COURSE MANUAL

Name of the Elective Course: LegalTech & GovTech Studio

Course Code:

Name of the responsible Faculty Instructor:
Prof. Spriha Bhandari

FALL 2026
(AY2026-27)

This document is prepared by the course instructor and contains basic information relevant to the execution of the course. It is the official record for all intends and purposes as far the elective course, *LegalTech & GovTech Studio*, is concerned.

This course manual can be used as a general guide to the subject. However, the instructor can modify, extend or supplement the course (without tampering its basic framework and objectives) for the effective and efficient delivery of the course. The instructor will provide students with reasons for such changes.

Part I

Course Title: **LegalTech & GovTech Studio**
Course Code:
Course Duration: **One Semester (14 Weeks)**
No. of Credit Units: 4 **Credits**
Level: **Both**
Medium of Instruction: **English**
Pre-requisites (if applicable): None
Equivalent Courses: N/A

Part II

1. Acknowledgement of Course Ideators

This course has been conceptualized and designed by Prof. Spriha Bhandari, drawing on her work in legal tech and gov tech, design and innovation.

2. Course Description

LegalTech and GovTech Studio is a practice-oriented elective that introduces students to the design, development and evaluation of technology-enabled interventions in legal, justice, compliance and government systems. The course begins from the premise that many legal and public systems are experienced by users as slow, confusing, opaque, exclusionary or difficult to navigate. It asks students to move beyond treating law and governance as fixed institutional structures, and instead to examine them as lived systems made up of users, rules, forms, documents, data, interfaces, institutions, workflows and points of failure.

The course is structured as a studio, where students will learn by analysing real systems, identifying meaningful problems, mapping user journeys, building service blueprints, designing interventions, testing prototypes and receiving feedback. The course will introduce students to the fields of LegalTech and GovTech, including tools and systems used in legal research, legal operations, court administration, access to justice, dispute resolution, compliance, public service delivery, digital public infrastructure and government-facing citizen services. Indian and comparative case studies will be used to help students understand how technology can improve service delivery, but also how poorly designed technology can reproduce or accelerate broken processes.

The course is structured in three parts. The first part focuses on problem discovery and diagnosis. Students identify a real legal, justice, compliance or public service problem and examine it through user research, stakeholder mapping, user journey mapping and service blueprinting. The second part focuses on intervention design. Students translate their diagnosis into a realistic LegalTech or GovTech prototype, using appropriate no-code or low-code tools, and present the prototype through a structured pitch with external practitioners on the jury. The third part shifts students from builders to evaluators. Students develop and apply a LegalTech and GovTech Service Evaluation Matrix to assess whether an existing solution solves the right problem, serves the right users, fits the institutional context, manages legal and data risks, and creates meaningful public or legal value.

By the end of the course, students will be able to analyse legal and government systems with a user-centred and systems-oriented lens, design grounded interventions, communicate solution logic to relevant stakeholders, and critically evaluate technology-enabled services in law and governance. The course is intended for students who are interested in legal innovation, legal design, legal engineering, access to justice, public

service design, technology policy, digital government, legal entrepreneurship and institutional reform. No prior technical knowledge is required.

3. Course Aims

The course aims to:

a. Introduce students to LegalTech and GovTech as fields concerned with the redesign of legal, justice, compliance and public service systems and enable students to examine law and governance as lived systems made up of users, institutions, rules, documents, data, interfaces, workflows, incentives and points of failure.
b. Equip students with methods to identify, diagnose and frame real problems in legal and government services through user-centred and systems-oriented analysis.
c. Train students to design and prototype realistic LegalTech and GovTech interventions that respond to user needs, legal context and institutional feasibility.
d. Develop students' ability to critically evaluate LegalTech and GovTech services in terms of problem fit, user fit, system fit, legal and governance fit, data and risk implications, accessibility, institutional feasibility and public value.
e. Cultivate a responsible innovation mindset that recognises that technology should improve access, clarity, dignity, efficiency, accountability and public value, rather than merely digitise broken processes.

4. Teaching Methodology

The course will be taught through a studio-based methodology that combines conceptual instruction, case analysis, design exercises, prototyping labs, peer critique and structured evaluation. The emphasis will be on learning by doing, while ensuring that all practical work is grounded in legal, institutional, technological and public service contexts. This is consistent with the course's assessment structure, where students first diagnose a real system through IA 1, then design and pitch an intervention through IA 2, and finally evaluate a new system or existing solution in the end-semester examination.

