

Elaborative comments on whether video conferencing helps or hinders the administration of justice

Video allows court hearings to be processed in a more efficient manner because you don't have to move inmates around in a non-secured area.

It also allows magistrate hearing to be held from a central location and officer simply have to go to the nearest video site rather than driving further to a magistrate office.

Interactive video is rated the top technology by Montana judges and clerks of court.

Use of video conference capability in a courtroom has met with mixed reviews from court and practitioners.

It allows hearings and trials to move more efficiently. It reduces the risk of bring prisoners to the courtroom and the risk of escape and it

It makes sense from a cost and safety perspective in not having to transport defendants, but we don't know the impact on defendant pleas and releases when the personal contact factor is taken away.

Increases efficiency, moves hearings and trial along.

I am only answering for the appellate courts of Texas, the Office of Court Administration, and the Texas Judicial Council. We are able to hold deeper and more frequent meetings on ongoing administrative issues, including ongoing projects with people more connected and better informed, yet without the costs in time and money of intercity travel in a large state.

Several courts are using it to accept pleas for defendants to serve time concurrently. As stated above, juvenile courts are using it to meet time standards, increases safety by reducing transportation of inmates.

Video Conferencing can help tremendously with the administration of Justice, IF you have all the stakeholders wanting to make it work. Proactive judges and attorney's that find ways to use it and make it work reap benefits for all. The problem we have been facing is public defenders not willing to use it. The other problem is that initially video conferencing hinders the flow of work in the courtroom. It is slow at first and then gets better. What saves money for the Sheriff department may not save time for the court or attorneys and vice versa. I personally believe if all embraced it, purchased it and used it all would benefit.

Court IT Survey of Judges, Clerks of Court and Chief JPO's in the state consistently rank Interactive Video as the number 1 technology in the court system.

Videoconferencing, while new in Massachusetts Juvenile Court, has allowed judges to participate in meetings without the need for travel. This has allowed judges more time to remain in court and available for hearings.

Video conferencing has allowed us to conduct and record training and to participate in meetings. As a multi-island state, video conferencing is particularly beneficial.

Videoconferencing makes our courthouses safer

Reduction of the number of defendant transports means a reduction of opportunity for violent acts committed against judges, court personnel, and members of the public, as well as court disturbances.

The technology achieves efficiencies in court operations in addition to cost savings.

Elaborative comments on whether video conferencing helps or hinders the administration of justice

We are a rural state. There is a great deal of "windshield time" that takes up judge and support staff time. Also we need to use ITV for more meetings to reduce time that it takes to travel. There is not a priority in this area as we need to schedule these around court time as that is the only location.

Savings on resources, coordination with and accessibility to the court ensuring timely justice.

Mendocino is a remote, rural, sparsely populated county. The two main court facilities are a 1.5 hour drive through rugged terrain. The use of video conferencing for meetings has been a huge time and cost savings. It has also allowed the court appearance from the jail of defendants with communicable diseases.

Reduces inmate transportation costs for short hearings and problems if defendants are not brought to court for a hearing. Can also be useful in high profile/security cases so that the defendant doesn't have to be brought to court. Also, when we have remote witness problems that might otherwise result in delay, we can use the video system to get the hearing completed.

We expect to save about \$75,000 per year on court security.

Reduces travel time. Increases courthouse safety. Expands services to rural counties.

More efficient. Less traumatic for mental patients.

During this time when everyone wants to do more with less Videoconferencing is a ray of hope to save money and help provide effective and timely Justice.

Aside from the financial benefits, it saves staff time and aids in the speedy trial process.

Cost savings

Keeps court moving without the delay of transport. The need to bring individuals from prison or jail

Costs for transportation have been reduced. Hearings are held more quickly and efficiently while security has been improved.

We are in Northwest Ohio. If we have snow/ice, the court stays open but the jail may not want to run the bus route to deliver prisoners. We can still do some of the criminal hearings by video. On child support contempt hearings, if the parties live in another state, they can make arrangements to attend hearings by video. BUT, they have to find a location where they are and arrange the connection for the conference. That is not easy to do.

allows us to be more flexible in scheduling, can do multiple hearings in a shorter period of time, and makes parents take responsibility to pick up their child if released from juvenile detention.

Saves time and money.

Not started yet

Is a convenience when used and is used primarily for criminal arraignments and civil pre-trials.

It allows off site persons to participate without travel costs being incurred. It is also safer. Prisoners are no longer transported and this saves money and man hours for law enforcement.

Improved security for defendant transport and courtroom staff. Reduced health concerns caused by defendants with medical conditions. It has also reduced the cost of transportation of prisons between the House of Correction and the Justice center.

Elaborative comments on whether video conferencing helps or hinders the administration of justice

Hearings are not postponed because a party from a correctional facility is not here on time, we are better able to work with families and providers of youth by having video meetings for services and planning

Since the court is located adjacent to the jail, the only benefit is for the jail staff so they do not have to walk defendants through the secure corridor to the courtroom. It is mainly done for security reasons. Video conferencing for the court has increased staff time/costs and is less efficient for the court and attorneys.

It helps as far as saving money for transportation costs, (travel and fuel costs), however it does seem to slow the court process down processing paperwork back and forth.

Helps when it works and hinders when it doesn't

We share a conference room with other city officials so all of our equipment has to be setup and taken down every time court is in session.

It is helpful because it is a cost effective and efficient alternative form of communication.

It is a hindrance because it is not a full substitute for personal communication and it is prone to technicalities.

The judges with the systems in their courtrooms were able to move the cases faster as they did not have to wait for the defendant to be brought into the courtroom from the lockup. The jail personnel liked the system since they had to arrange transport for fewer inmates. The Public Defenders did not like the system since very often the only time they could meet with their clients was when they were transported to the courthouse and in the holding cells. The system was invaluable when defendants were ill with TB, hepatitis, or AIDs or in combination.

It will eventually help in the administration of Justice. Until the State of Illinois, provides the approval of such tool and possibly provide dollars, the system will only be used in some basic or hearings and it will make time to work its way up to make it a usable system. Costs, connectivity & framework to accommodate the bandwidth and buy-in of all players will still be a concern. The other major concern is security.

--Cases move faster avoiding delays with scheduling experts

--Greater staff productivity by avoiding down time driving to meetings.

--Immediacy in providing TROs at the hospital when a DV victim is in the emergency room for treatment.

Biggest benefit has been administrative -- saves costs related to travel for training, education and meetings. Our court utilizes teleconferencing to help administer justice issues. Both entities must have video conferencing ability to utilize.

Good for educational use

1. Savings for Attorney General's Office. Oral argument via video conferencing saves the deputy A.G. 4 hours of travel

Cost savings for the taxpayer. Speedy hearing and release on bond. Convenient for judicial officers. Saves time and travel for expert witnesses.

Reduced cost;

Efficiency described previously
