

**CIVIL COURTROOM STAFFING  
Bailiff or Court Attendant?**



**Institute for Court Management  
Fellows Program  
2011-2012 Phase III Project**

**Deborah T. Kruse  
Courtroom Operations Manager  
Superior Court of California, County of Orange  
Family Law Division, Lamoreaux Justice Center  
Orange, California**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge and express an immense amount of thanks to Alan Carlson, Chief Executive Officer of Orange County Superior Court and Teresa Risi, Chief Operations Officer, for allowing me the extraordinary opportunity to participate in the Institute for Court Management Fellows Program. From start to finish, this has been an experience of a lifetime. It has afforded me opportunities I suspect would otherwise never have been experienced.

I extend my sincerest thanks for those in my home court who are a constant inspiration. To Snorri Ogata for being the best mentor I could ever hope to have! No question has ever been too remedial and your support and guidance is unending. To Lori Myers and Linda Daeley, for your leadership and for sharing your insights and passion for the work we do. To Cherie Garofalo, for your enduring spirit and for always being a listening ear; you are an inspiration to me and you have a never ending spark to inspire others. Virginia Davidow, for your constant words of wisdom, everlasting spirit of commitment to everything you do, and for giving me the wings to grow. You shaped me into the operations manager I am today. To Susan Rohde, for being the best “coach” and friend a girl could hope for! Your support is unending and you have cheered me on at every turn. Thanks also to Dan Petras; your input was invaluable and I am extremely grateful for your time and consultation. Thank you to each of the judges who participated in the interview discussions. You were so gracious in your willingness to share your time and thoughtful considerations on my research topic and I have been vastly fortunate to serve and support each of you on the bench.

I would like to thank all of the staff of the National Center for State Courts; you made us feel at home and immediately welcomed us to Williamsburg upon our arrival, guiding us in every way possible. Toni Grainer, for making the program participants’ lives run smoothly, keeping us on track and being a constant support since the day we started this journey. Joan Cochet, for

your extremely helpful and caring nature in assuring we got the resource information we needed. To Amy McDowell, for sharing your expertise, guidance and instruction during this amazing program. To Dan Straub, for the remarkable leader you are...prolific, caring and wise. My immense personal thanks for seeing me through this program and for your words of encouragement through times of personal tragedy. You kept my sights on that spark of hope that I could make it. You knew I wanted to make my Dad proud, even if he would now only be there in spirit. When my hurdles seemed insurmountable, your calming words and advice on how to conquer the next step made all the difference in the world.

To Matt Kleiman, for being the most insightful, inspirational and patient supervisor ever! You saw me through my project delays, guided me through each draft and iteration and kindly stuck by me throughout this process. To John Meeks, for the time you spent with us in Williamsburg, encouraging our introspection and for sharing your knowledge with us all.

To Mary McQueen, our time spent under your tutelage was amazing! You are truly an unending inspiration and I can't tell you how many times I heeded your lessons and insights since leaving Williamsburg. I have heard your words in my head in so many situations; I learned to "tell my story" which saved me on a number of occasions when I needed that advice most.

To my fellow Fellows...you are the best group anyone could hope to be in the trenches with! Specifically, to my Orange County fellow participants; through the crazy schedules of our home court and personal lives, we made it! Thank you so much for your support and laughter through the ups and downs.

Finally, I'd like to thank my family, but most notably, my loving husband Russell and my precious son Christopher. Russell, you often believed in me more than I did and you held me up when I couldn't do it alone. Thank you for holding down the fort since I started this journey.

You endured so many of my late nights and weekends spent working on my project and cheered me on in spite of time together that was sacrificed. You saw me through despair when our family endured tragic loss last year. You stood on the sidelines, constantly encouraging me and I love you forever. Christopher, I am such a blessed and proud mom and you were so brave when I had to be away in Virginia. Thank you for all my notes and pictures in my suitcase! You kept me smiling when I missed you so much. I love and treasure you both!

To my Mom and Dad, for being my lifelong inspiration, being my biggest cheerleaders always, and for raising me to believe I could do anything. You are truly amazing and I thank you for a lifetime of warmth, love and laughter. I'm so proud to be your daughter! To my brother Gregg, I love and thank you for being my heart and soul and for being a never ending personal inspiration. You have a divine spark for life and I love being your little sister. To Ken, thanks for always lending a listening ear, for caring and for being my shopping/collectible and library buddy. I love you for being such a wonderful loving brother. To Dina, for being by my side as a sister in every way. You mean the world to me and you share in my ups, downs, laughter, tears and love of life and critters. To Makuahine, for your never ending love and the gift of your giving heart. You are all the amazing gifts that I've been blessed with in life and I thank you for your love and patience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	5
LIST OF TABLES/APPENDICES.....	6
ABSTRACT.....	7
INTRODUCTION.....	10
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
Civil Courtroom Staffing Analysis.....	19
Feasibility of Staffing Court Attendants.....	24
Cost Benefits Discussion.....	28
METHODS.....	30
Project Plan.....	30
Survey and Interviews.....	30
Assessment of Other California Courts.....	32
Methods Assessment.....	32
Success Stories From Four California Courts.....	34
FINDINGS.....	36
Judicial Survey/Interview Results.....	39
Sheriff Discussion Re: Orange County Court Attendant Program.....	41
Cost Benefits.....	43
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45
APPENDICES.....	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	76

## LIST OF TABLES / APPENDICES

### Tables:

Table 1	Cross-Court Discussion Categories
Table 2	Court Attendant Staffing: Courtrooms to Attendants
Table 3	Bailiff/Sheriff Special Officer Staffing Analysis

### Appendices:

Appendix A	Judicial Interview Questions
Appendix B	Duties Analysis: Los Angeles/Orange County Superior Court
Appendix C	Minimum Qualifications Analysis: Los Angeles/Orange County Superior Court
Appendix D	Duties Analysis: San Bernardino/Orange County Superior Court
Appendix E	Minimum Qualifications Analysis: San Bernardino/Orange County Superior Court
Appendix F	Duties Analysis: Riverside/Orange County Superior Court
Appendix G	Minimum Qualifications Analysis: Riverside/Orange County Superior Court

## ABSTRACT

The Superior Court of California, County of Orange, as with other courts locally and nationally, continues to face budgetary shortfalls and a reduction in resources. In observation of continuing operational efficiencies yet realizing the need to address fiscal crises, Orange County restructured how Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms would be staffed. The program to staff Court Attendants in lieu of Sheriff's as bailiffs in these courtrooms was piloted in late 2009. The pilot program encompassed a total of five courtrooms for a period of 10 months; with an eye toward innovation, service and quality, the court embarked on full implementation of Court Attendants in 30 civil courtrooms as of July 2010. Throughout the transition to this staffing model, key consideration was given to recruitment strategies, designation of courtroom duties, training, and effective implementation planning.

This paper intended to address post-implementation considerations of the operational, judicial, and fiscal impacts of staffing Court Attendants. The study assessed benefits and/or drawbacks of implementation and compared the Orange County model to other California courts with similar staffing. In addition, escalating security issues in the courts was a topic considered.

In support of these research intentions, the literature review assesses various impacts on access to justice, procedural fairness and the escalation of security concerns in the courts. The methods utilized in the study included stakeholder interviews and focus groups made up of court staff, sheriff's, judges, and court administrators. Duties comparisons, personal interviews, and cross-court analysis

resulted in substantive quantitative data. Every effort was made to obtain information to gain a balanced perspective of all stakeholders.

Through the research conducted, it was determined that the Court Attendant staffing model is a valid consideration for civil courtrooms. This is evident as long as other effective controls are in place, such as courthouse weapons screening and availability of Sheriff or security staff on site in the event of security situations. It was clear that effective planning is critical to the success of such a program and all stakeholders must be adequately considered and involved in the implementation process. While Court Attendants are not suitable in other case types, Civil staffing considerations could yield sizeable savings in a court's security budget. The quality of administrative work is able to be retained, and in some circumstances studied, both quality and service were surpassed.

Through the analyses and discussions completed for this project, it is hoped that other courts will be able to utilize these references to assess the methods and impacts of Court Attendant staffing in their courts.

A number of recommendations resulted from the project findings, some of which are as follows:

- The Court Attendant program should be reassessed at a later date. Further data gathered from other recommendations of this paper should be considered in the reassessment (i.e. recruitment methods, further customer service assessments, expanded focus groups)
- It is recommended that effective recruitment methods continually be assessed to target appropriate skill sets, specific demeanor and abilities of viable candidates.

- Study safety/security incidents that occur to assess the potential benefits of Court Attendants carrying two-way radios.
- Give future consideration to enhanced weapons screening.
- Develop ongoing assessment methods to assure program efficacy.
- If deemed necessary, consider adopting first aid/CPR requirements for Court Attendants.
- The court should consider conducting a survey of attorneys and litigants of the Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation departments. This may prove critical for adequate assessment of the program and how it is meeting customer service needs.
- Consider placement of video cameras in courtroom.

## INTRODUCTION

The Superior Court of California, in and for the County of Orange is a general jurisdiction court located in Orange County, California and serves a culturally and economically diverse population of over three million citizens in 34 cities covering a land area of 2000 square miles.<sup>1</sup> Orange County Superior Court is the fifth largest court in the nation and covers the case types of Civil, Small Claims, Family Law, Mental Health, Probate, Criminal and Traffic.

The mission of Orange County is to “serve the public by administering justice and resolving disputes under the law, thereby protecting the rights and liberties guaranteed by the constitutions of California and of the United States of America”.<sup>2</sup>

Like other courts across the nation, Orange County Superior Court is facing dire fiscal crises with substantially reduced funding allocations. The court, in anticipation of such fiscal challenges, has taken a proactive stance of business process reengineering to improve processes and reduce budget expenses, yet continues to be innovative and provide exemplary service to the public.

Currently, the court contracts with the Orange County Sheriff’s department to staff deputies or Sheriff Special Officers (SSO) as bailiffs in courtrooms, weapons screening stations, and information desk locations. Considering operational and financial impacts of Court Attendant vs. bailiff staffing, it is with obvious consideration that a reduction in the security budget needed to staff all civil courtrooms could prove fiscally responsible yet continue to provide effective courtroom staffing and controls.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2011 U.S. Census Bureau Statistics

<sup>2</sup> OCSC Mission Statement/Trial Court Operations Plan

While the positions of bailiff and Court Attendant are funded from court budget resources, the difference in costs associated with bailiff staffing is vast for each of the 30 courtrooms intended for Court Attendants. With that thought in mind, coupled with conceptualizations of business processes, the court began considerations for a pilot program to staff Court Attendants in all civil courtrooms in lieu of bailiffs. Orange County's pilot program to staff Court Attendants commenced in the Fall of 2009.

