

LEGAL SERVICES OF SOUTH CENTRAL  
MICHIGAN

NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX REVIEW  
PROJECT—OPINION LEADER INTERVIEWS, USER  
RESEARCH AND TAXONOMY REVIEW REPORT

PREPARED APRIL 17, 2006

PRESENTED BY CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS, LLC  
FRED LEISE, OWNER AND PRINCIPAL  
6530 N. GREENVIEW AVE.  
CHICAGO, IL 60625  
(773) 764-2588  
[WWW.CONTEXTUALANALYSIS.COM](http://WWW.CONTEXTUALANALYSIS.COM)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
Opinion Leaders and User Interviews.....	4
NSMI Taxonomy Review.....	5
PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	6
OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS METHODOLOGY.....	7
Methodology Details.....	7
Analysis Procedures.....	8
OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS—FINDINGS.....	9
Legal Services XML Group.....	9
National Subject Matter Index—Content and Use.....	10
National Subject Matter Index—Maintenance Process.....	11
Case Management Intake Process.....	12
OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS—RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
Legal Services XML Group.....	13
National Subject Matter Index—Content and Use.....	13
National Subject Matter Index—Maintenance Process.....	14
Case Manage Intake Process.....	15
NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX REVIEW—FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS...	15
Overview and General Evaluation.....	15
Enumeration.....	17
Display.....	18
Category Labels.....	18
Cross-References.....	19
Categories.....	20
NSMI-TEMPLATE INTEGRATION.....	21

Methodology..... 21  
Kaivo Template—Findings..... 21  
Kaivo Template—Recommendations..... 22  
LawHelp.Org..... 22  
LawHelp Template—Findings..... 22  
LawHelp Template—Recommendations..... 23  
ProBono.Net Template—Findings..... 24  
ProBono.Net Template—Recommendations..... 25

NEXT STEPS..... 25

APPENDIX A—INTERVIEWEE LIST..... 26

APPENDIX B—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: OPINION LEADERS..... 28

APPENDIX C—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: WEBSITE CONTENT MANAGERS..... 30

APPENDIX D—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: CASE MANAGEMENT INTAKE USERS..... 32

APPENDIX E—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE VENDORS 34

APPENDIX F—INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SPREADSHEET: OPINION LEADERS..... 36

APPENDIX G—INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SPREADSHEET: WEBSITE CONTENT MANAGERS40

APPENDIX H—KAIVO STATEWIDE WEB SITE, OPEN SOURCE TEMPLATE—TOPICS LIST45

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### OPINION LEADERS AND USER INTERVIEWS

User research in the form of one-on-one interviews was performed to gather background information on the business context, users and content of the National Subject Matter Index (NSMI). The 20 individuals interviewed included opinion leaders, website content managers, case management intake users, web developers and case management software vendors.

#### Major Findings

- The fact that the Legal Services XML Group exists only as a collection of volunteers has caused difficulties with the efficient maintenance of the National Subject Matter Index (NSMI).
- There are no clear current plans for implementing information sharing projects and no existing roadmap for how to accomplish such programs, although expediting such information sharing was the impetus behind the creation of the NSMI.
- There is no written maintenance plan for regularly updating the NSMI; users are unaware of the update process for the index.
- Website content managers are often unable to find appropriate codes for tagging content.
- The NSMI has been revised and extended on a local basis to meet the needs of individual legal services programs. These multiple, inconsistent and possibly incompatible versions will impede the efficient sharing of documents.
- The content of the NSMI suffers from granularity, completeness and consistency issues.

#### Major Recommendations: Short Term

The Legal Services XML Group should:

- Reach out to the legal services community to (1) promote the activities and importance of the Group, (2) raise awareness in the legal services community of the importance of information sharing and (3) educate that community of the need for consistent content tagging.

- With the consultation of an individual with experience and expertise in building controlled vocabularies, undertake a complete ground-up review of the NSMI, revising it to improve consistency of coverage, granularity and terminology. Such a review must include an advisory body with a wide range of representatives from the field to ensure that the end product will be suitable for local use. This revision should include a thorough review of all individual local extensions of the NSMI to ensure that all appropriate additions are included in the revised NSMI.

### Major Recommendations: Long Term

The Legal Services XML Group should:

- Be institutionalized so that its important work can be supported with appropriate staff and other administrative and financial resources.
- Involve technology experts in realistic discussions of how information sharing can be implemented in the legal services community. A project plan, including timeline and required resources for the implementation of information sharing projects should be developed.
- For greatest flexibility, develop an online, real-time, web-based interface for the management and maintenance of the index. Such an interface should allow local index users to “reserve” codes for topics currently not covered in the index.
- Develop a process for working with case management software vendors with the view toward having the NSMI included in that software, thus further expanding the opportunity for information sharing using the NSMI.
- Establish a written index maintenance plan outlining specific procedures and responsibilities for updating the index on a regular basis.

Complete findings and recommendations can be found in the main body of the report below.

## NSMI TAXONOMY REVIEW

A heuristic taxonomy review of the NSMI was completed to identify general best-practices issues connected with the technical construction of

the NSMI itself. In general, this review did not cover the completeness of the index. Such a review would need to be completed by appropriate subject matter experts.

Recommendations are noted in italics in the two following sections.

### General Findings and Recommendations

- The NSMI is generally effective and appropriate for indexing legal services information. There appears to be no reason to scrap the index as it currently exists and start from scratch rebuilding such a legal services subject hierarchy.

### Specific Findings and Recommendations

- The enumerative suffix used to identify “Other” categories was inconsistent. While most numerical category identifiers for “Other” categories ended in “99,” a few ended in either “97” or “98.” *Any “Other” category should always end in “99,” e.g., 204099.*
- *Establish a numerical suffix that can be used to identify state-specific programs.*
- *General categories should always display before more specific categories.*
- *“Other” categories should always display last for ease of use.*
- *Because “Other” is used in so many places, the term “Other” should never stand alone; it should always be qualified.*
- *Use cross-references to ensure that higher-level categories collect all information pertaining to that subject not otherwise referenced by more specific categories.*
- *Specific headings should not refer to more general headings.*

Complete findings and recommendations can be found in the main body of the report below.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Legal Services of South Central Michigan (LSSCM), under a grant from the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), has engaged ContextualAnalysis, LLC (CA) to conduct a review of the National Subject Matter Index (NSMI).

As the initial stages of that project, opinion leader and user interview were conducted with 20 individuals from across the country. The interviews took place from June 24 through July 14, 2005. The goal of the interviews was to obtain background information on the business context, content and users of the National Subject Matter Index (NSMI).

