COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Alabama

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Alabama Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts. Local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.
  - The state court system continues to receive various funding from local sources, i.e., county commissions and local legislation.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Alabama’s state general fund appropriation was reduced from $174.5 million in FY12 to $161.4 million in FY13; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained declined from 2.05% to 2%.
  - There has been no increase to the level of court fees since 2009.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - An increase in civil filing fees earmarked for the trial courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts was propose for needed enhancements, but the Legislature instead used it to fund the court system.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased while the number of clerical staff persons has decreased.
  - **Compensation:** Salaries of court staff have been frozen at times over the past four years.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Alabama courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs, delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. The courts have delayed or reduced jury trials.
    - Service reductions have had an impact on court services. They have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services and increased delays and backlogs.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Alabama courts have implemented and plan in the coming year to continue to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow, e-payment of fees and fines, and a virtual web-based information center to
provide public access to records. All civil cases were mandated to be electronically filed as of October 1, 2012.

- **Business Processes:** The Alabama courts use videoconferencing of arraignments for incarcerated defendants.
- **Centralization:** Prior to 2009, the Alabama courts created a centralized call center and a centralized payable center and centralized traffic citation processing.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Alaska

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Alaska Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses. The state pays for the local courthouses and their maintenance and equipment.
  - Alaska’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $105.4 million in FY12 to $110.8 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $101.6 million to $107.2 million, an increase of 6%. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary increased from 2.08% to 2.12%
  - Technology funding has increased by 5% over the past year. In FY12, the court system received $1.4 million for development of an e-filing document management system and in FY13 received another $1.785 million. For FY14, the Alaska court system is seeking an additional $5.9 million. This funding comes to the court system through a capital appropriation. This funding for technology projects is in addition to the appropriations identified above.
  - Some fines have increased since FY2009, but they were not increased in order to enhance revenue for the courts.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The judicial branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the legislative body without prior approval by the executive branch.
  - The judicial branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. Judicial budgets contain too many line items and permission is required to move funds from one line to another.
  - The FY13 budget is not sufficient to enable the courts to provide or enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. Technology plans and reviews have indicated that the Alaska Court System requires several staff persons to meet current and future technical needs.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. The ability to pay fines and to look up case filing information on the Internet has provided citizens with greater efficiency and access to the court system.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 6%, the number of trial court staff persons has increased by 2%. The number of central office staff persons has increased 1% and spending on trial court operating expenses has increased 16%. In FY13, the number of trial court staff will increase 1% and trial court operating expenses will increase 6%.
Service Reductions: Non-judicial positions are only funded at 95% of the budgeted cost. To meet this underfunding requirement as non-judicial positions are vacated, rehires are not made until a 30-day vacancy period has been satisfied. Requests for waivers of the required 30-day vacancy period can be approved by the administrative director.

Efficiency Measures:
- The Alaska courts have implemented e-filing, an enhanced case management system. They have implemented e-citations by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees, virtual self-help centers, and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records.
- The Alaska Court System is in the process of developing e-filing and Document Management systems, but it will not be up and running in FY13.

Restructuring: The Alaska courts have expanded the jurisdiction and use of subordinate judicial officers, reallocated staff, and made use of part-time staff and off-hours workers. They will continue to reallocate staff. They are expanding their use of retired and pro tem judges.

Business Processes:
- The Alaska courts have enhanced their caseflow management program, created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors, implemented “in-court updating” for docket entries and sentencing orders and videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants. They have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings.
- The Alaska Court System is exploring the possibility of expanded use of videoconferencing for some court proceedings. In Anchorage, they have a courtroom located in the jail. Rather than having the prisoners travel to the court, the judge travels to the jail. The Alaska Court System has occasionally used videoconferencing or webcams for proceedings requiring a deaf interpreter.

Outsourcing: The Alaska courts have outsourced network services and the provision of language access services.

Centralization: The Alaska courts have centralized jury qualification and summoning.

The State of Alaska has a Criminal Justice Working Group with representation from all the justice agencies. This group works on efficiencies and improvements in all aspects of the criminal justice system. There is also a committee that works on streamlining the exchange of data between justice agencies to reduce redundant data entry.

The Alaska courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. The Alaska Court System has received increased funding for additional judges and clerical staff to assist with court caseloads. They have also received funding and legislative support for an e-filing and document management system, which when fully implemented should promote improved access and timely justice.
State/Local Funding
- The Arizona Judiciary has a mix of state and local funding.
  - The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, a large portion of juvenile and adult probation, technology and one-half of the salaries of the trial court judges (except in Maricopa County). Trial court clerical and support staff, operating expenses, courthouses and equipment are funded locally.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Arizona judicial system essentially stayed the same. The dollars decreased from $148.46 million in FY12 to $148.28 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation decreased from $108.8 million to $108.59 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary dropped from 1.32% to 1.28%.
  - Overall State General Fund appropriations for the Judiciary have been reduced by over 19% (over $22M) from FY 2008 to FY 2013. In addition, the Legislature has excluded the Judiciary in any GF increases to cover employer cost increases (Retirement/Health Benefits) creating an indirect cut to the Judiciary which is not included in the totals above. A total of $47M has been swept from the Judicial Branch’s state special revenue funds from FY 2008 through FY 2014. Included in that total is a $6M fund sweep for the current fiscal year (FY 13) and an already approved $6M fund sweep for the next fiscal year (FY 14).
  - The Arizona trial courts are largely funded by local units of government, e.g., City and County levels. Many Courts have undergone substantial budget reductions in the past four years, some over multiple fiscal years.
  - Since FY09, to enhance revenue, fees have increased 44%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to get worse.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch submits its budget directly to the Legislative Branch.
- The Judiciary receives a lump sum budget.
- The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology.
- The introduction of technology, such as 24/7 on-line access to some court documents, on-line jury qualification and scheduling and remote video interpretation has enhanced court services to the public.

Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
- Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
  - Over the past four years, the number of judges and has remained the same. Central office staff has been reduced by 16%.
  - This coming year, the number of judges will increase by one (Mohave County).
- Service Reductions: Over the past four years, the Arizona courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs, delayed filling judicial vacancies and have
delayed filling vacancies in judicial support positions. In the coming year, they will continue to delay filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. Service reductions have resulted in limited access to court services and have increased backlogs and delays in disposing of cases.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and have furloughed court staff. In the coming year, they will continue to freeze judicial salaries.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The Arizona courts have implemented E-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, and electronic workflow. They have enabled law enforcement to file e-citations. Persons can make e-payment of fees and fines, can access virtual self-help centers and can access a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. Arizona has expanded the use of video technologies, including video recording of court proceedings, video hearings and video interpretation.

- **Restructuring:** Arizona has consolidated courthouses and has reallocated staff. Justice Courts have been co-located at a new regional courthouse. Justice and Superior Courts have been co-located.

- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented and will continue to implement an enhanced caseflow management program. They have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings and are videoconferencing arraignments and detention hearings and remote interpretation. E-citations and e-filing are eliminating work for state agencies.

- **Outsourcing:** The courts are outsourcing the collection of fines, data entry, electronic filing and the translation of court protective order forms.

- **Centralization:** The courts have a centralized call center and payment center and have centralized collections processing.

