

5-2019

Formative Evaluation of an Online Access to Justice Triage and Intake System

Jessica A. Wiens
University of Nebraska Medical Center

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/coph_slce



Part of the [Public Health Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wiens, Jessica A., "Formative Evaluation of an Online Access to Justice Triage and Intake System" (2019).
Capstone Experience. 69.
https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/coph_slce/69

This Capstone Experience is brought to you for free and open access by the Master of Public Health at DigitalCommons@UNMC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Experience by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNMC. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@unmc.edu.

Running Head: FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF AN ONLINE ACCESS TO JUSTICE
TRIAGE AND INTAKE SYSTEM

Formative Evaluation of an Online Access to Justice Triage and Intake System

Jessica A. Wiens

University of Nebraska Medical Center – College of Public Health

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION.....	3
PLACEMENT SITE	3
PURPOSE OF RESEARCH	5
METHODS	8
<i>Analytical Methods</i>	11
<i>Ethics</i>	12
RESULTS	13
<i>Quantitative Data</i>	13
<i>Qualitative Data</i>	14
<i>General System Findings</i>	14
<i>Family Law</i>	16
<i>Criminal Record Law</i>	17
<i>Abuse and Protection Orders</i>	17
<i>Tax Law</i>	18
DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS	18
CONCLUSION	21
REFERENCES.....	22
REFLECTION	24
ACKNOLWEDGEMENTS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
APPENDIX A: LAWHELP NEBRASKA SYSTEM SCREEN SHOTS	27
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS & SCENARIOS.....	28
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT SURVEY	30
APPENDIX D: LEGAL AID LAWHELP NEBRASKA OBSERVATION/INTERVIEW FORM.....	33
APPENDIX E: LAWHELP NEBRASKA USER TESTING OBSERVATION & INTERVIEW RESULTS.....	35

Abstract

The objective of this project is to evaluate the usability of Legal Aid of Nebraska's LawHelp Nebraska online intake and triage system. A mixed-methods approach consisting of observations, semi-structured interviews, and validated survey were used with 14 participants as they interacted with the system. A convenience sample was used through recruitment of clients at Legal Aid of Nebraska's Omaha office during legal assistance walk-in hours. To analyze the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews and retrospective observation forms, researchers used thematic analysis. For quantitative data collected through a survey, researchers used descriptive analysis and validated scoring. The project and results were used to comply with Legal Aid of Nebraska's grant requirements for LawHelp Nebraska. Recommendations developed through the evaluation were given to Legal Aid of Nebraska's administrators to make appropriate changes to the LawHelp Nebraska system.

Introduction

Placement Site

Legal Aid of Nebraska (Legal Aid) is Nebraska's only not-for-profit civil law organization to offer free legal services and assistance to eligible, senior citizens (people ages 60 and above) and low-income men, women, and children. Across Nebraska, Legal Aid offers professional legal expertise to citizens in all 93 counties and to people experiencing legal issues in Nebraska's jurisdiction. Legal Aid has eight offices in Nebraska with locations in Bancroft, Grand Island, Lexington, Lincoln, Norfolk, North Platte, Omaha, and Scottsbluff. Over 80 staff members including 40 attorneys, four legal support staff, 28 paralegals, 12 administrative staff, and several volunteers support these offices (Legal Aid of Nebraska, 2017).

Guiding the organization's effort is the mission "To promote justice, dignity, hope and self-sufficiency through quality civil legal aid for those who have nowhere else to turn" (Legal Aid of Nebraska, 2017). The history and important services Legal Aid provides is highlighted on their website,

"For more than 50 years, Legal Aid of Nebraska has provided dignity, hope, self-sufficiency and justice through quality civil legal aid. That's the important job of Legal Aid of Nebraska. Legal Aid is a problem solver, standing side by side with low income, diverse Nebraskans – enforcing laws, protecting rights, all the while addressing urgent needs and shining a light on what more could be done...Legal Aid makes Nebraska a better place for everyone to live and prosper, not just a few with a bit more luck and a lot more money. That's a big job, but everyone associated with Legal Aid welcomes it. Because, in everything we do, for everyone in Nebraska: we make equal justice happen" (About Legal Aid of Nebraska, n.d.).

Legal Aid makes equal justice happen through services such as self-help Access to Justice walk-in hours, clinics, legal representation, and advisement. There is a specific dedication to help clients maintain life necessities including income, safety, health, and shelter, which prioritizes their resources. In 2016, Legal Aid of Nebraska helped over 1,000 Nebraska families in need of income support, including food stamps, social security income, health insurance, taxes, veteran benefits and unpaid wages (Legal Aid of Nebraska, 2017). Over 1,000 families were also supported with legal services to fight unfair housing evictions and other housing issues. More than 4,000 individuals were given help with protection orders against domestic abuse and sexual violence, custody

of children, guardianship, and divorce. Lastly, 1,700 families received assistance with medical debts, bankruptcy, and utilities. In 2016, over 20% of clients identified as being disabled, 66.7% were women, 30% considered to be in deep poverty, 3.9% were immigrants, and 4.9% were veterans (Legal Aid of Nebraska, 2017).

Purpose of Research

Every day, legal aid services in the United States are overwhelmed with requests for assistance leading to individuals being turned away without assistance (Legal Services Corporation, 2018). The problem is so widely known and acknowledged; the legal sector termed it the “justice gap.” According to the American Bar Association and Legal Services Corporation (LSC), the justice gap refers to the “difference between the civil legal needs of low-income Americans and the resources available to meet those needs” (Legal Services Corporation, 2018). The LSC 2017 Justice Gap Report titled measuring the Civil Legal Needs of Low-income Americans found over 1.7 million legal aid requests by low-income individuals (households at or below 125% of the Federal Poverty Level). However, 85% of civil legal problems reported in the 1.7 million requests received insufficient or no legal help (LSC, 2018) and almost three-fourths of low-income households faced one or more civil legal problem in 2017. Common issues include problems with health care, disability access, housing conditions, and domestic violence. All of which are major public health concerns.

To help close the justice gap, LSC, a non-profit established by the United States Congress in 1974, provides funding for services to increase access to justice. Legal Aid is one of the 133 independent nonprofit legal services organization that receives substantial funding from LSC (Legal Services

Corporation, 2019). In 2017, Legal Aid was awarded unique funding through the LSC's Technology Initiative Grants Program to develop LawHelp Nebraska. LawHelp Nebraska is intended to be an online unified intake and triage system aimed to improve delivery, accessibility, and availability of civil legal services for people needing legal assistance in Nebraska (Legal Aid Grant Narrative, n.d.).

The triage system is designed to work by screening each user within the first two screens encountered in the system. The first screening question states the system cannot help if users have a question about any of the following: traffic tickets, worker's compensation, suing, criminal charges, and guardianship, as these are issues the system says Legal Aid does not engage.