Through research conducted for this project, the question will be addressed as to whether or not staffing of Court Attendants in Civil courtrooms is an effectual staffing model for appropriate courtroom control. One of the first key considerations to review is the criticality of safety and the effects the Court Attendant program may have on daily operations, business continuities and safety in the [civil] courtrooms. Although administratively feasible to staff a Court Attendant in a courtroom, the importance of security considerations cannot be overstated.

Discussion on this topic is reviewed in a 2010 report on best practices for court building security.<sup>3</sup> An initial, yet critical observation is the importance of entry screening at courthouse facilities. Weapons screening is identified as a court's first line of defense. One of the policy and procedure best practices also identified is assuring communication with stakeholders. This encourages feedback in consideration of program adjustments, such as manuals, materials, or policies. Procedural drills, evaluation and modification to practices, if necessary, are also important. Information also reviewed in this report addresses access into a court building. Access

---

<sup>3</sup> Daniel J. Hall, *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*, **NCSC**, 2010, pages 6-12

considerations are extremely important and Orange County Superior Court is already successful in establishing a vast majority of protocols mentioned in the report, such as:

- Designating one or more doors be used for judges and court staff.
- Keeping exterior doors locked
- Installing emergency exit bars on exit doors and having them alarmed
- Set up full time weapons screening
- Providing basic court security orientation for judges and staff
- Testing duress alarms regularly
- Having a dedicated Sheriff's staff "rover" available to assist in courtrooms, as needed

This last bullet point is a protocol that Orange County specifically put in place upon implementation of the pilot program of Court Attendants.

Events of recent years have presented growing concerns about courthouse safety and violence against the legal profession as a whole has increased since the 1980's. An example of this was the murder of family members of a United States District Court judge in Chicago in 2005. Shortly after that incident, a judge, court reporter and sheriff's deputy were killed in a courthouse in Atlanta, Georgia. While some opinions lend themselves to the most volatile area appearing to be conflicts seen in Family Law and Criminal cases, security concerns are equally shared in civil cases.<sup>4</sup>

Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. voiced concerns about the Chicago and Atlanta murders in a report released in January, 2006:

These attacks underscored the need for all branches of government, state and federal, to safety and security for judges and judicial employees, both

---

<sup>4</sup> Pamela Horn, Violence Against Lawyers, 63-Aug. J. Kan. B.A. 6 (1994)

within and outside courthouses. We see emerging democracies around the world struggle to establish court systems in which judges can apply the rules of law free from the threat of violence; we must take every step to ensure that our own judges, to whom so much of the world looks as models of independence, never face violent attack for carrying out their duties.<sup>5</sup>

Douglas Shuit, in a 1998 article, states:

Despite advances in technology and greater awareness of the potential dangers of unruly defendants, security inside courtrooms remains a difficult balance between the safety of juries and court officers and the legal rights granted to defendants for a fair trial, experts say. As a result, both civil and criminal courts, once considered bastions of peace and civility where feuding parties could work out their differences calmly, all too often have become an extension of the war going on in America's streets or bedrooms.<sup>6</sup>

Despite efforts at weapon screening, California based events such as handguns being sneaked in through metal detectors in Pasadena and a sheriff's deputy stabbed in the chest in Compton by a prisoner with a homemade wooden knife still occurred. Weapons screening is critical and a large volume of weapons or items that could have potential use as a weapon, are constantly relinquished at the front doors of courthouses. It is also recognized with little dispute that at the state or local level, the amount of violence is higher than that experienced at the federal level.

Based on a 2007 survey conducted by the Emergency Response and Security Unit of the California Administrative Office of the Courts, there were 296 security threats to California Judges between December 2005 and December 2006.<sup>7</sup> Having safe and secure courthouse environments is critical to our justice system and assuring, albeit

---

<sup>5</sup> Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., **2005 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary**

<sup>6</sup> Douglas P. Shuit, Deputies Still Best Defense Against Violence in Court; Crime: Despite screening devices and inmate restraints, outbreaks happen. It falls on bailiffs to restore order, Los Angeles Times, Dec. 28, 1998

<sup>7</sup> Malcolm Franklin, *Ensuring The Personal Security of Judges*; **NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2009**, page 55

quietly and by mere presumption of safety in a courthouse, members of the public can openly and freely come to the court to resolve their disputes.

In light of such considerations, implementation of the Court Attendant pilot program has taken careful and planned steps toward recruitment, staffing, training, and determinations of adequate sheriff's support. These steps, combined with successful performance of safety in the courthouse environment is critical to access and fairness in our justice system.

By integrating existing Courtroom Assistant/Legal Processing Specialist staff, it is felt their courtroom role can incorporate responsibility for maintaining the order of the court, assist the court in operating effectively and efficiently, and ensure the physical integrity of the jury.

The initial fiscal impact is quite clear in the elimination of costs associated with staffing a bailiff in 30 courtrooms. It was realized that the administrative courtroom duties performed by the bailiff, absent security, could be performed by a Court Attendant, while utilizing existing staff that perform courtroom work but are in a different classification. As part of the pilot program, the Sheriff continued to provide security and safety by stationing a Sheriff Special Officer (SSO) at a location in the public hallway on the courtroom floor(s). The SSO provides an overall security presence and routinely performs security checks on the floor(s). Subsequent to the pilot program, the Court Attendant program was fully implemented in the 30 Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms in July of 2010.

Thus far, information regarding validity, effectiveness or post-implementation impacts has yet to be examined on the specific subject of staffing Court Attendants in

civil courtrooms. The focus of this project will analyze the effectiveness of the Court Attendant staffing model. Administrative/clerical workload needs will also be examined. In light of several high profile court security breaches, the examination of security and safety in the courtrooms will also be an important topic addressed in this project. Duties of both the bailiff and Court Attendant will be analyzed to consider the differences, if any, in courtroom management and controls.

Pamela Casey, in her judicial branch security plan of 2006, noted the fundamental idea of court security being a key aspect of our justice system. She recommended various strategies and most notably in relation to the subject of this project, states:

Education and training needs cover a wide range of court security topics such as leading and managing court security efforts, key elements for security planning, actions to take in the event of an incident, the types of threats that should be reported and to whom, and how to work collaboratively to address security concerns. In addition, there are multiple audiences such as state level officials; local court and law enforcement officials; court staff; and attorneys, community service providers, volunteers, and other individuals regularly in the courthouse who need targeted training to ensure the safety of all courthouse users.<sup>8</sup>

The point is well taken on security and safety and this project will examine the training that has been conducted in the Orange County Court Attendant program. Appropriate contact protocols and triage of issues or situations will be reviewed to assure that no critical or fundamental training was neglected.

Following are staffing details regarding Court Attendants in Orange County:

---

<sup>8</sup> Pamela Casey, **A National Strategic Plan for Judicial Branch Security**, 2006, page 6

- Court Attendants are only staffed at the Central Justice Center and the Civil Complex Litigation facility in the city of Santa Ana.
- Court Attendants are utilized in Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms.
- There are 37 Court Attendants who provide full-time staffing and support to 30 courtrooms, where approximately 17,000 civil cases per year are adjudicated.

The statistical data in this report will be attained through observation, survey and focus group discussions, and interview feedback attained from other courts who have adopted similar staffing structures.

This project will provide substantive background, current empirical data of the working staffing model, and crosswalk these to effectiveness, objectives, goals and strategic plans. Further, assessments will be done to determine and clarify the impact that Court Attendant staffing has on judges, litigants, attorneys, court employees, and operations as a whole.

This report will provide a literature review relating to Court Attendant staffing and will provide information on the methods and tools utilized for data collection; findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented.

Through the analysis methods described, the following primary research questions will be addressed:

- Is staffing of Court Attendants in lieu of bailiffs in Civil courtrooms an appropriate model to assure courtroom controls, quality of clerical/calendar preparation duties and maintain the integrity of the jury?
- What are the effects of the Court Attendant program on daily operations and service to the public?
- Is staffing of Court Attendants administratively feasible?
- What are the cost and operational benefits of staffing Court Attendants?
- How does performance of this staffing model align with the court's strategic plan?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Superior Court of Orange County's vision cites providing the highest quality of justice and court system services to the community.<sup>9</sup> As such, operational strategies are continually developed to produce a sense of purpose and a clear vision to function effectively on a long term basis.

This project will provide ancillary support information on subjects such as performance standards and measurement, procedural fairness, safety and security measures, and courtroom operations.

On the subject of safety in the courts and adding to information previously cited in this paper, the information outlined in the 2007 Judicial Council of California fact sheet on court security<sup>10</sup> confirms the discussion on why safety and security is such an important consideration for the court. It is documented that courts without entrance screening are at a greater risk of weapons and other materials being brought into a courthouse. The presence of unknown weapons provides obvious difficulty in effectively providing security inside the courthouse.

These correlations clearly support the importance of thorough examination of the impacts and structural feasibility of the Court Attendant staffing model. In considering resource allocations and following assessments of courtroom staffing of the unlimited civil and complex litigation departments, the Court Attendant Pilot Program commenced in September, 2009.

Government Code section 69921(b) identifies the following: "Court Attendant means a non-armed, non-law enforcement employee of the superior court who performs

---

<sup>9</sup> Superior Court of California, County of Orange 2008-2013 Strategic Plan

<sup>10</sup> Judicial Council of California, **Court Security Fact Sheet**, March 2007

those functions specified by the court, except those functions that may only be performed by armed and sworn personnel. A court attendant is not a peace officer or a public safety officer”.

### **Civil Courtroom Staffing Analysis**

An analysis of courtroom staffing, specifically the role of Courtroom Assistant/Legal Processing Specialist in the Civil Division of Orange County Superior Court, was conducted in 2009. Approximately 20 years ago, it was determined that Legal Processing Specialists [LPS] would be placed in courtrooms as a result of business needs to support differential case management and direct calendaring. Courtroom Assistants performed duties such as calendar preparation, filing of documents, answering telephonic and in-person public inquiries regarding scheduled hearings and case status and provided any necessary clerical support to the court clerk and judicial officer in the courtroom. LPS were a successful addition to the courtroom team of staff. Many changes have occurred since that time, ranging from business practices, workload shifts, implementation of automated case management systems and improved case management practices. A workload assessment was timely and deemed appropriate for review based upon workflow changes, planning for business process reengineering, measuring the impacts of the California Case Management System and budgetary resources.