The Arizona courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The courts and probation departments have undergone substantial budget reductions.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Arkansas

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Arkansas Judiciary has a mix of state and local funding.
  - The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, technology and for the salaries of the trial court judges and trial court support staff. Trial court clerical staff, operating expenses, courthouses and equipment are funded locally.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Arkansas judicial system increased from $74.5 million in FY12 to $76 million in FY13.
  - The state general fund appropriation increased from $66.7 million to $68.1 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary remained at less than 1%.
  - Since FY09, to enhance revenue, fees have increased 10%.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 46%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch submits its budget directly to the Legislative Branch.
  - The Judiciary does not have total authority to move funds between Judiciary programs. Appropriations are place within seven categories; the court has complete authority within those categories and some ability to transfer between categories.
  - The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 28% and the number of central office staff has increased 10%. Locally funded staff positions in the trial courts have not increased.
    - This coming year, the number of judges and court staff will remain the same.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and furloughed court staff.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Arkansas courts have implemented e-filing, an electronic document management system and an enhanced case management system. They enable law enforcement to file e-citations. Persons can make e-payment of fees.
  - **Restructuring:** Over the past four years, Arkansas has created a single tier trial court, consolidated the number of districts and reallocated judges to districts based upon weighted caseload.
  - **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program and have implemented in-court updating of docket entries and sentencing orders.
- **Centralization**: The courts have centralized the qualification and summoning of jurors.

The Arkansas courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. Operating budgets have been flat for four years. Staff positions in the trial courts have not increased over the past four years.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – California

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The California Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology, operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the California judicial system were reduced from $4 billion in FY12 to $3 billion in FY13.
  - State general fund appropriations were reduced from $1.7 billion to $730 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary fell from 1.6% to 0.8% in FY13.
  - The branch weathered a half billion dollar General Fund cut in the fiscal year, though a significant portion was offset by local court fund balances (trial courts have retained the ability to carry over funds from year to year) as well as a redirection of court construction funds to mitigate the General Fund cut.
  - Funding was eliminated for a statewide case management system that was nearing deployment. Over 70 different case management systems are currently utilized by the courts, some that will need to be replaced in the next 12 months. This represents a major issue for the branch. While court construction funds--over a billion dollars--have been used to offset budget cuts over the past four years, some court construction projects are moving ahead. Ongoing projects and programs will continue to be funded through special funds.
  - The budget situation over the next year is expected to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not submit its budget request directly to the Legislature. The Executive Branch conducts a significant review and analysis prior to the Governor releasing his proposed budget.
  - The Judicial Branch does not have the authority to move funds between line items. The branch has historically been allowed to manage budget reductions within the branch as well as administer branch funds with considerable leeway. Much of that flexibility has been lost and the branch must now work closely, and sometimes seek permission from, the state Department of Finance and/or Legislature when considering certain budget related matters.
  - The California Judiciary currently has the authority to roll over funds to the next fiscal year.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide for necessary technology nor enhance what they have. Many courts utilize aging and obsolete technology systems, several of which are expected to need replacing this year. Most courts do not offer e-filing.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, while the number of judges has remained the same, the number of trial court staff has
decreased by 10%, the number of central office staff have decreased by 30% and the amount available for trial court expenses has decreased by 5%. This coming year, the number of judges will remain the same, the number of trial court staff will decrease by 10%, the number of central office staff will decrease 10% and spending on trial court operating expenses will decrease 5%.

- **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the California courts have reduced hours of operation, imposed staff layoffs, delayed filling vacancies in the clerk’s offices and in judicial support positions, reduced the use of retired judges, and delayed jury trials. They have eliminated vacant staff positions and have restricted travel. These reductions will continue in the coming year.

- **Impact of Service Reductions:** These reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, produced delays and backlogs in the disposition of cases and diverted resources from civil to other mandatory case types.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, some of the trial courts have frozen and reduced the salaries of judicial officers and court staff. Some courts have furloughed court staff; one court furloughed court staff 40 days a year. Some courts will continue these steps this fiscal year.

- **Efficiency Measures:** Self-Help Centers--At the state level, the AOC administers an online Self Help Center and allocates funding to support self help centers at the local level. While considerable investment was made into developing a statewide case management system (which included document management, electronic workflow, e-citations, etc.), this project was terminated earlier this year. Current priorities are focusing on maintaining existing systems.

- **Restructuring:** The courts have reallocated staff and made use of part-time and off-hours workers, but actions in this area have been limited, based on the palatability of these actions.

- **Centralization:** The courts have centralized collections processing.

- **Commissions:** A working group was established in October, 2012 to review implementation of state trial court funding and whether this legislation has met its intended goals.

The California Courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Colorado

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Colorado Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts. Local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Colorado’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $385.6 million in FY12 to $397.6 million in FY13, approximately 3%. The state general fund appropriation was reduced from $260.9 million to $247.4 million; state special funds increased by $24 million.
  - Fees and fines have remained the same since 2009.
  - Over the past four years, funding for technology has increased 5%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch does not have authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges and trial court staff has increased by 10%. The number of central office staff has been reduced by 5%. Spending on trial court operating expenses has increased by 10%.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges will increase 2%, the number of trial court clerical staff will increase 1%. Central office staff and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen; judges’ salaries will continue to be frozen in the coming year.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Colorado courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs, and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges. These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Colorado courts have implemented e-filing and will continue to do so in FY13. They have created and implemented an electronic document management system.
The Colorado courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice, primarily due to decreased case load.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – District of Columbia

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The District of Columbia’s Judiciary is a federally funded system.
  - The federal government pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial and appellate court technology, operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total Judicial system appropriations increased from $293.1 million in FY12 to $294.2 million in FY13. Not counting grants, federal funding increased from $287.8 million to $289.6 million.
    - For FY13, the D.C. Courts are financed by a six-month continuing resolution. The FY13 appropriation amount, above, annualizes this funding.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 8%.
  - The D.C. Courts’ budget situation over the next three years is likely to get worse.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Courts present their budget directly to the US Congress and the Office of Management (OMB). The local legislature is provided a copy.
  - The Courts have the authority to move funds between line items.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology.
  - The introduction of technology has enabled the courts to provide enhanced services to other agencies. The Courts have worked with agencies to create computer interfaces for e-filing, warrants and shared information. These interfaces reduce duplicative data entry and improve the quality of court data. A new website provides public information in a more user-friendly format. Live web chats provide public information.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses**: Over the past four years, while the number of judges has remained the same, the number of trial court staff has increased 3%, the number of central office staff has increased 7% and the funds available for trial court operating expenses has increased 10%. Increases have focused on juvenile probation services. No changes to staffing levels will be made in the coming year.
  - **Service Reductions**: The D.C. Courts have deferred capital projects and plan to do so in FY13.
  - **Compensation**: Over the past four years, Congress has frozen judicial salaries. Court staff will not receive cost of living increases in the coming year.
  - **Efficiency Measures**: The D.C. Courts have implemented e-filing, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow and e-payment of fees and fines. They have implemented a virtual self-help center and a virtual web-based
information center to provide public access to court records. They have enabled law enforcement to file e-citations. The courts automated issuance of warrants using online video conferencing. Submission and payment of court-appointed attorney vouchers has been automated, along with internal processes.

