability (i.e., financially sustainable). The approach begins with humans—their needs, aims, and fears—and uncovers what is desirable, imbuing innovation and problem-solving with a human-centered ethos. The approach requires a thorough empirical understanding, through direct observation, of what people need in their lives and what they like or dislike about particular practices and institutions. Human-centered design seeks to create a range of options that are technologically feasible in meeting human needs and examines alternatives for solutions that are financially viable.

Human-centered civil justice designers draw from psychological and behavioral science when considering how members of the public experience the civil justice system and their encounters with court officials, including psychological science on procedural justice and distributive justice. Justice researchers have demonstrated that experiences of injustice erode the public’s beliefs about the legitimacy of the civil justice system.
system, whereas experiences of justice foster beliefs about legitimacy.\(^{65}\) Indeed, decades of research reveal that a sense of justice powerfully influences compliance with legal decrees,\(^{66}\) cooperation with legal authorities,\(^{67}\) and engagement in other pro-social,\(^{68}\) participatory,\(^{69}\) and democratic behaviors.\(^{70}\) These plural effects nourish a vibrant American democracy.\(^{71}\) The public’s experiences of justice are, therefore, central to human-centered civil justice design. These designers also draw from research on how altering features of rules, processes, and dispute resolution facilitates pro-social behavior, cooperation, and intergroup harmony, thereby allowing humans to achieve their full potential and to flourish.

Moreover, when designing an intervention, human-centered civil justice design moves through three overlapping spaces: inspiration, ideation, and implementation.\(^{72}\) Inspiration is the opportunity that

---


\(^{68}\) See Quintanilla, supra note 56, at 772–74; see also David De Cremer & Daan Van Knippenberg, *How Do Leaders Promote Cooperation? The Effects of Charisma and Procedural Fairness*, 87 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 858, 858–60 (2002).


\(^{71}\) See Quintanilla, supra note 56, at 772–75; see also Tyler et al., supra note 67, at 394 (reviewing psychological literature on legitimacy and concluding that “the exercise of authority via fair procedures legitimates that authority, and encourages voluntary deference”).

\(^{72}\) These are overlapping spaces rather than sequential stages of a lockstep
motivates the search for solutions.\textsuperscript{73} The inspiration stage entails identifying key beneficiaries and stakeholders (i.e., people and institutions that contribute to problems or solutions) and empathizing with them through direct observation, ethnography, surveys, psychological studies, and other forms of assessing their experiences. Perspective-taking, an empathic process by which human-centered designers seek to perceive the problem through the lens of the key beneficiaries and stakeholder to better understand their needs, is also used.\textsuperscript{74} After designers identify stakeholders, they narrow the number of needs the specific project will address. Next, in the ideation stage, designers translate these insights and generate, develop, and test ideas, always considering the criteria of desirability, feasibility, and viability.\textsuperscript{75} Finally, in the implementation stage, designers develop the best ideas into a concrete plan of action.

In the inspiration stage, human-centered civil justice designers seek to empathize with the many beneficiaries and stakeholders of the civil justice system—including parties to disputes, lawyers, judges, court administrators, and members of the public—conferring on them standing, dignity, and respect by ensuring that their needs, goals, and concerns are heard and considered.\textsuperscript{76} By

\textsuperscript{73} See \textit{BREST ET AL., supra note 57}, at 5–31.

\textsuperscript{74} See, e.g., \textit{Leonard, supra note 63}, at 104 (describing empathic user-centered design as a process that involves “gathering, analyzing, and applying information gleaned from observation in the field”); \textit{FRANK E. RITTER, GORDON D. BAXTER \\& ELIZABETH F. CHURCHILL, FOUNDATIONS FOR DESIGNING USER-CENTERED SYSTEMS: WHAT SYSTEMS DESIGNERS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT PEOPLE 4 (2014)} (advocating a theory of systems design that includes “[r]eflection and experimentation with potential users of the system . . . throughout the design and development process”).

\textsuperscript{75} See \textit{BROWN \\& KATZ, supra note 57}, at 16; see also \textit{IDEO.ORG, supra note 57}, at 75.

\textsuperscript{76} This approach has been successful in the medical context. A traditional patient-centered model of treatment consists of six interconnected components that make doctors partners with their patients in diagnosis and treatment: (1) exploring both the disease and illness experiences; (2) understanding the whole person; (3) finding common ground regarding management; (4) incorporating prevention and health promotion; (5) enhancing the patient-doctor relationship; and (6) being realistic. For
examining the way in which people experience justice as well as the justiciable hardships people face, civil justice designers uncover the needs, concerns, and goals of stakeholders (which may conflict), as well as the meaning people make of experiences in the civil justice system.77 This understanding may be collected through observation, interviews, surveys, focus groups, deep immersion within communities, and psychological and behavioral studies of stakeholder experiences.78

Next, in the ideation stage, human-centered civil justice designers involve stakeholders at multiple points in the design process, including brainstorming, evaluating, and piloting. This pluralism allows diverse perspectives to emerge and ensures that any civil justice intervention is balanced among the many process values promoted by the civil justice system. Finally, in the implementation stage, human-centered civil justice design is optimistic and humble, creating pilots in the implementation stage and evaluating these interventions before integrating them more broadly. Throughout this

example, a doctor who practices patient-centered care will involve patients in the decision-making process, make sure patients feel fully informed, treat patients’ physical discomfort, and provide emotional support. GERTEIS ET AL., supra note 61, at 5–11. Studies suggest that there is a relationship between patient-centered care and positive patient outcomes, which may also be related to a patient’s (1) “trust”; (2) “adherence to recommended treatment”; and (3) “continuity with health care providers.” Mark Meterko, Steven Wright, Hai Lin, Elliot Lowy & Paul D. Cleary, Mortality Among Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction: The Influences of Patient-Centered Care and Evidence-Based Medicine, 45 HEALTH SERV. RES. 1188, 1189 (2010).

77 One way in which we come to know the idea of justice is by observing justice and injustice in the world around us. See Aristotle, Physics, in 8 GREAT BOOKS OF THE WESTERN WORLD 259, 259 (W. D. Ross trans., 1952) (“When the objects of an inquiry, in any department, have principles, conditions, or elements, it is through acquaintance with these that knowledge, that is to say scientific knowledge, is attained.”); see also John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, in 35 GREAT BOOKS OF THE WESTERN WORLD 93, 121 (W. D. Ross trans., 1952) (“All ideas come from sensation or reflection.”).

78 This approach can help design teams define and understand problems in a way that the beneficiaries and stakeholders may not be able to articulate. For example, in the business context, a consulting group observed consumers who carried both cell phones and beepers and realized that the consumers were using the combination as a way to screen calls—they would give special beeper codes to people whose calls they wanted to screen. From that observation, the consultants were able to realize a consumer “need for filtering capabilities on cell phones.” Leonard, supra note 63, at 106.
process, designers harness these pilots and prototypes to develop insight from stakeholders regarding the causes, conditions, and nature of civil justice problems.