In March, 2009, an information and data gathering process began with focus groups consisting of staff from the courtrooms located at the Complex Litigation Center, Central and West Justice Centers. This examination provided information regarding the

workload of the courtroom staff due to procedural changes that occurred following implementation of the California Case Management System and subsequent procedural workflow improvements. Each of the courtrooms selected for the study provided an assessment of staff with a variance of experience levels, justice center location, complexity of duties, and a cross-section of subject matter within the civil case type.

Assessments were conducted through time and motion studies, task analysis, discussions with courtroom staff, and direct courtroom observation. Supervisors were present in the designated courtrooms to observe calendar preparation and assess the time needed to prepare calendars and complete duties related to paper on demand processes. Also reviewed were courtroom duties in support of the judge, court clerk and the public.

A total of 30% of the Courtroom Assistant/Legal Processing Specialist classification of staff performing work in the courtrooms was assessed. The study allowed for adequate measurement of calendar processing, observation of issues involving all calendars, specifically law and motion settings and calendaring. The considerations and analysis provided an opportunity to assess if the courtrooms were running efficiently.

Various considerations and methods were employed throughout the study to:

- Gain a basic understanding of courtroom LPS workload
- Review calendar schedules for each courtroom studied
- Analyze the daily calendar processes for each of the designated courtrooms with an average timeframe necessary for calendar preparation

- Analyze courtrooms with special calendaring needs based on judicial processes or courtrooms assignment
- Determine the level of direct assistance to court clerks
- Identify the average number of telephone calls handled in the courtroom, assistance topics and complexity
- Determine the level of and need for personal assistance to the public, counsel, and jurors in the courtroom
- Assess documents being processed by the courtroom LPS
- Identify additional clerical tasks performed in the courtroom (support to court clerk and judicial officer) not previously measured
- Identify variance of requests specific to each courtroom
- Examine department caseload/inventory processing
- Identify workflow changes relating to case management conference settings through the California Case Management System and inventory audit of existing cases
- Track workload output

Through analysis of the data acquired, it was apparent and confirmed that there was an ability to streamline duties to improve workload efficiencies. It was realized that the duties being performed by bailiffs to maintain order in the courtroom, and responsibilities associated to jurors, could be suitably absorbed and performed by a singular position; that of a Court Attendant.

Specific areas reviewed in consideration of implementation were as follows:

- Establish structure of Court Attendant assignments
- Define duties
- Define training needs
- Define calendar coverage needs
- Identify workflow needs
- Develop a notification and implementation plan for judicial officers
- Assess staffing impacts to operations
- Network with sister courts throughout pilot program
- Monitor and provide regular reporting on pilot program

The duties of a Court Attendant are specifically defined as providing courtroom support, advising the public of acceptable courtroom decorum, and functioning as the Court's liaison with jurors. There are two positions as a Court Attendant in Orange County; that of Trainee (for training purposes) and Court Attendant, in which incumbents have demonstrated 12 months of satisfactory performance as a trainee. Upon promotion, incumbents serve six months promotional probation. Court Attendants are required to exercise excellent judgment and perform duties with the highest degree of integrity. They are a highly visible representation of court staff to the public and success in their role is a key factor in upholding the public's trust and confidence.

Some of the specific duties of the Court Attendants are as follows:<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Orange County Superior Court; Job Descriptions, Classification: Court Attendant: Examples of Duties

1. Prepare courtroom and conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to court sessions including placement of necessary equipment; ensure and maintain inventory of courtroom equipment and supplies.
2. Open court sessions; serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, parties to cases and the judicial officers and other courtroom staff.
3. Observe people and activities during court sessions and report disruptions, security violations or suspicious items to Sheriff's or other appropriate personnel; use alarm systems and contact appropriate resource in the event of emergency situations; comply with evacuation plan and report actions as necessary.
4. Direct members of the media and the public to appropriate area or personnel and respond to questions in a courteous and service-oriented manner.
5. Instruct jurors and the public on appropriate courtroom protocol and monitor conformance, including procedures in the event of an emergency or juror's absence from the courtroom; prevent conversations between jurors, parties to the case, and witnesses during trial.
6. Assist courtroom clerks during jury selection process; take custody and escort jurors during deliberations and jury trials; provide jurors with exhibits, verdict forms, jury question forms and jury instructions as appropriate; act as liaison between jurors and the judicial officer; ensure integrity of the jury by maintaining order and isolation from the public and compromising situations.
7. Advise the judicial officer when jury reaches verdict; assist the courtroom clerks in assembling parties and calling the court back to order.

8. Assemble parties prior to calling court to order; assist courtroom clerks by taking appearances of counsel at calendar calls, accounting for exhibit materials during and at the end of trials, and coordinating the use of court evidence presentation systems when necessary.
9. Review documents for completeness, accuracy, and conformance to rules, codes, policies, and protocols; receive, process, and assign court proceedings based on pleadings, continuances, and other pertinent information; verify documents set for hearing are properly marked; prepare motion calendar files for court research attorney review.
10. Prepare court calendars and documents for the hearing.

### **Feasibility of Staffing Court Attendants**

As an introduction to factors supporting the feasibility analysis being conducted in this project, one of the literature reviews taken into consideration is the Trial Court Performance Standards.<sup>12</sup> The standards note that behavior of trial court personnel can make the courthouse safer, accessible and convenient. The link to the conduct of court personnel clearly relates to impacts the Court Attendant position can have in a highly visible position with a broad breadth of public contact.

An important consideration is discussed by Marcus W. Reinkensmeyer, in acknowledging the financial and operational challenges presented to court leaders in lean budget times.<sup>13</sup> Concern about potential need for reductions in security staff is clear and the need for collaboration is adequately supported with a goal to address

---

<sup>12</sup> The Trial Court Performance Standards were developed over an 8-year span of time, commencing in 1987 by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the National Center for State courts.

<sup>13</sup> Marcus W. Reinkensmeyer, *Court Security and Business Continuity in Lean Budget Times: A Collaborative Systems Approach*; **NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2011**, page 87

organizational problems and business process reengineering. The Court Attendant program addresses activity that is directly in line with business process reengineering fundamentals of breaking away from operational assumptions. Michael Hammer, in a Harvard Business Review article on reengineering<sup>14</sup> states,

Unless we change these rules, we are merely rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. We cannot achieve breakthroughs in performance by cutting fat or automating existing processes. Rather, we must challenge old assumptions and shed the old rules that made the business underperform in the first place.

Daniel J. Hall, in writing about the impacts of budget shortfalls in state courts states,

With less money to spend, one-half of state court systems will not be filling judicial vacancies or calling in retired judges to sit on the bench. More than half anticipate reductions in staff that provide direct adjudication support and judicial office support...Many states are looking at standardizing financial, administrative, and clerical functions to facilitate the centralization of the performance of those functions.<sup>15</sup>

The perception of a safe environment (by the public, employees, jurors, etc.) can also be created and measured.<sup>16</sup> The standards support a fair and reliable process which is associated to the quality of court processes and procedures. It is critical that a Court Attendant, often as the first point of courtroom contact, be trained and prepared for appropriate response in emergency situations.<sup>17</sup> In the interest of timeliness and assuring that unnecessary delays don't cause injustice, the performance of a Court Attendant and the ability to maintain control in the courtroom is essential. This is important as it overlaps with the court's monitoring and control of daily operations.

---

<sup>14</sup> Michael Hammer, *Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate*; **Harvard Business Review, July-August, 1990**

<sup>15</sup> Daniel J. Hall, *How State Courts Are Weathering The Economic Storm*; **NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2009**, page 3

<sup>16</sup> Trial Court Performance Standard 1.2: Safety, Accessibility and Convenience; Measure 1.2.3: Perceptions of Courthouse Security

<sup>17</sup> Trial Court Performance Standard 1.2: Safety, Accessibility and Convenience; Measure 1.2.4: Court Employees Knowledge of Emergency Procedures

Careful consideration was given in the Orange County Court Attendant Program to effectively implement and control courtroom functions with a direct impact on public trust and confidence.

Another area to be taken into account is procedural fairness. This can be defined as the extent to which the courts are understandable, accessible and trustworthy in the eyes of the people who use them. The Center for Court Innovation, on the subject of procedural fairness in California<sup>18</sup>, identifies that there are dozens of opportunities within the courts cycles of service, on a daily basis, to signal to its public that it is capable of meting out fair and impartial court experiences.

Standard 4.2<sup>19</sup> of the Trial Court Performance Standards discusses the need for resources to be appropriately allocated and to be used prudently and wisely. This pointedly addresses the question, “Are the court’s resources adequate for the work that is required?” There is a necessity to be responsive in the allocation of resources, to implement effectively, and evaluate continuously.

Through the efforts of this project, the implementation, methods and overall evaluation of the current program will be examined. Standard 4.5<sup>20</sup> cites a courts anticipation of emergent events and adjusting operations as necessary. The Court Attendant program is a direct example of adjustments in the face of declining budgetary resources. Once it had been determined as operationally feasible and cost-effective, the Court Attendant staffing solution was implemented.

---

<sup>18</sup> Center for Court Innovation, **Procedural Fairness in California; Initiatives, Challenges, and Recommendations**, May 2011

<sup>19</sup> Trial Court Performance Standard 4.2: Accountability for Public Resources; Measure 4.2.2: Evaluation of Personnel Resource Allocation

<sup>20</sup> Trial Court Performance Standard 4.5: Response to Change

Although the Trial Court Performance Standards were the precursor to CourTools<sup>21</sup>, the implications remain valid. The CourTools topic, specifically regarding Access and Fairness, will be a subject examined in reviewing the treatment of internal and external court customers by the courtrooms staffed with a Court Attendant.

This paper will focus on examining the feasibility, abilities and appropriateness of staffing Court Attendants in lieu of bailiffs. There is also relevance in examining a variety of performance factors. The strategic plan for California's judicial branch, specifically Goal IV, supports the quality of justice and service to the public.

Douglas Denton, when writing on the subject of procedural fairness in California courts<sup>22</sup> found that people are more likely to accept court decisions when those in authority act with fairness and neutrality. Focus groups made up of those with direct court experience in a high volume court, through jury service, as a witness, plaintiff, or defendant, were studied. Key information from the survey and focus groups confirmed that a high degree of trust and confidence exists toward the California state courts. Court users were consistent in their response that their courtroom experiences left them with an indelible memory. Jury service generated the most positive feedback and this speaks directly to the need for consistency in training and application of the duties of a Court Attendant to assure the perception of procedural fairness, safety, and efficiency.

---

<sup>21</sup> National Center for State Courts, 2005; CourTools is a set of ten trial court performance measures that offers court managers a balanced perspectives on court operations.

