TIG FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Grantee name: Statewide Legal Services of Connecticut   **TIG grant number: 14035**
Submission date: 8/15/16
Approved: 8/16/16

Contact person: Kathy Daniels   **Phone number: 860-344-8096 x 3026**
Email address: kdaniels@slsct.org

I.   Project Goals and Objectives

Our project goal was to **i**ncrease access to justice by developing and implementing an innovative online tool (digital game) that will equip self-represented litigants to more effectively secure their legal rights in court and before administrative agencies.

Our digital game is called RePresent. Game play takes the online player through scenarios where they are preparing for court at home, visiting the courthouse in advance, waiting for their court session in the hallway at the courthouse, and working through trial mechanics in the courtroom itself.

To achieve our goal, we completed the two objectives in our LSC-approved evaluation plan:

> **Project Objective 1:** In collaboration with stakeholders, develop an innovative online "digital game" that equips self-represented parties (SRPs) with the knowledge required to more effectively secure their rights in courts and before administrative agencies.

> **Project Objective 2:** Enhance Connecticut residents' ability to more effectively secure their legal rights in court and before administrative agencies by implementing, promoting, and publicizing the digital game.

No significant changes were made to our goal or the objectives. As we built out the game, we realized that attempting to simulate both a court and an administrative agency experience in the same game would be too confusing, so we staged RePresent in a courthouse with the understanding that much of the learning would be applicable to administrative hearings as well.

II.   Evaluation Data and Methodologies

We used the methods and data sets specified in the project Evaluation Plan to assess the project accomplishments. Our assessment was both quantitative and qualitative.

It included:

Testing: We conducted testing throughout the project. Our core group of testers as the game was being built included Kathy Daniels, IT Administrator, Statewide Legal Services (SLS); Susan Garcia Nofi, Executive Director, New Haven Legal Assistance (NHLAA); Kate Frank, Publications and Website Manager, NHLAA; Dan Jackson, Executive Director, Northeastern University (NU) School of Law's NuLawLab; game designers Dr. Casper Harteveld and Dr. Gillian Smith of the NU Game Lab; and a number of student interns involved in the work at NU. Testing was done at key stages during the design process with: our core group of stakeholders (31 people, see Stakeholders List, attached); people visiting the Court Service Centers in several Connecticut courthouses (7 people in two locations during two days of testing); members of the National Self-Represented Litigants Project in Canada (we sent an email to about 50 people); legal aid staff; legal aid clinic attendees (10 people); users of PlayTestCloud.com (30 online testers); staff and interns at the Northeastern University Game Lab (7 people); and law students at NU (10 people).

Surveys: We built an online exit survey inviting responses from people playing the game.

Game play analysis: The NU Game Lab staff built analysis tools into RePresent to provide an in-depth analysis of the players' behavior. That analysis is included in the attachment from the NuLawLab and NU Game Lab "Report on Major Findings of Game User Data and Feedback"

Usage statistics: From Google Analytics

III.   Summary of Major Accomplishments, Recommendations and Future Steps

Game completed and launched: RePresent is a unique self-help resource for self-represented parties (SRPs) facing the daunting challenge of going to court without a lawyer. It gives them a safe place where they can practice making choices about situations they might encounter while getting ready for and being in court. We have focused on providing SRPs with the generally applicable skills and tasks required for court and other adjudicatory proceedings, such as how to address the judge and how to cross-examine a witness. Going to court is still stressful, but being prepared can help improve the chances of an SRP achieving a positive outcome.

In the seven months since launching RePresent on December 31, 2015, a total of 1,201 unique visitors have played all or part of the game.

Elevating serious games for legal aid: RePresent is the first digital game produced specifically to help low-income people prepare for, and navigate, a court hearing without the assistance of a lawyer. The project and its early visibility launched a valuable dialogue within the legal aid community, and beyond, regarding the potential that digital games offer to legal aid organizations and SRPs. We significantly advanced that dialogue by delivering a successful

product that includes robust gameplay analytics, allowing for a better understanding over time of how SRPs are interacting with, and learning from, the game. Project results are being showcased in academic publications by NU team members, further positioning RePresent as a pioneering application of serious games in the legal space.