As the second stage of that project, CA undertook a thorough review of the NSMI, including the cross-reference list provided by Gwen Daniels. This review, along with the previously undertaken interviews, identified issues that were organized into five major categories:

- Enumeration (dealing with the NSMI numbering system)
- Display (dealing with the display of the NSMI categories)
- Category Labels (dealing with the wording used for the specific NSMI categories)
- Cross-References (dealing with the “See” and “See also” references used to assist content taggers in finding the best possible tag for their content)
- Categories (dealing with substantive issues of the categories themselves)

## OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS METHODOLOGY

### METHODOLOGY DETAILS

Using names supplied by LSSCM (Appendix A), CA interviewed 20 participants over the course of 18 interview sessions. Because of scheduling conflicts, it was not possible to interview three of the individuals originally identified by LSSCM as appropriate interview subjects.

The individuals interviewed had the following characteristics.

Audience segments:

- 5 Opinion leaders
- 9 Website content managers
- 1 Web developer
- 3 Case management intake users
- 2 Case management software developers

Programmatic distribution:

- 8 Statewide legal assistance programs
- 3 National legal assistance programs
- 1 Congressionally mandated program
- 2 Software vendors

Sixteen interviews were conducted with a single participant; two were conducted with two participants each. The CA interviewer introduced the session, including notifying participants that contemporaneous notes would be taken during the interview. The participants were then asked a series of prepared questions that were subject to modification based on the course of each interview (See Appendices B, C, D and E).

Transcripts of the interviews are supplied as a separate document. To the extent possible, identifying details about each individual respondent have been removed from the transcripts. Transcripts are not presented in the order of the interviews and no assumptions should be made about the identity of the interview subjects for each specific interview.

#### ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

After the interviews were completed, all interview transcripts were read thoroughly and analyzed using a number of different passes. Detailed information from opinion leaders and website content managers was put into a series of spreadsheets for further analysis. (See Appendices F, G.)

Using the information gathered from the interview transcripts and in the spreadsheets, common patterns were identified. From opinion leaders, these included issues about the nature of the Legal Services XML Group itself and the management of the NSMI. From website content managers, issues pertaining to two overarching topics emerged: the content of the NSMI, and

the management and administration of the index. Detailed findings from the interviews are presented in the following section.

## OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS—FINDINGS

### LEGAL SERVICES XML GROUP

The individuals who later formed the Legal Services XML Group were the creators of the National Subject Matter Index. The group is “an unassociated organization of unassociated, interested individuals.”<sup>1</sup> While the LSXML Group is considered as being good at finding resources and serving as a “forum for discussing issues of data sharing and interconnectivity not handled anywhere else,”<sup>2</sup> it does face several challenges. Interviewees noted the following factors as affecting the LSXML Group:

- It has no organizational home and no dedicated staff support.
- Its activities, undertaken solely by volunteers, often take longer than planned, as a result of participants’ limited time availabilities.
- While it has succeeded in creating the National Subject Matter Index and XML standards for sharing information, there are no clear current plans for implementing information sharing projects using the NSMI and no existing roadmap for how to accomplish such projects.
- Technology experts who understand the issues involved in approaching the implementation of information-sharing projects and who could provide guidance for discussing such issues are not regularly included in the group’s monthly discussions.
- The LSXML group has no authority or agreement from users to enforce the standards that enable information sharing, but must rely on the mandate of the Legal Services Corporation. Should that entity cease

---

<sup>1</sup> Opinion leader interview 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

funding technology projects, there is concern that individual states would no longer follow the current content coding practices.

- There is no general awareness in the field of the existence and activities of the LSXML Group or of its importance.

#### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX—CONTENT AND USE

Although the NSMI is seen as important to the vision of enabling the sharing of legal services information nationwide, both opinion leaders and website content managers identified a number of problems with the current NSMI content. These problems are a result of the process originally used to construct the index (“Everything goes in”<sup>3</sup>) and the current lack of communication between the LSXML Group and the field. These problems include:

- Inability of website content managers to find appropriate codes for the content that needs tagging. In some cases, this is a result of lack of specific codes and in others the lack of general codes. This problem is a reflection of the problem of granularity inconsistencies in the NSMI. It is clear from website content managers’ comments that some areas of the law are only weakly represented in NSMI, which other areas lack general headings to represent overall practice areas.
- Website content managers also cited the occasional lack of coverage in NSMI for newly developing fields of legal services—a problem of incompleteness
- Because there is no process in place for regularly updating the NSMI and because website content managers sometimes have difficulty finding appropriate codings (due to both granularity and completeness issues), individual website content managers have developed their own vocabulary extensions based on their specific needs. Since these individualized extensions and modifications are not tracked in any way, the NSMI essentially exists in multiple, inconsistent, and possibly incompatible versions.
- There is a recurring problem of content managers having to fit state-specific information into a national index. Several content managers noted that they had problems finding the right code for their material.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

Either it did not fit the national index exactly or there was no place for it.

- Because of the way the NSMI was constructed, essentially with all suggestions from interested parties being included, there are inconsistencies throughout the index.
- In numerous places in the NSMI, identically named subcategories exist under several categories. This can make it difficult to implement the NSMI in systems that require unique identifiers for different codes.
- Cross-references in the index often lead to improper terms. The cross-reference from Education under Disabilities leads to the main Education topic, not to a more appropriate subtopic such as Special Education.
- Because there are no guidelines for how end users are to implement the NSMI, there may be significant differences in how coding is handled across the various websites. This again leads to inconsistency of content tagging, increasing the difficulty of efficient information sharing.

#### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX—MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Opinion leaders, website content managers and software vendors all expressed concerns with the maintenance of the NSMI. The concerns included:

- Because the LSXML Group operates solely with volunteers overall updates to the NSMI appear infrequently and on an irregular basis.
- There currently exists no documented process for regularly updating the NSMI.
- Users of the NSMI are unaware of how updates to the index are generated; they do not know who is responsible for index maintenance.
- There currently exists no unified, centralized process by which website content managers can “reserve” a code for their own (and others’) use on a temporary basis.
- The NSMI is published in an undated form. This can cause confusion in end users not know whether or not they have the most current version of the index.
- When updates of the NSMI are issued, there is no specific guidance to software vendors as to which temporary codes have been accepted into the vocabulary, which codes are new and which (if any) codes have been dropped or changed. This places a significant burden on the

software vendors to comb the entire vocabulary for changes they will need to reflect in their products.

- While several website content managers have noted that they will be moving toward translating much, if not all, of their content into Spanish, there appears to be no recognition of the looming problem of the need for a multilingual subject matter thesaurus with the LSXML Group.
- Changes to the NSMI are propagated in a top-down manner, yet content managers regularly add codes for local use. No mechanism exists for looking on a regular basis at the totality of local changes, evaluating them and then incorporating appropriate changes into the NSMI and informing the NSMI community of those changes.

One important issue connected with index maintenance that came to light during the analysis of the interviews is that there seems to be a significant disconnect between end users of NSMI and the LSXML Group. Users say they have many changes they want to make to the NSMI; every website content manager interviewed noted specific instances of desired changes or additions. Yet at the same time, several members of the LSXML Group noted that they receive few requests for changes. It was suggested that users have a problem finding an appropriate code when they are entering content, so they put it under “other.” Then six months later when the LSXML Group asks for suggestions, the content manager doesn’t remember the changes wanted.