<sup>22</sup> Douglas Denton, **Court Review, Special Issue on Procedural Fairness; Procedural Fairness in the California Courts**, 2007-2008, Volume 44, page 44

Jake Chatters discussed the need to measure performance with the hope that organizations understand the need for the use of operational performance measures.<sup>23</sup> Examining measures is vital to focusing on timeliness and quality of the activities performed by line staff; the end result of these measurements is assuring considerations are adequately given to realizing the key role that all staff plays in maintaining the public's trust. Also, as funding reductions continue, measurements may aid in the determination of positions, staffing, customer service and maintaining operations.

The analyses conducted in this project will provide an accurate detailing of the current workload and will provide mechanisms for further feasibility evaluation based on implementation strategies. The study will define expectations, abilities and impacts and may substantiate similar staffing structures for other courts, providing a potential result of positive economic impacts.

### **Cost Benefit Discussion**

We are keenly aware of the troubling trend of declining budgets and increased workloads for the courts. The American Bar Association reported<sup>24</sup> that state judiciaries handle 95% of all cases filed in the United States. 2008 is the most recent year that data is available, with the states reporting 106 million incoming trial court cases – the most in 35 years. Despite caseload increases, NCSC says 42 states reduced their court budget in fiscal year 2011. Courts are faced with difficult decisions regarding continuing costs and services at the same level as previously offered. Court closures,

---

<sup>23</sup> Jake Chatters; *Defining Operational Successes: Measuring The Performance of a Court's Front-Line Staff*, **NCSC Future Trends in State Courts**, 2009, page 118

<sup>24</sup> American Bar Association, *Underfunding State Courts Threatens Our Constitutional Democracy*, **American Bar Association**, 2011

furloughs and increases in wait times are not uncommon. In the face of such fiscal crisis, the courts are assessing services and reengineering wherever possible to cut costs, yet operationally assure that they are open, available and adequately staffed.

## **METHODS**

The data in this report focuses on references, as cited in the literature review, interviews with other California courts, assessments of Orange County Superior Court's current Court Attendant program and survey/interview responses collected from judicial officers.

### **Project Plan**

Post-assessment of implementation of Orange County Superior Court's staffing of Court Attendants in Civil courtrooms is appropriate and timely. In light of continuous improvements, reengineering, undue budget issues, dwindling staff resources and continued fiscal challenges, a project plan was developed to adequately review Orange County's current processes. The plan also included analysis of other courts programs, job descriptions, similarities and differences, and survey of impacted groups of court users. These comparative analyses present information and outcomes directly relating to each of the research questions defined for this paper.

The project plan was developed with an eye toward executing a thorough assessment of Orange County's position expectations, recruitment strategies, training, implementation methods and strategic plan alignment.

### **Survey and Interviews**

Interviews commenced with the Chief Operations Officer, to review program considerations at an overall organizational level. Also interviewed was fiscal staff that assisted in identifying the cost benefits of staffing Court Attendants in lieu of bailiffs. Security and emergency management systems and related topics were also examined. Interviews were conducted with the Director of Security and Emergency Management

Services for Orange County Superior Court and Sheriff personnel, who had direct oversight and daily involvement with the planning and implementation of the Orange County pilot program. The duties previously performed by bailiffs were thoroughly examined, as were the duties of the Courtroom Assistant position (as previously staffed in the Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms). Further, transitional training needs for courtroom staff to the role of Court Attendant were reviewed; this assured an assessment of the administratively based duties of bailiffs which were being absorbed by Court Attendants. This review assessed if adequate transitional training took place. Another assessment completed was whether or not all resource needs of a Court Attendant had been considered. A review of hard goods and necessary equipment was completed to assure appropriate communications and resources for Court Attendants had been established.

A total of 30% of the judicial officers currently sitting on the Civil bench, with direct Court Attendant contact on a daily basis, were surveyed and interviewed. This equated to 10 of the 30 judicial officers staffed with Court Attendants. This 30% represented a sampling of judicial officers with variant case loads, jurisdiction (Unlimited/Complex Litigation), and calendar needs. It was imperative that this survey be concise and brief, yet be able to provide results that would be informative and clearly directed at key feedback needed from the bench. The survey contained a total of four questions which focused on the topics of: 1) impact, if any, to the quality of work produced for the judge in the courtroom; 2) number of security related issues, if any; 3) availability of appropriate Sheriff's staff, when needed, and; 4) any general comments regarding Court Attendants. The survey and interview outcomes directly address the

research question relating to appropriate courtroom controls. The specific survey questions are outlined in the Appendix section and the results analysis may be reviewed in the Findings section of this paper.

### **Assessment of Other California Courts**

Assessments regarding the workload and duties of a Court Attendant in a total of four counties (Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside) were reviewed. A cross-comparison of duties in each county was completed. This cross-comparison would address the research questions posed regarding cost, operational benefits and administrative feasibility of Court Attendant staffing.

Interviews were then held with specific Operations staff in each of the three neighboring California courts, to discuss not only the history of their Court Attendant programs, but the current status, performance, duties and expectations. The duties comparisons may be reviewed in specific detail, as noted in the Appendix section contained within this report. Another area discussed during interviews with other courts was specific implementation and training strategies.

### **Methods Assessment**

In consideration of access and fairness, the survey and interviews pay particular attention to measuring the impacts of Court Attendant implementation including customer service, quality of administrative work, courtroom control, and safety.

The planned analysis methods, which include an array of discussions, survey, focus groups and research proved to capture all the necessary elements to provide meaningful conclusions and recommendations.

Although there were a number of general areas that guided the judicial interviews, judicial feedback was variant and sometimes on both sides of certain issues. Specific outcomes of the judicial interviews may be reviewed in the Findings section of this paper.

During reviews of existing Court Attendant programs currently in place in other California courts, various questions were raised regarding staffing, duties, requirements, and compensation. The following information lists categorical discussion points for each of the phone interviews with Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties:

**Table 1 – Cross-Court Discussion Categories**

<b>DISCUSSION CATEGORIES</b>
<b>Interviews with Los Angeles/Riverside/San Bernardino Counties</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COURT STRUCTURE/STAFFING</li> <li>• TRAINING PROGRAMS               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation</li> <li>- Requirements</li> <li>- Certifications</li> <li>- Refresher Training</li> </ul> </li> <li>• PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION METHODS</li> <li>• POST-IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS METHODS</li> <li>• VARIANCES IN COMPENSATION AND DUTIES</li> <li>• CURRENT PROGRAM STATUS</li> <li>• SAFETY/SECURITY MEASURES CURRENTLY BEING UTILIZED</li> <li>• STATUS OF SHERIFF STAFFING</li> </ul>

## **Success Stories from Four California Courts**

As part of the feasibility analysis, the duties of a Court Attendant, as proposed for Orange County, were compared to the duties of Court Attendants in other California courts. Detailed analysis of the Court Attendant positions, including similarities and differences in duties, and training and certification requirements analysis will be discussed. The following discussion(s) focus on the counties of:

- Los Angeles
- Orange
- Riverside
- San Bernardino

The four courts listed above were chosen for comparison in this paper largely due to the fact that they have each previously implemented a Court Attendant staffing model. The intent was to compare duties of their Court Attendants vs. duties planned and assigned in Orange County. Orange County, as the court with the least amount of time with such a program in place, could potentially benefit from the overview of the duties and examination of implementation methods, training programs, and ongoing post-implementation assessments. Comparison of this group would also provide a review of duties assigned to the position that Orange County has not opted for at this time (i.e cpr/first aid, radio communications, full uniform). In addition, the counties listed were a viable survey group based on the following criteria which operationally relate to Orange County:

- Demographic comparisons
- Number of court staff

- Number of Civil courtrooms
- Number of Court Attendants
- Total number of courtrooms
- Approximate annual caseloads
- Number of judicial officers

Appendix B contained later in this paper outlines a comparison of Court Attendant duties and minimum qualifications between Orange County and Los Angeles Superior Court. This analysis was also done for Riverside and San Bernardino counties (see Appendices C-G). This provides for an assessment of whether or not Orange County has implemented similar duties and responsibilities for their Court Attendants. These cross-comparisons also provide an overview of salaries across courts for this position, and minimum qualifications in each county. Through this review, it was confirmed that there is a vast majority of similarities in expectations of the position in each of the four courts. The comparisons can relate to considerations beyond Orange County to compare if the position of a Court Attendant, especially as defined in Government Code section 69921(b), is being universally applied in other courts.

## FINDINGS

The comparison of job duties amongst each of the four courts, as outlined in their job specifications, reflect a vast majority of similarity in job requirements and performance. Orange County does not require First Aid and CPR certifications but the other courts require performance of such duties, when necessary, and certification must be completed within six months of attaining the position.

While San Bernardino's job specifications are brief and concise, it is again seen that the majority of duties expected of a Court Attendant mirror those expected in Orange County. On the subject of first aid and CPR requirements, the County of San Bernardino, like Los Angeles, requires performance of these duties from a Court Attendant.

San Bernardino Court Attendants carry radios on their person to facilitate direct communication with Sheriff personnel, as needed. Neither Orange County nor Los Angeles Court Attendants carry radios and instead rely upon intercom type units or telephone communication to contact Sheriff staff. Upon inquiry to Court Attendants in San Bernardino, when asked about their use of radios, they mutually confirmed that they found them useful in the application of their daily duties and courtroom oversight; they provided responses and scenarios when they had utilized the two-way radios which clearly validate their use.

An example provided was when a defendant fled a courtroom and proceeded to run down the public corridor of the courthouse; Sheriff's deputies were in pursuit of the individual. The courtroom in question was in session with the judge on the bench when the Court Attendant heard the information announced over the radio. She quietly

proceeded to lock the front doors of the courtroom, allowing the apprehension of the individual to continue outside, all while the activities in the courtroom where she was staffed were able to continue without pause or impact to court staff, litigants, or the public. This is just one of a few excellent examples of the effectiveness of the two-way radio use experienced by Court Attendants in San Bernardino.

Clerically based comparisons of job duties were somewhat varied amongst the courts. Court Attendants in San Bernardino and Riverside counties do not do any calendar preparation in the courtrooms while both Los Angeles and Orange County perform these duties. Los Angeles has the largest number of Court Attendants in the State of California and they complete calendar preparation and docket filings directly into the case management system. Los Angeles and Riverside also staffed Court Attendants in certain Limited Civil courtrooms.