B. Human-Centered Access-to-Justice Innovations and Technology

We now turn to a specific example of how the process and practice of human-centered design thinking is being harnessed to improve access to justice. For most low-income and many middle-income people living in the United States, the inability to receive legal advice or secure legal representation renders our civil justice system dysfunctional. Yet, in the past several years, partnerships among courts, legal-aid providers, and law schools have sought to weave human-centered design thinking with innovations and technology to address access barriers and hardships.79

One example of these partnerships is medical-legal partnerships, which seek to address the entangled nature of legal problems by dissolving silos between health and

legal service providers when addressing basic human needs. In medical-legal partnerships, health institutions serve as the entry point to civil legal-aid assistance for low-income populations. Medical-legal partnerships integrate health care and civil legal-aid services to allow clinical staff at hospitals to screen for health-harming civil legal needs, to work in tandem with legal-aid lawyers and, where necessary, to refer patients to a legal-aid team. This holistic medical-legal approach assists low-income patients by helping them to address public benefits, food security, disability issues, housing, employment, family matters, and other problems that require legal interventions. Therefore, access-to-justice providers are dissolving silos between social service and legal-aid providers.

In these holistic approaches, social workers working with social-service providers on the front lines identify unresolved legal needs that compound to create other hardships for those they serve. These social

---

80 See National Center for Medical Legal Partnership, supra note 9, at 2 (Medical-legal partnerships, sponsored by the National Center for Medical Legal Partnership, are active in 262 hospitals and health centers in thirty-eight states). See also Legal Servs. Corp., 2017 Annual Report Pro Bono & Tech 2–3 (2017), https://www.lsc.gov/media-center/publications/2017-annual-report-pro-bono-and-tech; Rebecca L. Sandefur, The Fulcrum Point of Equal Access to Justice: Legal and Non-legal Institutions of Remedy, 42 Loy. L. Rev. 949 (2009); Jack Tsai, Margaret Middleton, Randye Retkin, Cindy Johnson, Kevin Kenneally, Scott Sherman & Robert A. Rosenheck, Partnerships Between Health Care and Legal Providers in the Veterans Health Administration, Psychiatric Services in Advance (2016). See generally Bharath Krishnamurthy, Sharena Hagins, Ellen Lawton, & Megan Sandel, What We Know and Need to Know About Medical-Legal Partnership, 67 S.C. L. Rev. 377 (2015); Megan Sandel, Mark Hansen, Robert Kahn, Ellen Lawton, Edward Paul, Victoria Parker, Samantha Morton & Barry Zuckerman, Medical-Legal Partnerships: Transforming Primary Care by Addressing the Legal Needs of Vulnerable Populations, 29 Health Aff. 1697 (Sept. 2010). Research has revealed that between 50–85% of these low-income patients have unmet health-harming civil legal needs. See Peter Shin, Fraser R. Byrne, Emily Jones, Joel B. Teitelbaum & Lee Repasch, Dep’t of Health Pol’y, RCHN CMTY. HEALTH FOUND. RES. COLLABORATIVE, MEDICAL-LEGAL PARTNERSHIPS: ADDRESSING THE UNMET LEGAL NEEDS OF HEALTH CENTER PATIENTS (Pol’y Res. Brief No. 18), at 1 (May 4, 2010).

81 See Regenstein et al., supra note 9, at 2.

82 See id.

workers then refer cases to and coordinate with legal-aid providers who, in turn, address the underlying legal nature of these intertwined problems. These partnerships are examples of access-to-justice innovations that recognize the contingent, complex, and entangled nature of peoples’ lives.

Human-centered access-to-justice designers are facilitating these partnerships by creating effective, interactive online portals for such front-line health and social-service partners. These online portals enable health and social service providers to conduct effective, efficient evaluations that identify health-harming civil needs.

Civil Legal Aid (OCLA) in October 2015, the Alliance [For Justice] proposed an integrated, statewide system [in Washington state] for providing legal aid services to crime victims in association with other providers of professional services (health, safety, shelter, mental health, etc.) to victims.”. For example, Project Legal Link trains social service providers to assist in addressing unmet legal needs that compound into social, environmental, and financial hardship. See What is Project Legal Link? Train, Refer, Support, PROJECT LEGAL LINK, http://www.projectlegallink.org/. Project Legal Link trains these front-line social service providers to identify unmet legal needs and to engage in targeted referrals to legal-aid and pro bono providers. See id.

See generally Sandefur, supra note 8; Pleasence et al., supra note 8, at 72—76 tbls. 2 & 3.


legal needs—and enable non-lawyers to identify potential legal remedies to improve their client’s social, environmental, and financial well-being. By analogy, community-oriented technologists, such as Code for America, have helped to create online portals and apps that match people with drug and alcohol recovery resources. These online portals and apps are being designed for health and social service providers who interact with clients with health-harming civil legal needs, and they may, in the future, integrate with available civil legal-aid and pro bono networks.

Eventually, these online portals may help non-legal providers identify justiciable problems, direct their client to public services and legal-aid groups, and help their clients effectively navigate complex bureaucracies.

To further exemplify these partnerships, courts, designers, and legal-aid providers are laboring together to develop unified online portals for people in need that integrate helpful, albeit decentralized, statewide websites within state that provide information on the patchwork of

---

87 See Latimer, supra note 86; Rosenberg, supra note 1.
88 See, e.g., Baker, supra note 86.
89 See also, e.g., Incident-Platform: Case Management Support for Agencies Working with Homeless and Mentally Ill Populations, DEVPOST, https://devpost.com/software/incident-platform#updates (“This system allows case managers to subscribe to clients’ legal issues, with their consent, from multiple court, jail, and probation/parole systems. Case managers act on these alerts in accordance with their agency’s policy and the client’s individual goals. Case managers enter their clients’ information in a web interface and indicate the types of events to which they would like to subscribe. At specified intervals, the incident monitoring service searches public databases for matches to the clients’ personal identifiers. The message broker uses this information to generate events in a standard format, and publishes the events to the incident management application. The case manager receives alerts when new events are found.”).
91 See generally LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION, DOCUMENTING THE JUSTICE GAP IN AMERICA: THE CURRENT UNMET CIVIL LEGAL NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS (Sep. 2009).
courts, legal services, and private bar resources available. These unified legal portals synthesize available self-help resources, triage persons to legal assistance in the most appropriate form, and guide unrepresented litigants through the legal process. Access-to-justice providers aspire to create unified legal portals that offer unrepresented parties meaningful legal advice and that direct them to unbundled services, access to legal-aid and pro bono providers, and lawyers who are available to assist them.

For example, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) and Probono.net entered into a partnership with the Microsoft Corporation and received $1 million in grant funding to design statewide justice portals. The project

---

92 See John M. Greacen & William L. Jones, *Summit on the Use of Technology to Expand Access to Justice: Analytical Framework*, HARR. J. OF L. & TECH (Feb. 2013); Thomas M. Clarke, *Building A Litigant Portal Business and Technical Requirements*, NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS (Nov. 2015), https://www.lsc.gov/technology-initiative-grant-awards-2015 (“The grants supported a variety of initiatives, including developing a website with special resources for seniors and domestic violence victims; creating a hotline for family and housing law advice that can be accessed by text message; and implementing a videoconferencing system to conduct remote client interviews and provide informational videos.”).