- **Restructuring:** The D.C. Courts have reallocated staff and make use of part-time and off-hours workers.
- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented and continue to implement an enhanced caseflow management program.
- **Centralization:** As a unified court in a geographically small jurisdiction, the D.C. Courts are fully centralized.

The D.C. Courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. They have undertaken numerous initiatives since FY2009, including the creation of self-help centers for unrepresented parties, in cooperation with the D.C. Bar; implementation of time standards for trial cases; adoption of courtwide performance measures; increased information available on the Courts’ website; increased outreach to the community; expanded community courts and other problem solving courts (such as family treatment and mental health courts); and increased automation.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Delaware

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Delaware Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology, operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - State general fund appropriations remained at essentially the same amount this year, with increases focused on rising personnel costs and other mandatory services offset by the transfer of $2.9 million for court-appointed conflict counsel outside of the Judiciary. The dollar amount was reduced from $91.34 million in FY12 to $91.03 million in FY13. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary fell from 2.6% to 2.5% in FY13.
  - The Judicial Branch budget situation over the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present its budget directly to the Legislature.
  - The Judiciary does not have the authority to move funds between line items.
  - The FY13 budget minimally enables the courts to provide necessary technology. The courts struggle to address infrastructure improvements as well as programming enhancement needs. They do not currently have funds to make needed enhancements.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses**: In this fiscal year, the number of judges and staff persons has increased (two new judges and 16 associated full-time staff were funded). Besides these resources, minimal additional funding for new staffing resources was provided last year in the form of funding for casual/seasonal (temporary) resources. Funding for court operating expenses has declined by 10%.
  - **Service Reductions**: Over the past four years, the Delaware courts have delayed filling vacancies in judicial support positions.
  - **Compensation**: Until last year, the salaries of judicial officers were frozen and the salaries of court staff were reduced (during one year) and frozen. A salary reduction for judicial officers (for one year) was voluntary, with 100% participation.
  - **Impact of Service and Compensation Reductions**: These service and compensation reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, and produced delays and backlogs in the disposition of cases.
  - **Efficiency Measures**: The Delaware courts have implemented e-filing, an enhanced case management system, and e-payment of fees and fines. They have implemented a virtual self-help center and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to certain court records. They have enabled law
enforcement to file e-citations. Since FY 2009, more case information is available on-line. Other efficiencies include streamlining operations and instituting centralized functions to promote efficiency and improve public contact responses; e.g., a family court statewide call center.

- **Restructuring:** The Delaware Judiciary has and will continue to consolidate courthouses, expand the use of subordinate judicial officers, reallocate staff, and use part-time and off-hours workers.
- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented and continue to implement an enhanced caseflow management program. Videoconferencing for non-evidentiary hearings has been in place since the 1990s.
- **Centralization:** The Delaware courts have established a limited centralized call center (for family court cases) and have centralized collections processing and traffic citation processing.

The Delaware Judiciary is in a better position than a year ago to provide access and timely justice, but not better off than when the fiscal challenges arose in FY 2009.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Florida

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Florida Judiciary is both state and locally funded.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The counties pay for technology, security and for the local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Florida’s total state and federal grant appropriation was decreased from $458.1 million in FY12 to $443.9 million in FY13. Combined state general and special funds were reduced. The Judicial Branch budget was .7% of the total state budget in FY11/12 and .6% in FY12/13.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch does not have authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges and trial court and central office staff and the amount spent on operating expenses has remained the same. In the coming year, the number of judges and staff and the amount spent on operating expenses will continue to remain the same.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** Courts and Clerks (who are independently elected constitutional officers) are working collaboratively to establish a single statewide e-filing portal for all courts and all case types and additionally are implementing judge viewer systems that provide for a paperless courtroom. This initiative is expected to produce savings for filers and clerks’ offices as well as creating significant improvements in efficiencies in the disposition of cases.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Georgia

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Georgia Judiciary is funded both by the state and by the local funding bodies.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and for the salaries of the trial court judges. The salaries of trial court judges’ support staff and clerical staff, the cost of trial court technology and operating expenses and the expense of providing, maintaining and equipping local courthouses are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Georgia’s total state and federal grant appropriation of $162.6 million in FY12 increased to $171.5 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $158.3 million to $161.6 million, an increase of 3%. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at .86%.
    - The state appropriation includes the Court of Appeals, the Judicial Council, the Juvenile Courts, the Prosecuting Attorneys council the Superior Courts and the Supreme Court.
    - The increase includes greater costs for employee health benefits and the employees’ retirement system.
    - The FY13 budget includes additional money to fund e-filing in the Court of Appeals.
  - Funds available to the courts at the local level have been reduced.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased.
  - In 2010, civil filing fees in superior and state court were increased, with proceeds going into the state general fund.
  - The Judicial Branch budget situation over the next three fiscal years is expected to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
    - While the Branch has the constitutional authority to manage its appropriation, the Legislature may make their wishes known within the budget document and generally the courts follow. This generally happens on special or new projects with the majority of the appropriations handled as the courts see fit.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide for nor enhance technology necessary to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.
• Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
  o Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses: Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same. The number of central office staff persons has been reduced. In FY13, the number of judges and central office staff persons will remain the same.
  o Compensation: Over the past four years, the Georgia courts have furloughed court staff.
  o Service Reductions: Over the past four years, the Georgia courts have had staff layoffs and have reduced the use of retired judges.
    ▪ These actions have resulted in reduced service to the public and limited access to court services and have increased delays and backlogs.
  o Efficiency Measures: The Georgia courts have been implementing e-filing in the Court of Appeals.
  o Restructuring: The Georgia courts have reallocated staff. They use part-time and off-hours workers.
    ▪ The Administrative Office of the Courts relocated staff from Macon to Atlanta and closed the satellite office.
  o Business Processes: The Georgia plan in FY13 to begin, as a pilot project, remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.
  o Outsourcing: The Georgia courts plan in FY13 to outsource the provision of language access service and also to outsource some legal services to replace a full-time staff attorney.

The State Bar has created the Next Generation Courts Commission which has as one of its charges to make recommendations on how to promote adequate funding for Georgia’s courts.

The Georgia courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. If the budget situation improves, additional monies will be used on new technologies and new staffing needs for current projects.
• **State/Local Funding**
  
  o The Guam Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  o The state pays for the appellate courts, the AOC and the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology, operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.
  o The judiciary also receives appropriations separate from court operations that funds the adult and juvenile drug courts, indigent defense and two staff persons in the Mental Health Court. These appropriations are specific and cannot be comingle with court operations appropriations.
  o This year’s operations expenditures are $850,000 over budget. If the courts do not receive additional funding, they will begin to reduce court hours by four hours weekly, commencing May 21, 2012 through the remainder of the fiscal year.

• **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  
  o Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Guam judicial system declined from $39.2 million in FY12 to $36.8 million in FY13.
  o State general fund appropriations were reduced from $24.6 million to $23.6 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the Judiciary declined from 4.4% to 4.1%.
  o Over the past four years, fees have increased 50% and fines have increased 25%.
  o Over the past four years, technology spending has increased more than 100%.
  o The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

• **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  
  o The Judicial Branch presents its budget directly to the Legislature without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  o The Judicial Branch has the authority to move funds between budget line items.
  o The FY13 budget has funding to enable the courts to provide and enhance technology. They expect to become fully automated for court users and the public by June, 2013.

• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges and court staff has remained the same. The number of central office staff has been reduced by 10%. Funding for trial court operating expenses has been increased by 10%.
    - This coming year, the number of judges will remain the same. The number of trial court staff will decline by 10% and the number of central office staff will decline by 15%. Spending on trial court operating expenses will increase by 10%. In the coming year, Guam will continue to delay filling staff vacancies.
  
  o **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Guam courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs and have delayed filling vacancies in the
clerk’s offices and in judicial support positions. They have delayed jury trials. These reductions have resulted in limited access to court services.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have furloughed court staff. In the coming year, they will reduce and freeze the salaries of judicial officers and will again furlough court staff.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The courts have created an electronic document management system and virtual self-help centers. In the coming year, they will implement e-filing and enhanced case management system, electronic workflow and e-payment of fines and fees. Law enforcement will be able to issue e-citations. They will put into place a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records. Additional automated modules include jury management, probation, marshals, family counseling, procurement, public guardian, financial and human resources. The courts have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings, videoconferencing of arraignments and detention hearings for detained adults and juveniles and have implemented remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

- **Restructuring:** The courts in Guam have expanded the jurisdiction of subordinate judicial officers, consolidated clerk management positions, and reallocated staff. They have employed limited term employees (working full time to assist workload demands during the absences of National Guard active duty employees on deployment and medical leave due to PTSD an injury sustained. Approximately 16% of staff, including one judicial officer, are with the National Guard.

- **Business Processes:** The courts have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings and use videoconferencing for first appearance of criminal defendants and delinquent juveniles. In the coming year, they will implement a new caseflow management program, create a fine schedule for petty misdemeanors, and implement in-court updating for docketing and sentencing orders.

- **Centralization:** The courts have a centralized payable center and have centralized collections processing, traffic citation processing and jury qualification and summoning.

The Courts in Guam are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Hawaii

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Hawaii Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology, operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Hawaii judicial system increased from $145.4 million in FY12 to $148.6 million in FY13.
  - State general fund appropriations increased from $132.6 million to $134.9 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary fell from 2.39% to 2.34% in FY13.
  - Over the past four years, funding for technology increased 5%.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch provides the Executive Branch with its budget request, but the Executive Branch has no authority to approve/disapprove the Judiciary’s budget request submitted to the Legislature.
  - The Chief Justice has the authority to move funds between Judiciary programs if necessary.
  - While the courts have some funding in the Computer Systems Special Fund to provide some technology to help meet some of the public and court demands for technology, the level of funding is by no means sufficient. The Fund does have some funding available to continue to make some of their needed enhancements.
  - The introduction of these technologies, such as e-filing for the appellate and criminal trial courts, has enabled the courts to provide enhanced court services to the attorneys and the public. The public can view case information and can purchase filed documents on-line.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 1%. This coming year, the number of judges, the number of staff positions and funding for court operating expenses will remain the same.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Hawaii courts have reduced hours or operation, imposed staff layoffs, delayed filling vacancies in the clerk’s offices and in judicial support positions and delayed jury trials. They have eliminated vacant staff positions and have restricted travel. The courts have reduced the purchase of service contract expenditures for treatment, shelter and victim services programs. These reductions will continue in the coming year.
    - These reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, produced delays and backlogs in the disposition of cases and diverted resources from civil to other mandatory case types.
- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have reduced the salaries of judicial officers and court staff. Judicial officers were furloughed. The judges not only received a 5% pay cut; they did not receive their scheduled salary increases set by the Commission on Salaries for the fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The Hawaii courts have implemented e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow and e-payment of fees and fines. They have implemented a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records. In the coming year, they will enable law enforcement to file e-Citations.

- **Business Processes:** The courts have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings and now use videoconferencing of arraignments and detention hearings for detained adults and juveniles.

Service reductions have resulted in the Hawaii Judiciary being in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. Budget cuts from $150 million in FY09 to $135 million in FY13 have meant a reduction in services provided by and through the Judiciary, especially in the purchase of services related to providing victim/client/offender treatment, services and support. The budget cut and loss of positions in FY10 has contributed to some delays in other services and the ability to perform certain functions in a desired manner.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Idaho

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Idaho Judiciary has a mix of state and local funding.
  - The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, technology hardware and software, and for the salaries of the trial court judges and court reporters. Trial court clerical and support staff, courthouses and non-technology related equipment are funded locally.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Idaho judicial system increased from $48.3 million in FY12 to $49.5 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $29.2 million to $30.3 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary remained at 1%.
  - Since FY09, to enhance revenue, fees have increased 12%.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 44%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch submits its budget directly to the Legislative Branch. By statute, the Governor must transmit the Judiciary’s budget to the Legislature without change.
  - The Judiciary has the authority to move funds between Judiciary programs. The Legislature provides a “lump sum” appropriation to the Judiciary.
  - The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology. In FY15, the courts intend to propose new revenue streams for technology.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges and court staff has remained the same. Funding for trial court operating expenses has been reduced by 18%.
    - This coming year, the number of judges may increase by 3%. The number of court staff and funding for trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
    - During the fiscal crisis, four magistrate judge positions were held vacant; Idaho has now either filled the positions or has scheduled recruitment. As revenues permitted, additional problem-solving court coordinators and court assistance officers were funded. A behavioral health specialist and program evaluator were added as a result of the substance abuse treatment funds. As guardianship revenues increased, a statewide coordinator was added.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Idaho courts have delayed filling judicial vacancies and have delayed filling vacancies in judicial support positions. They have reduced travel and education and did not replace computer equipment. These reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public.
- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and furloughed court staff. Idaho judges voluntarily worked two days without pay. A 2% pay increase was received this year.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The Idaho courts enable law enforcement to file e-citations. Persons can make e-payment of fees and fines and have access to a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. In the coming year, Idaho will implement e-filing, an electronic document management system and an enhanced case management system.

- **Restructuring:** Idaho has expanded the use of retired senior judges and has assigned sitting judges temporarily to the counties where the caseload needs are greatest.

- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented “in-court updating” and have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. The Idaho courts are implementing an enhanced caseflow management program. The courts have aggressively instituted an “advancing justice” initiative to resolve cases more timely using the model time standards as a framework for review.

- **Centralization:** The courts have centralized the financial review of all conservator reports and in the next year will be centralizing the qualification and summoning of jurors. The courts are examining the centralization of collections.