During discussions with each of these counties regarding their Court Attendant programs, their staffing structure and the number of Court Attendants employed, the size of their relief pool was discussed. The following table represents the number of courtrooms supported by Court Attendants in each of the counties examined:

**Table 2 – Court Attendant Staffing: Number of Courtrooms to Attendants**

	<b>Orange County</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Bernardino</b>	<b>Riverside</b>
Number of Courtrooms Supported	30	165	16	4
Number of Court Attendants	37	180	18	6

In each county studied, regardless of the number of Court Attendants or courtrooms they support, they carry a relief pool ranging from 10% - 20% the size of their assigned Court Attendant staff. Each court has found this ratio to be adequate for daily support of the courtrooms and provides for coverage of scheduled and unscheduled absences.

Los Angeles County, of the four counties discussed here, is the only county that limits position availability to internal employees on a lateral or promotional basis. During discussions with the other counties on the results of Court Attendant recruitments, it was recognized that past strategies resulted in a variance of the knowledge base when the candidate was hired. An example of this was when candidates with a higher level of security or military background were hired. Some of these candidates had seen the position as more security related than was actually necessary for performance of the job duties and found some of the clerically based duties to be less desirable. In consideration of long-term retention of staff in this position, it is critical to identify the appropriate balance of qualifications sought in those considered to be viable candidates with long-term success in the position.

Riverside County's staffing model varied in one aspect from the other counties. They maintained staffing of Court Attendants in select civil courtrooms and split courtroom coverage with Sheriff's staff. Most recently, they have experienced closure of certain locations and have returned to sole staffing of Sheriff's in the courtroom.

There were universal findings from each of the courts. Amongst the primary topics found to be consistent amongst each court were:

- Training consists of classroom and applied learning environments for a period of approximately 2 – 3 weeks.
- Pursuit of this staffing model originated from cost savings measures of reducing the number of Sheriff's staff needed to support civil courtrooms.
- Providing a uniform promotes a consistent, professional appearance in the courtrooms and often establishes the Court Attendant as the first point of contact when entering a courtroom.
- Candidates with the ability to exhibit professionalism, assertiveness and command a presence in the courtroom are critical to successful performance in this position.
- Each of the courts found Court Attendants to be adept at handling all of their assigned courtroom duties.

### **Judicial Survey/Interview Results**

A total of 10 judicial officers, the equivalent of 30% of the Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation bench officers, were interviewed. Upon review of the outcomes, 100% of those surveyed responded as follows:

- Each of the judges felt that since Court Attendants have been staffed in their courtrooms, the quality of their administrative work remained the same and in some instances, was described as exceeding past performance of Legal Processing Specialists.
- Safety related issues had not increased and Sheriff's support, when needed, had been consistent and expediently available.

A number of general comments were discussed pertaining to Court Attendants being staffed in the courtrooms. It was commented that no major security incidents had arisen since the Court Attendant program began. A minor concern was expressed by a few of the judicial officers regarding the potential for a security incident. It was universally agreed that the Court Attendant position is a critical presence in the courtroom that is needed every day. In contrast, it was realized that the need for a bailiff could fluctuate throughout the day, dependent upon the status of court proceedings.

Comments were received as to a mildly challenging aspect of having Court Attendants in the courtroom; this position will commonly desire promotion to the position of a court clerk. The judicial officers recognized the need for staff with key skill sets to fill the position of a Court Attendant, yet there is the potential for increased frequency of staffing fluctuations of this essential courtroom position.

It is also felt the Orange County program assumed an excellent core structure by establishing a Sheriff's kiosk on the floors and an SSO is present. They also staffed a "rover" bailiff for the Civil courtrooms.

On another topic of consideration, technology efficiencies have helped the Court Attendants in performance of their calendar duties. It is felt that Court Attendants can be more effective through programs such as the Electronic Legal File (ELF) which allows for electronic preparation of court calendars. The use of instant messaging amongst courtroom staff also produces expedient communication in Orange County. These methods are a key component to creating an elegant balance of communication in the courtroom.

The overall consensus amongst the judicial officers was that it will be critical to continue to cultivate excellent people to fill this role, effectuate appropriate recruitment strategies and assure that staff has an excellent demeanor and interpersonal skills.

If another court was to consider utilizing Court Attendants in Civil courtrooms, it would be essential to repeat what was assessed in Orange County. Plan well in advance, involve appropriate stakeholders, assess the climate for change in the court's culture and pilot the program first.

In the grand scheme of courtroom structures and public perception, it was felt by a few, that staffing Court Attendants may be seen as a diminution of the legal process and the authority of law. This was based on the feeling that the absence of a uniformed Sheriff Special Officer lessens the impression of the court and detracts from the formality and authority of the court.

Orange County closely examined the necessary duties to be performed by Court Attendants to maintain and control the courtroom environment. The clear success experienced in Orange County reflects the keen awareness of the critical first line of defense which begins at the doors of the courthouse with weapons screening.

On another note, Court Attendants are court staff while the prior staff of bailiffs was not. Having Court Attendants as court staff provides for easier management and oversight of staff and issues. Workload in the courtroom is now more evenly distributed, with excellent support to the court clerk.

### **Sheriff Discussion Re: Orange County Court Attendant Program**

A discussion was held with the Sheriff's Sergeant directly responsible for oversight of transition planning and training of Court Attendants in the area of courtroom

awareness and safety/contact protocols. The Orange County Sheriff's were critical to the success of the transitioning of staff to this new role and their assistance was invaluable; this would be another important communication aspect for any court to consider if they were interested in staffing Court Attendants.

A discussion was also held with the Director of Security and Emergency Management Systems who was with Orange County Superior Court at the time of implementation.

When discussing the current status of the program, there were several topics which were considered "lessons learned" from the initial implementation. Those topics are:

- The staffing model of a Court Attendant made complete and logical sense. When considering the best use of resources, the Court Attendant coverage of courtroom duties is competent and proficient.
- The Orange County program is considered successful thus far. The law enforcement consideration is that the potential for occurrence must be considered and monitored, not merely deemed successful in the absence of an incident.
- It is important to consider the qualities Court Attendants must exhibit and assure candidates selected for these positions have all necessary attributes to successfully perform critical aspects of the job.
- Further the judicial awareness and buy-in prior to implementation activities.
- Involve judicial officers in transitional consultations.
- Reaffirm security processes on a routine basis.

- Consider additional debriefing and training of other courtroom staff (court reporter, judge, etc.)
- Assure safety refresher training is routinely performed. While Court Attendants are not responsible for security, their contact protocols support a need for routine refresher training.

### **Cost Benefits**

As discussed earlier in this paper, Orange County Superior Court is faced with the ongoing challenge of declining fiscal resources. When the staffing model previously in place in the Civil courtrooms was assessed, and duties determined to be a feasible transition, implementing Court Attendant staffing in the Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms was sought.

The cost breakdown and position analysis regarding annual costs of staffing a bailiff or Court Attendant position is listed in Table 3. This information clearly defines the budgetary benefits of implementation.

**Table 3 – Bailiff/Sheriff Special Officer Staffing Analysis**

<b>Bailiff/Sheriff Special Officer Staffing/Cost Analysis</b>						
	<b>Pre-Implementation</b>			<b>Post-Implementation</b>		
Position Title	# of Positions	Position Cost	Total Cost Per Annum	# of Positions	Position Cost	Total Cost Per Annum
Bailiff-Sheriff Special Officer (SSO)	30	85,336	2,560,080	4*	85,336	341,344
<b>Total Savings Per Annum:</b>	<b>2,218,736</b>					
Cost Differential (Conversion of 37 Legal Processing Specialists to Court Attendants)	110,667					
<b>Net Savings Per Annum</b>	<b>2,108,069</b>					

\*Four SSO's retained to staff at Sheriff Kiosks located on Civil Courtroom floors. The SSO's staffed in these locations provide security support.

## CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of this project is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the staffing structure of the Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation departments of the Civil Division of Orange County Superior Court. Through research and analysis, the impacts of the Civil Court Attendant Program were assessed. The study examined expectations, abilities, and impacts on security and safety, with a focus on consideration of judicial safety, access to justice and procedural fairness. The analysis also reviewed implementation stages and strategies. Considering dwindling fiscal resources, long-term impacts and the need for courtroom control, this project considered evidence to assure informed decisions are supported when assessing operational effectiveness.

Orange County Superior Court also did what is at the heart of business process reengineering. They asked why and what if? The existing program was analyzed to best understand the core of what the staffing model was to accomplish. The idea of netting substantial cost savings was realized and staff responsibilities were compressed.

The study confirmed that procedural fairness is a key understanding for all court staff, but it is even more pronounced for Court Attendants based on the level of consistent public interaction. The cost effectiveness of the staffing model is also clearly attainable and can be strongly supported.

While it is recognized that the judicial interviews yielded excellent qualitative data, it was reconciled that there was not a general consensus on some topics. One of the recommendations contained below will address reasons to consider surveying the local bar association in pursuit of feedback on public interaction with Court Attendants.

In review of the overall project analysis and outcomes, the following conclusions and recommendations are offered:

### **Conclusion #1: Duties Analysis**

The duties of a Court Attendant, when examined, were somewhat variant from county to county. Outside the research and comparison of duties reviewed in this paper, further specifics on the assignment of duties should be reviewed. Through further analysis, Orange County may make minor adjustments to the current program and potentially adopt additional duties for Court Attendants.

### **Recommendation #1:**

- The review of assigned duties should be repeated in one to two years and results examined. Treat this first assessment as a control factor for comparative reasons. Future examination, especially as the operation of the program matures, may result in an adjustment of responsibilities.

### **Conclusion #2: Variance in Recruitment Strategies**

As discovered during project research, various courts had, at one time or another, sought specific experience as minimum qualification requirements. Another critical factor to be sought during the recruitment process is behavioral qualities of Court Attendant candidates which may help assure the correct knowledge, skills and abilities are attained at the point of recruitment. The judicial interview responses provided examples of candidates successful in the position; Targeting a certain demeanor may also be beneficial, as judicial and administrative feedback attained during this project

pointed to critical interpersonal skills, such as excellent demeanor, calm and professional behavior, and the ability to be assertive when necessary.

**Recommendation #2:**

- It is recommended that effective recruitment methods continually be assessed to assure targeting specific demeanor and abilities of viable candidates.

**Conclusion #3: Equipment Analysis**

One of the outcomes of this project was the awareness of some courts carrying radios on their person to have direct communication and monitoring of the security channel in the courthouse. This allowed the Court Attendants to be fully informed at all times regarding any safety issues occurring in the courthouse. While the Court Attendant's job does not encompass security responsibilities, it was clear that awareness of security matters transpiring in the building allowed for smooth maintenance of operations when issues arose.

**Recommendation #3:**

- Review incidents that occur, to assess the potential value of providing two-way radios to Court Attendants.