93 See, e.g., *CheckIn*, DEVPOST, https://devpost.com/software/legendary-bassoon (“CheckIn is a web service intended for use after random pool of potential jurors is identified. The members of this pool will be notified, using existing infrastructure (via phone or mail) of summons to jury data. They will be given the option to use our web service to respond to the summons. They will provide a method of contact (phone, email, SMS) by which they will receive updates about what days they will be required to go to court. If they need to request a deferment of service, they will be able to do so through CheckIn.”).

94 CLARKE, supra note 92, at 1–2.

95 Press Release, Probono.net & Legal Services Corporation, The Legal Services Corporation Launches Pilot Program to Increase Access to Justice: LSC to partner with Microsoft and Pro Bono Net to Create Statewide Justice Portals, http://www.probono.net/library/attachment.283163. According to LSC’s 2017 annual Pro Bono and Tech Report, the LSC awarded grants to fifteen legal aid organizations in eleven states in September 2017 to “support innovations in pro bono legal services for low-income clients.” A majority of
aspires to facilitate a unified online portal accessible by mobile devices that provides, when relevant, document-assembly capabilities, the application of expert checklists, and simplified forms. Both attorneys and people in need of legal services can access the website, select their desired states, and find lists of relevant, available resources. The website also includes LawHelp.org, which assists people with filling out legal documents without an attorney. According to its 2016 annual report, Probono.net has provided over $5 million dollars of program services that focus on connecting legal aid providers and unrepresented litigants.

Human-centered designers seek to ensure that unrepresented litigants find these legal portals to be navigable, open, and usable. For example, Margaret Hagan has discussed design principles for these statewide portals, including taking the user’s point of view, using plain language, and allowing unrepresented litigants to view the complete journey as a decision tree. Relatedly, Stephanie Kimbro has recommended drawing on the fields of psychology and human-centered interaction studies to facilitate online engagement.

Information these projects incorporate technology “to connect low-income populations to resources and services.” 2017 Annual Report Pro Bono and Tech, LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION. Further, LSC awarded over $3,927,974 in Technology Initiative Grants (TIG), which support projects that use technology to increase access to legal assistance for low-income Americans, to over twenty-five projects in fifteen states in 2017. See id. These projects include the development of a chatbot capable of completing legal forms by the West Tennessee Legal Services to improve the state’s legal help portal, as well as the integration of artificial intelligence into the client intake process at Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida.

96 See 2017 Annual Report Pro Bono and Tech, LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION.
97 PRO BONO NET, ANNUAL REPORT 2016 (2016).
98 Id. at 31.
100 See Stephanie Kimbro, What We Know and Need to Know About
should be presented in plain language and in accessible, visual formats, making these portals usable for unrepresented parties.\textsuperscript{101} Dr. James Griener recently demonstrated that providing unrepresented litigants with legal advice styled in graphic novel formats can improve an unrepresented litigant’s ability to raise valid legal defenses against predatory lenders.\textsuperscript{102} Designers are also facilitating the development of virtual human guides or chat functions with which self-represented litigants can interact to improve their experience.

In a final example, judges, court-connected mediators, and court officials are partnering to develop effective ways for unrepresented parties to navigate complex procedures and bureaucracies.\textsuperscript{103} Many of these

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Gamification and Online Engagement}, 67 S.C. L. Rev. 345 (2016).
\item See D. James Greiner, Dalie Jimenez & Louis R. Lupica, Self-Help Reimagined, 92 Ind. L. J. 1119, 1136 (2017) (“[W]e propose that self-help materials include illustrations, more specifically, cartoons and stick figures.”); see also Helena Haapio, Daniela Alina Plewe & Robert de Rooy, Next Generation Deal Design: Comics and Visual Platforms for Contracting, 19TH INT’L LEGAL INFORMATICS SYMP. (2016) (proposing “new approaches to the use of visualisation to overcome [contracting pitfalls] . . . . [H] categorise[s] contract visualisation and introduce[s] comics and visual interfaces for deal-making as examples of two new categories.”); Stefania Passera & Helena Haapio, Transforming Contracts from Legal Rules to Communication Tools: A Human Information Interaction Challenge, 1.3 COMM. DESIGN. Q. 38, 41 (2013) (showing how “visualization can help users overcome much of the complexity inherent in contracts and gain better insights,” comparing “visual contracts and traditional, text-only contracts, through the experiences and the perceptions of contract users,” and employing “examples taken from [qualitative] interviews and focus groups.”).
solutions are human-centered in that they focus on the experiences and needs of court-users. For example, Court Hackathons have been used to improve court websites by rapidly prototyping, iterating, and improving upon these online access points. Innovations have even been made in reimagining the way litigants “go to court” in order to improve what some refer to as “access-to-courthouse” challenges. Several groups are actively engaged in similar human-centered design projects focused on improving the court experience, including Code for America, Design for America, IDEO, Courthack, Stanford’s Legal Design Lab, and


105 “Hackathons,” or social coding events, which have traditionally focused on bringing together tech innovators to use tech design to solve business-related problems, are now proliferating into the legal sector with a focus on improving how people experience the civil justice system. For example, the University of Seattle School of Law hosted the first “Social Justice” hackathon event in November 2015. Law School Hosts Social Justice Hackathon to Bridge Services Gap, SEATTLE U. SCH. OF L. (Oct. 22, 2015), https://law.seattleu.edu/newsroom/2015-news/law-school-hosts-social-justice-hackathon-to-bridge-services-gap. Today, A2J Hackathons are proliferating around the country. See, e.g., Allen Rodriguez, Legal Hackathons: Innovation Labs for the Legal Industry, L. TECH. TODAY (Oct. 23, 2015), http://www.lawtechnologytoday.org/2015/10/legal-hackathons-innovation-labs-for-the-legal-industry. On a national level, the Legal Services Corporation held a summit in 2013 on how to utilize technology to increase access-to-justice for low-income households. LSC subsequently prepared a report identifying five components for using technology to meet these needs. Heidi Alexander, Hack Access to Justice: ABA Journal’s Hackathon Competition Comes to Boston, L. TECH. TODAY (July 10, 2014), http://www.lawtechnologytoday.org/2014/07/hackaccess-to-justice-aba-journals-hackathon-competition-comes-to-boston/.


108 See About CourtHack, COURT HACK: MAKING JUSTICE FAIR AND ACCESSIBLE FOR ALL, http://courthack.org/#about (last visited Oct. 25, 2018) (“The core of every legal system is defined by access to complete, accurate, and timely information. Technologies developed the past decades have completely
Northeastern University’s NuLaw Lab, to name a few examples. Moreover, human-centered access-to-justice designers are seeking to embrace the perspectives and needs of unrepresented litigants throughout the design process, while balancing and incorporating the perspectives and needs of lawyers and non-lawyers who will implement these innovations. In sum, human-centered access-to-justice solutions are an important means to help low-income and middle-income Americans surmount justiciable hardships.