At the same time, content managers are frustrated when there is no code for the material they have. They want a way to add codes right away, even on a provisional basis, to the NSMI.

#### CASE MANAGEMENT INTAKE PROCESS

Both case management intake users interviewed noted that while it would be possible to use the NSMI to code cases, they were concerned about the problem of trying to fit problems into the codes. They seemed unsure whether or not the index would meet their needs and were concerned about the size of the index. One user noted that it might be better to have a subindex that would include only the specific practice areas they deal with.

One software vendor interviewed noted that he was “waiting for the final version” of the index to appear before it was implemented in the software. Another noted that while it would be possible to introduce NSMI in

standalone software, it would be more difficult to do that in an online environment because of the deep hierarchical structure of the index. Workarounds would have to be developed to enable a usable and navigable display of the index.

It is possible to extend the use of the NSMI into the area of case management, but such an undertaking must be completed only through close and careful coordination with the case management software vendor community.

## OPINION LEADER AND USER INTERVIEWS—RECOMMENDATIONS

### LEGAL SERVICES XML GROUP

- The LSXML Group should be institutionalized so that its important work can be supported with appropriate staff and other administrative and financial resources.
- The LSXML Group must reach out to technology experts and involve them in realistic discussions of how information sharing can be implemented among the legal services community.
- A project plan, including timeline and required resources for the implementation of information sharing projects should be developed.
- The LSXML Group should reach out to the legal services community to (1) promote the activities and importance of the Group, (2) raise awareness in the legal services community of the importance of information sharing and (3) educate that community of the need for consistent content tagging.

### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX—CONTENT AND USE

The LXSML Group (or another appropriate entity) should:

- With the consultation of an individual with experience and expertise in building controlled vocabularies, undertake a complete ground-up review of the NSMI, revising it to improve consistency of coverage, granularity and terminology. Such a review must include an advisory body with a wide range of representatives from the field to ensure that the end product will be suitable for local use.
- Establish task force or committee to review state-specific needs for codes and include those updates in the revised NSMI.
- Undertake a thorough review of all individual local extensions of the NSMI to ensure that all appropriate additions are included in the revised NSMI.
- Develop guidelines and offer training in the use of the NSMI to ensure the consistency of tagging that will be necessary for the implementation of information sharing.

#### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX—MAINTENANCE PROCESS

To ensure that a revised NSMI continues to reflect changes in the field of legal services, LSXML Group should:

- Establish a written index maintenance plan outlining specific procedures and responsibilities for updating the index on a regular basis.
- For greatest flexibility, develop an online, real-time, web-based interface for the management and maintenance of the index. Such an interface should allow local index users to “reserve” codes for topics currently not covered in the index. Such temporary codes should be reviewed for final approval within 24 hours. Having such an online capability ensures that those in the field are away of changes to the index and are using the most up-to-date version of the index. Provisional additions would be accessible to anyone, ensuring better consistency when new codes are added.
- Establish an automatic process of regular index updates with cooperating software vendors.
- Promote the LSXML group as the “owners” of the NSMI. Ensure that users know who is ultimately responsible for maintenance of the index and how individual users can make suggestions for changes or updates
- Establish a process for considering the issue of how and when the index should be translated into additional languages.

## CASE MANAGE INTAKE PROCESS

- Develop a process for working with case management software vendors with the view toward having the NSMI included in that software, thus further expanding the opportunity for information sharing using the NSMI.

# NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX REVIEW—FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings are noted below in roman font, recommendations in italics.

## OVERVIEW AND GENERAL EVALUATION

The NSMI is based on the two-digit LSC problem codes and uses an additional five digits to extend the coverage of the problem codes enable more granular subject analysis. The current NSMI hierarchy generally operates at three or four levels of depth.

NSMI seems to be a generally useful and appropriate tool for exchange of legal services information. In its current version, it contains nearly 1,300 substantive individual subject headings, as well as nearly 250 subject headings concerned with the internal operations of a legal services organization. Such a level of granularity appears to be appropriate for the NSMI's coverage, since the index is not concerned with the global universe of legal knowledge, but rather a specific subset of information relevant to legal services providers and clients. The index's usefulness could be further improved, however, by implementing the recommendations in this report. *However, there appears to be no reason to scrap the index as it currently exists and start from scratch rebuilding such a legal services subject hierarchy.*

Because the NSMI has grown organically, the enumerative code designations are not necessarily in numerical order. Since the state websites using the NSMI have already coded a significant amount of information using the current numerical codes, it would be a prohibitively complicated process to revise the numerical structure at this time. *It is not recommended that any change to the numerical structure be made at this time.*

While the current structure of the NSMI is not necessarily complete in coverage, especially on emerging legal issues, there is a basic process in place allowing for updating and expanding the index. That process should be continued and expanded; specific recommendations are given below.

Being based on the LSC problem codes, the NSMI organizes legal content from an attorney’s point of view. That organization seems generally appropriate and consistent, and reflects the time and effort that have gone into its preparation and updating.

However, as a result of its attorney-centric viewpoint, the NSMI does not reflect the mental model that the average lay person has when coming to find legal information. Most individuals do not, for example immediately understand the difference between civil and criminal proceedings. In addition, non-legal specialists identify with a specific problem rather than considering its place in a subject matter hierarchy. They may, for example want to find information about child support, without understanding that such an issue is considered part of family law.

Because of the need to match users mental models, most legal services websites use a content organization scheme that includes more specific topics at the top level of the hierarchy. Legal Aid of Georgia, as one example, uses the following top-level topics:

- |  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| AIDS/HIV, Terminal Illnesses             | Disaster Relief                  |
| Art Law and Intellectual Property        | Education                        |
| Business Law for Community Organizations | Environmental Law                |
| Cars                                     | Family Law and Domestic Violence |
| Children and the Law                     | Health                           |
| Civil Rights                             | Housing                          |
| Contracts, Loans, Sales and Bankruptcy   | Immigration                      |
| Criminal Law                             | Injuries to People and Property  |
| Disability                               | Migrant Workers                  |
|  | Military and Veterans’ Affairs   |

Public Benefits	Your Government
Seniors	Your World (international treaties, institutions and NGOs)
Tax	
The Legal System	
Wills and Life Planning	
Work and Unemployment	

Clearly, such a list of topics reflects a considerably different approach to the organization of legal subject matter than the NSMI. In addition, each state may use a different subject organization scheme of topics and subtopics that reflects the particular needs of its clients.

To help mitigate that difference in website content organization and to help ensure the proper exchange of relevant content, the two website templates most in use for legal services and pro bono websites, Kaivo and ProBonoNet, integrate NSMI into their system. This integration allows website topics and subtopics to be associated with specific NSMI numbers and is discussed in detail in the section below on template integration.