5. Intended Learning Outcomes

Course Intended Learning Outcomes	Weightage in %	Teaching and Learning Activities	Assessment Tasks/ Activities
Explain the scope, purpose and distinctions between LegalTech, JusticeTech and GovTech, and distinguish between digitisation, automation, redesign and	10	Concept briefings, case discussions, Indian and comparative case studies, classroom analysis of legal and government service interactions.	IA 1 and end-semester examination.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes	Weightage in %	Teaching and Learning Activities	Assessment Tasks/ Activities
transformation in legal and public service systems.			
Diagnose real problems in legal, justice, compliance and government service systems by identifying users, stakeholders, pain points, root causes, institutional constraints and system boundaries.	15	Problem discovery studio, stakeholder mapping, user research exercises, problem-framing workshops, peer critique and instructor feedback.	IA 1
Apply user journey mapping and service blueprinting methods to understand how users move through legal and government systems, and how visible and invisible institutional processes shape their experience.	20	Journey mapping labs, service blueprinting labs, case autopsies, analysis of forms, portals, workflows, documents, handoffs and backstage processes.	IA 1: Problem Sprint
Design and prototype a realistic LegalTech or GovTech intervention that responds directly to a diagnosed problem and reflects user needs, legal context, implementation logic and institutional feasibility.	35	Prototyping labs, no-code tool demonstrations, UX and plain-language design exercises, testing labs, iteration workshops and pitch preparation.	IA 2: Prototype and Pitch
Critically evaluate existing LegalTech and GovTech services using a structured evaluation matrix covering problem fit, user fit, journey fit, system fit, legal and governance fit, data and risk fit, accessibility, institutional feasibility, public value and unintended consequences.	20	Evaluation Studio, matrix-building exercises, critique of existing LegalTech/GovTech services, case-based discussions and application of evaluation criteria.	End-Semester Examination

6. Grading of Student Achievement

To pass this course, students shall obtain a minimum of 40% in the cumulative aspects of coursework, i.e., internal assessments (including moot court, mid-term exam,

presentations, research paper) and the end term examination. Internal assessments shall carry a total of 70 marks. **End of semester exam shall carry 30 marks out of which students have to obtain a minimum of 30% marks to fulfil the requirement of passing the course.**

The details of the grades as well as the criteria for awarding such grades are provided below:

PERCENTAGE OF MARKS	GRADE	GRADE VALUE	GRADE DESCRIPTION
80 and above	O	8	**Outstanding** – Exceptional knowledge of the subject matter, thorough understanding of issues; ability to synthesize ideas, rules and principles and extraordinary critical and analytical ability
75 – 79	A+	7.5	**Excellent** - Sound knowledge of the subject matter, thorough understanding of issues; ability to synthesize ideas, rules and principles and critical and analytical ability
70 – 74	A	7	**Very Good** - Sound knowledge of the subject matter, excellent organizational capacity, ability to synthesize ideas, rules and principles, critically analyze existing materials and originality in thinking and presentation
65 – 69	A-	6	**Good** - Good understanding of the subject matter, ability to identify issues and provide balanced solutions to problems and good critical and analytical skills
60 – 64	B+	5	**Fair** – Average understanding of the subject matter, limited ability to identify issues and provide solutions to problems and reasonable critical and analytical skills
55 – 59	B	4	**Acceptable** - Adequate knowledge of the subject matter to go to the next level of study and reasonable critical and analytical skills.

PERCENTAGE OF MARKS	GRADE	GRADE VALUE	GRADE DESCRIPTION
50 – 54	B-	3	**Marginal** - Limited knowledge of the subject matter and irrelevant use of materials and, poor critical and analytical skills
45 – 49	P1	2	**Pass 1** – Pass with basic understanding of the subject matter
40 – 44	P2	1	**Pass 2** – Pass with rudimentary understanding of the subject matter
Below 40	F	0	**Fail** - Poor comprehension of the subject matter; poor critical and analytical skills and marginal use of the relevant materials. Will require repeating the course
Incomplete	I	0	**Incomplete** - "Extenuating circumstances" preventing the student from taking the end-semester, or re-sit, examination as the case may be; the Vice Dean (Examinations) at their discretion assign the "I" grade. If an "I" grade is assigned, the student would appear for the end-semester, or re-sit examination, as the case may be, as and when the subsequent opportunity is provided by the University.