If users click on "I have a different question" on the first screening page, they are sent to a second screening page asking the users if they are any of the following: victim of domestic violence, live with a victim of domestic violence, losing public or subsidized housing, or have been denied a welfare benefit (Social Security, TANF, or SNAP). If users respond yes to one of the issues being true for them, they are automatically told to apply for Legal Aid services since cases regarding these issues are of high importance to Legal Aid. If users click no, they are moved on to a third screen introducing each the law issues the system is equipped to handle. The issues (also referred to as branches) include questions about landlord/tenant issues, debt collection, family law, criminal record, tax, and abuse protection orders. Beginning on this screen, users go through the specific branches related to their question which will lead to different outcomes including applying for Legal Aid services, creating a legal document to send to courts, advice

on how to handle specific legal issues at various stages, and referrals to other entities that can handle the user's specific issue. Because of Legal Aid's limited and restricted resources, funding, and ability to handle certain cases, users might be triaged out of the system.

Cabral et al. (2012) found that online intake and screening for legal services can give staff more time to devote to relevant and cause aligned cases. It can also benefit staff and clients by the nature of online access that can provide round the clock access to clients who might otherwise struggle to find legal assistance. Cabral et al. (2012) also documented the challenges online intake and triage systems can have including clients finding the system dehumanizing, lack of transparency, litigant privacy, perception that technology is not "full justice", and the accumulation of "search costs" that include the time and effort expended by the client to seek out and request assistance.

It is important to understand the usability of systems like these. Usability, as defined by the International Organization for Standardization (2004), is "the extent to which the product can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction in a specified context of use." The five attributes of usability are learnability, errors, efficiency, user satisfaction, and memorability (Scholtz, 2004). However, one attribute may be more impactful than another depending on the system.

When findings from usability studies are incorporated before systems fully launch, it is a formative evaluation (Scholtz, 2014). The purpose of formative evaluation functions to provide rapid feedback in the beginning phases of program development and

answers what aspects of the program works, do not work and why. When employing formative evaluation for usability studies, the primary data source is verbal data from users as they use the system (Scholtz, 2014). In addition, researchers are usually observing the users interact with the system and note important incidents, including non-verbal and verbal cues displayed. Post-evaluation interviews or debriefing with users after their engagement with the system can be a rich source of data, as this allows for researchers to probe into asseverations during the user testing and understand users' experience (Scholtz, 2014).

Greiner (2016) described the importance of effectiveness and efficiency with these specific types of systems from the client's perspective; one must be conscious of the "search costs" the client will invest when seeking assistance. "One would expect clients with the capacity to survive an intake process to be those with more time, organizational capacity, persistence, stamina, and ability to advocate for themselves" (Greiner, 2016, p. 290). Legal service organizations that are more difficult to find will require more time, effort, and energy to be spent by the client, thus increasing the search costs, potentially excluding many individuals who most need the services. Advertising and outreach efforts will help lessen the search costs for individuals who may struggle to locate the service on their own. Therefore, it is important to Legal Aid to understand users' perceptions of LawHelp's usability, the strengths and weaknesses of the system, and how to make improvements. While LawHelp is currently available, Legal Aid has not advertised or promoted the system until the evaluation is complete.

Methods

The research question the study addressed was, "What are the usability perceptions of Legal Aid of Nebraska's LawHelp system?" The question was used to assess how

fast users can use LawHelp Nebraska, how understandable LawHelp Nebraska's content is, how easy LawHelp Nebraska is to use, and how satisfied users are after using LawHelp Nebraska.

The study sample were clients of Legal Aid who were on site for Access to Justice walk-in hours to receive free legal assistance and guidance at the Omaha LAN branch during 1:00pm-4:00pm on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays. Convenience sampling was utilized to recruit participants attending the walk-in hours. During these specific times, Legal Aid personnel posted flyers in the reception and waiting areas advertising. Legal Aid's receptionist also surveyed clients' interest when they checked in and if interested, put their names on a list. Because participants' first priority was to receive legal help, participants completed the usability study after they received legal help. Once interested clients were finished receiving legal help from Legal Aid attorneys, the receptionist notified the researchers the participant was ready.

The sample goal was to have at least five people test out each of the four branches. According to Nielsen & Landauer (1993), having five users in a usability evaluation will uncover 85% of the system's issues. While other researchers (Faulkner, 2003) disagree on this number depending on the type of system and project, the researchers for this study decided five users would be adequate for the timeframe, resources, and size of this study. The final sample was 14 participants who had all had different combinations of two to three scenarios to test.

To test usability, the graduate student researcher, research manager (preceptor), and LawHelp Nebraska managing attorney developed instructions on how to interact with the system, observation form, interview guide, and survey (see Appendices B, C, &

D). Scenarios were developed to lead participants through specific courses that would end up in forms or information about resources, as this is the main function of the system and what LAN staff wanted to evaluate. The observation form was created to allow researchers to note the start and end times for each scenario, nonverbal and verbal cues such as frustration, confusion, or satisfaction.

Researchers then used a semi-structured interview questions to probe about the users' experiences and inquiry about specific notes researchers recorded. The questions included, "What came to mind when you were going through the scenario?" With a probe of "thinking about the text/language used, did the information provided make sense? Was it easy for you to understand? If not, why?" Once users completed all assigned scenarios, researchers asked concluding questions that included, "Can you speak in some detail about what you thought of the design/layout of LHN?" With a probe of, "For example, what are the pros and cons of how the text is presented on the screens, transitioning between pages, font size, color?" and "Did you notice captions, headings, menu options, icons, and/or links; was it clear to you what these things relate to?" To wrap up, users reported what they liked the most and least about LawHelp Nebraska. To view the full interview guide, see Appendix D.

To assess usability in a quantitative context, the graduate research assistant and preceptor developed a 14-question survey. The survey was approved by LAN lawyers who were managing LawHelp Nebraska. Four descriptive questions included in the survey were age, gender, how confident users are when using a computer with Likert-type responses from not at all confident to totally confident and how frequently users use a computer with responses from never to every day. The rest of the questions were from the Systems Usability Scale (SUS) (Brooks, 1996), a ten-question validated tool with a five-

point Likert response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The SUS is a validated tool with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.85 (Bangor, Kortum, & Miller, 2008). The scale is referred to as a “quick and dirty” way to measure usability with reliable results on small sample sizes (U.S. DHHS, 2019), and is why the researchers in the current study chose this tool. One SUS example question from the survey included, “I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.” To view the complete survey, see Appendix C. The finalized survey questions were uploaded to SurveyMonkey.

Once participants were ready to start, researchers provided a verbal consent narrative to participants along with an introduction of the study. Participants were given the instructions sheet to go through the system while the researchers sat behind them to view interactions. When each scenario was finished, researchers asked the interview questions and typed the responses. After all scenarios and interview questions were complete, participants logged into SurveyMonkey to complete the 14-question survey. Participants took approximately 25 minutes to 45 minutes to all assigned scenarios, interview, and survey.

