A State Judicial Institute

Faculty research brief

Course: February 2027 • Faculty meeting: September 2026

The proposed lab can compare Claude, Gemini, and ChatGPT at free and paid levels under the guidance a staff member presented at A State Judicial Institute All Hands. The useful question for Friday is what judges should learn from that comparison.

This brief brings the Maryland sources alongside the decisions they can help us make. Use it with the working skeleton. The source notes distinguish the August institutional materials from public sources checked in September 2026.

Reading route

1. Tools and institutional guidance
Policy, platform guides, and AIDA.

2. What the lab should reveal
The two faculty proposals and a fair comparison.

3. Rules and a federal filing example
Dated rulemaking status and the actual federal order.

4. Access to expertise
The AI Evidence Clinic statute and the implementation question.

5. Article review and follow-through
A finite author ask and the remaining preparation work.

Three decisions to bring to Friday

- What should a judge actually do during each proposed activity?
- Does the free/paid comparison teach a distinct access lesson, or should it be part of the judicial-use workshop?
- Which article passages belong in live discussion, and which can remain reading?

Source for the lab's planning basis: the staff member's A State Judicial Institute All Hands guidance, as reported in Alexander Karsh's September 2026 confirmation. The original presentation notes are not reproduced here.

Back to reading route

1. Tools and institutional guidance

The institutional guidance supports developing the three-model lab for February. Preparation can now focus on account tiers, the current settings instructions, appropriate classroom inputs, and a rehearsal.

What the recovered policy supplies

Source point	Use in preparation
Judicial coverage	The policy's employee definition expressly includes justices, judges, and magistrates. See §§III–IV.
Approved tools	The August appendix lists AIDA, ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot, and Gemini. All Hands guidance is the planning basis for the proposed three-model comparison.
AIDA preference	Section VI prefers AIDA for uses it supports and preserves use of approved external tools when convenient or necessary.
Input and output controls	Sections VII–IX address restricted inputs and qualified-human verification. Build the selected task around the applicable instructions and a visible review step.

Source date: the public Employee Handbook identifies §9.7 with a July 2026 revision. The full policy used here is the copy reproduced in the August 2026 binder, source pages 1–8, binder pages 12–19. The live CourtNet copy was not retrieved for this brief.

Settings and AIDA reference material

The binder retains the ChatGPT guide on pages 23–34 and the distinct nine-page Claude guide on pages 36–44. Use the current editions for the actual setup. Recover the Gemini guidance from the All Hands materials as part of that preparation. A privacy setting should be described by what its instructions say; it should not become a promise of zero retention.

The copied "Using AIDA" training excerpt expands the name as Artificial Intelligence Digital Assistant and names [illegible] CourtNet, People's Law Library, and Westlaw. It does not establish a model/vendor, update cadence, or universal account access. The excerpt was uploaded in August 2026 and is incomplete.

Faculty choice: Which supported task should AIDA illustrate, if it is included, and what output should participants inspect?

Alexander Karsh's preparation: Collect the current setup instructions, arrange the chosen accounts, and test the selected task with the activity lead.

Sources: CourtNet AI hub • Employee Handbook §9.7 • August source copy and guides • Training excerpts

Back to reading route

2. What the lab should reveal

The working notes contain two useful purposes. Keeping them visible should help us decide whether they need separate activities or two rounds of one exercise.

Faculty proposal in the working record	Decision for Friday
Judicial-use workshop, attributed to a faculty member: settings, prompts, a familiar opinion, and critique of the output.	Choose the participant action that matters most: configure, compare prompts, verify sources, or critique the result.
Access comparison, attributed to a faculty member with a justice's support: one problem and prompt across different tools or account arrangements.	Choose the access question and what participants should conclude from the observed differences.

These are planning paraphrases from the August skeletons, not direct quotations or a settled exercise assignment.

A small comparison record

For faculty review: use a shared source packet and record the conditions beside each saved output. This would make the debrief easier to assess without turning the class into a product ranking.

Record	Why keep it beside the output
Run date, tool, model label, account tier	Makes the example identifiable when products or account features change.
Prompt and supplied source material	Shows what each tool was actually asked and given.
Enabled search, retrieval, or other tools	Keeps a difference in available information visible.
Faculty-selected review question	Keeps the exercise focused on the judicial task.
Observed result and its limit	Separates what happened in this run from a broader claim about price, quality, or bias.

The record above is a proposed preparation method. No comparison has been run for this brief, and no result is predicted. "Personal," "paid," and "institutional" should be described separately when they overlap.

Faculty choice: Should judges work individually, in pairs, or from a shared display? What must every participant do, including someone who cannot use the selected interface?

Sources: Earlier proposal record • Later working skeleton

Back to reading route

3. Rules and a federal filing example

Maryland rulemaking: preserve the stage and date

The working documents attribute an August 2026 update to an appellate judge: AI-related changes to Rules 1-311, 5-107, and a Title 19 package had passed committee work and styling; a report, comment period, and later Court consideration remained. This is a dated planning paraphrase of his update.

