

Leveraging AI in Enriching Judicial Education

by Danielle M. Teagarden

EXPLORATORY PROJECT · AUDIT MEMO

Review of the Indiana evidentiary heat map project

Audit memo, October 23, 2026. Prepared by an AI assistant at the request of the author.

Revised for public release after the October 23, 2026 primary-source audit. Tool names and internal references were removed, the wording was simplified, and every number was recomputed from the published table with code. The field-vocabulary finding of the earlier version rested on fields that are not published and was dropped.

Reviewed: the project summary, the process record, the visualization handoff packet, the 176-row table and the Excel workbook; for the audit, the Indiana courts' own opinions and the Indiana Rules of Evidence.

BOTTOM LINE

The arithmetic holds and the reversals are real: every count in the table recomputes, and all eight reversals were opened and confirmed against the court's own opinions. But several statements in the project documents overreach, two of them in the headline claims ("all eight reversals are published" and "never above about 11% in any month"), and the data carry limits that matter for anything beyond teaching. The work is a sound screening dataset. It is not yet citable.

1. What was checked and how

- Recomputed every count in the documents from the table with an independent script and compared the table with the workbook.
- Flagged repeated citation strings and case names, compound labels and internal inconsistencies, and computed Wilson score intervals.
- In the October 23, 2026 primary-source audit, twelve AI agents opened the court's own documents and the official rules and compared them with the site: all eight reversals, 12 randomly chosen criminal opinions and 14 other opinions, all 63 rules word for word, and the Rule 103(b) order.
- Not done: no one has read all 176 opinions in full, and no person has yet read each record against its opinion. Holdings beyond the sample are not verified.

2. What holds

ITEM	CLAIM	RESULT
Headline tallies	176 opinions; 117 affirmed with no error, 41 error but harmless, 10 raised and not reached, 8 reversible	Recomputed from the published table with code. The arithmetic holds; the coding itself is unverified.
Monthly and quarterly splits	July to September 2025: 49 (31/13/5/0); October 2025 to June 2026: 127 (86/28/5/8) (affirmed/harmless/not reached/reversible)	Recomputed from the table.
Composition	170 Court of Appeals, 6 Supreme Court; 52 published, 124 memorandum; 142 criminal, 24 civil, 10 juvenile	Recomputed from the table.
Rule-family rollup	16 families, one per opinion	Counts sum to 176. Placement is first-match, a display rollup.
The eight reversals	Eight named opinions are coded reversible	AI agents opened all eight and confirmed them against the court's own opinions. Five rows needed corrected wording (Taylor, Fischer, Watson, Morgan, Boehm). A keyword scan of the other 168 found no ninth evidence reversal; it was not a full read.
Rule 103(b) amendment	Effective July 1, 2026	Confirmed: Indiana Supreme Court order of March 6, 2026 (Cause No. 26S-MS-8), effective July 1, 2026. Only Rule 103 changed; other rules carry their own effective dates.

3. Findings that need correcting

#	LEVEL	STATEMENT OR ISSUE	WHAT THE DATA SHOW	FIX
F1	High	"All eight reversals are published" (in three project documents)	Boehm v. Washboard BDF LLC is a memorandum decision. Seven of eight are published: 7 of 52 published opinions (13.5%); 1 of 124 memoranda (0.8%).	Change to "seven of eight."

#	LEVEL	STATEMENT OR ISSUE	WHAT THE DATA SHOW	FIX
F2	High	“Never above about 11% in any month” (in the project summary)	Highest months: March 2026: 2 of 12 (16.7%); December 2025: 2 of 16 (12.5%); May 2026: 1 of 10 (10.0%). Months hold 10 to 20 opinions.	Replace with the monthly range 0% to 16.7% and note that months hold 10 to 20 opinions.
F3	High	July to September 2025 records are only partly coded	All 49 have no holding note. Any analysis of holding text uses 127, not 176. All 8 reversals fall in the 127 (6.3%; 95% Wilson score interval 3.2% to 11.9%); the lightly coded quarter has none.	Complete the 49 records or label the fields “not coded.” Report 8 of 127 alongside 8 of 176 as a sensitivity check.
F4	Medium	Decision dates	93 records (all July to December 2025) carry only a month; 83 carry a day. The opinions give day-level dates (for example E.K., Oct. 16, 2025; Fischer, Dec. 16, 2025; Taylor, Dec. 17, 2025).	Keep “month only” where the day is unknown; fill the day from the opinion where known.
F5	Medium	Rollup described as “most consequential rule”	The rollup is an ordered match in which the first match wins. 65 opinions cite more than one rule in the data. Confrontation appears in the issue label of 12 opinions but is the lead issue in 6. The relevance family also holds items that are not Rules 401 to 403 (motions to strike, limine, exhibits).	State the first-match rule in captions; consider renaming the 401 to 403 family “Relevance and related motions.”
F6	Medium	“Independent” blind verification	The second pass re-ran the same retrieval tool and model family. Agreement shows the coding is consistent; it cannot show that no reversal was missed, because both passes see the same ranked results. No chance-corrected agreement (such as Cohen’s kappa) is reported for the hard calls, harmless versus no error. No second-pass data are published.	Have two people double-code a stratified sample (all eight reversals plus samples of harmless and no-error records) and report kappa; add a sampling frame from the courts’ own listings.
F7	Medium	Rate language	4.5% (2.3% to 8.7%, Wilson 95%) is a share of the 176 opinions retrieved, not the probability that a trial ruling is reversed. 10 of 16 families hold fewer than ten opinions; their intervals are wider than the estimate (for example Rule 704(b): 1 of 11, 1.6% to 37.7%).	Say “share of coded opinions,” give intervals, and show counts only for small cells.