Research: Commencing in December, 2014, NuLawLab staff and students undertook a significant amount of end-user research for the purpose of better understanding the needs of SRPs, how an online game can respond to those needs, and key considerations that should go into the design of the game. That research will be helpful for any program seeking to help SRPs.

Introduction of co-design: The carefully planned steps, detailed milestone reports, and TIG conference presentations helped introduce the co-design process to the legal services community as a means of creating more meaningful digital experiences. Another benefit of the co-design process is how it builds and reinforces partnerships with stakeholders. Co-design offers participants a chance to team up with others to actively brainstorm ideas and work together for a common purpose. Because co-design turns stakeholders into co-creators, our participants were very engaged in the process, enthusiastically attending multiple sessions over several months. As expected, the co-design process proved to be valuable in strengthening our existing community partnerships and building new ones. The co-design process was very important to our planning the game and the scenarios by surfacing ideas from the broader self-representation experience.

Report on major findings of game user data and feedback: This report, prepared by NU's NuLawLab and Game Lab, provides an extremely helpful analysis of how it has been used, tested and evaluated. It examines the user interactions and decisions. The report articulates the NU Game Lab and NuLawLab professional assessments of meaningful future project improvements and their in-depth analysis of how users are seeking help.

Recommendations: We knew that building a digital game would be a large and complex process, so right from the beginning we felt that we should work in a way that would help SRPs in other states benefit from our foundational work. RePresent was specifically built to be easily replicated in other jurisdictions and to be expanded into other substantive areas. We selected a subject that could be applicable in any jurisdiction, and the underlying technology can be used to efficiently create new games for other substantive areas. We feel that replicating the game in other states will expand online resources for SRPs in a way that is both cost and time efficient.

Future Steps: The Game Lab at NU continues to update the game and scripter. Based on our work to date there are a number of updates in the works and they are included in the NU Report.

We have been invited to apply for a 2016 TIG to replicate the game for SRPs in two other states (Maine and Massachusetts) and to build another version specifically for SRPs facing summary process eviction in Connecticut and Maine. We will continue to learn from each iteration of the game and build on the knowledge and experience as we reach out to a broader user base.

The NULawLab has recently received inquiries from organizations in Great Britain and Australia about adapting the game for their jurisdictions. Should those relationships continue they would contribute to further development.

IV.   In-Depth Analysis of Accomplishments

We have achieved our goal of increasing access to justice by developing and implementing an innovative online tool to equip self-represented litigants to more effectively secure their legal rights in court. Since its launch on December 31, 2015, RePresent remains the only online game we know of that was specifically designed to provide SRPs with an understanding of how to self-advocate in court. (See attached: RePresentHomePage.pdf)

There exist many good resources for SRPs to help them create, complete, and file the necessary documents to get their day in court. Once that day comes, however, most SRPs lack experience advocating for themselves in a formal setting, and they find themselves carrying out these tasks for the very first time in a real-life hearing environment with a lot at stake. This project developed and implemented an interactive online game to provide SRPs with a basic, retainable understanding of how to prepare for and self-advocate in court.

Project Objective 1: In collaboration with stakeholders, develop an innovative online digital game that equips Self-Represented Parties with the knowledge required to more effectively secure their rights in courts and before administrative agencies.

The steps to achieve this objective are: research, co-design, scripting, game building, and testing.

Research

Prior to starting this project, staff and students at the NuLawLab conducted extensive research to identify SRP needs and how to address them. Two broad categories of end-user research were deployed. The first was observational field research. The second was research into publicly-available secondary source materials such as studies and existing SRP guidance materials. The results of both research paths, detailed below, provided the foundation for implementing the next steps.

Observational Field Research:

- As a means of replicating the SRP experience, NuLawLab seminar students conducted observational field research in either a courtroom/adjudicatory setting or in a public space that was completely unfamiliar.
- To supplement that end-user research, the entire project team then conducted a full day of observational research at two Connecticut courthouses (on May 12, 2015, in Hartford and New Britain). Attending from Northeastern University were Dan Jackson, Casper Harteveld, Gillian Smith, Steven Sutherland, Dean Thurston, and Chris Clark. Attending from CT were Kathy Daniels and Kate Frank. Time was spent observing courtrooms, clerk's offices, court service centers, and hallways. The day ended with a full team working session where scenario scripting priorities were discussed in tandem with technical game platform capabilities.
- On June 22, 2015, Kathy Daniels and Kate Frank conducted additional observational research for several hours at the Superior Court in Middletown, CT.
- Results of the observations were factored into the scenario scripts and digital prototype builds.

