

## APPENDIX A: DESIGN SPRINT WORKSHOP AGENDAS

	ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS	BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS	DENVER, COLORADO	DES MOINES, IOWA	RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA
<b><i>Discover/Identify the Problems</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix: Current Positives, Current Negatives, Future Positives, Future Negatives.</li> <li>Map out process for litigant, court, and professional; identify emotional highs and lows; identify money and time issues; identify points of confusion or frustration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix: Current Positives, Current Negatives, Future Positives, Future Negatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix: Current Positives, Current Negatives, Future Positives, Future Negatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix: Current Positives, Current Negatives, Future Positives, Future Negatives.</li> <li>Map out process for litigant, court, and professional; identify emotional highs and lows; identify money and time issues; identify points of confusion or frustration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix: Current Positives, Current Negatives, Future Positives, Future Negatives.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Brainstorm</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persona: Identify three stakeholders (for each list concerns and needs, underlying values, power/strengths); identify one litigant persona to carry through; create design brief for this person (“how might we...?” questions).</li> <li>Brainstorm solutions around the problems and “how might we” questions: products, services, policies, wildcard; place on matrix.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brainstorm solutions: products, services, policies, wildcard; place on matrix.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brainstorm and rank solutions to the identified problems; feedback on solutions from previous sprints; identify one solution to prototype and test.</li> <li>Detail the chosen solution: target user, must dos, must not dos, nice to have.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persona: Identify three stakeholders (for each list concerns and needs, underlying values, power/strengths); identify one litigant persona to carry through; create design brief for this person (“how might we...?” questions).</li> <li>Brainstorm solutions around the problems and “how might we” questions: products, services, policies, wildcard; place on matrix.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rank solutions proposed in previous sprints; select one of these for prototyping.</li> <li>Detail the chosen solution: target user, must dos, must not dos, nice to have.</li> </ul>

	ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS	BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS	DENVER, COLORADO	DES MOINES, IOWA	RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA
<b><i>Build + Test + Refine</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create low-fi prototype; test with other groups; get feedback from test groups re: most likely fail points; address and revise based upon feedback.</li> <li>• In final debrief, identify user requirements, highest priority ideas, describe how a new divorce tech platform should be, final insights/patterns/takeaways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pick a solution and prototype.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storyboard prototype; Create low-fi prototype; test with other groups; get feedback from test groups re: most likely fail points; address and revise based upon feedback.</li> <li>• In final debrief, develop final proposal for solution; identify top three takeaways re: what needs to change in the divorce system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create low-fi prototype; test with other groups; get feedback from test groups re: most likely fail points; address and revise based upon feedback.</li> <li>• In final debrief, develop final proposal for solution; identify top three takeaways re: what needs to change in the divorce system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storyboard prototype; Create low-fi prototype; test with other groups; get feedback from test groups re: most likely fail points; address and revise based upon feedback.</li> <li>• In final debrief, develop final proposal for solution; identify top three takeaways re: what needs to change in the divorce system.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX B: ALL PROTOTYPED SOLUTIONS

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<i>Colorado Group 1</i>	<p>Mobile App:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Profiles for tailored advice and resources.</li> <li>• A descriptive overview of the process.</li> <li>• Document repository.</li> <li>• Resource page.</li> <li>• Additional features:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Expand from divorce (could expand to custody disputes and other family court functions in later versions).</li> <li>○ Could e-file completed forms directly from website.</li> <li>○ Questions designed to customize process (i.e., opt-out of parenting classes, select judge) in later version.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not to surpass a common reading level (i.e., fifth-grade).</li> <li>• Must make language accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not involve too many parties (different governmental and nonprofit resources) that fail to have a cohesive vision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty providing customized and appropriate resources.</li> <li>• Getting courts/bar associations/various stakeholders to agree to give self-represented litigants this degree of unsupervised control over their cases (i.e., filling out their own forms online).</li> </ul>
<i>Colorado Group 2</i>	<p>The Colorado Family Law Resource Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency staffed with lawyers, financial experts, and counselors.</li> <li>• Public domestic relations attorneys (PDRAs) who are a free/low-cost alternative to a private attorney appointed by the court.</li> <li>• Hotline available for procedural issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must have a sliding scale for cost. The high end of the sliding scale must be lower than the cost of a private attorney.</li> <li>• Must involve the court as a partner.</li> <li>• Court must inform people about the resource.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not include a financial need requirement.</li> <li>• Must not make this a mandatory program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea is similar to the Center for Out-of-court Divorce.</li> <li>• Uncertain about funding source.</li> <li>• An overload of cases would force the agency to start turning people away.</li> </ul>