#### ENUMERATION

- The enumerative suffix used to identify “Other” categories was inconsistent. While most numerical category identifiers for “Other” categories ended in “99,” a few ended in either “97” or “98.”

*Any “Other” category should always end in “99,” e.g., 2204099. Example: Criminal > Substantive Crimes > Other Substantive Crimes should be 2041599 instead of 2041503; Housing > Federal Housing Programs > Other Public Housing is listed as 1610098 and should be changed to 1610099; Food Programs > Other Food Programs should be 1710099.*

- Line 558 (Family Law > Divorce/Separation/Annulment > Other Divorce/Separation/Annulment (1320099) appears to be out of order and *should be interfiled with the other Family Law > Divorce/Separation/Annulment headings.*
- There was no consistent way to differentiate state-mandated programs from similar federal programs. *Accordingly, establish a numerical suffix*

*that can be used to identify state-specific programs. I recommend using the final two digits of “95” or “98.” Thus Housing > Homelessness > State-specific Programs becomes 1690795 (or 1690798). Similarly Mental Health > Mental Institutions > State-specific Programs becomes 1820495 (or 1820498).*

This will ensure that there is a place for such items that would otherwise be placed under an “Other” category and can now be differentiated from nationally mandated programs, for instance.

Obviously, such a suffix would not be used to modify categories that refer to specific federal programs, such as Housing > Federal Housing Programs.

#### DISPLAY

- *General categories, e.g., Employment (1290000) should always be displayed and be available for content tagging purposes.*
- *The display order of categories was often inconsistent from a logical/conceptual point of view.*

*General categories should always display before more specific categories, e.g., Attorneys/Legal Services > Attorney Fees (2010200, display level 8) should appear before Attorneys/Legal Services > Attorney Fees > Consent Decree/Settlements (2010203, display level 1). Ditto Attorneys/Legal Services > Ethical Issues.*

*“Other” categories should always display last for ease of use, e.g., Nonprofit Law > Other Tax (2200810) should display after Nonprofit Law > Tax Exemption (2200800).*

*Conceptual order should trump strict alphabetization, making the NSMI easier to use.*

#### CATEGORY LABELS

- *Because “Other” is used in so many places, the term “Other” should never stand alone; it should always be qualified, e.g., Criminal >*

*Collateral Review > Other (2041899) should be Criminal > Collateral Review > Other Collateral Review.*

- *“Other” categories should also be fully qualified, e.g., Employment > Discrimination Remedies > Other Remedies (1210699) should be Employment > Discrimination Remedies > Other Discrimination Remedies.*
- The word “issues” is essentially meaningless in the context of the NSMI and should not be used in category labels. It is clear to anyone connected with the index that it is used for dealing with legal issues having to do with a specific topic.

*Accordingly, Family Law > Grandparent Custody/Visitation/Adoption Issues should be changed to Family Law > Grandparent Custody/Visitation/Adoption.*

*This principle should be followed throughout the index.*

#### CROSS-REFERENCES

- *In general, cross references should be added whenever possible so that content managers are directed to all related categories, ensuring the best possible tagging of content.*
- *Use entry cross-references to point users to the second part of multi-part terms, e.g., Energy See Public Utilities/Energy.*
- *Ensure that where appropriate, “see also” cross-references point in both directions, e.g., Economic Development > Nonprofit Incorporation/Dissolution See also Nonprofit Law > Incorporation/Dissolution and Nonprofit Law > Incorporation/Dissolution See also Economic Development > Nonprofit Incorporation/Dissolution.*
- *Use cross-references to ensure that higher-level categories collect all information pertaining to that subject not otherwise referenced by more specific categories. E.g., Employment (1290000) should have a See also cross-reference to Immigration > VISA processing > Employment*

*Petitions (1811201) and Migrants > Employment (1290000) and Nonprofit Law > Labor and Employment (2200300) and Prisons > Employment (1830400).*

This ensures that content managers are directed to all possible specific codes for tagging content.

*Similarly, Employment > Discrimination > Race (121502) should cross reference Rural Issues > Race Discrimination in Agriculture (2110300).*

- *Specific headings should not refer to more general headings, e.g., Disability > Education (1110000) should not point to Education (1110000), but to the appropriate subcategory: Education > Special Education/Learning Disabilities (1111300). If an appropriate specific subcategory does not exist, it should be created.*

#### CATEGORIES

- I question the usefulness of the top-level “Other” category (1990000). If something is so general or so unusual that it cannot be specifically placed, it is unclear to me how anyone could search for such a topic or how it would be possible to equate all items that had been tagged with such a category tag.

*I recommend removing the top-level “Other” category.*

- Issues connected with gays, lesbians, bisexual and transgendered individuals appear to be missing from the NSMI. Given the growing body of legislation and judicial decisions concerning this topic, especially in the last 10 years, consideration should be given as to how best to accommodate this subject.

*Since GLBT issues cross many other subject categories, consideration might be given to establishing a two-number suffix to denote GLBT issues, such as “97.” Thus, Family Law > Marriage > GLBT would be assigned number 1390497.*

*Similar categories could be created for appropriate subject categories.*

## NSMI-TEMPLATE INTEGRATION

### METHODOLOGY

Using a combination of conference calls and website review, CA participated in demonstrations of the two major template systems used for legal services websites: Kaivo and Law Help/ProBono.Net. A discussion of findings and recommendations follows.

### KAIVO TEMPLATE—FINDINGS

Kaivo uses an open source template for statewide legal services organizations. As part of the process for checking in documents to be available on the website, content managers must select at least one NSMI topic code to represent the content of the document. To do this, the content manager clicks on a “Topic Chooser” link, which provides direct access to a separate window providing a list of topics and subtopics and their associated NSMI codes.

Because the topics are used to display content to end users of the website, the organization of the topics does not directly match the organization of the NSMI; rather they represent a user-centric mental model instead of an attorney-centric mental model. In addition not every NSMI code is represented in the Kaivo topic index. A complete listing of the Kaivo topics is provided in Appendix H.

However, the entire NSMI is pre-loaded into the template topic chooses and a website coordinator can chose which categories to display to the user. Therefore, while all the codes are available to tag content, not all the categories appear to users. Administrators do have the ability to add codes to content on their site, i.e., for state-specific codes that they do not find in the index.

## KAIVO TEMPLATE—RECOMMENDATIONS

- *Consider working with Kaivo to develop an expanded set of document topic tags that more closely represents the breadth and depth of the NSMI subject hierarchy.*

## LAWHELP.ORG

The organization LawHelp.Org was created for people living on low-incomes and the legal organizations that serve them. LawHelp.org provides referrals to local legal aid and public interest law offices, basic information about legal rights, self-help information, court information, links to social service agencies, and more in your state.