Secondary Source Materials:

- Lab staff and students conducted ongoing research into secondary source materials. The most noteworthy of these is the [2013 Canadian study](#) published by Julie MacFarlane. As a result of connections made at the 2015 LSC-TIG conference in San Antonio, we gained access for this project to the library of materials compiled since 2001 by the Self-Represented Litigation Network (SRLN). Lab seminar students reviewed the entirety of the library of materials for content that could be useful while we designed the game.

Based on the results of this research, we identified the following unifying experiences and emotional states to be considered as we began to script the gameplay: fear, anxiety, intimidation, preparation, and mystery/unknown. We summarized the insights by grouping them into the stages of preparation and the experiences that SRPs face.

 Key Insights by Reality Space:

- The Weeks Before: Determining which tasks were critical for preparing for court; arranging for time off from work; filing necessary paperwork; getting documents in order; organization to increase confidence; preparation to increase confidence; lining up childcare and transportation.
- The Morning Of: Emotional and physical self-care; what to eat; what to wear; what to bring; plan in advance; critical vs. not critical tasks; developing resilience; remaining flexible.
- Courtroom: Finding the correct courtroom; where to stand when speaking to the judge; how to address the judge, clerk, and marshal; minimizing unknowns; getting your pitch down to 30 seconds; getting an outcome you understand and can live with.
- Hallway – a surprisingly important experience for SRPs: Crowded; chaotic; lawyer for the other party approaching and pressuring for an agreement; the tension of being in the same vicinity as the opposing party.

Achievements for this phase of work included continuing to build an engaged network of co-design stakeholders and participants through the use of engaging, collaborative design sessions; using video to capture and document the full experience; and developing common themes and insights across all sessions.

Co-Design

The structure for the introductory co-design sessions in February, 2015, had at their foundation the Triadic Game Design approach to designing serious games, which was originally developed by project collaborator Dr. Casper Harteveld. The approach was modified to fit within the context of the SRP experience, as revealed by the end-user observational research findings detailed above (See attached: Outline-for-CoDesign-Plan.pdf and Session-Worksheets.pdf).

The first round of Co-Design sessions were held as follows:

Hartford Co-Design Session #1
February 6, 2015

Greater Hartford Legal Aid, Hartford CT
Our first co-design session challenged two teams of legal aid lawyers, technologists, and court personnel to translate the preparation and courtroom experience into fully-formed game ideas. A video of the entire session can be viewed here: https://vimeo.com/119367582 (See attached still photos: Co-DesignVimeo.pdf)

Hartford Co-Design Session #2
February 13, 2015
Greater Hartford Legal Aid, Hartford CT
At our next co-design session, SRPs joined court personnel, legal aid lawyers, and community advocates as we explored an important environment: the hallway outside the courtroom. We focused primarily on exploring reality spaces from the perspective of participating SRPs. A video of the entire session can be viewed in three parts:
https://vimeo.com/120056952
https://vimeo.com/120056951
https://vimeo.com/120056953

New Haven Co-Design Session #3
February 20, 2015
United Way of Greater New Haven, New Haven CT
Our single New Haven session included a woman in the midst of representing herself in family court. We split into two groups in order to examine the full spectrum of the experience, from preparing months in advance to the hearing itself, again primarily using defined reality spaces. A video of one of the groups can be viewed here: https://vimeo.com/120514255

The benefits of a robust co-design process were immediately evident to us, and we feel that other organizations could benefit from using this approach for similar projects. These factors should be foundational for any similar endeavor:

- Our project had a broad impact in the community.
- We identified a diverse group of participants and invited them to engage in the process.
- The project was one with which our participants could closely identify.
- The sessions were very well-prepared.
- Our facilitator, Dan Jackson, was experienced with the multiple steps of the co-design process. He understood and was comfortable with the participants.
- It was FUN! The benefit of fun in this context cannot be understated, especially in the legal profession. The fun that co-design participants experienced in each session provided them with an incentive to return for additional sessions.