III. DESIGNING AN EXPERIENTIAL ACCESS-TO-JUSTICE SERVICE LEARNING PROGRAM

When designing the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, we engaged in a backward and forward curricular design process. Regarding backward design, we drew upon the J.D. learning outcomes adopted by the IU Maurer School of Law. With regard to forward design, we designed in light of the common bottlenecks to learning civil procedure in the first-year curriculum.
A. Backward Design: Designing to Achieve J.D. Learning Outcomes

When engaging in backward course design, an educator develops a course based upon the skills and knowledge that one seeks for students to learn by the end of the course. In this scenario, our learning goals were not only that students master the basic material in civil procedure, but that they also emphasized students’ socio-emotional learning skills and their abilities to practice law ethically. Using the Maurer School of Law’s J.D. Learning Outcomes, we selected three backward design goals:

Goal 1: Ethics and Values. We aspire for our students to be ethical lawyers, adhering to the rules that govern lawyers’ conduct as well as the values that guide our profession, including a commitment to the rule of law, access to justice, and public service.

Goal 2: Professionalism. We aspire for our students to empathize with and respect those affected by their work, to take ownership of their own career development, to employ the habit of dynamic learning, and to engage with the communities to which they belong.

Goal 3: Passion. We aspire for our students to be inspired by their studies, by the nature and power of the law, and by the role law plays in society, locally, nationally, and globally.

When backward designing the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, our goal was for the program to meet all three aims. For example, we aspired for law students to empathize with those affected by their work, as well as to understand the role and power of law, and hence their ethical roles and responsibilities as legal professionals. Further, these learning goals are intellectual activities that require active inquiry into the nature of the students’ commitments to access to justice, their communities, and the nature and power of law. As will be described below, we operationalized these goals in a manner that allowed for measurement and an evaluation of whether the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program advanced these three aims.

B. Forward Design: Designing to Address Bottlenecks in Learning

We then engaged in the process of forward design, employing Dr. Joan Middendorf’s bottleneck approach to curriculum design. The bottleneck approach offers a framework for analyzing the gaps between expert and novice thinking. The nature of expertise enables legal experts to do many difficult things all at once. Indeed, an expert’s mental moves are so habitual that they are often implicit, or natural, in a particular field, making them unavailable for conscious scrutiny, and therefore difficult for novices to observe and apply.

---

117 Whereas backward design shows what students should learn by the end of the course, forward design reveals what students need to do to get there, especially by prioritizing what is most difficult. “Decoding the Disciplines” provides a methodology to uncover the mental moves of the expert and turn them into specific student learning outcomes, which can be readily assessed. See Leah Shopkow & Joan Middendorf, Caution! Theories at Play! Threshold Concepts and Decoding the Disciplines (2018). In J. Timmermans & R. Land (Eds.) Threshold Concepts on the Edge; see also Middendorf & Shopkow, supra note 116, at 14.
Applying the bottleneck approach, we identified and focused on the places where students struggle to learn in the first-year curriculum. These bottlenecks mark where critical, but often implicit, legal thinking needs to be made more explicit and available to students. In particular, we sought to address three cognitive and affective bottlenecks in first-year courses:

- **Systems thinking**—Students often struggle with the complexity of law, where simple right and wrong answers may not exist. Legal systems consist of complex models of interconnecting rules and processes, rather than isolated rules.

- **Empathy and teamwork**—Students often struggle to understand the viewpoints of others in the community. In addition, collaborating as equals in teams can be difficult for students who tend to take over the work of a whole team, as well as for those who have avoided teams and mostly worked by themselves.

- **Lack of passion**—First-year courses may be perceived as dry “book learning,” and often involve reading legal cases and rules that many students perceive as having no connection to a passion for justice, which is often the very reason they entered law school.

After we identified the mental moves legal experts use for systems analysis and empathy, the next part of the bottleneck approach entailed modeling these mental moves to students and providing them with structured practice. For example, when incorporating systems thinking into the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, we stressed human-centered civil justice design thinking, which focuses on the way that the civil justice system operates when low-income members of our community encounter and experience it. This wider perspective revealed an authentic problem-solving scenario where there were no simple right and wrong answers. Moreover, we harnessed the metaphor whereby the students saw their roles as outside consultants who were coming in to do an analysis for their paired legal-aid

---

providers, much like a consultant offering an analysis for a medical practice, where the doctor still provides care.

When engaging in the forward design to account for perspective taking, we wanted students to see themselves in service as legal professionals who were engaged in a true empathetic process to gain a collective understanding of their legal-aid partners and members of the community, not as outsiders who have resources helping those who do not.120 To help them understand this goal, we used a metaphor of a mountain, noting that the mountain will look different depending on one’s vantage point, whether one views the mountain from halfway up it, from a distance, or from different sides. This metaphor showed students not only how to take the perspectives of different community partners but also that these different points of view may be valid.

C. The Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program

By engaging in the process of backward and forward curricular design, we developed the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, which was woven into the first-year curriculum as a module within an introductory civil procedure course. In Fall 2016, all 187 law students at the IU Maurer School of Law were assigned to civil procedure sections taught by Professor Quintanilla. We developed the Access-to-Justice Program as an accompanying in-class and out-of-class module in this civil procedure class. We will next describe the program, its arc, goals, and form.

i. Description of the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program

In the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, each of twenty-eight groups—comprised of six to seven students each—selected and worked with a local community partner. The students’ goal was to design a strategy that met their community partners’ needs in

120 Janice Miller-Young, Yasmin Dean, Melanie Rathburn, Jennifer Pettit, Margot Underwood, Judy Gleeson, Roberta Lexier, Victoria Calvert & Patti Clayton, Decoding Ourselves: An Inquiry into Faculty Learning About Reciprocity in Service Learning, 22 MICH. J. COMMUNITY SERV. LEARNING 32 (2015).
delivering access to justice. The great majority of the community partners serve the eleven economically disadvantaged counties in South-Central Indiana that Indiana University is seeking to positively impact with a series of initiatives through the IU Center for Rural Engagement.

Each team of students sought to learn about members of the community with unmet legal needs and to understand those who serve those needs. They partnered with community providers, including legal-aid providers, social-service providers, court administrators, and attorneys who administer pro bono programs. The student teams learned from and collaborated with their community partners with the aim of developing an access-to-justice solution that both met their partners’ needs and addressed the legal needs of low-income or unrepresented people who encounter and navigate the civil justice system.

These law student teams designed access-to-justice solutions that integrated the three overlapping criteria described above in Part II: desirability, feasibility, and financial viability. Throughout the semester, the law student teams moved through the three overlapping spaces, described above in Part II, when designing their access-to-justice interventions: inspiration, ideation, and implementation. Six assignments guided the students through the possible bottlenecks in this process with each assignment purposely designed to change the students’ perspectives on civil procedure to that of their clients—the community partners.

ii. Arc of Assignments in the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program

**Assignment 1:** In the first assignment, 1L students learned about access-to-justice problems. We asked them to identify four unanswered questions that they had about the problem areas we identified for them in background reading materials. The 1L students then discussed these themes and questions with three people with legal training and three people without training in order to learn more. In short, Assignment 1 provided the experiential foundation to help students begin to learn about access-to-justice gaps and barriers.
Assignment 2: In Assignment 2, the 1L students focused more deeply on understanding and uncovering the perspectives of the populations affected by the problems researched in Assignment 1, an exercise that later helped students more precisely define access-to-justice needs and problems. Working in teams, 1L students used Assignment 2 to uncover the ways in which members of the public make meaning of and experience these access-to-justice barriers. The teams identified populations affected by the problems they researched and interviewed two members of these groups. The 1L students used these interviews to understand deeply the perspective of those individuals primarily affected by access-to-justice barriers.