LawHelp.Org provides two templates for use by states and other advocacy organizations: the public LawHelp template and the ProBono.Net template for advocates.

Those two templates will be discussed separately in the following sections

## LAWHELP TEMPLATE—FINDINGS

In general, resources for the public on individual state and organization sites are organized by topic and subtopic and then in some cases a “channel,” which includes such items as “court forms,” “find a lawyer,” or “legal information,” all related to the chosen topic and subtopic. The specific organization of information is determined by the creators of each site, who must create an appropriate topic and subtopic structure. This allows states the greatest flexibility in developing the organization of their site, but does mean that different sites will have different topic/subtopic structures.

However, resource sharing is possible because NSMI codes must be assigned to each topic and subtopic when developing the content structure of a website. There are several aspects of the LawHelp template that mitigate against precise sharing of information.

First, resources can only be associated with a subtopic. That means that for resources to be associated with a general NSMI (top-level) code, individuals must create a “subtopic” with that high-level NSMI code. That results in such content hierarchies as:

## Health

Health

Medicaid

Medicare

This can be confusing for users.

Second, subtopics may be associated with one or more major topics on a site, so the resources associated with that subtopic will appear in more than one place in the hierarchy.

Third, when browsing the NSMI, users select a level-one topic list. The system then displays appropriate level two topics. When users select a level-two topic, the system displays the appropriate level three topics, if any. In all cases, however, users can only see four lines of the information at each level and must use scroll bars to view all possible choices. This makes it difficult for users to develop a good mental model of the entire NSMI structure. This can reduce the quality of content tagging.

Fourth, the NSMI is implemented in LawHelp as a flat list. There is no automatic association between items tagged with a level 4 and items tagged with a level 3 code in the same NSMI hierarchy. This again makes it difficult to compare, import or export resources to other systems.

The creators of LawHelp received feedback from users that they wanted the flexibility to be able to display different resources for different subtopics, even if those subtopics had been assigned the same NSMI code. This is a reflection of the fact that NSMI codes offer an attorney-centric subject hierarchy that does not necessarily match general LawHelp site users' mental models.

### LAWHELP TEMPLATE—RECOMMENDATIONS

- *Although this would be a significant (and long-term) undertaking the Legal Services XML Group may want to consider developing a specific mapping between NSMI and its various instantiations in state/organization LawHelp-based websites. This would help ensure that appropriate content can be exchanged between organizations using the LawHelp template.*
- *Legal Services XML Group may want to explore the possibility of creating a single user-facing hierarchy that would be mapped to NSMI codes. LawHelp users would be able to choose whether or not to*

implement (include) any specific part of the user-facing hierarchy, but there would at least be a single, clear mapping between LawHelp topics/subtopics and NSMI codes.

#### PROBONO.NET TEMPLATE—FINDINGS

The ProBono.Net template is used by state-based organizations to provide online resources for legal advocates, including legal services and pro bono attorneys, law professors and students, and other social services advocates who provide legal services to low-income individuals. The sites provide online support and resources to their members, including news, calendars of events, volunteer opportunities, and online resources.

When individual ProBono.Net websites are created, content managers create a content organization for resources and assign NSMI codes to the topics and subtopics they choose.

Once a ProBono.Net website is created, resources are assigned to appropriate subtopics directly, and administrators are not exposed further to the index. It is unclear whether site administrators have the capability of changing topic-NSMI assignments at a later time.

In a major difference from the LawHelp template, topics in the ProBono.Net template inherit all resources assigned to subtopics within that topic. For example, ProBono.Net Iowa uses the following as part of its topic hierarchy:

- Juveniles
  - Recent Case Law
  - International Voices
  - Recent Legislation, Trends
  - Useful Links

All of the individual resources that can be viewed in each of the four subtopics can also be found concatenated under the topic “Juveniles” itself, in addition to any resources assigned only to the main topic. Resources are therefore tagged with both the topic and subtopic NSMI codes.

As a result of the ProBono.Net topic hierarchy inheritance and because NSMI index codes are assigned separately to topics and subtopics, it is possible for resources to show up in inappropriate places in the NSMI hierarchy. Essentially, resources on a specific topic are also tagged with a

different (perhaps more general) code, when they may or may not include discussion of the larger topic directly.

This can cause confusion when resources are shared among organizations.

#### PROBONO.NET TEMPLATE—RECOMMENDATIONS

- *Investigate the possibility of a template revision so that resource concatenation for topics is done by the system itself using specific queries rather than having resources tagged with both topic and subtopic. This will mitigate the problem of topic inheritance and inappropriate resource tagging.*

## NEXT STEPS

After reviewing the findings and recommendations outlined in this report, the Legal Services XML Group should engage an experienced taxonomist to make the specific changes to the NSMI recommended in this report and to assist with a thorough NSMI subject review as recommended in the previous user research report.

## APPENDIX A—INTERVIEWEE LIST

### **Opinion Leaders**

Gwen Daniels  
Illinois Legal Aid Online

Hugh Calkins  
Pine Tree Legal Assistance

Steve Gray  
Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law

Mark O'Brien  
Pro Bono Net

Glenn Rawdon  
Legal Services Corporation

### **Web Site Content Managers, Open Source Template**

Bonnie Roswig  
Statewide Legal Services of Connecticut

Vickie Deak  
Indiana Legal Services

Vince Morris  
Center for Arkansas Legal Partnership

### **Web Site Content Managers, Lawhelp Template**

Sharon Elmore (MN)

Tracey Roberts (GA)

Lorraine Jones (NHLP)

### **Web Site Content Managers, Others**

Dan Rieken  
Illinois Legal Aid Online

Michelle Nicolet  
Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law

Dan Collis Puro (*not interviewed*)  
Massachusetts Law Reform Institute

Anna Van Lenten  
Pro Bono Net

### **Web Developers**

Mike Barborak  
(Lead developer/Pro Bono Net Advocate Web site)

Bill Schmidt (*not interviewed*)  
(Programmer/Kaivo.com)

### **Case Management Intake Users**

Kelly Shuptrine  
Virginia Legal Aid Society

Kari Deming (Pika)

### **Case Management Vendors**

Aaron Worley  
Pika Software

John Kemp (*not interviewed*)  
Kemps Case Works

IV Ashton  
Network Ninjas

## APPENDIX B—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: OPINION LEADERS

### INTRODUCTION

- Hi. I'm Fred Leise and as you know I am a consultant working for Legal Services of South Central Michigan on a project studying the national subject matter index.
- I will be interviewing a number of people including opinion leaders, website content managers, case management intake users and case management software vendors, getting background information on the business context, users and content of the subject matter index.
- This interview should take about 45 minutes, but definitely no longer than one hour.
- In the first part of the interview I'll be getting background information about you and then we'll focus on your website and the national subject matter index: how you use it and your evaluations of it, including any changes that you would make to improve its usefulness.
- I can't promise any specific changes will be implemented based on our discussion today.
- Anything you say will be summarized and passed on anonymously; no specific information will be attributed to you. I'm really interested in getting your gut reactions to the questions I will be asking.
- While I have a set of prepared questions, please feel free to cover any information that you think is important and relevant.
- I will have you on speaker phone and will be taking notes as you talk. Again, that's only for my reference as I summarize my findings from the interviews.
- Do you have any questions?