We developed paper prototypes of game modules based on the content we developed in the co-design sessions. Specific modules were outlined for the following scenarios:

- Residential Space – At-home Preparations (weeks prior to hearing, special preparations, and hearing day)
- Court Service Center and Clerk's Office
- Hallway Outside the Courtroom
- Inside the Courtroom

Videos of both 90-minute paper prototype testing sessions are available for viewing:
- April 30: https://vimeo.com/126824528
- May 1: https://vimeo.com/126824527

(See attached: Paper-Prototypes.pdf)

Scripting

Work began on scripting following the paper prototype testing sessions. The project team efforts focused on detailed scripting of the "Residential Space – At-home Preparations" and the "Inside the Courtroom" scenarios. As part of this work, the project team experimented with group scripting calls using GoToMeeting, which proved to be an effective way of making solid progress. Scripting was outlined initially in paper as a starting point, and was shortly thereafter transferred to the game design platform on which RePresent was built (Mad Science Scripter, the software used to build the game scenarios). (See attached: Script Excerpt.pdf)

Game Building

Game design student coders began building the game based on the scripts in the Mad Science Scripter. A digital artist began to construct the art assets. (See attached: Art-Asset-Examples.docx)

As we began building we considered several ways to explain what RePresent was. At the beginning we were calling RePresent a "game," but at the same time not totally comfortable with the expectations that that word would create for users. As we learned, it is more accurately a "serious game." We toyed with other language like "online simulation," but that doesn't really work when trying to communicate what RePresent is. In the end, we stuck with "game" most of the time even though for many that word implies something less serious.

Testing

Given the vulnerability of the population of self-represented litigants and the un-tested nature of the product, we decided to first test with our original group of co-design participants during our first round of testing the digital prototypes. (See attached: Stakeholders.pdf)

We conducted the first rounds of testing on August 6th and 13th of 2015, hosting two sessions with our co-design stakeholders in Wethersfield, Connecticut. In-depth feedback was gathered from the testers in each session. Both sessions were video recorded in full for later reference.

We found it invaluable to watch people play the game, so three game design students conducted game play observation at the testing sessions. Our observations showed us where players experienced hang-ups navigating the game and where they hesitated on a question or action. This was particularly helpful and interesting because these little hesitations in the game play were not always something that we would have anticipated. We also asked participants about their experience and reported on it in their debriefing. This type of testing gave us the opportunity to talk with the testers/co-designers about where they had questions and to ask them in one-on-one conversations about their experience playing the game. By first testing with co-design participants, we were also able to identify areas where the digital prototype veered from the original vision of the game as articulated by the co-designers.

The data that we gathered from our testing sessions was examined primarily by Dr. Casper Harteveld and Dr. Gillian Smith, and also by the Connecticut team members, NuLawLab staff, and Game Design students for the data analysis and the modification phase. (See attached: TestingScreenshots.)

In September, 2015, we created an online feedback survey so users can answer questions about their experience immediately after playing the game. A link to the survey is included on the RePresent page on CTLawHelp.org. (See attached: BetaTestingProtocol.pdf, FeedbackLink.pdf)

Just over100 survey responses were received between December 31, 2015 and June 30, 2016. 57% of survey respondents had been involved in a court case before playing RePresent; 43% of respondents had not. Notably, the vast majority of players who completed the survey rated the game as a valuable experience. The following table summarizes the percentage responses by question, with responses grouped into three categories: Positive Gameplay Experience (consisting of responses of Strongly Agree, Agree, and Somewhat Agree), Neutral Gameplay Experience (consisting of responses of Neutral), and Negative Gameplay Experience (consisting of responses of Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree):

Question	Positive Gameplay Experience	Neutral Gameplay Experience	Negative Gameplay Experience
I would tell someone who is representing themselves in court to play this game.	81.5%	2.1%	16.5%
I learned something about going to court.	77.6%	14.3%	8.1%
I enjoyed playing the game.	63.3%	16.3%	20.4%
It would have been helpful to play this game before going to court.	74.2%	17.5%	8.2%