Analytical Methods

All notes and interview responses were transcribed by researchers as they recorded the observations and interviews by typing. Afterwards, each researcher reviewed their notes for clarity. Interview analysis was performed by thematically coding all of the observation notes and semi-structured interviews. The researchers went through each completed scenario and grouped issues into either related specific branches or the overall system. Afterwards, common and significant themes within the overall system and in specific branches emerged. Then recommendations for the

LawHelp system were fleshed out from the themes and specific comments from users. Then themes and recommendations were organized according to branch.

After the graduate student researcher cleaned the data from SurveyMonkey, responses were analyzed through Microsoft Excel for descriptive and SUS scoring results. The Likert scale responses were coded as the following: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neutral = 3, agree = 4 and strongly agree = 5. To find the score of each user, subtract one point from all odd-numbered questions, and subtract the values for all even numbered questions from five. These new values were added together and multiplied by 2.5. The equation used was:

$$[(Q1-1)+(5-Q2)+(Q3-1)+(5-Q4)+(Q5-1)+(5-Q6)+(Q7-1)+(5-Q8)+ (Q9-1)+(5-Q10)]*[(2.5)]$$

= SUS score out of 100.

Ethics

Prior to conducting this study, the University of Nebraska IRB reviewed the proposal and deemed it a quality improvement study. Therefore, an IRB application was not required. Each participant had an identification number that was specific to their observation form and survey. The only identifying participant information was gender and age reported by participants in the survey. In accordance with Legal Aid’s policy, participants provided their names in order to receive compensation. However, these names were not linked to any of the research forms or surveys. The observation form, interview, and survey did not pose any potential risks to participants. Lastly, the research team personnel only viewed the observation forms. At the end of the study, Legal Aid’s Director of Research and Evaluation will keep all documents for safe keeping.

Results

Quantitative Data

All 14 participants filled out the survey. The average age was 42 years old (SD 12), 10 participants identified as female and four identified as male. Five participants reported using a computer every day, seven reported sometimes, two reported often, and no one reported never using a computer. About 80% (n=11) reported being totally confident or mostly confident in their level of confidence when using a computer; 14% (n=2) felt mostly not confident and one participant reported not confident when using a computer. The overall SUS score was 78 out of 100 possible points with a range from 48 to 100. 50 percent of users scored above 80, with specific values of 80 (n=1), 85 (n=2), 97.5 (n=2), and 100 (n=2). The other half under 80 reported specific values for each of the following 47.5, 50, 62.5, 67.5, 70, 72.5, and 75.

Participants' reported computer use related to SUS score was broken down into three categories: using a computer every day (n=5) with an average SUS score of 87 (SD 17), using a computer often (n=2) with an average SUS score of 86 (SD 16), and using a computer sometimes (n=7) with an average SUS score of 69 (SD 16). Zero users reported never using a computer.

SUS scores in relation to users' confidence with using a computer were broken down into four groups. The average SUS for users who were totally confident (n=5) was 84 (SD 15), mostly confident (n=6) was 83 (SD 14), mostly not confident (n=2) was 83 (SD 14), and not at all confident (n=1) was 50.

User ID	Age	Computer Use Frequency	Computer Use Confidence	SUS TOTALS
1	43	Every day	Totally Confident	68
2	59	Sometimes	Mostly Confident	85
3	36	Sometimes	Mostly Not Confident	48

4	65	Often	Mostly Confident	75
5	34	Every day	Totally Confident	98
6	41	Every day	Totally Confident	100
7	45	Every day	Totally Confident	70
8	23	Sometimes	Totally Confident	85
9	27	Sometimes	Mostly Confident	63
10	47	Sometimes	Not Confident at All	50
11	54	Sometimes	Mostly Not Confident	73
12	30	Every day	Mostly Confident	100
13	42	Sometimes	Mostly Confident	80
14	36	Often	Mostly Confident	98

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data relating to users' experience and interaction with LawHelp Nebraska were from the researchers' observations and semi-structured interviews. This section will highlight important discoveries and overall themes from the findings. Thorough results of each issue are detailed in Appendix E. Findings are organized into categories of either general system findings (relating to the overall system) or in the specific branches (family law, criminal records, protection orders, and tax law).

General System Findings

Since each participant logged in and went through the screening questions, everyone gave feedback on the general use, interaction, and perception of the system. When asked about the design and layout of LawHelp Nebraska, most participants liked the color scheme, size of text, and font. Issues users brought up include being unsure of how to navigate from screen to screen, confusion with legal terms and how to use the forms, inability to start the process over on each screen, mentioning some irregular text size and layout in specific branches (family law and child support), trying to click on the LawHelp logo to start over, and what LawHelp system is supposed to do and what it can do.

Overall, participants reacted positively to LawHelp Nebraska. When asked what users liked most about the system, most responses pointed to the accessibility of the system. Participants liked the easy access to the system and how lawyers could be bypassed for people to receive legal help with some issues. One user mentioned that the initial use or first-time users would have a learning curve interacting with the system, “but once they get it, they are good to go.” Not using legal terminology frequently was mentioned by one participant and reversely, another participant liked that the system did not have a “dumbed down feeling” to it. Additionally, multiple participants responded that the system did not have a lot of questions they had to go through and that most questions made sense. One participant said liked the colors and graphics used the best.

Aspects participants liked the least in LawHelp Nebraska were accessibility if people did not own a smartphone or computer with internet access, which was explicitly mentioned by a participant. Another participant related to this issue and said, “If I need to go to the library to do this, then I will just come to Legal Aid.” One participant mentioned the lack of clarity and system instructions, underscoring users’ confusion with what this system is for and what it can do. For example, a participant said they didn’t the system could help them fill out forms and didn’t even realize they started to fill out a form. Several participants commented on the functions of the system. One participant said instructions or buttons need to be clearer on how to get back to the home screen. Multiple people were unsure of how to logout of the system and either didn’t see the logout icon on each screen and/or the icon was not clear that is how to logout. Only a few participants noted that the text should be bigger, specifically for the buttons that take user each page.

The main findings to fall under this category were confusion about what LawHelp does or can do, confusion with being screened out of the system for issues that the system or Legal Aid can help. For example, users who had a criminal records scenario faced confusion on the first screening page where if they clicked yes to having a question about a criminal charge they are facing, they would automatically screen out of the system. Additionally, users who had an instruction scenario to apply for a domestic, sexual, or harassment protection order through the system were confused on the second screening page where they were automatically pushed to an online application form to see if they are eligible for Legal Aid's services instead. When these issues came up, the researchers observing had to guide users back on track which caused confusion and frustration with users.

Family Law

Family law was one of the most content-rich branches with the largest set of questions about visitation, custody, divorce, and child support. Nine participants tested family law as one of their scenarios. The main feedback for this branch was, participants mentioned they did not understand what all family law encompassed. Participants said they would not pick family law on the list of different branches to find information or help on child support (one picked the branch on debt, and another clicked on having a different answer than what was listed) or they would not go to family law to find information about a divorce, with the reasoning two people divorcing aren't seen as a family anymore.