### BACKGROUND

- What organization do you work for?
- What is your job title?
- What are your duties/job responsibilities?
- What does your organization do?
- What is your connection to the National Subject Matter Index?

## BUSINESS CONTEXT

- Tell me about the Legal Services XML group.
- What does it do particularly well?
- What are the factors that will most affect the LSXML group over the next two to three years?
- What are the key challenges that the LSXML group faces now.

## NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX

- Tell me about the origins of the national subject matter index. Who created it and why was it created?
- How did you become involved in the national NSMI?
- Who are the users of the NSMI?
- How do they use the NSMI?
- What does the national NSMI do particularly well?
- Is there a regular review of the NSMI?
- How often is it updated?
- In your opinion, what are the factors that will most affect the national NSMI's success over the next two to three years?
- What are the key challenges that the national NSMI faces now?
- From a broad perspective, what do you see as key strengths of the NSMI in its current incarnation?
- From a broad perspective, what do you see as weaknesses of the NSMI in its current incarnation?
- What unmet opportunities do you see for the NSMI?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being poor and 5 being excellent, how would you rate the current NSMI?

## VISION FOR NSMI

- In the best of all possible worlds, with money being no object, how do you envision the NSMI operating? What will people's experience of it be like?
- What things will the NSMI do or enable that it currently doesn't?

## WRAP UP

- What, in your opinion, are the top 3 priorities for improving the NSMI?
- Is there anything we haven't covered today that we should?
- Thanks for your time. If there is anything you think of later that you'd like to add, please feel free to contact me.

## APPENDIX C—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: WEBSITE CONTENT MANAGERS

### INTRODUCTION

- Hi. I'm Fred Leise and I am a consultant working for Legal Services of South Central Michigan on a project studying the national subject matter index.
- I will be interviewing a number of people including opinion leaders, website content managers, case management intake users and case management software vendors, getting background information on the business context, users and content of the subject matter index.
- This interview should take about 45 minutes, but definitely no longer than one hour.
- In the first part of the interview I'll be getting background information about you and then we'll focus on your website and the national subject matter index: how you use it and your evaluations of it, including any changes that you would make to improve its usefulness.
- I can't promise any specific changes will be implemented based on our discussion today.
- Anything you say will be summarized and passed on anonymously; no specific information will be attributed to you. I'm really interested in getting your gut reactions to the questions I will be asking.
- While I have a set of prepared questions, please feel free to cover any information that you think is important and relevant.
- I will have you on speaker phone and will be taking notes as you talk. Again, that's only for my reference as I summarize my findings from the interviews.
- Do you have any questions?

### BACKGROUND

- Who do you work for?
- Tell me about what the organization does.
- What is your job title?
- What are your duties/job responsibilities?

#### WEBSITE/TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

- As a content manager you are responsible for a website. What is its URL?
- Tell me about the contents of the website.
- How often does the website change?
- How often do you add material to the website?
- I understand that you use one of the templates in preparing your website. Which one is that?
- What has been your experience using the template?
- What are some of the positive things about your website?
- What are some of the challenges the website faces?
- If you were to rate your website on a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent, what would your rating be?
- What are the top three changes you would make to your website to make it better?

#### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX OVERVIEW

- Tell me about how you use the index.
- What things do you will about it?/What does it do especially well?
- What problems does it have?
- How do these problems affect your job?
- Tell me about how the index works with the template.
- What do other people say about the usefulness of the national subject matter index?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent, how would you rate the national subject matter index?
- What are the top three changes you would make to the national subject matter index to make it more usable for you?

#### VISION FOR NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX

- In the best of all possible worlds, where money was no challenge, how would the national subject matter index work?
- What would it do for you that it doesn't now?

#### WRAP UP

- Is there anything we haven't covered today that we should?
- Thanks for your time. If there is anything you think of later that you'd like to add, please feel free to contact me.

## APPENDIX D—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: CASE MANAGEMENT INTAKE USERS

### INTRODUCTION

- Hi. I'm Fred Leise and I am a consultant working for Legal Services of South Central Michigan on a project studying the national subject matter index.
- I will be interviewing a number of people including opinion leaders, website content managers, case management intake users and case management software vendors, getting background information on the business context, users and content of the subject matter index.
- This interview should take about 45 minutes, but definitely no longer than one hour.
- In the first part of the interview I'll be getting background information about you and then we'll focus on your website and the national subject matter index: how you use it and your evaluations of it, including any changes that you would make to improve its usefulness.
- I can't promise any specific changes will be implemented based on our discussion today.
- Anything you say will be summarized and passed on anonymously; no specific information will be attributed to you. I'm really interested in getting your gut reactions to the questions I will be asking.
- While I have a set of prepared questions, please feel free to cover any information that you think is important and relevant.
- I will have you on speaker phone and will be taking notes as you talk. Again, that's only for my reference as I summarize my findings from the interviews.
- Do you have any questions?

### BACKGROUND

- Who do you work for?
- Tell me about what the organization does.
- What is your job title?
- What are your duties/job responsibilities?

#### CASE MANAGEMENT INTAKE QUESTIONS

- Tell me about the case management intake process.
- What tools (software and others) do you use during the process?
- What things to those tools do really well?
- If you could make three changes to make those tools better, what would those changes be?
- How would you rate those tools as they currently exist, on a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent?

#### NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX OVERVIEW

- Tell me about your project of incorporating the NSMI into the Kemps database.
- What challenges does the project face?
- How does the NSMI fit with your needs?
- What are the top three changes you would make to the NSMI to make it better?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent, how would you rate the national subject matter index in terms of its usability for case management/intake?

#### VISION FOR NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX

- In the best of all possible worlds, where money was no challenge, how would the national subject matter index work as part of your system?
- What would it do for you that it doesn't now?

#### WRAP UP

- Is there anything we haven't covered today that we should?
- Thanks for your time. If there is anything you think of later that you'd like to add, please feel free to contact me.

## APPENDIX E—INTERVIEW SCRIPT: CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE VENDORS

### INTRODUCTION

- Hi. I'm Fred Leise and I am a consultant working for Legal Services of South Central Michigan on a project studying the national subject matter index.
- I will be interviewing a number of people including opinion leaders, website content managers, case management intake users and case management software vendors, getting background information on the business context, users and content of the subject matter index.
- This interview should take about 45 minutes, but definitely no longer than one hour.
- In the first part of the interview I'll be getting background information about you and then we'll focus on your website and the national subject matter index: how you use it and your evaluations of it, including any changes that you would make to improve its usefulness.
- I can't promise any specific changes will be implemented based on our discussion today.
- Anything you say will be summarized and passed on anonymously; no specific information will be attributed to you. I'm really interested in getting your gut reactions to the questions I will be asking.
- While I have a set of prepared questions, please feel free to cover any information that you think is important and relevant.
- I will have you on speaker phone and will be taking notes as you talk. Again, that's only for my reference as I summarize my findings from the interviews.
- Do you have any questions?