We continue to test and update the game. In addition to the extensive testing with our stakeholders, we did the following:

- Dan Jackson conducted testing with attendees at the annual meeting of the advisory board of the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System's Honoring Families Initiative in Denver, Colorado. Testers at the event included former self-represented litigants and Dr. Julie Macfarlane of Canada's Self-Represented Litigant Network.
- Kathy Daniels conducted testing with SLS staff and self-represented parties who were at SLS attending a walk-in clinic. (See attached: LiveTester Example.pdf)
- We obtained permission to email 50 interested members of the National Self-Represented Litigants Network and did so at the end of December to seek their feedback with an online survey.
- Dan Jackson constructed a kiosk, which we took to the 2016 TIG Conference in San Antonio, Texas, to test the game with conference attendees and seek their feedback.
- In the spring of 2016, two master's students in the Game User Research course at NU did a study around RePresent. Their study included testing with 30 people using PlayTestCloud.com and the results are incorporated into the NU Report.
- We did live testing with patrons at two Court Service Centers.
- We have solicited feedback using the online form since the game initially went live. Since then, we have received responses from over 25% of the people who have played it, an unusually high response rate.

Here is some direct feedback from the website form:

- "The information about preparation is excellent. Advising people to go to watch a case is good. You also showed that when a litigant doesn't understand a concept they can ask. It also shows that you can't predict what will come up in court."
- "Overall I really liked it, but I do wish there could have been a little more emphasis on trying to settle instead of going to the hearing. I realize that isn't really the point of the game, but I also feel it would be realistic."
- "I learned a lot."
- "The game is very simple, yet informative to those who are not working in the legal world. However, it is much too simple that I personally cannot do anything else besides clicking. Overall, this is very good beginner's game."
- "It was very quiet and made me feel awkward."
- "It is an awesome game for anyone even if they do not have a case at the moment. It is very educational."
- "Enjoyable and understandable. Perhaps the text options should be more obvious. They were a little tucked away at the bottom."
- "Gameplay needs to be more interactive and less dialogue examples should be provided, subjects should be more animated. Make the judge use the gavel, etc."
- "This is an excellent way of teaching someone what they need to do before a court hearing. I can also see this being very helpful in a classroom setting."

Updates made to the game based on testing have been ongoing. These include story and dialogue modifications, adjustments to the art assets, and new character animations.

Other significant updates include the following:

- We added introductory text to the RePresent home page to clarify what players can expect from the game. (See attached: RePresent-Home-Page.pdf)
- We added a short scenario to the beginning of the game to show players how to play the game (game mechanics) (See attached: Game-Intro.pdf).
- Music and scene transitions were added.
- Coding was modified so the game would load and play more efficiently.
- We gave users the ability to restart the game.
- We improved the visual fidelity of existing character art.
- The game now resizes correctly for different screen sizes.
- We added skip and reset commands.
- We reorganized all assets for clarity and efficiency.
- Content creation tools were modified to work on the Apple operating system to pass scenes between one another, and to delete elements from existing scenes.
- The process of creating redistributable builds was simplified.

The "Report on Major Findings of Game User Data and Feedback" produced by NU's NuLawLab and Game Design Lab provides in-depth analysis of those topics and is attached.

Project Objective 2: Enhance Connecticut residents' ability to more effectively secure their legal rights in court and before administrative agencies by implementing, promoting and publicizing the digital game.

The game was fully implemented on CTLawHelp.org on December 31, 2015.

Promotion and publicity for the game in Connecticut has been ongoing, in fact it began before we even started with an invitation to present our project at the Hiil (Hague Institute for the Internationalisation of Law) during the Annual Innovating Justice Forum held in the Peace Palace in the Netherlands in November 2014. We placed third in the Innovative Ideas category.

Other highlights include:

- Early press coverage of the project that captured the involvement of all organizations is Alaine Griffin's September 15, 2014 article in the Hartford Courant.
- It was featured in an article in the Connecticut Law Tribune (See attached: LawTribune.pdf).
- The first of the digital prototype testing sessions was captured by a local NBC news crew and the resulting story can be seen here: http://www.nbcconnecticut.com/on-ai r/as-seen-on/New-Video-Games-Teaches-The-Ins-And-Outs-Of-Court_Hart ford-322507311.html.The broadcast was available to end users and others throughout Connecticut both when it initially aired on August 21, 2015 and now in the station archives. (See attachment: NBCScreenshot.pdf.**)**
- We have made presentations to the legal aid community at the 2015 and 2016 TIG conferences.