**Conclusion #4: Weapons Screening**

Based on discussions with Sheriff personnel, weapons screening doesn't always catch everything that comes through the front doors of the courthouse. As safety concerns continue to increase for the courts, it will become more and more critical to assure that weapons screening remains effective, with the ability to apprehend items that may be used as a weapon in the courtroom.

**Recommendation #4:**

- Courts should give significant consideration to eventually switching to airport style screening to allow enhanced view of weapons being carried by public entering the courthouse, especially those made up of materials that may not be picked up by metal detectors currently being used. It is duly recognized that the courts are facing severe financial constraints and airport style screening comes at an increased cost to the court.

**Conclusion #5: Continually Assess Program Elements**

Parallels may be drawn from the interviews completed during project research. The lessons learned outline the criticality of this position and the need to review the program on a routine basis to assure it endures societal and technological changes requiring awareness and the need for enhanced training.

**Recommendation #5:**

- Develop ongoing assessment methods to assure program efficacy.

**Conclusion #6: Sheriff Staffing Levels**

Based on feedback from the Sheriff's department during project research, if future reductions of Sheriff personnel occur, this may affect the frequency during which an SSO may be immediately available when called upon.

**Recommendation #6:**

- If fluctuations occur in the number of Sheriff personnel support, the court would plan accordingly for potential dwindling resources. If the Sheriff's service level was decreased, consider adopting first aid/CPR requirements for Court Attendants.

### **Conclusion #7: Survey Court Users**

Although every effort at appropriate research and feedback was completed for this project and meaningful and valuable responses and outcomes were attained, a further assessment of court users is recommended. While a vast amount of comparative data is contained in this paper, feedback attained from surveyed attorneys and litigants could prove critical for an adequate assessment of the program and how it is meeting the needs of the public.

### **Recommendation #7:**

- The court should consider conducting a survey of attorneys and litigants identified as doing business in courtrooms staffed with a Court Attendant. This feedback could prove critical for further assessment of the program and how it is meeting customer service needs. The survey would be recommended to assess their experiences, rate of satisfaction and identify any issues or concerns, if any. This process would also coincide with long-term procedural fairness goals.

### **Conclusion #8: Install Cameras in Courtrooms**

Consider a long-term plan to install cameras in the courtrooms which focus on the courtroom audience. Video feed to a centralized sheriff location would provide live monitoring of the courtrooms and may enhance response times in the event an SSO is ever called upon for an emergency purpose in the courtroom.

### **Recommendation #8:**

While recognizing that installation of cameras is a cost related recommendation, this concept should be retained as a long-term consideration to increase awareness and provide enhanced courtroom controls.

Through the analyses and discussions completed for this project, Orange County will be able to assess the resulting data, conclusions and recommendations in consideration of ongoing operational facets of the existing program. It is further hoped that other courts will be able to utilize these references to assess the adoption methods, feasibility and impacts of staffing Court Attendants in their own court.

## Appendix A - Judicial Survey/Interview Questions

<b>JUDICIAL SURVEY/INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</b>	
<b>Re: Court Attendant Staffing in Unlimited Civil And Complex Litigation Courtrooms</b>	
1. Since implementation of the Court Attendant staffing in the courtroom, has there been any impact to the quality of administrative work and calendar duties performed in your courtroom? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  If Yes, please describe:	
2. From your experience, have security related issues in your courtroom increased since the staffing a Court Attendant? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  If Yes, please describe the areas of concern (Please select all that apply):  <input type="checkbox"/> Number of incidents  <input type="checkbox"/> Severity of incidents  <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  Comments:	
3. Has Sheriff support been appropriately available when needed in the courtroom? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  If No, please describe:	
4. Please share any other general comments, feedback or recommendations regarding the Court Attendant Program:	

**Appendix B - Duties Analysis: Los Angeles/Orange County Superior Court**

<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>	<b>LOS ANGELES</b>
<b><u>Position Title:</u></b> Court Attendant Trainee Court Attendant	<b><u>Position Title:</u></b> Courtroom Assistant
Position available to internal employees/external candidates	Position available to internal court employees only
<u>Trainee:</u> 3,260.40-4,042.13/Monthly  <u>Attendant:</u> 3,447.60-4,264.00/Monthly	3,469.73-4,302.55/Monthly
Provides for Trainee classification (12 month probation with no permanent status as a trainee). Court Attendant Trainee is used as the entry level classification for training purposes. Satisfactory probationary performance results in advancement to Court Attendant (journey level). Upon promotion to Court Attendant, incumbents serve six months probation.	No Trainee Classification
<b>DUTIES**</b>	
<b>Note: Duties which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>	
Support efficient operations of an assigned civil courtroom	Assist the court in operating effectively and efficiently, including maintaining the safety of the courtroom
Maintain the integrity of the jury	Ensure the physical integrity of the jury
Perform other duties, as assigned, to support the courtroom	Perform a range of specialized and responsible duties
Prepare courtroom and conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to court sessions, including placement of necessary equipment	Performs pre-court searches of courtroom and surrounding areas

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>DUTIES**</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Ensure and maintain inventory of courtroom equipment and supplies	Checks emergency equipment within designated time frames and makes or requests repairs; Ensures the courtroom's efficient operations; regularly monitors courtroom equipment; identifies maintenance or custodial problems, notifies maintenance or custodial services and ensures that problems are promptly addressed; monitors and maintains inventory of and orders courtroom supplies/equipment
Open court sessions	Act as court crier
Serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, parties to cases, judicial officers and other courtroom staff	Act as liaison between the court, jurors, Sheriff's department, attorneys, witnesses, litigants and the public ; assists witnesses during trial by holding gate when witness is called and dismissed, directing witnesses to appropriate location to be sworn and adjusting microphone for witnesses' convenience
Observe people and activities during court sessions and report disruptions, security violations or suspicious items to Sheriff's or other appropriate personnel	As directed by judicial officer, maintains order while court is in session by carefully monitoring juror, spectator, witness and attorney demeanor and actions and anticipating and taking prompt, appropriate actions to address potential disturbances, including notifying the sheriff's office. Identifies hazardous/suspicious items or conditions and takes prompt and appropriate steps to rectify
Use alarm systems and contact appropriate resource in emergency situations	Contacts appropriate personnel or agencies in emergency situations
Comply with evacuation plan and report actions	Administers courtroom evacuation procedures; completes related reports and forms, including incident reports, theft reports and injury reports

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>DUTIES**</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Direct members of the media and public to appropriate area or personnel and respond to questions	No direct comparable description
Instruct jurors and public on appropriate courtroom protocol and monitor conformance, including procedures in the event of an emergency or juror's absence from the courtroom. Assist courtroom clerks during jury selection process	No direct comparable description
Take custody and escort jurors during deliberations and jury trials; provide jurors with exhibits, verdict forms, jury question forms and jury instructions	Greet and orients jurors to courtroom procedures; takes jury attendance; passes out jury questionnaires
As appropriate, act as liaison between jurors and the judicial officer	Acts as liaison with jurors and takes charge of the jury; as assigned, holds gate and seats jurors in box; reviews questions for proper format and transports all questions in written format from jury to judge
Ensure integrity of the jury by maintaining order and isolation from the public and compromising situations  Prevent conversations between jurors, parties to cases, and witnesses during trial	Ensures the physical integrity of the jury during trials and deliberations and ensures appropriate isolation from public and compromising situations; during jury deliberations, remains available at all times; as necessary, coordinates meals for jurors
Advise judicial officer when jury reaches verdict	Informs court when verdict is reached or when jury cannot reach a decision
Assist courtroom clerk in assembling parties and calling the court back to order	Perform all applicable court crier and jury information recitations
Assemble parties prior to calling the court back to order	Assembles all necessary parties and court staff; verifies that all necessary parties and court staff are present; performs necessary notifications for calendar call; acts as court crier

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>DUTIES**</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Assist court clerks by taking appearances of counsel at calendar calls	Checks counsel and parties in; contacts attorneys and litigants regarding calendaring matters
Account for exhibit materials during and at the end of trials. Coordinate the use of court evidence presentation systems	Gathers and secures exhibits and at trial end, destroys jurors' notes
Review documents for completeness, accuracy, and conformance to rules, codes, policies and protocols	Accepts and processes designated materials, including documents for filing and confidential materials; rejects incomplete documents; enters and retrieves documents and case data into case management databases; verifies accuracy of data entry; types and distributes a wide variety of legal notices and other assigned documents and materials within legally required time frames; maintains judicial library by copying, inserting and replacing new/revised case laws and by obtaining and organizing assigned law books; maintains inventory of case files within courtroom; copies, posts and distributes or faxes materials, such as daily court calendar and tentative rulings; provides daily Courtroom Status Reports to Supervisor; picks up, sorts and distributes courtroom mail and materials
<p>Prepare court calendars</p> <p>Prepare motion calendar files for court research attorney review</p> <p>Verify documents for hearings are properly marked</p>	<p>Ensures the court is prepared for calendar call by generating, pulling, organizing, assembling, cross-referencing and providing required case files, moving papers, minute orders and other documents</p> <p>Reserves or re-schedules motion/hearing dates for upcoming calendars; maintains and updates caseload inventory and performs purges by reviewing caseload, pulling and reviewing relevant files and takes appropriate action; updates calendar book and daily calendar with dispositions, continuances and other information</p>

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>DUTIES**</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Perform related duties as assigned	<p>Performs other court-related duties as assigned</p> <p>May be assigned to other courtrooms to perform back-up and relief duties and may provide assistance to familiarize relief Judicial Assistants with courtroom protocols</p>
No First Aid or CPR certification required in Orange County	Provides emergency assistance by administering First Aid and CPR and by contacting appropriate personnel or agencies in emergency situations
	<p>** Examples of duties are intended to describe the general nature and level of work performed by personnel assigned to this classification. Any one position in this class may not perform all the duties listed, nor are the duties described intended to be an exhaustive list of all duties, responsibilities and skills required of personnel so classified</p>

**Appendix C – Minimum Qualifications Analysis:  
Los Angeles/Orange County Superior Court**

<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>		<b>LOS ANGELES</b>
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b>		
<b>Note: Qualifications which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>		
<b>COURT ATTENDANT TRAINEE</b>	<b>COURT ATTENDANT</b>	<b>COURTROOM ASSISTANT</b>
One year full time experience of clerical, customer service, legal/court case processing or other experience that would demonstrate possession of the required knowledge and abilities.	One year full-time experience as a Court Attendant Trainee with the Superior Court.	<p>Graduation from high school or G.E.D. equivalent; and two years of progressively responsible experience in performing court service duties and functions at least at the level of Court Services Assistant II.</p> <p>Licenses; Certificates; Special Requirements: A valid California Class C Driver’s License or the ability to utilize an alternative method of transportation when needed to carry out job-related essential functions.</p> <p>United States citizenship is required for appointment in accordance with the California State Constitution and Government Code.</p> <p>Required to successfully complete a Court-certified CPR and first aid course during first six months of employment.</p>