Additional confusion in this branch was from some of the terms used. Users said they didn't know what a Satisfaction of Judgement Form meant or what it is for and what a Material Change in Circumstances meant; therefore, they did not know how to

respond and continue in this branch. Other confusion was from the layout and wording of questions. For example, under response options for custody and visitation, two answers on the screen are, "I have a question about visitation" and "I have a question about child custody and visitation." Another example was on the screen on having a question about visitation and being a parent where responses included having questions about "getting visits" and "getting more visits." For both of these instances, multiple participants were about unsure which option to choose.

Criminal Record Law

The criminal record law branch walks users through understanding if their Nebraska criminal records could be sealed, set aside, or pardoned. If eligible, users can fill out forms to send to county attorneys to start the process to seal, set aside, or pardon records. When going through the juvenile specific branch, participants were confused by certain screens that had hyperlinks to outside resources but still had the "next" button on the bottom of the screen because it was unclear to participants which option they should choose. The second common issue was the branch starting with expungements, which is not available to do in Nebraska. The system explains this to users and gives guidance for sealing, set asides, or pardoning. However, users suggested putting those three actions in the beginning screens.

Abuse and Protection Orders

The abuse and protection orders branch allow users to apply for domestic, sexual, or harassment protection orders. One detrimental flaw with LawHelp Nebraska was uncovered by users who were assigned scenarios about abuse or protection orders. On the second screening page of the system, if users respond to any of the listed situations, including being a victim of domestic violence or living with a victim of

domestic violence, as applying to them, then they are automatically pushed to a new screen to an online application for Legal Aid Services and will encounter the abuse and protection orders branch. Once participants were told to say no to the second screening page and made it to the abuse and protection order branch, everyone thought the process was fairly straight forward. Issues that came up were respondent fatigue from the transition page lag time combined with clicking through multiple information only screens with small amounts of text. Additionally, while all participants clicked on the correct responses from the instructions, two participants brought up other users might click on the family law branch to find information about domestic abuse protection orders. Lastly, one participant brought up the issue of security when applying for protection orders and how applying for an order, filling out forms, and even logging into the system will send LawHelp emails will leave a trace that could compromise safety.

Tax Law

Tax law was the shortest branch by far. Participants who were assigned a tax scenario took about two minutes to complete the branch from start to finish, and all but one thought it was okay as is. Only one participant commented that the wording “How to fill out tax forms” was confusing and misleading because it led the participant to believe that the system would guide a person to fill out taxes, which it does not.

Discussion & Recommendations

The goal of this project was to evaluate Legal Aid’s LawHelp Nebraska by understanding users’ perceptions of the system and to provide recommendations to improve the system. Additionally, this project met grant requirements that funded the startup of this system.

Results from the survey show that most participants were “mostly” or “totally” confident computer users. However, only a third reported using computers “every day” or “often.” Half of the participants reported using computers “sometimes.” Participants who had higher confidence gave the LawHelp Nebraska a higher usability score through the Systems Usability Scale (SUS) compared to participants that had lower confidence. The SUS overall average was 78 points out of 100. According to the literature, a SUS score above 68 is considered “above average” (U.S. DHHS, 2019). Therefore, we can conclude from the evidence from this study that LawHelp Nebraska’s usability is above average. However, this average is based on several different types of systems and does not compare to other LawHelp systems. Because SUS scores are often a comparison between two systems or interfaces, researchers recommend that the SUS scores from this study be compared to future LawHelp Nebraska evaluations if Legal Aid expands on the system or needs to complete grant requirements.

The observation and interview results from the project provided Legal Aid personnel in charge of LawHelp Nebraska a better understanding of users’ experience with the system, detailed notes from the users’ interactions, and comprehensive recommendations for improvement. To view the complete list of observations and corresponding recommendations, see Appendix E.

Major findings from this formative evaluation study were that, in general, participants’ perception of LawHelp Nebraska’s usability was very positive. Several participants were excited about the system, could see the benefits for users, and said they would use it if they needed legal assistance in the future or recommend it to others. Additionally, a few participants went through their assigned scenarios and interacted

with the system, they did not have any recommendations for improvement or have any issues with the system.

Many users that did provide insight, recommendations, and suggestions for improvement after interacting with the system said they were minor issues of improvement. Issues such as these were changing the layout and font on certain screens to make vital information stand out and hyperlink the Legal Aid logo to take users back to the home page.

From the researcher's perspective, the most critical findings from users' perspective were the confusion around what LawHelp Nebraska is for and what it can do and the use of unclear terms, directions, and icons throughout the system. The main recommendations researchers have to remedy these issues are

- 1) Develop a tutorial video and/or a welcome screen with details and instructions on what the LawHelp Nebraska is for and the potential outcomes the system can help with (such as forms, links to resources, or applying for services).
- 2) Develop Frequently Asked Questions and Definition pages for users to reference to clarify terms used, directions, or functions of the system. These pages should be accessible on every screen user encounter.
- 3) Provide examples of issues covered in each branch. For example, adding divorce, custody, visitation, and child support underneath family law can help users clearly understand that is where they need to click for assistance with these issues.
- 4) Revisit the skip logic used throughout the system, as the current layout will screen certain users out of the system before they have received help.

Specifically, for domestic abuse victims who might screen out before they can access information and/or forms for protection orders.

This study has several limitations to note. First, because participants had scenarios that did not pertain to them, perceptions of the system, terms, and usability might not represent the real-life experience of others who are using the system for those specific scenarios. Secondly, because of time and resource constraints, small sample size was used. Additionally, user testing was only at Legal Aid's Omaha branch, which does not represent the other offices or more rural populations. Lastly, because the researchers were observing and interviewing participants on site, participants might have felt the need to be agreeable to the system since they are trying to receive services.

Conclusion

The current study demonstrates the usability perception of LawHelp Nebraska very highly. Most participants had very positive views of the system after interacting with it. From observations and semi-structured interviews, researchers were able to uncover and compile the strengths, weaknesses, and detailed issues of LawHelp Nebraska and provide specific recommendations to further improve the system. Researchers suggest further user testing in other Legal Aid branches, specifically in rural areas, and testing on tablets and smartphones to increase usability.

References

- About Legal Aid of Nebraska. (n.d.). Retrieved April 20, 2019, from <http://www.legalaidofnebraska.org/about/about-legal-aid-of-nebraska/>
- Bangor, A., Kortum, P., Miller, J. (2008). An empirical evaluation of the system usability scale. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 24(6).
- Brooke, J. (1996). SUS: A “quick and dirty” usability scale. In P. W. Jordan, B. Thomas, B. A. Weerdmeester, & I. L. McClelland (Eds.), *Usability evaluation in industry* (pp. 189–194). London: Taylor & Francis
- Cabral, J. E., Chavan, A., Clarke, T. M., Greacen, J., Hough, B. R., Rexer, L., & Zorza, R. (2012). Using Technology To Enhance Access To Justice. *Harvard Journal Of Law & Technology*, 26(1), 241-324.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2004). Part 11: Usability: Definitions and concepts. *Ergonomics of human-system interaction*. Retrieved April 20, 2019, from <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:9241:-11:en>
- Faulkner, L. (2003). Beyond the five-user assumption: Benefits of increased sample sizes in usability testing. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 35(3), 379-383.
- Greiner, D. J. (2016). What we know and need to know about outreach and intake by legal services providers. *South Carolina Law Review*, 67(2), 287-294.
- Legal Aid of Nebraska. (n.d.). Technology initiative grant: Grant Narrative for LSC funding.