Public-source checking in September 2026 did not establish adoption of that AI package. The June 4, 2026 order on the 228th Report lists the rules it adopted and does not list 1-311 or 5-107. It should not be cited as their AI-amendment adoption order.

Useful next source: The actual report, amendment text, signed Court order, and effective date for each provision selected for teaching. A dated expectation remains useful history; it is not the operative text.

Sources: Rules changes and orders • June 4 order, pp. 1–3 • August planning paraphrase

Federal example: Standing Order 2026-03

The U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland issued this one-page order on August 5, 2026. It addresses accuracy in filings by attorneys and unrepresented parties, including fabricated authorities, quotations, and factual representations, and identifies possible sanctions and disciplinary consequences.

This is an issued federal source for the attorney/litigant-use discussion. Faculty can decide whether a short comparison is useful and which passage deserves attention. Its jurisdiction should stay attached to every reference.

Faculty choice: Where should filing accuracy, self-represented use, and possible judicial responses sit so they are not repeated in both the Maryland segment and the hypotheticals?

Sources: District of Maryland Standing Order 2026-03

A source set for the attorney/litigant discussion

The useful combination would be the state materials the Maryland faculty select, this federal example if helpful, and the relevant article passage. That gives the discussion identifiable sources while leaving the judicial response and teaching emphasis to the faculty.

Back to reading route

4. Access to expertise

The free/paid comparison asks what tools a person can use. The AI Evidence Clinic statute adds a second access question: what help is available when the authenticity of electronic evidence is disputed?

The Maryland source

CJP §13-101.2 directs the Administrative Office of the Courts to establish the Artificial Intelligence Evidence Clinic Pilot Program. It addresses expertise and expert testimony concerning electronic evidence that may have been created or altered using AI. Subsection (c)(3) prioritizes civil cases where a party lacks representation or reasonable access to expert testimony.

The clean statutory text was checked in September 2026. The statute does not, by itself, establish that referrals are currently available. The remaining factual question is implementation: the program owner, operating status, and actual access route.

Sources: Clean CJP §13-101.2 text • Chapter 17 / SB 655, enactment record

A possible connection for faculty to assess

The source could give the equity discussion a concrete Maryland reference without requiring a separate program-history presentation. The connection is proposed: access to a generative tool and access to expertise about disputed evidence are different resources, and both may matter to the discussion the faculty choose.

Faculty choice: Would a brief access-to-expertise reference sharpen the existing equity activity or attorney/litigant discussion? What verified implementation fact would justify giving it more time?

Alexander Karsh's follow-through: Identify the AOC/program contact and recover a dated description of current availability. Keep the question finite: who can use the program, through what route, and when?

Optional technical reference on bias

NIST SP 1270, March 2022, §2.1.2 distinguishes systemic, statistical/computational, and human bias. It offers a compact background lens beyond inaccurate output. Faculty should decide whether it adds anything to the manuscript. It is technical background, not Maryland legal authority.

If useful, assign the relevant passage rather than the full 86-page report. The author-review question is whether the course already makes this distinction and, if so, whether another source helps.

Sources: NIST SP 1270, §2.1.2, printed p. 6 / PDF p. 15

Back to reading route

5. Article review and follow-through

The faculty judge and the faculty author's most useful contribution now is to reshape the existing skeleton against the article: what to keep live, what to cut, and what each activity should teach.

Questions for the article authors

- Mark the live blocks that substantially repeat the paper and identify what, if anything, the live treatment adds.
- Correct the provisional article references against the current manuscript version.
- Identify one principal participant task for the judicial-use workshop and the free/paid comparison.
- Mark where a faculty-owned hypothetical should recur, or where a separate short problem is preferable.

The August 2026 manuscript is the version referenced in the planning documents. The section references remain provisional until checked against the version the faculty author is circulating. Manuscript circulation stays with the faculty author and within the faculty planning group.

Review surface: Existing working skeleton for review

Preparation that can proceed alongside that review

Work	Concrete result
Alexander Karsh with the All Hands presenter / Tech Ed	Dated All Hands notes and current three-model setup guidance; account/tier arrangements; rehearsal support.
Alexander Karsh with activity leads	Selected source material, saved prompt/output record, readable materials, and an equivalent participation route.
Alexander Karsh retrieves; Maryland faculty select	Exact rule text, status, and effective date for the provisions that will be taught.
Alexander Karsh with the Clinic program owner	Verified operating status and access route, or an accurate statement that only the statutory framework is available.
Faculty choose; Alexander Karsh incorporates	Article corrections, accepted activity purposes, lead roles, sequence, and timing in the existing skeleton.

These are preparation outputs and faculty decisions, not new deadlines or recorded promises from the people named. Permission for the proposed three-model lab is already the planning basis.

Source-copy locator

In the August source binder: policy pp. 12–19; short guidelines p. 21; ChatGPT pp. 23–34; Claude pp. 36–44; federal order p. 46; Clinic chapter pp. 48–50. The original source dates and the September public checks are distinguished in the notes above.

Sources: August source binder

Back to reading route