ORANGE COUNTY		LOS ANGELES
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> <b>[Continued]</b>		
Completion of 24 college semester units or 36 quarter units in business administration, administration of justice or a closely related field from an accredited college or university may be substituted for up to one year of experience.	Up to six months of the required experience may be substituted with six month experience as either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Legal Processing Specialist II with Orange County Superior Court working in civil case processing, or;</li> <li>2. A Courtroom Assistant [prior courtroom classification]</li> </ol>	
<b>General Knowledge - Required of Both Orange County Classifications</b>		
Legal terminology, court procedures and customer service practices		General functions and organization of the judicial system, including various divisions of the court
Problem solving and conflict resolution techniques		No direct comparable description
Correct English usage, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; basic mathematical calculations		Correct English usage, including spelling, grammar and punctuation
Clerk and legal record keeping practices and procedures		Case research methods and techniques; Regulations and procedures governing the disclosure of Court records and documents
Preparation of correspondence, reports and statistical summaries		No direct comparable description
Modern office methods; personal computers, commonly used software applications		Operate a computer using standard business software and operate standard office equipment

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Knowledge/use of court case management system, computerized data and record keeping systems	Use and operations of automated case management systems
Function, practices and procedures in a courtroom and the legal system	Carry out duties in accordance with policy, procedure and scope of responsibility; State regulations and court policies and procedures regarding jury service, including attendance, supervision and empanelment
Telephone usage and appropriate etiquette	Principles and practices of customer service and telephone etiquette
Alphabetic, numeric, and chronological indexing of records and files	Office administrative practices and procedures, including recordkeeping and filing
California Codes and Rules of the Court pertaining to Civil operations	Knowledge of state and local statues and Rules of Court that govern general court operations
Purpose and processing of court related documents, operations, procedures and jurisdictions of the court	<p>Knowledge of codes, local rules, procedures and legal terminology.</p> <p>Preparation, acceptance, processing and distribution of legal documents</p>

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS [Continued]</b>	
Ability to listen and obtain accurate and complete information from judicial officers, court staff, attorneys, jurors and other personnel to identify and appropriately respond to their needs; Communicate clearly, both orally and in writing	Communicate clearly and effectively in English
Understand and carry out oral and written instructions	Understand and follow written and oral instructions
<p>Observe situations, recognize when to react and take appropriate course of action</p> <p>Use good judgment and interpersonal skills to calm disputes in the courtroom and surrounding areas of the responsibility</p> <p>Maintain order and silence in a courtroom</p>	No direct comparable description
Remain calm in a fast-paced work environment while effectively handling competing and multiple tasks	Work in an environment that includes frequent interruptions and simultaneous attention to multiple tasks
Accurately and quickly use a computer system to retrieve information, record entries and /or update case information	Keyboard at a level of speed and accuracy necessary to perform assigned duties
Use tact and diplomacy when dealing with sensitive and/or confidential issues and situations	Use tact, discretion and courtesy in dealing with sensitive situations. Maintain confidentiality of Court documents/records
Establish and maintain cooperative working relationships with judicial officers, court staff, and other personnel encountered in the course of work	Establish and maintain effective working relationships with judicial officers, court and county employees, members of the public and others in the course of work

ORANGE COUNTY	LOS ANGELES
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS [Continued]</b>	
Interact with the public and others in a high visibility and/or high volume environment which may involve intense and difficult situations; ensure parties conform to rules and procedures	No direct comparable description
Elevate issues to the judicial officer, security or management for resolution when appropriate	No direct comparable description
Schedule cases, notify parties, place cases on calendar and assemble case documents	No direct comparable description
Read and understand correspondence and forms	Read and understand legal documents and verify completeness
Learn court methods, procedures, rules and terminology	No direct comparable description
Classification Requirement: Wear court-approved attire	Must wear a special uniform and provide part of uniform at own expense

## Appendix D – Duties Analysis: San Bernardino/Orange County Superior Court

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<u>Position Title:</u> Court Attendant Trainee Court Attendant	<u>Position Title:</u> Court Attendant
Position available to internal employees/external candidates	Position available to internal court employees/external candidates
<u>Trainee:</u> 3,260.40-4,042.13/Monthly  <u>Attendant:</u> 3,447.60-4,264.00/Monthly	3,035.00 – 3,872.00/Monthly
Provides for Trainee classification (12 month probation with no permanent status as a trainee). Court Attendant Trainee is used as the entry level classification for training purposes. Satisfactory probationary performance results in advancement to Court Attendant (journey level). Upon promotion to Court Attendant, incumbents serve six months probation.	No Trainee Classification
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>Note: Duties which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>	
Maintain the integrity of the jury	Instruct jury panels on appropriate courtroom decorum and monitor conformance
Perform other duties, as assigned, to support the courtroom; support courtroom and case processing areas	Court Attendants work in the Clerk's Office when not needed in the courtroom
Prepare courtroom and conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to court sessions, including placement of necessary equipment	Conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to morning and afternoon session to ensure courtroom security and observe people and activities during courtroom hours

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Open court sessions	Open court sessions
Serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, parties to cases, judicial officers and other courtroom staff	Serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, litigants and parties to cases and the Judge or Commissioner and his/her court staff
Observe people and activities during court sessions and report disruptions, security violations or suspicious items to Sheriff's or other appropriate personnel	Monitor persons in the courtroom to ensure non-disruptive activity
Use alarm systems and contact appropriate resource in emergency situations	Report security violations or suspicious items to the Sheriff or other appropriate personnel and use alarm buttons or radio communication for emergencies
Comply with evacuation plan and report actions	No direct comparable description
Direct members of the media and public to appropriate area or personnel and respond to questions	No direct comparable description
Instruct jurors and public on appropriate courtroom protocol and monitor conformance, including procedures in the event of an emergency or juror's absence from the courtroom	No direct comparable description
Prevent conversations between jurors, parties to cases, and witnesses during trial	Prevent conversations between jurors, parties, witnesses, spectators, media and the public to the case during trial
Assist courtroom clerks during jury selection process	No direct comparable description
Take custody and escort jurors during deliberations and jury trials; provide jurors with exhibits, verdict forms, jury question forms and jury instructions	No direct comparable description

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
As appropriate, act as liaison between jurors and the judicial officer	No direct comparable description
Ensure integrity of the jury by maintaining order and isolation from the public and compromising situations	No direct comparable description
Advise judicial officer when jury reaches verdict	No direct comparable description
Assist courtroom clerk in assembling parties and calling the court back to order	No direct comparable description
Assemble parties prior to calling the court back to order	No direct comparable description
Assist court clerks by taking appearances of counsel at calendar calls	No direct comparable description
Account for exhibit materials during and at the end of trials	Deliver exhibits to and from the exhibit room or locker; inventory and ensure appropriate supplies are available for courtroom use.
Coordinate the use of court evidence presentation systems	No direct comparable description
Review documents for completeness, accuracy, and conformance to rules, codes, policies and protocols	No direct comparable description
Prepare court calendars Prepare motion calendar files for court research attorney review Verify documents for hearings are properly marked	Post and distribute court calendars
Perform related duties as assigned	Perform related duties as assigned
No first aid or CPR is required in Orange County	Administer immediate first aid or CPR as needed and contract appropriate personnel or agency in the event of medical or emergency situations

**Appendix E – Minimum Qualifications Analysis:  
San Bernardino/Orange County Superior Court**

<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>		<b>SAN BERNARDINO</b>
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b>		
<b>Note: Qualifications which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>		
<b>COURT ATTENDANT TRAINEE</b>	<b>COURT ATTENDANT</b>	<b>COURT ATTENDANT</b>
One year full time experience of clerical, customer service, legal/court case processing or other experience that would demonstrate possession of the required knowledge and abilities.	One year full-time experience as a Court Attendant Trainee with the Superior Court.	Eighteen months of service as a Legal Processing Assistant for the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, including completion of probation and promotion to a Legal Processing Assistant II, or any combination of training and/or experience that could likely provide the desired knowledge and abilities. Court Attendants are required to successfully complete a court approved CPR certification and first-aid training course during their first six months of employment and are required to maintain such certification.
Completion of 24 college semester units or 36 quarter units in business administration, administration of justice or a closely related field from an accredited college or university may be substituted for up to one year of experience.	Up to six months of the required experience may be substituted with six month experience as either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Legal Processing Specialist II with Orange County Superior Court working in civil case processing, or;</li> <li>2. A Courtroom Assistant [prior classification]</li> </ol>	

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]	
<b>General Knowledge - Required of Both Orange County Classifications</b>	
Legal terminology, court procedures and customer service practices	No direct comparable description
Problem solving and conflict resolution techniques	Use good judgment and interpersonal skills in the courtroom to mediate and diffuse disputes
Correct English usage, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; basic mathematical calculations	No direct comparable description
Clerk and legal record keeping practices and procedures	
Preparation of correspondence, reports and statistical summaries	
Modern office methods; personal computers, commonly used software applications	
Knowledge/use of court case management system, computerized data and record keeping systems	
Function, practices and procedures in a courtroom and the legal system	
Telephone usage and appropriate etiquette	
Alphabetic, numeric, and chronological indexing of records and files	
California Codes and Rules of the Court pertaining to Civil operations	
Purpose and processing of court related documents, operations, procedures and jurisdictions of the court	

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]	
Ability to listen and obtain accurate and complete information from judicial officers, court staff, attorneys, jurors and other personnel to identify and appropriately respond to their needs	Analyze jury and public requests and determine appropriate response
Communicate clearly, both orally and in writing; Understand and carry out oral and written instructions	No direct comparable description
Observe situations, recognize when to react and take appropriate course of action	Observe situations, identify when to react and determine an appropriate course of action without a supervisor present
Use good judgment and interpersonal skills to calm disputes in the courtroom and surrounding areas of the responsibility	No direct comparable description
Maintain order and silence in a courtroom	
Remain calm in a fast-paced work environment while effectively handling competing and multiple tasks	
Accurately and quickly use a computer system to retrieve information, record entries and /or update case information	
Operate and set up equipment used in the courtroom	
Use tact and diplomacy when dealing with sensitive and/or confidential issues and situations	
Establish and maintain cooperative working relationships with judicial officers, court staff, and other personnel encountered in the course of work	
Interact with the public and others in a high visibility and/or high volume environment which may involve intense and difficult situations.	
Ensure parties conform to rules and procedures	