- Legal Aid of Nebraska. (2017). 2016 Annual Report. Retrieved April 20, 2019, from https://www.legalaidofnebraska.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Legal-Aid-2016-Annual-Report.final_.pdf
- Legal Services Corporation. (2019). *How we work*. Retrieved April 20, 2019, from <https://www.lsc.gov/what-legal-aid/how-we-work>
- Legal Services Corporation. (2018). *2017 justice gap report: Measuring the civil legal needs of low-income americans*. Retrieved April 20, 2019, from <https://www.lsc.gov/media-center/publications/2017-justice-gap-report#bfrtoc-img-srcsitesdefaultfilesimagesjustice-gap-executive-summaryjpg-altjustice-gap-executive-summary-cover-image-width150-height194-stylemargin-10px-float-leftexecutive-summary>
- Nielsen, J. & Landauer, T. K. (1993). A mathematical model of the finding of usability problems. Proceedings of ACM INTERCHI'93 Conference 1993; Amsterdam. New York: ACM.
- Scholtz, J. (2004). Usability evaluation. *National Institute of Standards and Technology*. Retrieved April 20, 2019, from https://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/IADpapers/2004/Usability%20Evaluation_rev1.pdf
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (DHHS). (2019). System usability scale (SUS). Retrieved April 20, 2019, from <https://www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/system-usability-scale.html>

Reflection

My capstone experience with Legal Aid of Nebraska was very positive. LAN staff were very accommodating to the type of projects I was interested in, and it happened to work out that they needed an evaluation project completed for grant requirements. The timing fell into place.

I was unfamiliar with LAN at the start of my project, so my knowledge about the organization grew immensely. It is a large yet small organization that is spread-out all-over Nebraska. The main branches are in Omaha and Lincoln. One of the first things I learned about the organization is the funding and who they can help and what type of legal problems they can take on. Because they receive a majority of funding through federal dollars and grants, they have a lot of stipulations they have to follow. This includes not being able to provide help for people who are not citizens of the United States. They also do not help with providing defendants or felony crimes.

Another thing that I learned about the organization is that there is only one person doing the data, research, and evaluation projects for day to day happenings. And they do not have this process streamlined. I was somewhat surprised by this because many grants require the analysis and evaluation of projects. From what I conclude, there are people that are interested in this process and people who do not want to touch it. I can see both sides, which is heavily related to someone's current job and background. I think my preceptor is very appreciate of the (free) help I can provide. She has also said she is very thankful for the past public health students she has worked with because they have been dependable and do quality work.

In order to complete this project, I relied on my preceptor to guide what the organization wanted. Though I searched the literature and found several different methods for usability testing, not all was appropriate or useful for the site. This is knowledge that I didn't have and context I didn't understand and was grateful for my preceptor to provide this information. I was also lucky that my preceptor shared detailed reports about LAN, including their latest needs assessment and grant narrative for this system. These two documents provided a wealth of knowledge for me to understand how impactful this project could be.

My greatest challenge during my capstone experience was during the initial phase of the project. LawHelp Nebraska had been evaluated before, and because there are over 80 branches users can take, I did not fully grasp what the LAN personnel wanted out of my project. I spent several hours developing scenarios that ended up not being the scenarios LAN wanted to test. I had misunderstood the forms and online application form. However, my preceptor was very helpful during this time and helped me develop the correct scenarios.

My views of public health practice have been impacted by my experience in how broad, narrow, deep, and shallow public health practice can be. For various reasons I did not think this could be a capstone project at the beginning. However, this project was a great experience for me, and I have a lot of gratitude for being able to impact a program that will have a great impact.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to thank my preceptor, Kelly Shaw-Sutherland, who partnered with me and took me on during a very hectic time. Her passion for research and evaluation made this project what it is. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Brandon Grimm and Dr. Nizar Wehbi. From classes at UNMC through this capstone journey, I am lucky to have been under your leadership, guidance, and knowledge. Lastly, I want to thank all LAN personnel who had a hand in this project including Ann, Muirne, Margarete, and Andi. And a shout out to my UNO Support and Training for the Evaluation of Programs (STEPS) family who are all evaluation extraordinaires and incredible resources.

Appendix A: LawHelp Nebraska System Screen Shots

Legal Aid ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Are you facing any of these issues ?

- I have a question about a traffic ticket
- I have a question about worker's compensation
- I got hurt and I want to sue somebody
- I have a question about a criminal charge I am facing
- I have a question about a guardianship

Yes

No, I have some other question

Save as Draft Jessica Wiens

Previous Next

FIRST SCREENING PAGE

Legal Aid ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Are any of these things true for you?

- I am a victim of domestic violence.
- I live with a victim of domestic violence.
- I am losing public or subsidized housing.
- I have been denied a welfare benefit, like Social Security, TANF or SNAP.

Yes

No

Save as Draft Jessica Wiens

Previous Next

SECOND SCREENING PAGE

Appendix B: Participant Instructions & Scenarios



USER TESTING INSTRUCTIONS LAWHELP NEBRASKA

Participant ID: _____

Thank you for agreeing to be a test user for our newly expanded program, LawHelp Nebraska (LHN). Our goal is to assess how fast users can use LHN, how understandable LHN's content is, how easy LHN is to use, and how satisfied users are after using LHN. Our goal is NOT to test you or your knowledge, rather we want to understand your perceptions of the program. The entire testing process may take up to 45 minutes.

As a test user:

- We will provide you with two fake legal scenarios to test and will observe you during this process.
- Once a scenario is completed, we will ask you follow-up questions based on what we observed.
- After both scenarios and follow-up questions have been completed, you will complete a short survey.
- After completing the survey, you will receive your payment for participating.

Legal Scenarios

For the purposes of testing, you can assume that you are not facing issues about traffic tickets, worker's compensation, or suing someone, and that you do not have a question about criminal charges. You can also assume that you are not a victim of domestic violence, you do not live with a victim of domestic violence, you are not losing public or subsidized housing, or have been denied a welfare benefit.

Scenario 1: Family Law Question About Child Support

- a. You have a family law question about past-due child support that you owe to your child's other parent, and you want to know if there is any way to get rid of this debt.
- b. You think that the other parent will forgive some or all of the child support debt.
- c. You need to fill out a satisfaction of judgement form.
- d. **YOUR GOAL** is to find the appropriate information and successfully complete the judgement form.

Scenario 2: Criminal Record Question About Sealing a Juvenile Offense

- a. You have a question about sealing a juvenile offense from when you were 17 years old.
- b. Your case was heard in juvenile court and the County Attorney's Office was involved.