Assignment 3: In Assignment 3, the 1L student teams were each matched with a community partner, such as a legal-aid organization or court that serves members of the affected community, and worked with these community partners for the remainder of the semester. As such, we structured the assignment so that these student teams would learn the perspectives, experiences, and needs of their community partners—through an interview process—regarding the access-to-justice problem areas that they sought to address. Whereas Assignment 1 led them to identify problems that existed in certain areas, the interviews in Assignment 3 enabled them to more deeply understand problems from their community partners’ perspectives, as well as the needs of these community partners, in relation to the access-to-justice barriers and problems. In the context of these interviews, the community partners provided in-depth advice, opinions, and ideas for improving the problem areas. We ensured that the 1L student teams conceived of their community partners as collaborators with whom their group worked to solve an access-to-justice problem area, treating them much like a client.

Assignment 4: In Assignment 4, the 1L student teams brainstormed strategies designed to meet the needs of their community partners in delivering access to justice. After brainstorming and researching different strategies to address their community partner’s needs, each team selected five strategies that they believed were desirable, feasible, and financially viable. The 1L student teams presented these strategies to their community
partners in memorandums (Assignment 4) and then discussed them with their community partners in second interviews (Assignment 5).

For this assignment, a metaphor was helpful: we asked them, for example, to view the relationship between their community partners and members of the affected communities as a doctor-patient relationship. These 1L student teams, in effect, served as consultants to these “doctors” who were doing everything they could do to help “patients.” We asked them to imagine that their teams had been hired to consult on the doctors’ needs and current practices with the aim of developing strategies to help the doctors address their needs, which would in turn enable the doctors to better serve patients. The 1L student teams’ goal was not to completely transform the doctors’ practices. Instead, their goal was to work with the doctors to learn as much as they could about the doctors’ needs, challenges, difficulties, and how the doctors served patients, and to present the doctors with potential strategies and solutions. This necessitated carefully interviewing their community partners to learn about their community partners’ needs, expectations, desires, and limitations first.

**Assignment 5.** In Assignment 5, the 1L teams met and conferred with their community partners about the five strategies developed in Assignment 4. They worked with their community partners both to identify which strategies best fit their needs and to iterate the best strategy to prepare for their final recommendations.

We designed the assignment such that each 1L student team held a second meeting with their community partner to discuss the five strategies developed in Assignment 4. The goal of this meeting was to learn their community partners’ perspectives and to work with them to identify which strategies best fit their needs. This conversation, moreover, enabled the 1L student teams to further develop and iterate the best strategy after learning their community partners’ perspectives; the 1L student teams ultimately further expanded on this strategy. This second conversation with community partners encouraged openness, understanding, professionalism, gratitude, and active listening. The 1L student teams once again treated their community partners much like clients. By analogy, in
Assignment 5, after sharing a memorandum with five excellent strategies, the students were told to imagine that they were consultants returning to and working with doctors to learn as much as possible about whether, why, and how the strategies would meet the doctors’ needs, challenges, and difficulties. This feedback loop was absolutely essential in the design process, as it enabled the 1L student teams to learn their community partners’ perspectives and to select and refine the best strategy for an ultimate recommendation.

**Assignment 6.** In Assignment 6, each 1L student team prepared both a final memorandum and a fifteen-minute in-class presentation on their human-centered access-to-justice projects.

Within the final memorandum, each team: (1) discussed their community partner’s needs in delivering access to justice; (2) outlined the five strategies that they developed to address their community partner’s needs in delivering access to justice (and which they shared and discussed with their community partner in Assignments 4 and 5); (3) analyzed why they ultimately selected the strategy recommended by weighing the strengths and weaknesses of the five strategies; and (4) described their final recommendation in greater depth, telling the story of how their strategy would meet their community partner’s needs in delivering access to justice and positively affect the lives of members of our community. The aim of Assignment 6 was to harness the insights their community partners shared during their second meetings (Assignment 5) to select the strategy that best fits their community partners’ needs.

By this point, each team had consulted with their community partner and gathered all the information needed to understand the community partner’s needs and whether, how, and why each strategy would meet their needs. In Assignment 6, each team again treated their community partner much like a client and selected one of the five strategies, developed in Assignment 4 and discussed with their community partner in Assignment 5, that best addressed their community partner’s needs in delivering access to justice, and they proposed their recommendations in the final memorandum.

We asked the students to recall the metaphor of viewing the relationship between their community
partners and members of the affected community as a
doctor-patient relationship. In Assignment 6, students
had to keep the strengths and weaknesses of each
strategy in mind (incorporating the criteria of desirability,
viability, and feasibility), and by working with their
community partner, each group learned the strengths and
weaknesses of each strategy from their community
partner’s perspective.

Regarding the in-class presentations, each group
presented their Access-to-Justice Project to their
classmates, team coaches, and guests invited to attend
the class. Additionally, these presentations were recorded
for review to assist with the professor’s selection process
to decide which five teams would be invited to present in
Spring 2017 and potentially receive funding from external
stakeholders.

The primary goal of the presentations was for each
1L student team to communicate how their access-to-
justice solution was desirable, feasible, and viable. The
presentations were distilled versions of a final
memorandum to the community partners, which reported
on the information covered in the arc of the assignments.
Accordingly, each presentation began by explaining the
access-to-justice problem that the 1L student team’s
community partner faced and the resulting needs, desires,
and concerns associated with that problem. Each 1L
student team then discussed five strategies and those
strategies’ strengths and weaknesses in terms of the
above three criteria. Finally, the 1L student team selected
a strategy with which to move forward, explaining why
that strategy was selected and how it would address the
community partner’s needs. All members of the 1L
student teams were required to participate in their teams’
presentations.

iii. February 2017 Presentations to the Indiana
Coalition for Court Access

In February 2017, the IU Maurer School of Law
hosted a conference entitled Accessing Justice: The
Interplay of Design Thinking, Access to Justice, and Legal
Education. The purpose of the conference was to highlight
the uniqueness of the program, gather stakeholders,
disseminate scholarship, share the work of selected student teams, and workshop ideas of the student teams.

The access-to-justice conference gathered fifteen access-to-justice scholars, members of the Indiana Coalition for Court Access, community partners, legal-aid providers, social service providers, funders, student presenters, and other members of our community who were interested in learning more about the program. The conference also included members of the Indiana Supreme Court, including Justice Steven David, and the pro bono coordinators of Faegre Baker Daniels. The event also served as a symposium for the *Indiana Journal of Law & Social Equality*.

The access-to-justice conference began with a brief introduction and overview of the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program, including the aims of the project. This overview included the arc of the semester and the community providers involved and then noted the engagement of the first-year class—the twenty-eight student groups that completed these service-learning projects. The conference featured the top five projects from the year. Teams presented their projects for fifteen minutes per project, with questions and answers from the audience after each presentation. The conference also featured presentations from the visiting scholars on their own work pertaining to access to justice.