The Idaho courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. They have renewed their commitment to timely justice, achieving efficiencies through technology, and protecting families, children and communities through problem-solving courts, family court services and other innovative methods.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Indiana

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Indiana Judiciary is funded by a mix of state and local bodies.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges. The counties pay for trial court clerical staff, judicial support staff, technology and the operating expenses for the courts. The counties provide the local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Indiana’s total state and federal grant appropriation was reduced from $130.46 million in FY12 to $130.39 million FY13. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 0.89%.
  - Over the past four years, funding for technology has decreased 50%.
  - Fees have increased 1% since 2009.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The budget is reviewed by the budget agency in the Executive Branch that submits a recommendation to the Legislature.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. Funding for an enhanced case management system has been cut.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. These services include e-citations for law enforcement agencies, improved case management, and a protective order registry.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 2%.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges will increase 2%.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Indiana courts have had staff layoffs.
    - In the coming year, they will continue to delay filling vacancies.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Indiana courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-filing and an electronic document management system. They have implemented e-payment of fines and fees and e-citations by law enforcement.
  - **Business Processes:** The Indiana courts have implemented enhanced caseflow management programs and have implemented remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants. They have implemented in-court updating for docket entries and for producing sentencing and other orders.
A group of judges has established a strategic planning committee to study unification of the court system as a means of lowering the cost of court services.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Kansas

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Kansas Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. Local funding bodies pay for technology, trial court operating expenses and court facilities and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Kansas Judiciary was increased from $126.5 million in FY12 to $131.8 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $102.5 million to $106.2 million. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 1.7%.
  - Local funding appears to be consistent.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased 10%. The Kansas Judiciary does have grant funding to begin exploration into moving to a statewide electronic court system. They also have grant funding to begin e-filing in the appellate courts and three pilot trial courts.
  - The Kansas Judiciary has grant funding to review the collections process to learn where improvements may be possible.
  - Docket fees have not increased. Adult Supervision fees have increased 104% and the Judicial Branch receives the increased revenue.
  - The judicial branch receives $10 million from a surcharge which has doubled from $5 million since FY 2009.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.
  - If the budget situation improves, fully staffing the courts is a priority.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The Judicial Branch budget is included in the Governor’s budget without modification as a placeholder for the Legislature to consider.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget is sufficient to enable the courts to provide or enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. They have funding from the state and from grants to implement pilots in FY 2013 for e-filing. The FY 2014 budget request includes an increase to enable continued roll out statewide.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others in state government to provide or receive enhanced court services.
• Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
  o Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
    ▪ Over the past four years, the number of judges, central office staff positions and trial court staff positions has remained the same. Local funding for trial court operating expenses has been stable.
    ▪ While the Legislature has not eliminated Judicial Branch positions, they have reduced funding significantly. Eighty non-judicial positions have been held vacant and will be held vacant in FY13 to meet the reduction in funding.
  o Compensation: Over the past four years, salaries of judges have been reduced and frozen and court staff persons have been furloughed. Judges’ salaries are frozen again in FY13.
  o Service Reductions:
    ▪ Over the past four years, the Kansas courts have reduced hours of operation and delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in judicial support positions and in the clerks’ offices. They have reduced the use of retired judges. They are planning to continue all these steps in FY13.
    ▪ These steps have resulted in limited access to court services and increased delays and backlogs.
  o Efficiency Measures:
    ▪ The Kansas courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-filing and e-payment of fines and fees. In FY13, they plan to implement an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow and e-citations by law enforcement agencies.
    ▪ In FY 2013, Kansas will be able to accept credit cards, file cases electronically and accept citations electronically. Since district court operations are county-funded, statewide implementations require assistance from sources outside of the state.
  o Restructuring: The Kansas courts are considering restructuring options, but are not in the action phase yet. They have done a weighted caseload study and are proceeding with requests as documented.
  o Business Processes: The Kansas Courts have and will continue to transition to digital recording of court proceedings. They are videoconferencing incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles and are doing remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.


The Kansas courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. Current funding has been reduced compared to funding provided in FY09.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Kentucky

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Kentucky Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Court of Appeals and Supreme Court, the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology, operating expenses, courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Kentucky judicial system increased from $353 million in FY12 to $365 million in FY13. State general fund appropriations of $316 million remained essentially the same.
  - The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary dropped from 3.48% to 3.405%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to get worse.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch submits its budget directly to the Legislature without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judiciary has the authority to manage its budget, which has a few line items.
  - While technology funding has increased by 8% over the past four years, the Judiciary does not have adequate funding to provide for necessary technology. The technology fee collected is not sufficient to fund the needed enhancements.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same while the number of trial court staff persons has been reduced by 6%, the number of central office staff persons has been reduced by 11% and funding for trial court operation expenses has been reduced by 5%. In the coming year, the number of judges and staff persons will remain the same.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Kentucky courts have imposed staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerk’s offices and in judicial support positions. The courts will continue to delay filling vacancies in the coming fiscal year.
  - **Compensation:** In the coming year, the courts will freeze the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and will furlough court staff.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Kentucky courts enable law enforcement to file e-citations. They have e-warrants statewide. Some fines and fees can be paid online. The courts are in the process of seeking funding for developing a new “e-courts” case management system to encompass e-filing and an electronic document management system.
  - **Centralization:** The courts have a centralized jury management system.

The Kentucky courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The Kentucky Judiciary needs to increase salaries for Judicial Branch employees whose pay has continued to fall behind that of the Executive and Legislative Branches.
• **State/Local Funding**
  - The Louisiana Judiciary has a mix of state and local funding.
  - The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, and for the salaries of the trial court judges. Trial court clerical and support staff, technology, operating expenses, courthouses and equipment are funded locally.
  - Louisiana’s judicial branch is non-unified. Accordingly, the responses to many of the questions in this survey are reflective of the operations of the Supreme Court (including the Judicial Administrator’s office and several other state-level judicial branch entities) and the intermediate courts of appeal only. The operations of the state’s trial courts and other lower courts are generally funded by local government.
  - Information from lower courts relating to budgets and operations is not available and not included in survey responses unless otherwise indicated.

• **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - The state general fund appropriation increased from $159 million in FY12 to $163 million in FY13. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary is less than ½ of 1%.
  - The increase of $3.9 million was used to fund mandated increases in the employer contribution rates to the Louisiana State Employees Retirement System.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

• **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch submits its budget directly to the Legislative Branch.
  - The Judiciary has the authority to move funds between Judiciary programs.
  - The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology.
    - Funds are available to support upgrades and changes to hardware and software in the Supreme Court, its several divisions and departments, and its closely affiliated entities. Information regarding technology budgets in the lower courts is unavailable.

• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years and in the coming year, the number of judges has and will remain the same. The number of central office staff has and will increase by 1%.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Louisiana Judiciary has delayed filling vacancies in the Supreme Court Clerk’s office and in Supreme Court judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the Louisiana Judiciary has frozen the salaries of Supreme Court state-paid staff.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Louisiana Supreme Court has implemented e-filing, an electronic document management system and an enhanced case management
system and electronic workflow. They have implemented e-payment of fines and fees. The Supreme Court has deployed an Enterprise Resource Plan.

- Several lower courts have taken steps through the use of technology generally and the initiatives listed above specifically to increase their efficiency. The AOC is unaware of the scope and deployment status of these projects and initiatives.

  o **Restructuring:** It is possible that lower courts have taken steps to increase efficiency through consolidation or reduction of positions, reallocation of staff and/or the use of part-time and off-hour workers, although we are unaware of the scope and impact of such steps.