- It is featured on the CTLawHelp.org Facebook page. (See attached: facebook-outreach-screenshot.jpg)
- LSNtap's webinar on "Innovating Through Technology: Ideas from Inside and Outside the Legal Aid Sector" included the game on slide 19.
- The game was included in the "Small Steps towards Big Goals" section of the National Self-Represented Litigants Network Newsletter in September, 2015.
- The game was highlighted in the National Association of Bar Executives newsletter.
- We were surprised to discover that our work was noticed by Legal Cheek, a website with news for junior lawyers and law students in the U.K. The Connecticut Bar Foundation noticed that and posted a link to their article on their own Facebook page, which is promoted to lawyers and agencies throughout Connecticut. (See attached: CBFFacebookPage.pdf.)
- RePresent is prominently featured on CTLawHelp.org, Connecticut's statewide website, with a colorful graphic element. CTLawHelp has a lot of traffic: from January through July of 2016, the site had 1,284,720 sessions with 1,099,424 users and 1,942,901 pageviews. So far this year, the homepage for RePresent has had 6,457 pageviews. (See attached: CTLawHelp-Home-Page.pdf, RePresent-Home-Page.pdf.)
- We printed 10,000 business cards providing information about RePresent for distribution in Court Service Centers, legal aid offices, and by Statewide Legal Services in follow-up letters sent to hotline callers. We believe that this promotion is a particularly effective way to reach SRPs, as traffic to the site has increased noticeably since we began sending them out. It's simple and inexpensive and while low-tech, it gets the right information to SRPs when they are at home, and if they have internet access, can take the time to go to the site. (See attached: Represent-business-card.pdf.)

Our core group has met weekly using GoToMeeting to do updates, review current work and do planning throughout all phases of the project, and we continue to convene on a regular basis.

We were contacted by Voices for Civil Justice, who had an interest in seeking possible national press coverage for our project. As part of our relationship with Voices for Civil Justice, we developed an Outreach Goals document, which we also used as our Outreach Plan. (See attached: Media Outreach Goals.pdf)

We have informed our staff, boards and partner agencies about the game at meetings and in newsletters throughout the process. (For example, see attached: SLS Newsletter Pg 7.pdf, which was sent to 1336 Pro Bono attorneys in Connecticut.)

V.   Factors affecting project accomplishments

The path to RePresent began with a creative idea from SLS: to build a digital game that would educate SRPs about how to go to court without a lawyer. With matchmaking services performed by LSC TIG staff, we soon had a project team that included Connecticut's legal services organizations, NU's game design faculty, and the NuLawLab, a new interdisciplinary innovation laboratory sited at Northeastern University School of Law. The project quickly expanded beyond simply building a digital game to include collaboration with judicial staff, libraries and other agencies in Connecticut, faculty and students in higher education and the pursuit of a cutting edge approach to collaborative design – aka co-design. These novel aspects provided both enhancements and limitations to the project.

In terms of enhancements:

- The co-design process significantly strengthened the relationships between SLS, CTLawHelp.org, NHLAA, and local stakeholders by engaging key players in an extended design process that was both fun and productive. Stakeholders saw their original ideas manifested in the paper and digital prototypes of RePresent, as well as in the final product. This engagement resulted in, among other things, our ability to actively publicize the game through the network of Connecticut Court Service Centers, resulting in a significant uptick in game play.

- By partnering with a regional research university, the project saw benefits that included building on streams of existing research and funding to create the game platform on which RePresent was built, exposing undergraduate and law students to the SRP crisis in our courts, and enhancing the publicity of the game by linking to the NU network (including ongoing efforts with Voices for Civil Justice).

Factors that limited the project's accomplishments include:

- The sheer amount of work that goes into building an educational digital game from scratch.
- The regular, semester-driven churn of students leaving and new students joining the project.
- The limitations placed on the ultimate product as a result of building the game using the Unity game design software.
- The fact that players have not provided us with outcome-related feedback.