7. Criteria for Student Assessments

Assessment of the participants will be based on the following criteria. If a student is granted an approved accommodation for missing an internal assessment, the alternative assessment will be a 35 marks written case-based innovation critique paper of equivalent difficulty, as determined by the course instructor in accordance with applicable policies.

Assessment	Weightage	Remarks
IA 1: Problem Sprint	35	Diagnose a real legal, justice, compliance, or government service problem through user journey mapping and service blueprinting. **Deliverable:** Problem statement, stakeholder map, user journey map, pain-point analysis, and service blueprint.

Assessment	Weightage	Remarks
		Grading Criteria: Problem identification and relevance: 7 User and stakeholder understanding: 7 User journey mapping: 7 Service blueprinting: 7 Clarity, evidence, and presentation: 7
IA 2: Prototype and Pitch	35	Build and present a realistic LegalTech or GovTech intervention that directly responds to the problem diagnosed in IA 1. **Deliverable:** Prototype, demo, pitch deck, implementation logic, and adoption/reflection note. Grading Criteria: Link between problem and solution: 7 Prototype quality and usability: 8 Legal, governance, and implementation fit: 7 Innovation value and impact: 6 Pitch, demo, and communication: 7
Alternate Assessment	35	Written Case Based innovation critique paper
End Semester Examination (Compulsory)	30 Marks	There will be a compulsory end-semester examination/component for all participants of the course who have successfully met the requisite attendance as per the governing JGU policies. Students will be required to analyse a new system or existing solution and assess whether it actually solves the right problem.

Part III

Course/Class Policies

Cell Phones, Laptops and Similar Gadgets

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Learning and knowledge production of any kind is a collaborative process. Collaboration demands an ethical responsibility to acknowledge who we have learnt from, what we have

learned, and how reading and learning from others have helped us shape our own ideas. Even our own ideas demand an acknowledgement of the sources and processes through which those ideas have emerged. Thus, all ideas must be supported by citations. All ideas borrowed from articles, books, journals, magazines, case laws, statutes, photographs, films, paintings, etc., in print or online, must be credited with the original source. If the source or inspiration of your idea is a friend, a casual chat, something that you overheard, or heard being discussed at a conference or in class, even they must be duly credited. If you paraphrase or directly quote from a web source in the examination, presentation or essays, the source must be acknowledged. The university has a framework to deal with cases of plagiarism. All form of plagiarism will be taken seriously by the University and prescribed sanctions will be imposed on those who commit plagiarism.

Disability Support and Accommodation Requirements

JGU endeavours to make all its courses inclusive and accessible to students with different abilities. In accordance with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), the JGU Disability Support Committee (DSC) has identified conditions that could hinder a student's overall well-being. These include physical and mobility related difficulties, visual and hearing impairment, mental health conditions and intellectual/learning difficulties e.g., dyslexia, dyscalculia. Students with any known disability needing academic and other support are required to register with the Disability Support Committee (DSC) by following the procedure specified at https://jgu.edu.in/disability-support-committee/

Students who need support may register before the deadline for registration ends, as communicated by the DSC via email each semester. Those students who wish to continue receiving support from the previous semester, must re-register every semester prior to the deadline for re-registration as communicated by the DSC via email. Last minute registrations and support are discouraged and might not be possible as sufficient time is required to make the arrangements for support.

The DSC maintains strict confidentiality about the identity of the student and the nature of their disability and the same is requested from faculty members and staff as well. The DSC takes a strong stance against in-class and out-of-class references made about a student's disability without their consent and disrespectful comments referring to a student's disability. With due respect for confidentiality, faculty and students are encouraged to have honest conversations about the needs of students with disabilities and to discuss how a course may be better tailored to cater to a student with disability.

All general queries are to be addressed to disabilitysupportcommittee@jgu.edu.in

Safe Space Pledge

This course may discuss a range of issues and events that might result in distress for some students. Discussions in the course might also provoke strong emotional responses. To make sure that all students collectively benefit from the course, and do not feel disturbed due to either the content of the course or the conduct of the discussions. Therefore, it is incumbent upon all within the classroom to pledge to maintain respect towards our peers. This does not mean that you need to feel restrained about what you feel and what you want to say. Conversely, this is about creating a safe space where everyone can speak and learn without inhibitions and fear. This responsibility lies not only with students, but also with the instructor.

P.S. The course instructor, as part of introducing the course manual, will discuss the scope of the Safe Space Pledge with the class.