The Louisiana courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The Supreme Court and courts around the state work to identify and share information about process improvements on an ongoing basis. At the Supreme Court, for example, a new Enterprise Resource Plan has been implemented. In addition, since 2009 the Court has established task forces or committees dealing with self-represented litigants, court security, uniform rules, plain language jury instructions, and other topics. The work of these groups is likely to translate into better and more responsive policies and practices in courts around the state.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Maine

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Maine Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses. The state pays for the local courthouses and their maintenance and equipment.
  - Maine’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $60.8 million in FY12 to $63.9 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $55.2 million to $57.1 million, an increase of 3.6%. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 1.9%.
  - Technology funding has remained the same.
  - Debt service is included in the general fund amounts.
  - Increases from FY11/12 to FY12/13 were for:
    - Personal Services: an additional $494,000 for benefit increases and an additional $250,000 for filling vacancies.
    - Security: an additional $638,000 was received for entry screening.
    - Debt Service: an additional $613,000 was received for debt service for issuance of bonds.
  - Over the past four years, fees decreased 7%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present its budget directly to the Legislature. The Judiciary presents its budget request to the Executive Branch for inclusion in the Governor’s budget.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget is not sufficient to enable the courts to provide or enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. Maine is seeking additional funding in FY14 and FY15 to replace their case management system which does not now have the capacity to support e-filing or to meet the demands of data exchange.
  - The introduction of technologies has not yet enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels:** Over the past four years, the number of judges, the number of trial court staff persons, the number central office staff persons and spending on trial court operating expenses has remained the same and will continue to remain the same in FY13.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Maine courts have reduced hours of operation and have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions.
These actions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, increased delays and backlogs, to a limited extent.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the Maine courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and will continue to do so in FY13.

- **Efficiency Measures:**
  - The Maine courts have implemented e-payment of fines and fees; they have set up a Courts on-line fine payment system.
  - They plan to purchase a new Case Management System in FY14 to build a platform for e-filing. An e-citation workgroup has convened and will continue planning for implementation in FY14 and FY15.

- **Restructuring:** The Maine courts have created a unified criminal docket in two locations and are planning to expand the model in FY14 and FY15.

- **Business Practices:**
  - Maine is videoconferencing arraignments for incarcerated defendants and mental health proceedings in locations with the highest volume of mental health cases.
  - In FY13, they will be transitioning to digital recording of court proceedings.

- **Outsourcing:** The Maine courts have outsourced the provision of language access services. Using Google Mail, they have moved from local e-mail/storage servers to the cloud.

- **Centralization:**
  - The Maine courts have implemented a service center and have centralized traffic citation processing.
  - They implemented a pilot call center for three counties and plan to expand slowly statewide in FY14 and forward. Centralized traffic citation processing was implemented prior to 2009.

The Maine courts are in the same position as they were in FY09 to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Maryland

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Maryland Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology and operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment of the District Courts.
  - The state and local political subdivisions fund the Circuit Courts.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Judicial system state and federal grant appropriations increased from $431 million in FY12 to $447 million in FY13.
  - State general fund appropriations increased from $374.6 million in FY12 to $387.4 million in FY13. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary rose from 2.5% to 2.6% in FY13.
  - Technology funding has increased by 8% over the past four years.
  - The Judicial Branch budget situation over the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents it budget directly to the Legislature.
  - The Judiciary has the authority to move funds between line items. A budget amendment is required.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology.
  - Technology has enabled the courts to enhance services. Justice partners can more easily obtain warrants and protective orders. The public has greater access to court information.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges increased by 1%, the number of trial court staff increased by 3%, the number of central office staff increased 2% and funding for court operating expenses has increased 1%. In the coming year, central office staff will increase 1%.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Maryland courts have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions and will continue to delay filling those vacancies in the coming year.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have frozen and reduced the salaries of court staff. They have furloughed court staff.
  - **Impact of Service Reductions:** These service and compensation reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, and produced delays and backlogs in the disposition of cases.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Maryland courts have a virtual self-help center and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records. They have enabled law enforcement to file e-citations and the public to make e-
payment of fees and fines. In the coming year, they will implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system and electronic workflow.

- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors, have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings, and have instituted videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles.
- **Centralization:** The Maryland courts have centralized traffic citation processing.

The Maryland Judiciary is in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Massachusetts

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Massachusetts Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology and operating expenses, local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Total state general fund appropriations for the Massachusetts judicial system increased from $580.3 million in FY12 to $597.5 million in FY13. The increase in funding is mainly attributable to collective bargaining contracts for union employees.
  - The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary fell from 1.9% to 1.8%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present its budget directly to the Legislature without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch has authority to move limited amounts between budget line items.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same, while the number of trial court staff has been reduced by 14%, the number of central office staff has been reduced by 9% and the funding for trial court operating expenses has been reduced by 10%.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges and the number of trial court staff and central office staff will remain the same. Spending on trial court operating expenses will increase by 3%.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Massachusetts courts have reduced hours of operation and delayed filling vacancies in the clerk’s offices and in judicial support positions. These reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public and delays and backlogs in the disposition of cases.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the courts have furloughed judicial officers and court staff.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Massachusetts courts have implemented an enhanced case management system and plan to implement e-filing this coming year. As of July 1, 2012, the Legislature has abolished life tenure for management level employees of the court.
  - **Restructuring:** Over the past four years, the Massachusetts courts have consolidated court hours. In the coming year, they plan on reallocating staff.
  - **Business Processes:** The courts have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings, videoconferencing of arraignments and detention hearings for
detained adults and juveniles and have implemented remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

Service reductions have resulted in the Massachusetts courts being in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice.
State/Local Funding
- The Michigan Judiciary has a mix of state and local funding.
- The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, and for the salaries of the trial court judges and for some trial court technology. Trial court clerical staff and judicial support staff, courthouses, operating expenses and equipment are funded locally.
- The state budget includes appropriations for a trial court case management system (funded through local user fees and used by approximately 70% of the local trial court locations) and a judicial technology improvement fund of approximately $4.5 million that funds various projects benefitting local trial courts such as a judicial data warehouse, e-ticket payment, e-filing, and installation of video conferencing equipment.
- Many of the local trial courts have faced reductions in recent years, some significant, but information on specific courts would require reviewing each court's budget. For the largest district court in the state, in the city of Detroit, the adopted budget for FY 2008-09 was a gross budget of $44.2 million with 392 FTEs ($21.5 million revenue funded). The adopted FY 2012-13 budget is $33.0 million with 285 FTEs ($17.6 million revenue funded).

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Total state and federal grant appropriations for the Michigan judicial system increased from $256 million in FY12 to $271 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $8.5 billion to $9.0 billion. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary increased from 1.85% to 1.90%.
- The FY 12/13 budget includes a $5 million increase in funding for a Swift and Sure Sanctions program (funded at $1 million in FY 11/12) to expand it beyond four pilot courts. This program is modeled after Hawaii's Opportunity Probation with Enforcement program (HOPE).
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch does not submit its budget directly to the Legislative Branch. The annual Executive budget recommendation includes budget recommendations for both the Legislature and the Judicial Branch in addition to the Executive Branch. The Judiciary has a good working relationship with the budget office, and if the courts succeed at justifying increases to them, the Legislature has been more receptive to such changes. If not, they still have an opportunity to try to convince the Legislature during their legislative budget presentations. This approach has also made it easier to incorporate necessary changes to personnel costs related to changes in wages and benefits into the budget.
- The Judiciary does have authority to move funds between Judiciary line items.
- The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology.
  - A judicial technology improvement fund of approximately $4.5 million is included in the Judiciary’s appropriation to be used for technology
innovations at the trial courts. These include the development of an upgraded case management system, e-filing, e-ticketing, a judicial data warehouse, and video conferencing. The Judiciary is developing requests for additional funding in FY 2014 to accelerate the progress on these projects.

- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts to provide better service to others in government and to the public.
  - The Judiciary has been working with the Michigan Departments of Corrections, Human Services, State Police, and Community Health to reduce travel between prisons and mental health facilities and courts through video conferencing and to more effectively share information between agencies and the courts. A new and better-organized web site debuted October 2012 to provide better access to information. A self-help web site was also introduced in 2012. The citizens have benefitted by being able to pay traffic tickets on-line. Attorneys have improved access to courts who have implemented e-filing.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has decreased 1%; the number of central office staff has increased 3%.
  - **Service Reductions:** State Judicial Branch employees had six unpaid furlough days in FY 2009.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the state-funded courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff and furloughed court staff. The last salary increase for judges was effective 1/1/2002. State Judicial Branch employees received a 2% salary increase effective 4/1/2007 and did not receive another increase until 10/1/2013 (3%). Employee contributions to health insurance costs have increased from 5% in FY 2008 to 10% in FY 2009 to 20% in FY 2013. In the coming year, salaries of judicial officers will remain frozen.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Michigan courts have begun implementing e-filing and an enhanced case management system. They enable law enforcement to file e-citations. Persons can make e-payment of fees. The courts have created virtual self-help centers. In the coming year, the courts will begin to implement an electronic document management system and continue to expand the other technology efficiencies.
  - **Restructuring:** Over the past four years, Michigan has consolidated the number of districts and reallocated judges to districts based upon weighted caseload. They have made changes to jurisdiction to share judicial workload.
  - **Business Processes:** The courts are implementing videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles. In the coming years, they will implement an enhanced caseflow management program.
  - **Centralization:** The courts are in the process of centralizing traffic citation processing.
• **Special Commissions:** In 2009, the State Bar of Michigan formed a Judicial Crossroads Task Force including 28 lawyers and judges. The task force issued a report in 2011 which included recommendations to reduce judgeships where needed, create specialized dockets such as business, and putting in a standardized statewide computer case-management system. An Indigent Defense Advisory Committee has recommended new standards and increased funding for court-appointed criminal attorneys.

The Michigan courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The financial situation in the state appears to have stabilized. Steps taken to improve efficiencies, particularly through technology and the use of performance measures, leave the courts better positioned to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Minnesota

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Minnesota Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts. Local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Minnesota’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $289.3 million in FY12 to $293 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $274 million to $277.8 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 1.7%.
  - Over the past three years, court fines increased 1%.
  - The MN Judicial Branch is predominantly funded by the state's general fund. While the Branch budget may not account for a significant portion of the overall state general fund budget (less than 2%), it does make up a sizable share of the funds appropriated to it by its Legislative fiscal committee (approximately 30%). The Branch collects approximately $200 million per fiscal year in fine and fee revenue that is allocated to the state general fund, other state agencies and local units of government. The Branch does not rely on the fine and fee revenue it collects to fund its operations; however, changes to those revenues can impact funding decisions.
  - The FY13 budget includes funding for a special initiative: implementation of an ambitious multi-year transformation project to move the court system from a paper centered system to an electronic records environment. This project is called eCourtMN. This project, along with others that are referenced later in the survey, is being paid from within existing budget resources.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
    - The Judiciary is required by statute to submit their budget request to the Governor as part of the biennial budget process. While the Governor can make a recommendation regarding the Branch budget, he cannot modify the original request. The Governor forwards the Branch's original request along with his recommendation on that request to the Legislature for their consideration.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
    - The Legislature appropriates a lump sum to the Supreme Court (which includes the Supreme Court, State Court Administrator's Office and State Law Library), to the Court of Appeals and to the Trial Courts. The MN
Judicial Council, the governing board of the Judicial Branch, determines how these three lump sum amounts are allocated.

- The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide nor enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The Branch is leveraging existing resources to invest in technology initiatives. For example, rather than fill vacant positions, the Branch is using salary savings along with other funding sources to create and make needed enhancements. If the Branch is faced with a budget cut in the upcoming biennium (FY14/15), it is likely the funds it has set aside for technology initiatives will have to be used to absorb the cut.

- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.
  - The public has the convenience of paying their tickets over the phone or web. The statewide call center better ensures the public gets consistent information regarding court matters. With e-filing, attorneys can file their civil cases electronically. With e-charging county attorneys can file their complaints electronically. With e-citations law enforcement can enter tickets into squad car computers, transfer the ticket information to their case management systems and send that information directly to the court's case management system. Expanded use of ITV will result in savings for justice partners. With the automated collections of past due debt, more debt is being sent to collections and revenues are enhanced for the state general fund, state agencies and local justice agencies.

**Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**

- **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
  - Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same. The number of trial court staff has been reduced by 8% and the number of central office staff has been reduced by 8%; trial court operating expenses were reduced by 1%. Starting in FY09, the Judicial Branch base budget was cut by $3.9M. For the FY10/11 biennium, the biennial budget was cut by another $14.6M. In FY12 the Judicial Branch budget was increased by $1.1M to cover the rising costs of health insurance premiums and statutorily mandated increases to the employer pension contribution rate. The net change over this period was a base decrease of $17.4M for a cumulative decrease in funding of 1.2% for the period of FY09-FY12. Over this same period, the number of staff persons in the trial courts was down by approximately 200 FTE or 8.3%. The number of staff persons in state court administration was down by 15 FTE or 8.1%.
  - In the coming year, the number of trial court staff will increase by 3% and trial court operating expenses will increase 2%. The Branch budget was increased by $1.1M in FY12 (from base) and $4.9M in FY13 (from base) for a biennial increase of $5.9M. This compares to cuts taken during the period of FY09-FY11 totaling $18.5M. The new monies were appropriated to cover the increased costs associated with rising health insurance premiums and a statutorily mandated employer pension.
contribution increase. Clearly, these monies were not sufficient to offset cuts made to the Branch's budgets for fiscal years FY09-FY11. The net difference between cuts and increases for the period of FY09-FY13 is an overall budget decrease of $12.5M. When compared to the prior fiscal year, in FY13, staff in the Trial Courts are up by 75 FTE or 3.3%; however, overall staff in the Trial Courts are down by 127 FTE or 5.3% when compared to FY09 (baseline year). Staff in the State Court Administrator's Office remain the same.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen and will continue to be frozen in the coming year. The Branch did provide a one-time lump sum payment to its employees in FY13. The last time judges and employees received a permanent, base increase in pay was FY09.

- **Service Reductions:**
  - Over the past four years, the Minnesota courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
  - Additional measures taken since FY09 include the provision of a voluntary separation program, leave without pay, and voluntary furloughs.
  - In the coming year, they will continue to reduce hours of operation, delay filling vacancies and reduce the use of retired judges.
  - These reductions in court services have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, increased delays and backlogs and court counters remained closed to the public in some districts.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The Minnesota courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow, and virtual self-help centers. They have enabled law enforcement to issue e-citations and the public to make e-payments of fines and fees.
  - In partnership with the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, an e-charging system is being implemented for county attorneys to file complaints electronically. The Judicial Branch has automated its process for collecting past due debt so that staff spend significantly less time manually tracking and referring past due accounts and receipting payments from the collection agency. The Branch is expanding the use of centralized digital recording of court proceedings in lieu of an in-person court reporter for every judicial officer. The overall result is a more efficient use of court reporter resources and real budget savings. The Judiciary is expanding the use of interactive television to enable remote participation in preliminary hearings and testimony. ITV saves time for witnesses, law enforcement, prosecutors and public defenders, reducing travel time that could often take up many hours of their busy days.