- c. You completed an appropriate diversion or mediation program.
- d. **YOUR GOAL** is to find the appropriate information to answer your question and successfully complete the form letter to get your record sealed.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. From the LHN home page, find the login page using the following test email and password:
 - a. User name: lhntester1@gmail.com
 - b. Password: lawhelpnebraska
2. Complete the steps for Scenario 1.
3. Answer follow-up questions for Scenario 1.
4. Complete steps for Scenario 2.
5. Complete follow-up questions for Scenario 2.
6. Complete steps for Scenario 3.
7. Complete follow-up questions for Scenario 3.
8. Go to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LHNusertesting> to complete the user testing survey.

Appendix C: Participant Survey



LawHelp Nebraska User Testing Survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in testing Legal Aid of Nebraska's LawHelp Nebraska system. This survey is the last activity you will need to complete as a test user. Please complete all of the questions outlined below. The survey should only take a couple of minutes to complete. When you are done with the survey, find the person who was observing you, and they will take you to reception to retrieve your payment.

1. What is the Participant ID printed on your instruction form?

2. How often would you say you use a computer?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Everyday

3. How would you rate your level of confidence using a computer?

- Not Confident at All
- Mostly Not Confident
- Mostly Confident
- Totally Confident



LawHelp Nebraska User Testing Survey

4. I think that I would like to use LawHelp Nebraska frequently.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I think that I would like to use LawHelp Nebraska frequently.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I found LawHelp Nebraska unnecessarily complex.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I thought LawHelp Nebraska was easy to use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to use LawHelp Nebraska.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I found the various functions in LawHelp Nebraska were well integrated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I thought there was too much inconsistency in LawHelp Nebraska.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would imagine that most people would learn to use LawHelp Nebraska very quickly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I found LawHelp Nebraska very cumbersome/awkward to use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt very confident using LawHelp Nebraska.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with LawHelp Nebraska.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



LawHelp Nebraska User Testing Survey

5. Please indicate your sex/gender

- Male
- Female
- Other

6. Please indicate your age

Appendix D: Legal Aid LawHelp Nebraska Observation/Interview Form



Participant ID	Date observed	Observer name	Time observation started	Time observation ended

What to observe:

- How participants interact with the software (use of use hotkeys, menus or buttons to access a function).
- Non-verbal: frowning/grimacing, surprised, furrowed brow/concentration, impatience, leaning towards screen, fidgeting, groaning/deep sigh, etc.

OBSERVATION	
Page/Task Observing	Observation Notes
Scenario 1	Start time: End time: Notes:
Scenario 2	Start time: End time: Notes:
Scenario 3	Start time: End time: Notes:

INTERVIEW	
Questions	Notes
Scenario 1: What came to mind when you were going through this first scenario? (<i>Probe: Thinking about the text/language used, did the information provided make</i>	

<p><i>sense? Was it easy for you to understand? If not, why not? If not, why not?)</i></p>	
<p>Scenario 2: What came to mind when you were going through the second scenario? <i>(Probe: Thinking about the text/language used, did the information provided make sense? Was it easy for you to understand? If not, why not? If not, why not?)</i></p>	
<p>Scenario 3: What came to mind when you were going through the second scenario? <i>(Probe: Thinking about the text/language used, did the information provided make sense? Was it easy for you to understand? If not, why not? If not, why not?)</i></p>	
<p>Could you speak in some detail about what you thought of the design/layout of LHN? <i>(Probe: For example, what are the pros and cons of how the text is presented on the screens, transitioning from one page to the next, font size, color, etc.)</i></p>	
<p>Could you speak in some detail about what you thought about navigating through the different pages on LHN? <i>(Probe: Was it easy to get through? If not, why not? Did you notice captions, headings, menu options, icons, links? Was it clear to you what these things related to?)</i></p>	
<p>What did you like most about LHN?</p>	
<p>What did you like least about LHN?</p>	

Appendix E: LawHelp Nebraska User Testing Observation & Interview Results

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Screening Questions	1 st Screening Page	<p>Users were guided how to answer these screening questions based on assumptions provided in each scenario that was tested in order to get them to the substantive trees.</p> <p>Some users were confused by the issues listed on the left side of the page (see below). It wasn't clear whether a user should say yes for scenarios related to criminal records, particularly how to get to the later substantive trees related to clearing criminal records.</p> <p>Are you facing any of these issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I have a question about a traffic ticket - I have a question about worker's compensation - I got hurt and I want to sue somebody - I have a question about a criminal charge I am facing - I have a question about a guardianship 	<p>Consider keeping the question, "Are you facing any of these issues?" on the left side of the screen, but moving the issues to the right side of the screen to replace the "Yes" and "No, I have some other question" with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about a traffic ticket <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to screen out page, "LAN does not handle these cases..." • I have a question about worker's compensation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to screen out page, "LAN does not handle these cases..." • I got hurt and I want to sue somebody <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to screen out page, "LAN does not handle these cases..." • I have a question about a guardianship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to screen out page, "LAN does not handle these cases..." • I have a question about a criminal charge I am facing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to new page with question, "Do you need help clearing your criminal record?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Choosing "Yes" will skip the first page of the substantive trees and take the user directly to the first page of the Criminal Record tree. ▪ Answering "No" will take the user to the first page of the substantive trees.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Some users didn't seem to quite understand all of the terms on this page, particularly guardianship.	Consider including the definition of guardianship on FAQ page (see recommendation below under Design, Layout and Navigation)

	<p>2nd Screening Page</p>	<p>Similar to the 1st Screening Page, users were guided how to answer these screening questions based on assumptions provided in each scenario that was tested in order to get them to the substantive trees. Users were also confused by the issues listed on the left side of the page (see below). It wasn't clear whether a user should say yes for scenarios related to domestic violence, particularly if the scenario they were testing was for protection orders. They were unclear how they would get to the actual substantive trees for protection orders because the inclination was to say yes to one of the first two issues below.</p> <p>Are any of these things true for you?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am a victim of domestic violence. - I live with a victim of domestic violence. - I am losing public or subsidized housing. - I have been denied a welfare benefit, like Social Security, TANF or SNAP. 	<p>Consider keeping the question, "Are any of these things true for you?" on the left side of the screen, but moving the issues to the right side of the screen to replace the "Yes" and "No" with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am a victim of domestic violence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user the first question of the first page of the abuse tree where it asks, "Are you in danger right now?" • I live with a victim of domestic violence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user the first question of the first page of the abuse tree where it asks, "Are you in danger right now?" • I am losing public or subsidized housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to the intro page to the online application. • I have been denied a welfare benefit, like Social Security, TANF or SNAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choosing this issue will take user to the intro page to the online application.
--	---	---	---