Part IV

Keywords Syllabus

Legal Innovation, Legal Tech, GovTech, Service Design, Design Thinking, Prototyping, No-Code Tools, User Experience, Innovation Pitching, Entrepreneurship in Law

Course Design and Overview (Weekly Plan)

Week	Topics and Description	Reading/Course Materials (Tentative)
1.	**Framing: The System is the Problem** • Course orientation, manual walkthrough, IA structure, end-term structure, attendance, AI use policy, work product expectations, tool stack overview, studio etiquette. • Legal and government systems as lived experiences. Delay, confusion, cost, opacity, exclusion, dependency and fear	1. Engstrom, David Freeman, ed. 2023. Legal Tech and the Future of Civil Justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Open access edition. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/legal-tech-and-the-future-of-civil-justice/B314D47188D0446A9B96D4D475C5A560 2. Margaret Hagan, "Legal Design as a Thing: A Theory of Change and a Set of Methods to Craft a Human-Centered Legal System," Design Issues 36, no. 3, 2020, pp. 3–15.

	as system failures. Law and governance as services, not only as rules or institutions. • What LegalTech and GovTech are, what they share, where they differ. • The difference between digitisation, automation, redesign and transformation. When technology makes broken systems faster but not better. Examples from government websites, forms and grievance systems. • Students map one frustrating legal or government interaction from memory.	3. GOV.UK Service Standard, Point 2, "Solve a whole problem for users." https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/service-standard/point-2-solve-a-whole-problem
2.	**Mapping the Field: LegalTech:** Legal research tools, contract automation, document automation, e-discovery, litigation support, legal operations, court technology, legal aid tools and ODR; legal research tools, court portals, dispute resolution tools; Access to justice tools, legal help AI, intake systems, triage tools. eCourts Phase III as an Indian anchor; courts as service systems; e-filing, cause lists, virtual hearings, case status, paperless courts, access and inclusion. eCourts Phase III expressly speaks of justice as a service and of moving beyond merely replicating offline processes digitally. **Mapping the Field: GovTech and Digital Public Infrastructure:** Digital public services, citizen-facing platforms, identity, verification, payments, public dashboards, grievance systems and welfare delivery.	1. eCommittee, Supreme Court of India. 2022. Vision Document for Phase III of eCourts Project. New Delhi: Supreme Court of India. https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/document/vision-document-for-phase-iii-of-ecourts-project/ 2. World Bank, Digital Public Infrastructure and Development: A World Bank Group Approach, 2025. 3. World Bank. 2025. GovTech Maturity Index 2025 Update. 4. OECD, Good Practice Principles for Public Service Design and Delivery in the Digital Age

	DPI, document wallets, integrated service access, government websites and apps, accessibility, usability, security and inclusion. DigiLocker, a secure cloud-based platform for storage, sharing and verification of documents, GIGW: guide the lifecycle of government websites and apps. Lessons from Digital India, UK GDS, Estonia, Singapore and other public innovation models	
5.	**Finding a Real Problem** How to identify a real legal, justice, compliance or government services problem; Difference between symptoms, root causes, user pain points and institutional constraints; **Problem Boundaries and System Boundaries**: Who is affected, where the system begins and ends, what is in scope, what is outside scope, and what cannot be solved by a student prototype. **Problem Selection Studio** Students bring possible problem areas Testing whether the problem is real, specific, researchable and suitable for intervention **Framing the Problem** Problem statements, "How Might We" questions and scope definition; Moving from broad complaint to precise design challenge **Users, Stakeholders and Institutions** Identifying users, affected persons, decision-makers, gatekeepers and intermediaries; Stakeholder maps, incentives, power, constraints and hidden actors	1. GOV.UK Service Manual, "How the discovery phase works." 2. IDEO.org. 2015. The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design. San Francisco: IDEO.org. Read the Inspiration phase methods, especially "Frame Your Design Challenge," "Define Your Audience," and "Stakeholder Mapping." https://unosd.un.org/sites/unosd.un.org/files/ideo_field_guide_to_human-centered_design.pdf 3. John M. Bryson, "What to Do When Stakeholders Matter: Stakeholder Identification and Analysis Techniques," Public Management Review 6, no. 1, 2004. 4. Nielsen Norman Group. 2025. "How to Use How-Might-We Questions to Generate Solutions." Updated 2025. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/how-might-we-questions/ 5. World Bank Group, Public-Private Dialogue Stakeholder Mapping Toolkit, 2016.