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<i>Colorado Group 3</i>	<p>Night Court:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An after-hours court for those who cannot make it during regular hours due to work, child care, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must involve as much staff as needed to provide the same services available during the day.</li> <li>• Must include night mediators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not charge an extra fee for night court.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might cost more money to run.</li> <li>• Concerns about the effect of night court on staffing.</li> </ul>
<i>Colorado Group 4</i>	Notes for CO Group 4 row intentionally left blank.			
<i>Colorado Group 5</i>	<p>One Family, One Judge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every family is assigned one judge to take care all of the elements of their case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must start small with pilot trials.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is crucial to make sure all systems align so that filing and process would be the same.</li> </ul>
<i>Colorado Group 6</i>	<p>Online Divorce Portal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An online portal where all divorce items and information can be accessed including forms, FAQ's, and scheduling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be integrated with state court website.</li> <li>• Must be able to save and close, and then continue later.</li> <li>• Everything must be in one place (status updates, links for more feedback, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not make the portal too busy or confusing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be difficult to handle both parties filing from the portal.</li> </ul>

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<i>North Carolina Group 1</i>	<p>Individualized Divorce Plan and Evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A triage system to provide litigants with a variety of options to make the information accessible to individuals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be able to determine which questions are/are not relevant to different cases regardless of the complexity of the case.</li> <li>• Must be accessible online or at courthouse.</li> <li>• Must be available in a variety of languages.</li> <li>• Must make available contact information for a real person to ask questions or discuss concerns.</li> <li>• Must make the system uniform across the state/nation.</li> <li>• Must offer resources to take care of additional concerns (i.e., name change).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not be confusing.</li> <li>• Must not be expensive.</li> <li>• Must not include a year of separation.</li> <li>• Must not be permanent without room for amendment.</li> <li>• Must not use legal jargon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear on where the information would be available (i.e., at Clerk's office).</li> <li>• Need to determine who is responsible for reviewing.</li> <li>• Uncertain about funding source.</li> </ul>
<i>North Carolina Group 2</i>	<p>Court Concierge/Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A guide who provides legal advice and assistance throughout the divorce process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must prevent injustice and improper property divisions.</li> <li>• Must tell everyone their options.</li> <li>• Must explain legal rights.</li> <li>• Must combine form assistance and Court Concierge instead of mediated divorce.</li> <li>• Must provide form review.</li> <li>• Both parties must be able to address the Concierge.</li> <li>• Must include a fee waiver for indigent individuals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not use legal jargon.</li> <li>• Must not conduct business in Clerk's office.</li> <li>• Must not make the program mandatory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should eliminate repetitiveness in forms.</li> <li>• Preference is that individual can access attorney for quick advice.</li> <li>• Not sure who receives funding.</li> <li>• It would cost money to do this.</li> <li>• Need to determine how to strike a balance between guidance and advice.</li> </ul>

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<i>North Carolina Group 3</i>	<p>Tailored Online Resource Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An individualized resource guide integrated into a Divorce App.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must address entire divorce including child custody, spousal support, property division, etc.</li> <li>• Must have flow chart management.</li> <li>• Must be in multiple languages.</li> <li>• Must link individuals to case management system.</li> <li>• Must have section for managing disputes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not charge extreme fees.</li> <li>• Must not be ad supported.</li> <li>• Must not collect data from participants.</li> <li>• Must not sell data from participants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about other party being compliant.</li> <li>• Domestic violence situations.</li> <li>• Concerned about details of questions.</li> <li>• Would be important to continue after the divorce (name change, real estate, etc.).</li> <li>• App may be untrustworthy.</li> </ul>
<i>North Carolina Group 4</i>	<p>Law Student Legal Review Assistance, Court Concierge, and Smart Forms (Used together)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must use third-year law students who receive school credit.</li> <li>• Must be affordable for all.</li> <li>• Must include a simple way to set up appointments and meet the students.</li> <li>• Must collect cash.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not make the program expensive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear on who will collect the service fees and when the fees would be collected.</li> <li>• Need to decide who will supervise the law students.</li> <li>• Different age groups might be better served through different modes of messaging.</li> </ul>
<i>North Carolina Group 5</i>	<p>Divorce Valet: A Tailored Online Resource Guide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include phone access, translations, smart forms, and a fill-in-the-blank guided questionnaire.</li> <li>• Must allow the client to enter information about children, alimony, etc. in order to receive specific information regarding those issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not extend the service to decisions around custody, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to figure out how people would know where to go to get these forms.</li> <li>• Provide an online forum for questions.</li> <li>• Case management issue—in the form of video conference, this may plug up the court system and back it up.</li> </ul>