#	LEVEL	STATEMENT OR ISSUE	WHAT THE DATA SHOW	FIX
F8	Low	Identifiers	Eleven reporter-citation strings are shared by 23 records, and 19 records repeat a case name (8 names). Jones v. State appears five times (AUG-02, OCT-10, JAN-10, JAN-03, MAY-07). The table carries a docket-number field (dk) for 176 of 176 rows. Reporter citations were not verified against a primary source.	Use the docket number as the primary key; label reporter citations unverified.
F9	Low	Definition of “reversible”	The workbook defines it as an evidentiary ruling contributing to reversal. It covers a civil summary judgment reversed in part (Boehm), a State’s interlocutory appeal reversing an admission ruling (Watson), and a jury-room exposure that was not an admission ruling (Morgan). At least eight other opinions were reversed in part on non-evidence grounds and are not counted.	Say “reversed because of an evidence ruling, in whole or in part”; add fields for direction and procedural posture.

4. A fairer way to say “volume is not danger”

The project documents describe an “inversion”: high-volume rules are safe and danger sits in small cells. Per-family comparisons cannot carry that claim, because 10 of 16 families hold fewer than ten opinions. A pooled comparison, chosen after seeing the data and so exploratory, gives firmer footing:

GROUP	OPINIONS	REVERSED	SHARE (95% WILSON SCORE INTERVAL)	ERROR FOUND OR ASSUMED
Four busiest families (404, hearsay, relevance, authentication)	108	1	0.9% (0.2% to 5.1%)	29% (31 of 108)
All other families	68	7	10.3% (5.1% to 19.8%)	26% (18 of 68)

Error is found or assumed at about the same rate in both groups. The difference is conversion: in the busiest families error nearly always ends as harmless. That is a better formulation than “volume is safe.” The one reversal in the busiest group, *Morgan*, concerned excluded material reaching the jury room.

5. Corroboration performed

SOURCE	WHAT IT SAYS	RESULT
Neace v. State, No. 25A-CR-1615 (Ind. Ct. App. Apr. 21, 2026)	Vouching under Rule 704(b); voir dire door-opening argument rejected; reversed and remanded for a new trial	Matches the table (April 2026, published, reversible).
State v. Watson, No. 25A-CR-1789 (Ind. Ct. App. Mar. 18, 2026)	State's interlocutory appeal from a pretrial ruling; prior accusations not shown to be demonstrably false; reversed	Matches. The ground is the "demonstrably false" threshold under Rule 412; the trial court's missing explanation is an aside.
In re Trust of B. Alice McCoy, No. 25A-TR-367 (Ind. Ct. App. May 8, 2026)	Impeaching emails excluded as hearsay without being reviewed; Rule 806; reversed	Matches, including first impression.
Taylor v. State, No. 25S-CR-349 (Ind. Dec. 17, 2025)	Supreme Court, 3-2 on transfer; the State conceded a Confrontation Clause violation; error not harmless; new trial	Corrected. The earlier wording ("reviewed de novo", the Court of Appeals docket) was wrong.
Fischer v. State, No. 25A-CR-494 (Ind. Ct. App. Dec. 16, 2025)	Decided on the notice-and-demand statute (IC 35-36-11); Level 1 count reversed, other counts affirmed; Confrontation Clause claim not decided	Corrected. The reversal is real and partial; "confrontation" overstated the ground.
Matter of E.K., No. 25A-JC-703; Morgan v. State, No. 25A-CR-836; Boehm v. Washboard BDF LLC, No. 25A-CT-1008	Judicial notice; a denied mistrial after excluded material reached the jury room; Rule 408 emails, a memorandum decision with partial reversal	Confirmed, with Morgan and Boehm wording corrected.
Evidence Rule 103(b)	Order of March 6, 2026 (Cause No. 26S-MS-8), effective July 1, 2026: no need to renew a definitive ruling made before or at trial	Confirmed. Only Rule 103 changed.
Sample of 12 criminal and 14 other opinions	Name, court, docket and month compared with the court's own documents	All 12 criminal opinions matched on name, court, docket and month; 2 of 12 outcome codes were wrong (4.7% to 44.8%, Wilson 95%). Rule and issue labels were the weaker part. The 14 other opinions had no wrong outcome, one wrong case name and two wrong rule flags.

SOURCE	WHAT IT SAYS	RESULT
Rule text	All 63 rules compared word for word with the official site	Sixty matched. Three had lost text (Rules 402, 604 and 801(c)) and were restored.
Reporter citations	N.E.3d citations for all 176 opinions	None was verified against a primary source, so every citation is labelled unverified.

6. Who did what

The opinions were retrieved by ranked searches and coded by an AI assistant: it filled in the codebook categories for each opinion, ran a second pass without seeing the first, and produced the dataset, codebook, runbook and first workbook. The AI assistant (this review) audited the output, rebuilt the visual layer, and produced the decks, handouts and the website. In the primary-source audit, twelve AI agents opened the court's own documents. The human verification step is still to do: no person has yet read every record against its opinion.

AI-assisted screening, then a primary-source audit by AI agents (all eight reversals, 12 random criminal opinions and 14 other opinions checked against the court's own documents); no person has yet read every record.

7. Recommendations, in order

1. Correct F1 and F2 in every document before further circulation.
2. Complete or relabel the 49 partly coded records (F3); keep the docket number as the primary key and label reporter citations unverified (F8).
3. Run the human gate on the 8 reversals and the 41 harmless records, with two readers on a stratified sample and a reported kappa (F6).
4. Re-run retrieval against a sampling frame independent of ranked search, such as the courts' opinion listings, and compare counts.
5. Add direction-of-error and procedural-posture fields; publish the rollup sensitivity table (F5, F9).
6. Describe results as shares of coded opinions with intervals; keep small cells as counts (F7).