	Stakeholder Power and Incentive Mapping: Incentives, constraints, bottlenecks, institutional habits, informal workarounds and hidden dependencies; students create a first stakeholder map for their IA1 problem.	
6.	**User Research in Legal and Public Systems** Interviews, observation, secondary research, document review and ethical listening; How to avoid assuming the problem before understanding the user journey What counts as evidence in a studio course; how to use observations, public documents, screenshots, forms, user accounts, policy documents, statutes and institutional process notes. **Journey Mapping** What is a user journey map? Stages, touchpoints, emotions, pain points; Mapping how a person moves through a legal or government system; Delay, cost, confusion, exclusion, fear, dependency and information gaps **Studio lab: first draft of user journey map**	1. Nielsen Norman Group. 2023. "Journey Mapping 101." Updated June 25, 2023. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/journey-mapping-101/ 2. IDEO.org. 2015. The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design. Read the Inspiration phase methods on Interview, Group Interview and Expert Interview. Free PDF at https://unosd.un.org/sites/unosd.un.org/files/ideo_field_guide_to_human-centered_design.pdf 3. Hagan, Margaret. 2019. "Participatory Design for Innovation in Access to Justice." Daedalus 148 (1): 120–27. Open access PDF: https://www.amacad.org/sites/default/files/publication/downloads/19_Winter_Daedalus_Hagan.pdf 4. UK Central Digital and Data Office. n.d. "Service Manual" and "Service Standard." Government Digital Service. https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/service-standard
7.	**Service Blueprinting** Frontstage and backstage systems, people, documents, rules, data and handoffs; How service blueprints reveal what users cannot see; Mapping institutional workflows and operational failures **Studio lab:** first draft of service blueprint	1. Gibbons, Sarah. 2017 (updated 2024). "Service Blueprints: Definition." Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/service-blueprints-definition/ 2. Nielsen Norman Group. 2022 (updated 2024). “Service Design: Study Guide.” https://www.nngroup.com/articles/service-design-study-guide/ 3. Nielsen Norman Group. 2024. "Service Blueprinting: A Digital Template."

	IA 1: Problem Sprint Presentations Student presentations of problem statement and user journey; Student presentations of service blueprint and diagnostic findings	https://www.nngroup.com/articles/service-blueprinting-template/ 4. World Justice Project. 2025. "Atlas of Legal Needs Surveys." https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/atlas-legal-needs-surveys
8.	**From Diagnosis to Intervention** How to move from problem analysis to solution logic; Moving from "this is broken" to "what kind of intervention is appropriate"; information intervention, form redesign, workflow redesign, triage, automation, dashboard, chatbot, repository, checklist, decision tree or policy/process change. **Problem-Solution Fit:** Why not every problem needs an app; avoiding solutionism, overbuilding and performative innovation; matching the intervention to the journey breakdown and service blueprint failure point. **UX and Interaction Design for Legal and Gov Systems** Clarity, usability, plain language, navigation, trust and accessibility; Designing for stressed, vulnerable, time-poor or low-literacy users; Designing for stressed, vulnerable, time-poor, low-literacy, non-expert and first-time users; trust, clarity, sequence and cognitive load. **Plain Language and Legal Information Design:** Notices, forms, FAQs, legal rights explanations, procedural guidance, chatbot answers and document instructions as interfaces. **Accessibility, Inclusion and Assisted Digital Access:** GIGW	1. Hagan, Margaret. 2021. "Prototyping for Policy." In Legal Design: Integrating Business, Design and Legal Thinking with Technology, edited by Marcelo Corrales Compagnucci, Helena Haapio, Margaret Hagan and Michael Doherty, 9–31. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. Open access through Stanford Legal Design Lab reading list: https://www.legaltechdesign.com/reading-list-on-legal-design/ 2. Nielsen, Jakob. 1994 (updated January 30, 2024). "10 Usability Heuristics for User Interface Design." Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/ 3. National Informatics Centre. N.d. "New Features of GIGW 3.0." Government of India. https://guidelines.india.gov.in/new-features-of-gigw-3-0/ 4. Plain Language Action and Information Network (PLAIN). 2011. Federal Plain Language Guidelines. May 2011. Archived at the Center for Plain Language. https://centerforplainlanguage.org/learning-training/tools-training/ 5. Nielsen Norman Group. 2025. "How to Conduct Usability Studies for Accessibility." https://www.nngroup.com/articles/usability-testing-accessibility/ 6. GOV.UK Service Manual, "How the alpha phase works." 7. MeitY/NeGD, User Experience Handbook, UX4G. 8. Stanford Legal Design Lab, "Court Forms Evaluation & Design Guide."