Following the morning presentations, the afternoon featured break-out sessions where the selected 1L teams were paired with three access-to-justice researchers, their community partners, member(s) of the Indiana Coalition for Court Access, and where relevant, partners from neighboring IU departments, such as informatics, business, computer science, psychology, etc. The break-out sessions were designed to reiterate and improve upon each of the 1L team’s projects and to connect the student teams with additional stakeholders who were invaluable for implementing the projects.

IV. **Empirical Analysis and Curricular Evaluation**

After engaging in this intervention within the first-year curriculum, we measured the effect of the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program and the extent to which we met our backward-design and forward-design
objectives. We measured the effectiveness of the curriculum using a combination of pre- and post-surveys and by examining the law school’s Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE) reported in Spring 2017, the semester immediately after the curriculum was woven into the first-year curriculum.

A. Backward Design

To assess whether the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program achieved the three primary objectives reflected within the law school’s learning outcomes—ethics and values, professionalism, and passion for the role law plays in society—we surveyed each of the 187 students in the 1L class through anonymous feedback provided within course evaluations.

We included the following three diagnostic items to the standard course-evaluation portal, which allowed students to rate the extent of their agreement/disagreement using a Likert scale of five responses ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” with the middle position being “Undecided.” In total, 168 students completed these diagnostic items.

Program Goal # 1: Ethics and Values of the Legal Profession.

“My team’s A2J service-learning project helped me understand the values that guide our profession, including a commitment to the rule of law, access to justice, and public service.”

Program Goal # 2: Professionalism.

“My team’s A2J service-learning project helped me develop and put into practice empathy for those affected by my work, the capacity for dynamic learning, and engagement with the community.”

Program Goal # 3: Passion.

“My team’s A2J service-learning project helped me understand the nature and power of the law and the role that law plays in society.”
Below are the results of the survey as well as student responses related to each of these three supplemental items:

As is shown, these survey responses are quite promising and consistent with the backward-design goals of the program, which were drawn from the law school’s learning outcomes. According to the survey, 72.0 percent of the 1L class (121 students) concluded that the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program helped them understand the values that guide the profession, whereas 70.8 percent of the 1L class (119 students) concluded that the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program helped them put into practice empathy, perspective taking, and professionalism. Finally, 75.6 percent of the 1L class (127 students) concluded that the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program helped them understand the nature and power of the system of law.

B. Forward Design

In addition, we developed an anonymous survey that was administered to the 1L class in the final week of the semester. Regarding student participation, 164 1L students (87.7%) responded to the anonymous survey.

121 Approximately ninety percent (89.84%), or 168 out of 187 students participating in the program, completed the online course evaluation forms from which the data in this Section of the Article is reported.
The survey asked several open-ended, free-response questions, three of which were designed to examine the effectiveness of the curriculum in meeting the primary bottlenecks in the curriculum—systems thinking, empathy and teamwork, and lack of passion:

1. What did you learn about yourself by engaging in your A2J project?
2. What skills did you exercise and grow?
3. What did you learn by engaging with the community?

The open-ended responses were then qualitatively coded by an independent, upper-level student rater using a detailed codebook and coding scheme that we developed by reviewing the themes emerging from open-ended responses. The coding scheme is available online. Each of the survey responses and the relevant coding scheme were applied and reviewed three times by the independent rater to ensure the accuracy of the coding for each entry.

i. Perspective Taking and Empathy

To begin, when responding to the prompt asking them about what they learned about themselves by engaging in their project, Sixty (36.6%) 1L students responded that they learned about the importance of perspective taking, empathy, and/or compassion. Moreover, forty-one (24.7%) 1L students responded that they exercised and grew skills in perspective taking, empathy, and/or compassion. Finally, 137 (83.5%) 1L students responded that they learned about the

---

122 The student responses that were coded as “perspective taking, empathy, and/or compassion” reflected how the students learned about the different perspectives of the legal system and how it impacts different communities. For example, one student wrote: “I learned that many people do not enter the system on fair grounds. There are many barriers and restrictions on certain communities.” Another student wrote, “I developed sympathy and care for other people by putting myself in the situation that they face.” Another student responded “[t]hat civil legal issues are rarely identified when they arise amongst low-income, high-need populations, that people feel intimidated when approaching the legal system generally, and that unfortunately the view of the justice system tends to be negative amongst these populations.”
importance of perspective taking, empathy, and/or compassion by engaging with members of the community. As such, more than 80 percent of the 1L class responded that they had learned about the importance of perspective taking, empathy, and/or compassion as a result of the curricular intervention.123

ii. Ethical Development, Reconciling Personal and Professional Identities, and Public-Interest Career Insights

Moreover, several additional categories emerged from the qualitative responses. For example, many students indicated that the curricular intervention enhanced their understanding of professional values, pro bono work, public service, and the need to care about unrepresented litigants.124 Indeed, seventy-three (44.5%) 1L students responded that they learned about the importance of these professional and ethical values by engaging with members of the community.

In addition, fifty-six (34.1%) 1L students indicated that the program helped them reconcile their own personal values in serving the public with their professional identity as a lawyer.125 Finally, 38 (23.2%) 1L students responded that they learned how to reconcile this public-oriented aspiration with the practice of law by engaging with members of the community.126

Finally, one unintended, albeit measurable, effect was that thirty-one (18.9%) 1L students spontaneously

123 The coding scheme applied and additional detail can be found in the appendix.
124 For instance, a student wrote, “I learned that the volume and society of unmet legal needs, even in this relatively small town, is considerable and that willing attorneys and students can make an equally considerable impact.” Another student wrote, “I think I was ignorant about my surroundings. Help is needed everywhere.”
125 A student stated, “I learned how incredibly fortunate I am and how many opportunities there are for us all to contribute at many levels.” Another student wrote, “You don’t really need a specific license or title to have an impact on the justice system. The first step can start now.” Additionally, a student discussed, “I learned that small steps mean a lot to [people with legal needs] and that an expressed interest can mean the world to them and can implement change as well.”
126 The coding scheme and additional detail can be found in the appendix.
expressed that the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program fostered an interest in engaging in a legal-aid career, government lawyering, or pro bono service upon joining a law firm.  

iii. Teamwork: Cooperative Learning, Group Work, and Working with Others

Next, we examined the extent to which the curricular intervention fostered and developed teamwork skills. When responding to the prompt asking them about what they learned about themselves by engaging in their project, thirty-three (20.1%) 1L students self-reflected that they learned about the importance of teamwork, cooperative learning, group work, and working with others. Moreover, 101 (60.8%) 1L students responded that they exercised and developed teamwork and group work skills. As such, approximately 60 percent of the 1L class self-reported that they had exercised and grown teamwork, cooperative learning, and group work skills as a result of the curricular intervention.

iv. Professional Identity and Skills Development

In addition to allowing a coding scheme to emerge organically from the open-ended responses, we also applied a top-down coding scheme generated from the Shultz and Zedeck metric of important professional

127 Students wrote, “I am more interested in public interest than I originally thought,” as well as, “This project also further affirmed that I am on the right path to help the community.” One student wrote, “I did not realize how many groups are underrepresented until we researched actual data. I learned that by looking at the data, I want to eventually practice some pro bono help.”