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<i>1st Page of Substantive Trees</i>	Not everyone understood the options on the right side of the page, particularly for family law and protection order issues (see observation above for 2 nd Screening Page).	<p>Suggest adding examples of type of issues in parentheses for each of the branches, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a landlord/tenant question (<i>eviction, notices from landlord, repairs, move in list, utilities</i>). • I have a debt collection question (<i>debt collectors calling, can't pay bills, got papers from lawyer/court, money being taken from bank account or paycheck</i>). • I have a family law question (<i>divorce, child support, child custody, visitation</i>). • I have questions about cleaning up a criminal record (<i>pardons, set asides, record sealing</i>). • I have a tax question (<i>filling out tax forms, problem with IRS</i>). • I have question about protection orders (<i>domestic abuse, harassment, sexual assault</i>). • I have a different question.
Family	<i>Child support</i>	Some users were confused about child support being under family law. For example, some users looked for questions about paying back child support under “I have a debt collection question,” and in other instances they went to “I have a different question”.	<p>Consider...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising the options of the initial interview tree choices to include examples in them (see examples in “Family, Overall” above). • Adding an explanation about what child support is and why if falls under family law related issues to a FAQ page (see recommendation below under Design, Layout and Navigation)

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>Some users were confused by the language used in 1st and 4th responses thinking that both could be considered past-due. For example, after clicking on the “I have a family law question,” and then clicking on, “I have a question about child support,” users are presented with the following options, and the bolded options are what caused confusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about past-due child support. • I want to change how much I pay or how much I get in child support each month. • My only income comes from Social Security. The state is taking child support out of my check. What do I do? • My ex is not paying child support. What do I do? • I am paying child support for a child who is not mine. What do I do? • I have a different question. 	<p>Consider...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using clarifying language so that the 1st option indicates that it is from the user’s perspective that there is a question about past-due child support. 2. Reordering the choices so that the related options are closer together and easier to delineate between similar choices. 3. Using formatting to highlight the focus of certain choices to make them stand out more. <p>Example Version 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about past-due child support <i>that I owe</i>. • My ex is not paying child support. What do I do? • I want to change how much I pay or how much I get in child support each month. • My only income comes from Social Security. The state is taking child support out of my check. What do I do? • I am paying child support for a child who is not mine. What do I do? • I have a different question. <p>Example Version 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about past-due child support <i>that I owe</i>. • I have a question about past-due child support <i>that my ex owes</i>. • I want to change how much <i>I pay or how much I get</i> in child support each month. • My only income comes from Social Security. The state is taking child support out of my check. What do I do? • I am paying child support for a child who is not mine. What do I do? • I have a different question.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>Satisfaction of Judgement Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some users were not clear that they had started filling out a form. • Some users missed the text indicating what they would need to fill out the form. • Users might not have the information/court number to start the form. • On the second and third screens of the form, where it asks for plaintiff and defendant names, there was some confusion over plaintiff and defendant. 	<p>When a user clicks “Yes” for the question, “Do you think your child’s other parent will forgive some or all of the child support debt?” on the screens that follow, consider...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revising the language and formatting on the first 2 information screens to make it clear with additional formatting that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the user fills out the form, they will need it signed in front of a notary public (for example this could be made bold or underlined or written in all caps, etc.) b. Create bullets and reformat to make it stand out more clearly that the user will need to know the party’s names in their case and what their court case number is and tell users where they can locate this information directly on the screen (even if this is repeated later, have it in both places). 2. On screen that asks, “Do you have that information?” replace with “Do you have the party names and court case number?” so that the user doesn’t have to click back to the previous screen to remember what information they needed OR <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Could combine the information from the previous screen with the question on this screen to make it one less page the user needs to click through. 3. On the screen that “In what county was your child support case filed?” insert some sort of heading or note that indicates that this page marks the beginning of the form (this suggestion could be applied to all forms that within the LHN system) 4. Add some clarifying language or definition of what plaintiff and defendant mean. 5. Add definitions to a FAQ page (see recommendation below under Design, Layout and Navigation)
		<p>Users pointed out irregular text sizes throughout the child support branch.</p>	<p>Recommend reviewing content to ensure text (font/size) is uniform (see recommendation below in Design, Layout and Navigation)</p>

CATEGORY	OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Visitation & Custody</p>	<p>After choosing family law, users were confused by the options for custody and visitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about visitation. • I have a question about child custody and visitation. <p>From these choices above, and the responses on the pages that follow each, it is also unclear why visitation is included in the second option above when it appears that most of the options after you click on “child custody and visitation” mostly have to do with child custody.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider revising language to make it clearer what the differences are for what the user will get if they click on either one. 2. Consider moving the two options closer together. 3. Consider creating one question for both and insert another skip logic to get user to the appropriate screens if the two branches are in fact closely related. <p>Example Version 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about visitation only. • I have a question about child custody AND visitation. • I have a question about child support. • I have a question about divorce. • I have a different question. <p>Example Version 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a question about visitation. • I have a question about child custody. • I have a question about child support. • I have a question about divorce. • I have a different question.
	<p>When clicking on “I have a question about visitation”, then “Parent” on the next screen, some users were confused by the questions that asked about “getting visits” and “getting more visits”.</p>	<p>Consider revising the language and the order of the choices presented to users to something like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I DON'T HAVE visits with my child. What can I do to get visits? • I HAVE visits with my child, but I want to get more. How do I make that happen? • How do I STOP visits between my child and the other parent? • I have a different question.
	<p>Some users weren't sure what “Material Change in Circumstances” means.</p>	<p>Consider including an example in parentheses, but also adding to a FAQ page. Give a definition on same/current page.</p>