ORANGE COUNTY	SAN BERNARDINO
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]	
Elevate issues to the judicial officer, security or management for resolution when appropriate	No direct comparable comparison
Schedule cases, notify parties, place cases on calendar and assemble case documents	
Learn court methods, procedures, rules and legal terminology; read and understand correspondence and forms	
Classification Requirement: Wear court-approved attire	Must wear a court uniform

## Appendix F – Duties Analysis: Riverside/Orange County Superior Court

ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSIDE
<u>Position Title:</u> Court Attendant Trainee Court Attendant	<u>Position Title:</u> Court Attendant
Position available to internal employees/external candidates	Position available to internal employees/external candidates
<u>Trainee:</u> 3,260.40-4,042.13/Monthly  <u>Attendant:</u> 3,447.60-4,264.00/Monthly	3,052.85 – 3,976.25/Monthly
Provides for Trainee classification (12 month probation with no permanent status as a trainee). Court Attendant Trainee is used as the entry level classification for training purposes. Satisfactory probationary performance results in advancement to Court Attendant (journey level). Upon promotion to Court Attendant, incumbents serve six months probation.	
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>Note: Duties which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>	
Support efficient operations of an assigned civil courtroom	Performs specialized work in support of courtroom operations
Maintain the integrity of the jury	Maintain the integrity of the jury
Perform other duties, as assigned, to support the courtroom; support courtroom and case processing areas	No direct comparable description
Assigned only to Unlimited Civil and Complex Litigation courtrooms	Responsible for maintaining security and order in Civil courtrooms
Prepare courtroom and conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to court sessions, including	Conduct search of courtroom and surrounding areas prior to morning and afternoon session to ensure courtroom

ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSIDE
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
necessary equipment	security and observe people and activities during courtroom hours
Ensure and maintain inventory of courtroom equipment and supplies	Ensure appropriate supplies are available for courtroom use
Open court sessions	Open court sessions
Serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, parties to cases, judicial officers and other courtroom staff	Serve as liaison between attorneys, jurors, witnesses, litigants and parties to cases and the Judge or Commissioner and his/her court staff
<p>Observe people and activities during court sessions and report disruptions, security violations or suspicious items to Sheriff's or other appropriate personnel</p> <p>Use alarm systems and contact appropriate resource in emergency situations</p>	<p>Monitor persons in the courtroom to ensure non-disruptive activity. Report security violations or suspicious items to the Sheriff or other appropriate personnel</p> <p>Use alarm buttons or radio communication for emergencies</p>
Comply with evacuation plan and report actions	No direct comparable description
Direct members of the media and public to appropriate area or personnel and respond to questions	No direct comparable description
Instruct jurors and public on appropriate courtroom protocol and monitor conformance, including procedures in the event of an emergency or juror's absence from the courtroom	Instruct jury panels on appropriate courtroom decorum and monitor conformance
Prevent conversations between jurors, parties to cases, and witnesses during trial	Prevent conversations between jurors, parties, witnesses, spectators, media and the public to the case during trial
Assist courtroom clerks during jury selection process	No direct comparable description

ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSIDE
<b>DUTIES</b> <b>[Continued]</b>	
Take custody and escort jurors during deliberations and jury trials; provide jurors with exhibits, verdict forms, jury question forms and jury instructions	No direct comparable description
As appropriate, act as liaison between jurors and the judicial officer	
Ensure integrity of the jury by maintaining order and isolation from the public and compromising situations	
Advise judicial officer when jury reaches verdict	
Assist courtroom clerk in assembling parties and calling the court back to order	
Assemble parties prior to calling the court back to order	
Assist court clerks by taking appearances of counsel at calendar calls	
Account for exhibit materials during and at the end of trials	Inventory and/or deliver exhibits to and from the exhibit room or locker
Coordinate the use of court evidence presentation systems	No direct comparable description
Review documents for completeness, accuracy, and conformance to rules, codes, policies and protocols	Accept legal documents for filing. Assist the courtroom in processing legal documents as needed
Prepare court calendars; Prepare motion calendar files for court research attorney review; Verify documents for hearings are properly marked	Post and distribute court calendars
No first aid or CPR is required in Orange County	Administer immediate first aid or CPR as needed and contact appropriate personnel or agency in the event of medical or emergency situations

**Appendix G – Minimum Qualifications Analysis:  
Riverside/Orange County Superior Court**

<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>		<b>RIVERSIDE</b>
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b>		
<b>Note: Qualifications which are similar for each county are listed side by side for purposes of comparison</b>		
<b>COURT ATTENDANT TRAINEE</b>	<b>COURT ATTENDANT</b>	<b>COURT ATTENDANT</b>
One year full time experience of clerical, customer service, legal/court case processing or other experience that would demonstrate possession of the required knowledge and abilities.	One year full-time experience as a Court Attendant Trainee with the Superior Court.	<p>Option I: Eighteen months of service as a Court Services Assistant for the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside or any combination of training and/or experience that could likely provide the desired knowledge and abilities.</p> <p>Option II: Minimum of two years of experience providing security services for the well being and safety of customers and employees. Experience must include enforcement of processes and procedures for proper access control; and conducting regular patrols of sections and/or property to identify safety hazards and breaches in security.</p> <p>Court Attendants are required to successfully complete a court approved CPR certification and first-aid training course during their first six months of employment and are required to maintain such certification.</p>

ORANGE COUNTY		RIVERSIDE
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]		
		Special Requirements: A valid California Class C driver's license requirement will be reviewed on a position basis in accordance with ADA regulations.
Completion of 24 college semester units or 36 quarter units in business administration, administration of justice or a closely related field from an accredited college or university may be substituted for up to one year of experience.	Up to six months of the required experience may be substituted with six month experience as either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Legal Processing Specialist II with Orange County Superior Court working in civil case processing, or;</li> <li>2. A Courtroom Assistant [prior courtroom classification]</li> </ol>	
<b>General Knowledge - Required of Both Orange County Classifications</b>		No direct comparable description
Legal terminology, court procedures and customer service practices		
Problem solving and conflict resolution techniques		
Correct English usage, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; basic mathematical calculations		
Clerk and legal record keeping practices and procedures		
Preparation of correspondence, reports and statistical summaries		
Modern office methods; personal computers, commonly used software applications		
Knowledge/use of court case management system, computerized data and record keeping systems		

ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSIDE
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]	
Function, practices and procedures in a courtroom and the legal system	No direct comparable description
Telephone usage and appropriate etiquette	
Alphabetic, numeric, and chronological indexing of records and files	
California Codes and Rules of the Court pertaining to Civil operations	
Purpose and processing of court related documents, operations, procedures and jurisdictions of the court	
Ability to listen and obtain accurate and complete information from judicial officers, court staff, attorneys, jurors and other personnel to identify and appropriately respond to their needs	
Communicate clearly, both orally and in writing	
Understand and carry out oral and written instructions	
Observe situations, recognize when to react and take appropriate course of action	
Use good judgment and interpersonal skills to calm disputes in the courtroom and surrounding areas of the responsibility	
Maintain order and silence in a courtroom	
Remain calm in a fast-paced work environment while effectively handling competing and multiple tasks	
Accurately and quickly use a computer system to retrieve information, record entries and /or update case information	
Operate and set up equipment used in the courtroom	
Use tact and diplomacy when dealing with sensitive and/or confidential issues and situations	

ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSIDE
<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS</b> [Continued]	
Establish and maintain cooperative working relationships with judicial officers, court staff, and other personnel encountered in the course of work	No direct comparable description
Interact with the public and others in a high visibility and/or high volume environment which may involve intense and difficult situations; ensure parties conform to rules and procedures	
Elevate issues to the judicial officer, security or management for resolution when appropriate	
Schedule cases, notify parties, place cases on calendar and assemble case documents	
Read and understand correspondence and forms	
Learn court methods, procedures, rules and legal terminology	
Classification Requirement: Wear court-approved attire	

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

2011 U.S. Census Bureau Statistics

American Bar Association, *Underfunding State Courts Threatens Our Constitutional Democracy*, American Bar Association, 2011

Casey, Pamela, *A National Strategic Plan for Judicial Branch Security*, 2006, page 6

Center for Court Innovation, *Procedural Fairness in California; Initiatives, Challenges, and Recommendations*, May 2011

Chatters, Jake; *Defining Operational Successes: Measuring The Performance of a Court's Front-Line Staff*, NCSC Future Trends in State Courts, 2009, page 118

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., 2005 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary

Denton, Douglas, *Court Review, Special Issue on Procedural Fairness; Procedural Fairness in the California Courts, 2007-2008, Volume 44*, page 44

Franklin, Malcolm, *Ensuring The Personal Security of Judges*; NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2009, page 55

Hall, Daniel J., *How State Courts Are Weathering the Economic Storm*; NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2009, page 3

Hall, Daniel J., *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*, NCSC, 2010, pages 6-12

Hammer, Michael, *Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate*; Harvard Business Review, July-August, 1990

Horn, Pamela, *Violence Against Lawyers*, 63-Aug. J. Kan. B.A. 6 (1994)

Judicial Council of California, *Court Security Fact Sheet*, March 2007

Los Angeles Superior Court; *Job Descriptions, Classification: Courtroom Assistant*

OCSC *Mission Statement/Trial Court Operations Plan*

Orange County Superior Court; *Job Descriptions, Classification: Court Attendant*

Reinkensmeyer, Marcus W., *Court Security and Business Continuity in Lean Budget Times: A Collaborative Systems Approach*; NCSC, Future Trends in State Courts, 2011, page 87

Riverside Superior Court; Job Descriptions, Classification: Court Attendant

San Bernardino Superior Court; Job Descriptions, Classification: Court Attendant

Shuit, Douglas P., Deputies Still Best Defense Against Violence in Court; Crime: Despite screening devices and inmate restraints, outbreaks happen. It falls on bailiffs to restore order, Los Angeles Times, Dec. 28, 1998

Superior Court of California, County of Orange 2008-2013 Strategic Plan

Trial Court Performance Standard 1.2: Safety, Accessibility and Convenience; Measure 1.2.3: Perceptions of Courthouse Security

Trial Court Performance Standard 1.2: Safety, Accessibility and Convenience; Measure 1.2.4: Court Employees Knowledge of Emergency Procedures

Trial Court Performance Standard 4.2: Accountability for Public Resources; Measure 4.2.2: Evaluation of Personnel Resource Allocation

Trial Court Performance Standard 4.5: Response to Change