	3.0, accessibility, multilingual access, mobile-first realities, disability access, assisted access and offline-online hybridity.	
9.	**Data in LegalTech and GovTech Systems:** What data is collected, from whom, for what purpose, where it flows, who verifies it, who accesses it, how it is stored and when it should be deleted. **Privacy, Confidentiality and Data Protection:** DPDP concerns, professional responsibility, confidentiality, consent, purpose limitation, data minimisation and risk in legal/public service tools. **AI, Automation and Human Oversight:** AI-assisted legal information, classification, triage, drafting, summarisation, eligibility screening, risk scoring and workflow automation.	1. NITI Aayog. 2021. Approach Document for India, Part 1: Principles for Responsible AI. New Delhi: NITI Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2021-02/Responsible-AI-22022021.pdf 2. NITI Aayog. 2021. Approach Document for India, Part 2: Operationalizing Principles for Responsible AI. New Delhi: NITI Aayog. https://niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2021-08/Part2-Responsible-AI-12082021.pdf
10.	**Tool Choice and Tech Stack Thinking:** Figma, Miro, Lovable, Landbot, Google Forms, Airtable, Cursor, Replit and spreadsheets; choosing a tool based on the problem, user, data, risk and implementation context. **Prototype Lab:** What Counts as a Prototype? Paper prototypes, clickable prototypes, chatbot flows, workflow maps, decision trees, dashboards, repositories, forms and assisted-service mockups. Building the first version of the prototype	1. IDEO.org Design Kit, “Methods.”

11.	**Prototype Lab** Instructor feedback and peer critique **Testing Lab:** **Testing Methods for Law and Governance Prototypes:** Usability testing, role-play testing, scenario testing, expert review, assumption testing and task completion testing. Students test prototypes using short user scenarios; identify confusion points, missing information, unrealistic assumptions, risk and friction. Iterating the prototype based on feedback	1. Nielsen, Jakob. 2000 (updated). "Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users." Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/why-you-only-need-to-test-with-5-users/ 2. Nesta/DIY Toolkit, "Prototype Testing Plan."
12.	**Iteration and Pitch Architecture:** Students revise the prototype and prepare the pitch narrative: problem, user, system failure, solution, demo, impact, implementation, limitations and next steps. **IA 2: Prototype and Pitch** **Pitching LegalTech and GovTech** Student prototype demos and pitch presentations	1. Federal News Network. 2025. "How Healthcare.gov's Botched Rollout Led to a Digital Services Revolution in Government." July. https://federalnewsnetwork.com/technology-main/2025/07/how-healthcare-gov-botched-rollout-led-to-a-digital-services-revolution-in-government/
13.	**Evaluating Existing Solutions** Why evaluation matters after prototyping; difference between building a prototype and evaluating a real service; what makes LegalTech/GovTech evaluation different from ordinary product review; user value, public value, legal fit, system fit and institutional fit. What Problem Does the Service Claim to Solve? Who Is the Service Actually For? Does It Fit the User Journey?	1. GOV.UK Service Manual, "Service assessments and applying the Service Standard." 2. OECD, Enabling Digital Innovation in Government: The OECD GovTech Policy Framework, 2024. 3. NIST, Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework 1.0, 2023 4. HM Treasury, "Green Book Supplementary Guidance: Use of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis in Options Appraisal," 2024.

	Implementation and Adoption Logic: Who will own the tool, who will maintain it, who must approve it, how users will find it, how it fits existing workflows and what institutional resistance may arise. **Evaluation Matrix:** **Does It Understand the System Behind the Screen?** Legal, Regulatory and Procedural Fit Data, AI and Risk Fit Can the Institution Actually Adopt It? Accessibility, Inclusion and Trust; Public Value and Impact; Failure Modes and Unintended Consequences **Building the Final Evaluation Matrix** Consolidating criteria, refining questions, assigning weights, deciding scoring levels and creating a reusable evaluation matrix for LegalTech and GovTech services. **Careers in Legal Innovation & GovTech** Pathways to entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship.	
14.	**REVISION WEEK** [NOTE: There shall be teaching classes scheduled during the fourteenth week subject to the JGU Academic Calendar circulated by the Office of the Registrar, JGU and any official declaration of non-working days by the JGU Registrar.]	