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Confusion on “what is your question about child custody and visitation” page.	It would be helpful to have an option that would take you to next step if you already have visitation but want to take next step in custody. With current options, it is unclear if this is a possibility to get this information. Also, the option for “what does “best interests of child” mean? Could be added to a FAQ page.
	Divorce	Information screen does not clearly say if you should use Nebraska Supreme court or LA website. So, they do not know the difference, or which would be a better choice for them. Or if they are the same thing but different plat forms, so why give them choice?	Identify the differences between the two or take out if they are the same.
		People do not think that divorce is under family law.	Again, give examples.
Criminal Record	Juvenile	Pages with links for juvenile records has “next” button. Confusing of what to do on this page.	Make it clearer what users need to do on these pages.
		Confusion about expungement when looking for set aside, sealing, etc.	Put examples.
Protection Orders & Abuse		People might go to family law for domestic situations.	Language on last two lines for the “click here link” are confusing. The last two could use some rewording to make it clearer that it is not talking about the link anymore.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Second set of screening questions asks if you are a victim of domestic violence or living with a victim with domestic violence.	If the person says yes, it takes them directly to online application. Sometime needs to happen to route the people.
		Can screen of “all three orders have some things in common” be combined with the previous screen? Has screen of “petitioner and respondent” put this on a FAQ screen.	Need to go to application and wants more info on orders. Huge problem with screening questions and getting to domestic abuse protection orders.
		Screen that reads, “Do you want more information on (each protection order)?” doesn’t make sense with the available responses on the right side. It has a response for each protection order or “No. I just want to fill out the forms to get an order.” Issues with this screen: -Left side: it’s not clear what a user is supposed to do on the right based on this text; many users who went through these scenarios were confused Right side: first 3 options should clearly state that they are info only options vs the last option that takes you to a form.	Revise for clarity on left and right sides. Left side should clarify that people can fill out the forms. Right side should clarify the first three responses are for information only. Sentence with hyperlink should be moved to the end The last 2 specifically could use some rewording to make it clearer that it’s not talking about the link anymore because that is confusing.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Concerns about filling out an abuse form and safety. Are there forms/information/sign up documents sent directly to email?	Some Legal Aids have a button on the screens that you can click that takes you to somewhere else unrelated to LawHelp or Legal Aid.
		Unsure what protection order response on “What do you have a question about” screen entails.	Recommend changing text to “Do you need assistance with a protection order.” Or providing examples (info or assistance)
		Visually, protection order branch is confusing. Lots of clicking with little information and have to wait for lag time.	Put bullet list for the three types on the information page. See if “all three orders have some things in common” can be merged onto the page about the 3 types of protection orders. And subsequent pages that are information only can be merged together so users don’t have to click so many times but still have a balance with wording.
Tax		Confusion over wording on “How to fill out tax forms” page.	Say “is your question about filling out tax forms” not “how to fill out tax forms.”
Design Layout Navigation		Even with most of the chosen language written at a 6 th – 9 th grade level, users still got confused by certain terms.	Recommend building a FAQ page that includes definitions (particularly those specific to legal system), and what specific buttons are used for. Suggest that, if created, the page should be accessible via embedded link on every screen.
		Not always clear where to navigate from screen to screen.	One user suggested a embedding a short video tutorial at the beginning that users can click on to tell them how to use the LHN, what the various buttons represent, when to use them, etc.
		Not clear how to get to the main menu.	Define what the main menu is and put option on each screen or in drop down menu.
		Not able to start over on each screen.	Put “start over” option on each screen or in drop down menu.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Irregular text size/layout (specifically in family law-child support- when returning to main menu screen) (mentioned above).	Reformat size/font of text to be the same throughout LHN. Recommendations to check for consistencies and pick one color/format and go with it throughout the program.
		Users kept clicking on the logo to go back to the beginning or the Legal Aid website.	See if the logo can be hyperlinked to the beginning or to LAN website. Or put in another logo to go back to LAN website.
		“New issue” and “walk in survey” does not make sense to people. & only found in “my responses” page.	Changing the wording will be helpful.
		Label welcome page as home page.	Clarify the homepage.
		Users were unclear about what “save as draft” meant.	Need to clarify what the button should be used for. This could be achieved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including information about it in a tutorial video. • Including clarifying information in text has you hover over the button. • Including information about it on a FAQ page
		Some transitions are very slow.	Increase speed if possible or merge pages that have little information.
		Initial confusion on how to work the website. Participants were not always sure what to do.	Maybe do something that is visible for a tutorial or FAQ page. That is imbedded on each page. Put a “help” button. Have a drop-down menu
		On the screens that are information only, it was not clear for users what to do next/where to go.	Write “click next to continue”

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Information only pages get hard to read with spacing, all left justified.	Use bullet points. Break up text.
		Overall confusion	Time needs to be spent with formatting and organization. Different between screen where there are questions and text only, the justification for the text wraps. Do we want to wrap the text? Maybe an issue of space.
		When filling out forms, the site requires date format to be 00/00/0000. However, people have to guess and only says the required format after people input it wrong (notification is small). Many people had this problem. Also, people don't know what the date is referring to. All it says is "Enter Date" (is this today's date or...?).	Default to today's date if that is what it asks for. Left side needs to define what date. Right side needs to have the format already there. Like the dashes.
		Another issue in the information only, the embedded links are not always easily identifiable.	Maybe make them a different color. More spacing or better organization to make it clearer.
		LAN Website: white on white is hard to see.	Maybe Bold/all caps. Potentially talk to Sam Bates.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Guardianship is on first page of screening questions. If people click “yes” about having any of those issues, screen reads LAN does not help with these cases & doesn’t have any information to share.	Change to reflect that LAN does help with guardianship.
		Some clickable options have periods, and some do not. Specifically, the yes or no.	Revise for formatting consistency.
		Not all hyperlinks are the same color/underline/etc. Users said links do not stand out.	Revise for formatting consistency.
		In general inconsistencies-when you click “yes I am currently in danger”, then the next screen you click no, you get the screen that takes back to main menu.	Doesn’t tell you to contact police/help
		Leave program button takes you to survey.	Clarify this will take people to survey
		More explanation about what to do with the forms once you have filled it out. And clarifying that you are filling them out.	Tutorial of how to use this would be helpful, especially with people who are not computer savvy. So, something that can help them use the buttons etc. Can put it up on YouTube and link directly to it.
		Second overall screening question page- when you click “yes”, it automatically takes you to an application. However, participants don’t know.	Add more clarification/information about the application and why clicking “yes” takes you there.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Participant said they wished they had their glasses.	Make text font/buttons bigger.
		Most didn't notice the menu/log out button.	Make the buttons bigger.
		Wording confusion on problem list.	Potential rewording recommendation for problem list: -Family law (divorce, child support, visitation)? -Cleaning up criminal record (pardons, set asides, record sealing)? -A tax problem with the IRS?
		When you click yes, I'm in danger in protection order branch, you go to a screen saying call the police. The link that says "here" is hard to read; see notes about formatting. And not sure what "here" takes you to.	Reformat left side to have a distention between calling the police, the 1-800 number/link, and applying for services.
		At the end of some branches if you click on "leave program" it takes you to "thank you page" to get users to take the user survey. If the user clicks on "leave the program" on 2 nd screen it takes you to the 3 rd screen which makes no sense as it just seems like a filler page.	Revisit skip logic for pages
		Survey has broken link with skip logic.	Revisit skip logic for pages

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Liked Most		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial use/first time users are somewhat problematic with the acclimated the system. But once they get it, they are good to go. • Not legal jargon. Easy questions. • Not too many questions. • Can bypass lawyers to get help. • Easy access. • Like the colors/graphics. • Didn't have dumb down feeling. • Most questions made sense. 	
Liked Least		Questions are easy to follow but how the information is laid out is complex (like not knowing what a family law issue is).	Have FAQ/Help pages and give examples.
		Make it clearer how to get back to home screen.	Maybe put it under the dropdown menu.
		Mouse lags.	Try to merge as much content (without being overwhelming) on to pages.
		Not all people have access to a computer.	
		No idea how to log out/what the icon means.	
		Buttons on bottom should be bigger and match text.	
		No option for separation help.	Providing examples would be helpful- like complex or simple divorce.
		Have more instructions what this website is for. Like printing out the forms and sending them in. Put more details for this in.	Use tutorial video.

CATEGORY		OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		Only suggestion would be to add more forms!	
		Explain what new issue means.	Make this part of drop-down menu.
		If I need to go to library to do this, then I will just come to Legal Aid.	