128 Students wrote, “I was able to work with people outside of my everyday life. I had the opportunity to design effective strategies that can solve a complex legal issue,” and “if a team works well together, you can accomplish so much more as a unit than an individual.” Other students identified the necessary skills of working with others: “[l]earned how to communicate with fellow group members and how to reach out to others to accomplish a common goal,” as well as, “[c]hoosing to yield to other people’s ideas should not be an excuse to shut down.” These students identified strategies with working in a team successfully.

129 The coding scheme and additional detail can be found in the appendix.
development skills. Several important themes emerged, particularly around socio-emotional, ethical, and personal development skills.

When responding to the prompt What skills did you exercise and grow?, thirty-four (20.5%) 1L students responded that they exercised and grew problem-solving skills; thirty-three (19.9%) 1L students responded that they exercised and grew questioning and interviewing skills; thirty-nine (23.5%) 1L students responded that they exercised and grew writing skills; and fifty-five (33.1%) 1L students reported that they exercised and grew speaking and listening skills.

Moreover, when responding to the prompt What did you learn about yourself by engaging in your A2J project?, thirty-five (21.3%) 1L students reported that they developed passion and engagement for practicing law, and fifty-nine (36.0%) responses indicated themes of personal growth and self-development.

Finally, when responding to the prompt What did you learn by engaging with the community?, eighty-eight (53.7%) 1L students reported that they learned how to see the world through the eyes of another, and forty-two (25.6%) 1L students reported that they learned about the importance of legal professionals engaging in community service.

This coding scheme is included within the appendix. See Marjorie M. Shultz & Sheldon Zedeck, Identification, Development, and Validation of Predictors for Successful Lawyering (2008).

For example, students wrote, “I learned that I’m passionate about addressing access to justice issues going forward,” as well as, “I learned that I am more interested than I thought in helping unrepresented litigants.”

Students shared a variety of ways that they fostered personal gratitude and pursued growth of awareness and maturity. In the survey, a student stated, “I learned about my strengths and weaknesses. I learned more about what I bring to a group of peers.” Additionally, a student wrote, “I learned that I am more equipped to help others than I thought I was.” Others were more specific about their self-development such as, “I need to take advantages of more public speaking opportunities.”

For instance, a student wrote, “I learned that I have been fortunate throughout my life to have many advantages over other groups of people that I was not aware of.” Another student discussed that they learned “[j]ust how eager I am to get going. That I made the right decision to come to law school. No matter how broad I may try to allow my perspective to expand, there are always new ways to see the world. An infinite number of lenses.”

Students identified Bloomington, Indiana, as a community but also identified the needs of unmet legal needs as a larger community. For
C. Analysis of LSSSE 2017 Survey Responses

As the curricular intervention took place in Fall 2016 and among the entire 1L class, we examined the responses of 1L students in the LSSSE survey administered in Spring 2017. This LSSSE administration captured the responses of 1L students at the IU Maurer School of Law and enabled our research team to compare and contrast the responses of IU Maurer School of Law 1L students with peer law schools’ averages. We will highlight below several survey responses that relate to the backward and forward aims to which the curriculum was designed.

i. Perspective Taking and the Ethical Practice of Law

Encouraging the ethical practice of law. In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the IU Maurer School of Law to the prompt Encouraging the ethical practice of law was significantly higher ($M = 3.49$) than peer institutions ($M = 3.31$, $p = .014$).

Included diverse perspectives. In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, sexual orientations, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments was significantly higher ($M = 2.94$) than peer institutions ($M = 2.69$, $p = .002$).

ii. Teamwork and Collaborative Projects

Worked with other students on projects during class. In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt Worked with other students on projects during class was significantly higher ($M = 2.23$) than peer institutions ($M = 1.97$, $p < .001$).

example, a student stated, “People here in Bloomington really need our help.” Another student wrote, “I learned that the community needs our help, and that the community wants our help. They truly care about solving the lack of access to justice, and they are open to hearing many different strategies.”
Worked with classmates outside of class. In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments* was significantly higher ($M = 2.74$) than peer institutions ($M = 2.23, p < .001$).

Working effectively with others. In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt *Working effectively with others* was significantly higher ($M = 2.98$) than peer institutions ($M = 2.57, p < .001$).

iii. Pro bono and Public Service

**Participation in clinical or pro bono project for course credit.** In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt, *In your experience at your law school during the current school year, about how often have you done of the following: Participated in a clinical or pro bono project as part of a course or for academic credit* was significantly higher ($M = 2.01$) than peer institutions ($M = 1.37, p < .001$).

**Participation in pro bono work or public service enrichment.** In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt, *Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do at your law school before you graduate: Pro bono work or public service* was significantly higher ($M = .96$) than peer institutions ($M = .85, p < .001$).

**Participation in pro bono work not required for class.** In 2017, the mean response of 1L students at the law school to the prompt, *During the current school year, about how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following: Legal pro bono work not required for a class or clinical course* was significantly higher ($M = 2.31$) than peer institutions ($M = 1.33, p < .001$).
CONCLUSION

In this Article, we have described and evaluated a curricular intervention designed to help first-year law students develop lawyering skills while fostering their ethical and social-emotional development. While this may be the first Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program administered within a first-year curriculum, we believe that the program can be adapted to other local contexts and replicated at other law schools. While the program required attention to detail, design, and feedback from students and stakeholders to accomplish, these results suggest that similar curricular interventions are promising ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of the first-year curriculum.

Trends in society and within American educational institutions make this an important moment for U.S. law schools to reflect on ways to weave experiential education with programs that address access to justice needs in local communities. Indeed, as previously described, U.S. law schools are increasingly being called upon to train their students to become ethical members of society who address access-to-justice challenges that the public experiences when encountering and navigating the civil justice system.

The Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program was designed to help law students understand the values that guide our profession—including a commitment to the rule of law, access to justice, and public service—and to help law students empathize with those affected by the civil justice system. This evaluation, using a variety of instruments including online surveys, post-course surveys, and LSSSE data evidences that authentic learning environments and community engagement nurtured by service-learning programs may help law students learn about the ethics and values of the legal profession, develop perspective taking and empathy, reconcile their personal and professional identities, develop teamwork skills, and practice a variety of professional skills.

This evaluation reveals that the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program fostered many of the benefits produced by other similar service-learning programs that generate authentic learning environments. Indeed, like
this program, other authentic learning environments have been found to kindle self-knowledge and self-awareness. Moreover, similar service-learning programs in the undergraduate context have been found to nourish passion and care for volunteerism and civic participation. Like this program, moreover, other service-learning programs in the undergraduate context have been found to generate a sense of purpose and social consciousness.