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<i>North Carolina Group 6</i>	TurboTax® for Divorce: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a complete library of resources, guide, and an in-person workshop for understanding the divorce process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must use simplified language.</li> <li>• Must reduce complications and tension between parties.</li> <li>• Must reduce high cost legal services.</li> <li>• Must be completely transparent between spouses.</li> <li>• Must include a human component (whether an online chat, phone call, or in-person workshop).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not be complicated.</li> <li>• Must not use legal jargon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to determine the best format for the workshop (e.g., online, in person).</li> <li>• Need to create an advertising strategy.</li> <li>• This may not work well for contentious divorces.</li> <li>• Need to decide which forms will be included.</li> <li>• Could benefit from a review before submitting.</li> <li>• Not sure how this would work for the subpoenaed party.</li> </ul>
<i>Iowa Group 1</i>	Divorce App: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A standardized, state-wide process.</li> <li>• The app will fill out forms using provided data to minimize the amount of work for the user.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Iowa Group 2</i>	Smart Forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auto-populated form</li> <li>• Similar to TurboTax®</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive feedback for its simplicity and self-explanatory set-up.</li> </ul>
<i>Iowa Group 3</i>	Children in the Middle <sup>1</sup> Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-person two-hour long course.</li> <li>• Mediation.</li> <li>• Online CITM.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Execution of prototype needed more work.</li> <li>• Might be difficult to make sure all litigants are taking the online course.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Children in the Middle is a two-hour co-parenting class. <http://www.iowachildren.com/>.

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<b><i>Iowa Group 4</i></b>	Divorce Prime: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interactive website to order a divorce decree.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to make sure both the other party also receives their decree in seven days.</li> <li>• Balancing both simplicity and comprehensiveness.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Iowa Group 5</i></b>	“DissolutionSolution.com”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Divorce Packet, Divorce Alexa, and TurboTax®.</li> <li>• Assists litigants to participate in the divorce process.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must allocate resources to address typical website obstacles and limitations in order to create an accessible and non-stressful experience.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Andover, Massachusetts Group 1</i></b>	Triage that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portal that is online or at a kiosk.</li> <li>• Helps narrow down what case management specialist the litigant needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must make the service available in many languages.</li> <li>• Must make the process user-friendly.</li> <li>• Must make the portal accessible anywhere.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged, happy, and knowledgeable employees.</li> <li>• Line employees don't get same training as management.</li> <li>• Public needs to understand what the role of the line employee (manage expectations).</li> </ul>



GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<p><b><i>Andover, Massachusetts Group 2</i></b></p>	<p>The Divorce Van:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobile triage.</li> <li>• Legal services that travels to different areas with a website as to where it will be each day.</li> <li>• Not for filing but for prepping to see judge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must ensure all forms are complete, compliant, and accurate, and the final agreement must be sustainable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not use legal jargon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to come up with a way to determine that the individuals are who they claim to be.</li> <li>• Need to make sure that requiring an ID still allows this to be accessible to everyone.</li> <li>• Need to determine if this actually saves time.</li> <li>• The "van factor" is very trendy and appealing, but it may be too gimmicky, and for the <i>cost</i> of the van, it's not actually that helpful.</li> <li>• If the people have already filed, the mobility of the van coming to you isn't as important.</li> <li>• Changed it to having these kiosk locations at local libraries (instead of in a mobile vehicle) to make it more accessible.</li> </ul>

GROUP	PROTOTYPE IDEA	MUST DO	MUST NOT DO	TESTING FEEDBACK
<b><i>Andover, Massachusetts Group 3</i></b>	<p>Court Concierge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers personal service regarding the divorce process.</li> <li>• Located at entry of court. Coordinates information.</li> <li>• Provides referrals to other services</li> <li>• Provides comprehensive oral and visual roadmap of divorce process.</li> <li>• Non-profit with court oversight.</li> <li>• Recruit from Lawyer for the Day Program, DCF workers, social workers.</li> <li>• Sponsored by private law firms and grants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must have engaged, knowledgeable employees.</li> <li>• Must use court interpreters.</li> <li>• Must allow users to select judges.</li> <li>• Must give public education seminars.</li> <li>• Must use plain language forms.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will need a privacy disclaimer.</li> <li>• Initial client interview involves overwhelming information. Try using more visual aids to disseminate information.</li> <li>• Concierge can work with existing self-help center.</li> <li>• Creation of intake form.</li> <li>• Problems could arise if non-lawyers giving legal advice.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Boston, Massachusetts Whole Group</i></b>	<p>Individualized Divorce Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment, what services are needed, unbiased, computer technology included in this.</li> <li>• Legal review assistance.</li> <li>• Program can be run by both parties or just one.</li> <li>• Directs people to what resources they need.</li> <li>• Court provides a kiosk or printing services to produce documents offline.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not make the plan product-driven rather than client-driven.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some privacy concerns on the use of technology with personal information.</li> </ul>