The combination of the first two factors resulted in a significantly compressed digital testing phase.

The use of Unity as the game authoring foundation made a lot of sense because it is the industry-leading game design software, but it also resulted in the need for a few web browsers to require a Unity plug-in. Because this download is not authorized by the Connecticut Judicial Branch's IT department, we were not able to host the game on Court Service Center computer terminals.

We have invited user feedback from the website and from a feedback form link in the game itself. To date we have not received any feedback from people who have played the game in

Connecticut and then gone to court. Many cases take quite a bit of time and involve multiple steps. If people have not indicated that we can follow up with them, that's where we need to stop. And by the time they finally finish preparing for and going through court, they likely don't even think of coming back to us with their feedback.

We have received responses from some people in the Canadian SRP network who helped with testing and this has been valuable feedback coming from a group of people who have come together to educate others and share experiences to help others facing similar challenges.

VI.   Strategies to address major challenges

Due to the regular, semester-driven churn of student involvement, as we approached the product launch, NU secured the services of an independent Unity game designer, Ziba Scott, at no additional cost to the LSC-TIG project. This step was taken by NU as a vendor to SLS in response to, and acknowledgement of, the insufficiency of relying exclusively on undergraduate and master's student employees to produce a final, polished product. This was coupled with the hire of a game design-savvy law student to staff the project-funded law school co-op placement at the NuLawLab. Both strategies were successful in enabling the project team to produce the final RePresent.

Upon closer analysis, we realized that while the Unity Plugin could not be run on the Court Service Center computers, it was less critical than we had originally felt. When we were in the Court Service Centers doing live testing, we observed that only one of the two locations even had public computers and they were not really being used. Both Centers were very busy, with visitors talking with staff or their lawyers or collecting forms and information. We realized that it would be important to reach them with an opportunity to play the game when they were in a quieter, less busy environment. We decided to print up business cards promoting the game and offering the website for them to take home from the Court Service Centers and for SLS to mail to people who had called the hotline.

Going forward, we will look for opportunities to obtain more outcome-related feedback from players, both for the Connecticut version of RePresent and any future versions for other jurisdictions. This will include exploring the possibility of a controlled study with a cooperating court. Our goal will be to demonstrate that gameplay by SRPs improves the overall courtroom experience for litigants, judges, and court personnel.

VII.   Major lessons and recommendations

As discussed earlier, we found the co-design process to be very helpful and would highly recommend it to others tackling similar projects.

We had never worked on a project of this scope in partnership with a higher education entity before and were aware of the academic calendar when we started the project, but with the student changes from semester to semester we realized that it was more difficult to maintain continuity than originally anticipated. Most importantly:

- New students had to learn not only the software but also the dynamics of the project each semester.
- With many people involved in the game build over time differences in coding crept into the software.
- We needed to make timing adjustments because of the academic calendar.

NULawLab provided the perfect solution, hiring a Unity Programmer from outside the university to oversee the game buildout and standardize the work.

Building a game is a large and complex project. The Mad Science Scripter, which is the software that the game is built on, was already well along in development when we came in with our project. We have seen a number of benefits from this:

- We were building on an existing foundation. Had it not been in place the complexity and cost for our game would have been significantly higher.
- We benefit from the work of others using Mad Science.
- We benefit from the ongoing work on the platform.

A lot of the foundational work has been done on this game and we believe that it would be a useful tool for other programs to use. While we made it as generic as we could, there might be some changes required for those who would like to replicate it, but they should not be significant.

We have been able to do a lot for low-income people, pro bono lawyers, legal aid staff and agencies in Connecticut because of partnerships with other legal aid organizations and others outside of our immediate community doing meaningful work, but we didn't really know where to go with our game idea. Had we not talked with David Bonebrake, our Program Counsel at LSC, about it we likely would not have connected with the NuLawLab and been able to accomplish this project.

We feel strongly that our work should be as replicable as possible for other organizations. Staff at different programs have their own skills and experiences to bring to the table, and we all have staffing and budget constraints to factor in. As we said earlier we planned to make our work replicable right from the beginning and urge others to do the same whenever they can.