The first-year cohort who participated in the Access-to-Justice Service Learning Program gained the perspective of affected members of the community and were matched with legal-aid partners in central and southern Indiana. These first-year students at the IU Maurer School of Law worked with their community partners to help deliver legal services more effectively to low-income members of the community by engaging in a human-centered access-to-justice design process. These first-year students grew not only as individuals, but by working together in teams, they developed as future members of the legal profession. Their collective efforts are revitalizing access to justice in Indiana; having a ripple effect for people with unmet legal needs, stakeholders, and civil society across our community; and revealing the promise and potential of experiential access-to-justice service learning programs woven within the first-year curriculum of U.S. law schools.

APPENDIX

Qualitative Examples from the Access-to-Justice Survey, Fall 2016

I. QUALITATIVE CODING SCHEME FOR FORWARD-DESIGN

A. Perspective-Taking, Empathy, and/or Compassion
a) “We cannot afford to continuously assess situations from our own shoes. We must find ways to relate to people who are different from ourselves.”

b) “Very rarely do people have it as good or as easy I have. Humbling.”

c) “I learned that many people do not enter the system on fair grounds. There are many barriers and restrictions on certain communities.”
   (1) This person learned about the different perspectives on “the system” and how it impacts different communities.

d) “By engaging with the community, I learned that those who need the most help are often victims of chance.”
   (1) This person learned about the varied circumstances of others and how “chance” can impact them negatively.

e) “I developed sympathy and care for other people by putting myself in the situation that they face.”

f) “That civil legal issues are rarely identified when they arise amongst low-income, high need populations, that people feel intimidated when approaching the legal system generally, and that unfortunately the view of the justice system tends to be negative amongst these populations.”
   (1) This is a (P) because this person developed an understanding of how others feel and their perspectives of the legal system and why they feel intimidated to approach the legal system.

B. Ethical Development, whether about professional values, pro bono, public service, unrepresented litigants
a) “I was surprised at how great the needs of pro bono groups are.”

b) “I think I was ignorant about my surroundings. Help is needed everywhere.”

c) “I learned that the volume and society of unmet legal needs, even in this relatively small town, is considerable and that willing attorneys and students can make an equally considerable impact.

C. Teamwork, cooperative learning, group work, working with others.

a) “I was able to work with people outside of my everyday life. I had the opportunity to design effective strategies that can solve a complex legal issue.”

138 This coding scheme originates from Marjorie M. Shultz & Sheldon Zedeck, Identification, Development, and Validation of Predictors for Successful Lawyering (Sept. 2008). These provided examples serve to illustrate how the survey responses were coded for the purposes of gathering quantitative analysis from the project.
b) “That even small behaviors can be taken now and have a large impact on the community. I also learned that if a team works well together, you can accomplish so much more as a unit than an individual.”
c) “Learned how to communicate with fellow group members and how to reach out to others to accomplish a common goal.”

D. Leadership
a) “I learned how to motivate people. I was very excited about the project but had to work to make others share my same excitement.”
b) “In the long term group projects, I think you learn a lot about your own leadership strengths and weaknesses.”

E. Reconciliation, of how to do law and doing public good
a) “I learned how incredibly fortunate I am and how many opportunities there are for us all to contribute at many levels.”
b) “You don’t really need a specific license or title to have an impact on the justice system. The first step can start now.”
c) “Learned there are communities that can be positively affected by a little outside help.”

F. Positive career insights and aspirations: legal aid, community service, public service, government lawyering, pro bono.
a) “I am more interested in public interest than I originally thought.”
b) “This project also further affirmed that I am on the right path to help the community.”
c) “That I’m interested in identifying and helping solve A2J problems.”
d) “I did not realize how many groups are underrepresented until we researched actually data. I learned that by looking at the data, I want to eventually practice some pro bono help.”

G. Restricting aspirations to do any form of public service or pro bono. Selfish, egoistic, aspirations.
a) “That I want to make money as an attorney and I’m not going to be an attorney working on the grassroots level to provide aid to groups that have access to justice issues.”
b) “I don’t want to help people as much as I thought I did. It is way too difficult and demoralizing. I’m going to work for corporate clients.”
c) “I learned that I do not want to do public interest work.”

a. Professional Development
b. Intellectual and Cognitive
   i. Analysis and Reasoning
      1. “Communication, leadership, analytical thinking, presentation skills.”
   ii. Creativity/Innovation
   iii. Problem-Solving
      1. “I learned how to critically think about solutions and visualize their implementation.”
      2. “It opened my eyes to problem solving abilities I never knew I had. The key skill wasn’t coming up with a solution but identifying a serious yet solvable problem.”
   iv. Practical Judgment: recognizing the realities of a situation or the practical perspective of an idea.
      1. “I learned that although we may come up with wonderful strategies, we have to have a realistic state of mind and realize
that in a mental health setting, things may not always go as planned.”
2. “How education and intelligence are not the same thing.”

c. Planning and Organizing
i. Strategic Planning: Ability to understand the project, break it down, and create an end goal for the project.
   1. “Learning how to break down large, complicated problems into manageable pieces.”
ii. Organizing and Managing One’s Own Work
   1. “My ability to juggle an intense amount of work.”
iii. Organizing and Managing Others
   1. “Delegating.”
   2. “Group management skills.”

d. Conflict Resolution
i. Able to See the World Through the Eyes of Others
   1. “I developed sympathy and care for other people by putting myself in the situation that they face.”

e. Working With Others (Specifically, legal professionals)
   i. “I learned how many aspects of the legal system work and got real-life experience with a legal service group.”
   ii. “Communicating with professionals.”

f. Character
i. Passion and Engagement
   1. “I learned that I’m passionate about addressing access to justice issues going forward.”
ii. Diligence
   1. “Through engaging in the A2J Project I learned that I am very passionate about solving a problem with the best possible strategy. It showed me that I approach every problem with 100% effort.”
   ii. Integrity/Honesty
   iv. Stress Management
v. Community Service
   1. “People here in Bloomington really need our help.”
   2. “I learned that the community needs our help, and that the community wants our help. They truly care about solving the lack of access to justice, and they are open to hearing many different strategies.”
   vi. Self-Development: Fostering personal gratitude and pursuing growth of awareness and maturity.
   1. “I learned about my strengths and weaknesses. I learned more about what I bring to a group of peers.”
   2. “I learned that I am more equipped to help others than I thought I was.”
## Results of the Coding
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#### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Coding Scheme for Forward/Design</th>
<th>Total Count 164</th>
<th>Total Count 166</th>
<th>Total Count 164</th>
<th>Percent responding</th>
<th>Percent responding</th>
<th>Percent responding</th>
<th>Percent responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P) Perspective taking, empathy, compassion</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.59%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>83.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Ethical development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) Teamwork, cooperative learning, group work, working with others</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.12%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60.54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Reconciliation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34.15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career insights and aspirations (IC+)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.63%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development from Schulz and Zedeck Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual and Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Analysis and reasoning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Creativity and innovation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Practical judgment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and information gathering</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Researching the law</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Fact finding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Questioning and interviewing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Influencing and advocating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Speaking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Listening</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Strategic planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Organizing and managing one's work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Organizing and managing others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Negotiation skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Able to see the world through the eyes of the other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client business relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Networking and business development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Advising clients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Developing relationships within the legal profession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Evaluation, development, and monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Passion and engagement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Diligence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Integrity and honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Stress management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Community service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Self development</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>