### BACKGROUND

- Who do you work for?
- Tell me about what the organization does.
- What is your job title?
- What are your duties/job responsibilities?

CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE QUESTIONS

- What does your software do?
- How many systems is it implemented in?
- What does your software do really well?
- If you could make three changes to make those tools better, what would those changes be?
- How would you rate the software as it currently exists, on a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent?

NATIONAL SUBJECT MATTER INDEX

- What do you know about the National Subject Matter Index?
- What are its strengths and weaknesses?
- How would you rate the NSMI on a scale of 1 to 5, one being poor and five being excellent?
- What are the top 3 changes you would make to the NSMI to make it better?

WRAP UP

- Is there anything we haven't covered today that we should?
- Thanks for your time. If there is anything you think of later that you'd like to add, please feel free to contact me.

## APPENDIX F—INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SPREADSHEET: OPINION LEADERS

Opinion Leaders	About LSXML Group	What LSXML Group Does Well	Factors Affecting LSXML Group	Origins of NSMI	What NSMI Does Well
Interview 1	Legal services community isn't good at standards. Meets monthly by phone	Brainstorming uses for XML. Good at prioritizing. Good at finding resources. Developed XML schema for websites, case management systems	Funding. Without LSC funding and NSMI requirements, groups many not continue to use standards. Need to demonstrate value of NSMI	Created NSMI to encourage searching across state websites.	Does a good job of finer increments of problem codes. Allows people to share information.
Interview 2	Founded by legal services techies.	The one group that pulls everyone together.	Funding for cool pilot tests. Where do we go next?	IMAG group developed taxonomy for website content management. Based NSMI on Shriver Center's thesaurus of legal services terms	Easy to understand numbering system, tied to LSC problem codes. Not difficult to update.
Interview 3	No separate legal identity. Not really part of anything else. Unassociated organization of unassociated, interested individuals.	Provides forum for discussing issues of data sharing and interconnectivity not handled anywhere else.	Can we build a system providing useful info from the national level for advocates at the local level? Need to filter content. Need to get buy-in from field.	Small group talking about how to use technology to further work of LS community. Sharing of information surfaced. Needed common standard of identifying info. Core group listed everything we could think of. "Everything goes in."	

Interview 4		Promotes communication among folks building web-based technology.		Created to that content could be shared. Clear that individual sites could use index to organize content for both administrators and public. Create meaningful reporting on content being used.	
Interview 5	First task was developing NSMI. No paid staff. Primary index author is Gwen Daniels. Group is volunteers, including vendors.	Good at being a collaborative group. Good representation from key players.	Level to which get adoption of projects from the field. Sharing among websites hasn't happened yet. Funding is a large part. Depend on volunteers. No organization or staffing.	Need to code things in a consistent way if sharing will happen. Used in probably 25% of case management systems.	Gives organization of information, a place to start for sharing information among sites. It exists.

Opinion Leaders	Regular Review of NSMI	Factors Affecting NSMI	Rating of NSMI	Vision for NSMI	Other Issues?
Interview 1	No. Wanted to have revision every six months. Haven't been able to keep that schedule. People now adding their own codes; we're losing control of the index.	IF LSC no longer funds state websites, will they voluntarily use the NSMI?	4 out of 5. There are holes, but in general it's good. Process rated as 2.	Would have staff support, be proactive about filling holes, website for NSMI administration; get leverage with case management vendors. Could be used for RSS feeds	Do we let people use numbers on a temporary basis?

Interview 2	Not updated often. Problem gathering info from states for what they need. Form on tech.org for update requests.	Whether it is being used. So few people say we need things added; are they using it? Need better updating process.	3.5 out of 5	Used on advocate sites, tag content within CMS, used to share data between applications, sharing docs across websites, within case mgt systems. Automatic update process. Need way to support state-specific topics.	We don't know how other people are using it. Kaivo implements it one way, ProBonoNet implemented it another way. Kaivo has cross-referencing problems.
Interview 3	No review process, but everything continues to go in.	It is being used by state-wide websites. Next step is to actually use it to share information. Haven't seen the actual use of sharing info yet.	4, but could be better	We should be able to put lots of staff time to testing and working on the issues. Filtering so people get only the information they want, not get inundated with 50 motions to dismiss when you only need one.	Same subtopic name in multiple places, e.g., Administrative Hearings under both Social Security and Unemployment Compensation. Our database won't accept that, so we're having to make adjustments to NSMI. There are gaps. Elder law not robust. It needs overall review.
Interview 4		Need to articulate to the field what it is and why it is. Need actual projects of sharing content so people can see it working.	Rates it at 2; 4 for effort. It's a good effort, but it's a difficult thing to do. In the practical world, it's only operating at a 2.	What is right practice for updating index? Updated index shows relationship to old index, what was added, what changed into something else, what was dropped. Needs a change roadmap. It would have the confidence of the community and would capture the major work areas that people are engaged in. Needs to be dependable. Clear process for changes.	NSMI has all sorts of gaps. Problems with hierarchy. Problem of organizing content using NSMI. Content organization on site doesn't match NSMI. Problem of improper cross-references. Problem of public presentation of topics vs. NSMI. Index doesn't cover lots of content. Individual topic maps have diverged from NSMI.

Interview 5	Yes. Send emails to users, get feedback. Now doing another round of changes.	None of the codes apply to my site. We added a technology section. I haven't found the index to be effective. Problem codes aren't the way to organize content on my site. Different audiences think about information in different ways.	3.5. On the technology side, it's a 2.	Easy for content authors to find the area that would apply to content. They click and it's coded. A button for suggesting additions to a category. Feedback within 24 hours on the proposed change. NSMI would be managed automatically via a website. Would check each [state] website overnight to capture changes/ additions. Half-time person to promote index.	Need online NSMI management site. Should be put in database form. Needs a better technology size; better way to update the index.
			Average (index): 3.4		
			Average (operations): 2		

## APPENDIX G—INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SPREADSHEET: WEBSITE CONTENT MANAGERS

Web Content Managers	Website Used	Template	Website Updates	Use of NSMI	NSMI Problems
Interview 1	Kaivo		On a piecemeal basis.	Built into Kaivo. It's a great starting spot, but I tweak it.	Has added folders and changed names, e.g., Spouse Abuse changed to Domestic Violence.
Interview 2	Kaivo		A series of state task forces reviews material yearly. Additional material added when change in laws or new practice area developed, when there is a client need.	For tagging content.	It tries to be objective, but is subjective. We had to create our own [index codes] for state material. There was nothing titled "Public Benefits." Inconsistencies: generic number for Housing, no generic number for Benefits. Not clear on civil procedure information. Not sure what to do with our pleadings bank.
Interview 3	Customized template		Continual updates.	All content tagged.	N/A
Interview 4	ProBonoNet		N/A	Index codes assigned to topics and subtopics.	Difficult working with national index and finding codes. Sometimes codes don't exist at all. Sometimes level of detail wasn't there. Sometimes I needed a broader topic. I don't know how NSMI gets updated. There are gaps in it.
Interview 5	Moving to content management system.		Continual updates.	Index many of the materials I post, all of the cases we post.	Difficult to use in online format. Sometimes it goes too deep. Should be simpler.

Interview 6	LawHelp template; ProBonoNet template	Daily changes.	To tag all content.	Hasn't been adapted to most recent legal developments; things don't really fit. NSMI is more detailed than what we need. Emerging issues not recognized. Public benefits area: in NSMI, still listed as Welfare. People don't use that term any more. State programs don't fit anywhere. We have a program that is state health insurance and benefits for low-income people. Not medical assistance, not just health insurance. Not Medicare. States have different programs.
Interview 7	Kaivo	N/A	Added codes to our original brochures.	Sometimes we have altered the last two digits to meet our needs. I have no access to coding being used in another state.
Interview 8	ProBonoNet	Added to all the time. Now working to translate entire site into Spanish.	NSMI is the backbone of our topics and subtopics. Everything is assigned a problem code.	NSMI was very narrow, didn't cover a lot of the topics I wanted. Much is keyed to "Other." Codes were created for attorneys for billing; that doesn't match how clients view subjects. Public doesn't know "Consumer Law" but they do know "Bankruptcy and Fraud." Public things about "a problem with my car" then car insurance or traffic ticket or defrauding for repair bill. Needs a topic called "Cars." We had a wills and estates seminar and coded it there, but in calendar it shows up as "Disability Rights" problem code. How did it get there?

Web Content Managers	Top 3 Changes to NSMI			
	Rating of NSMI	NSMI Vision	Changes to NSMI	Other Issues
Interview 1	Rates it a 3.	My focus is on the content, not NSMI	More specificity in subcategories. Sometimes it's too specific. Spouse Abuse was too specific. Sometimes we deal with non-spousal abuse.	Add a major category for General Pleadings.
Interview 2	Rates it a 3.	It takes a lot of time. Not always relevant. Not clear to me what proper coding is.	Problem of relating organization of statewide law to national index.	Ability to look at what different state programs are, find similarities, then index appropriately so everyone on same page with terminology. Index is someone else's way of viewing material, not mine. Not sure how it was put together. They need more input into how they come up with codes.
Interview 3	N/A	N/A	Ability to expand and do that sooner than every five years. Needs centralized place for people to go and add things. We use this every day. Take to people who use the index.	Not comprehensive enough. Nothing for Traffic Court or Traffic issues. We don't use "other." That doesn't mean anything to our clients. Needs more specificity, more categories, more places to add codes.
Interview 4	Rates it a 3.	N/A	Add codes to health section. Have someone review it regularly. Have subject matter expert committee look at it. A feedback loop, a way for people on the ground to suggest changes.	N/A

Interview 5	Rates it a 3.	N/A	Simplify it, maximum of 3 levels. Needs more internal integrity; now duplication of substantive ideas.	Not sure how often index is updated. Needs to be a mechanism for updating it as law evolves. Reviewed at least annually. Not sure how it works on a state level.
Interview 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	Subject matter experts should have input into index. Problem of cross references that are inappropriate: Taxes area is underdeveloped. Need to bring it up to date and keep them up to date, being flexible. Ability for people to have input.
Interview 7	Rates it a 3.5	N/A	A definition of where they came up with the codes. Where does 20 come from: legal as well as criminal? I'd like the "keys to the system."	Home Repairs under Home Ownership. Financing under Home Ownership. We built the codes for that. We haven't shared the codes, only built them within our system. Who is responsible for maintaining it? Need annual discussions on the index, seeking input of people. Tell us what changes you have made. I'm not seeing much on gay rights. That's an issue in some states. Should be some way we can get changes to it. The copy I printed doesn't have a date.

Interview 8	Rates it a 2.	Expand problem codes to all my topics and subtopics. Especially important for advocate websites; they can benefit from expertise of national support centers. Need a national clearinghouse for sharing. I have to search the 10 support websites. Lots of statewide websites. I have to figure out what is new, download it and post it on my site. Different support centers don't talk with one another. New information would appear in the right folder. Need to have a comprehensive NSMI and educate everyone about how to use it.	N/A	I find something vaguely related, then code "Other." I can't share improvements to the index that other states have made.
Average (index): 2.9				

## APPENDIX H—KAIVO STATEWIDE WEB SITE, OPEN SOURCE TEMPLATE— TOPICS LIST

Consumer	1090000
Automobile	1090100
Bankruptcy	1010000
Consumer Laws	1030300
Debt and Debt Collection	1020100
Home Purchase, Improvement and Foreclosure	1620900
Payday Lenders	1090001
Phone and Utilities	1070800
Small Claims Court	1090200
Sweepstakes and Prizes	1090002
Student Loans	1060402
Disability Rights	1370100
Education	1110000
General	1110099
Rights Discipline, Suspension or Expulsion	1110300
Special Education	1111300
Student Loans	1060402
Employment	1290000
Criminal Records	1290200
Discrimination	1210500
If You Lose Your Job	1291500
Work Support	1760000
Work Support (new)	1760001
Family Law	1390000
Adoption	1300100
Child Custody	1310100
Child Support	1380100
Divorce	1320200
Miscellaneous	1390099
Paternity	1360100
Spousal Support	1320300
Visitation	1310200
Health Care	1590000

Advanced Directives	1330700
General	1590099
Healthy Start	1593200
Home and Long Term Care	1591901
Medicaid	1510100
Medicare	1520100
Nursing Homes	1591900
Housing	1690000
Court Forms	1690001
Evictions	1630300
Landlord/Tenant	1630100
Lead Paint	1591500
Mobile Home Parks	1091400
Public Benefits	1710000
Disability Assistance	1840000
Earned Income Tax Credit	1290600
Food Stamps	1730100
Ohio Works First	1710001
Prevention, Retention and Contingency (PRC)	1714600
Social Security	1740000
Unemployment Compensation	1760000
Veterans Benefits	1770300
WIC	1710200
Your Rights	1890000
Elder Law	2120000
Abuse/Domestic Violence	2120199
Credit	1091100
Discrimination	2120100
General	2120000
Health Benefits	2120001
Social Security Benefits	1740100
Criminal Law	--
ProBonoNet	2011800