- **Restructuring:** The Minnesota courts have expanded the use of subordinate judicial officers, consolidated clerk management positions and reallocated staff. In the coming year, they will start using part-time or off-hours workers.
Using staff weighted case load statistics, districts are able to redistribute staff to the counties with the greatest staffing needs. The Branch has consolidated administration by reducing county level court administrators by one-third. With the rollout of eCourtMN, the Branch will explore offering extended hours of support for those utilizing the e-filing and related functionality, including judges, employees and the public.

- **Business Processes:** The Minnesota courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program, have created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors, have implemented “in-court updating” for docket entries and sentencing orders and have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. The courts do remote videoconferencing of incarcerate defendants and use remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

- **Outsourcing:** The Minnesota courts outsource the collection of fines, electronic filing, and language access services. The Branch has used an outside collection agency for several years. Most recently (2010), the Branch has established an interagency agreement with the MN Department of Revenue, the State's collection agency, for debt collection. Some districts have outsourced the scanning of court documents into digital format as part of the eCourtMN initiative.

- **Centralization:** The Minnesota courts have a centralized call center and a centralized payable center. They have centralized traffic citation processing, jury qualification and summoning and the processing of probate annual reports.

- **Commissions:** The Coalition to Preserve Minnesota's Justice System was formed to present a unified front at the Legislature for purposes of seeking/maintaining funding for the justice system to ensure access to justice.

The Minnesota courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. The Branch faces significant fiscal challenges and continues to aggressively employ strategies to contain costs. The Branch has made significant efforts to find court process efficiencies and to expand the use of technology to reduce costs while continuing to provide Minnesotans with quality justice. Examples include: Centralized Payables; e-citations; e-charging; e-filing; centralized conservator annual accounting reports; expanded use of ITV; use of pro-bono conciliation court referees; digital recording of the court record; technology aided training; and, remote interpreting.

Given the steps the Branch has and is taking to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its delivery of services, any new monies will likely be used to further enhance those services or provide compensation to judges and employees who have received no permanent, base cost of living or merit increases for the past four fiscal years.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Missouri

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Missouri Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology. Courthouses, trial court operating expenses and equipment are paid locally.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Missouri’s total state and federal grant appropriation for the judicial system increased from $190.8 million in FY12 to $195 million in FY13.
  - Missouri’s state general fund appropriation decreased from $8.071 million to $8.013 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary increased from 2.11% to 2.13%.
  - Missouri received a $4 million core reduction in FY13.
  - Local funding has been reduced, but the amount or percentage is unknown.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Governor presents the entire state’s budget to the general assembly in the State of the State speech. The Judiciary presents its budget to the legislative budget committees and indicates which items were recommended by the Governor.
  - The Judicial Branch has 50% flexibility to move funds between budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget provides for the technology necessary to meet the demands of the public and to make needed enhancements.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 1% while the number of trial court staff and central office staff has remained the same. In the coming year, the number of judges will be reduced by 1%.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Missouri courts imposed staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges. In the coming year, they will again delay filling judicial vacancies and reduce the use of retired judges.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries have been frozen for court staff.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Missouri courts have implemented e-filing along with an electronic document management system. Law enforcement can file e-citations. The courts have created a virtual self-help center.

The Missouri courts are in a similar position as they were four years ago to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Montana

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Montana Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts. Local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Montana’s total state and federal grant appropriation is $38 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation is $35 million, an increase of 1% to 4% over FY12. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary is less than 2%.
  - Over the past four years, funding for technology has been level.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The Executive Branch is not obligated to fund Judicial Branch priorities within the Governor’s balanced budget. However, proposals that are not funded still move forward to the Legislature. For practical purposes, however, it is best to have proposals included in the Executive Branch’s balanced budget.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. However, some line items, including drug court funding, juvenile delinquency intervention programs funding and pro se program funding are earmarked at the request of the Judicial Branch.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. The 2013 Legislative proposal includes a large technology package. Staffing has remained flat resulting in unmet needs in the trial courts. E-filing is a time and cost saver for courts and litigants but can only be done with an increase in IT staff. In addition, creating data exchanges with the Executive Branch departments (i.e., law enforcement, traffic records, and vital statistics) requires additional staff resources.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. Self-help services have improved with automated forms and mobile self-help centers. Smartcop technology combined with court technology has enabled electronic ticket transactions at the limited jurisdiction court level. On-line ticket payment has enhanced customer service and decreased demands at the limited jurisdiction court level.
• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 9% and the number of trial court staff has increased 10%. The number of central office staff and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses has remained the same.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges, staff persons and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
  
  o **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the Montana courts have frozen the salaries of court staff and will continue to do so in this coming year.
  
  o **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Montana courts have delayed filling vacancies in judicial support positions and will continue to do so in this coming year. In addition, they have authorized the voluntary reduction in hours by staff and have had long periods of vacancy savings for youth court probation staff.
    - These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public and increased delays and backlogs.
  
  o **Efficiency Measures:**
    - In the coming year, the Montana courts plan to implement e-filing. The Montana courts have already implemented and will continue to implement electronic workflow, e-payment of fines and fees and a virtual self-help center. The Montana courts have enabled law enforcement to issue e-citations.
    - Montana has a robust video network for judges, witnesses, litigants and attorneys. The use of the video network reduces travel time and costs, especially important in a state the size of Montana.
  
  o **Business Processes:** The Montana courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program and have created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors. They have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. They are videoconferencing arraignments of incarcerated defendants and detention hearings of detained juveniles and conducting remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency. In the coming year, they plan to implement in-court updating for docket entries and for orders.

The Montana courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. While the budget has suffered, Montana has added three judges and two standing masters to the five most overwhelmed judicial districts. In addition, Montana has developed a case processing "dashboard" for judges, staff and clerks, which creates a visual look at the caseload and timeliness.
State/Local Funding
- The Nebraska Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
- The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment for the courts. Local funding bodies pay for local courthouses and for their operating expenses and equipment.
- Probation is within the judicial branch in Nebraska; their operating expenses are paid by the counties.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Nebraska’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $90.1 million in FY12 to $99.5 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $74.9 million to $84.3 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 2%.
- Local funding has been and is estimated to remain steady.
- Over the past four years, court fees increased 5%.
- Over the past four years, technology funding increased 38%.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch does not present the judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body. The Judiciary’s budget is submitted to the Governor and the Governor makes a recommendation on the Judiciary’s budget (and on all of State government) in his biennial budget to the Legislature. The Judicial Branch is not bound by the Governor’s recommendation.
- The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
- The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
- Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
  - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 1% while the number of court staff and central office staff and the level of trial court operating expenses have remained the same. In the coming year, the number of court staff and central office staff will increase 1%.
- Compensation: Salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen for a portion of the past four years.
- Service Reductions:
  - Over the past four years, the Nebraska courts have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
o **Efficiency Measures:** The Nebraska courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow, and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. The public can make e-payment of fines and fees. In the coming year, they will implement e-citations by law enforcement agencies.

o **Restructuring:** The Nebraska courts have reallocated judges to districts based upon weighted caseload, consolidated clerk management positions, reallocated staff and started using part-time and off-hours workers.
  - Through the use of their state-wide information system, courts in different areas of Nebraska are assisting other courts with various tasks. However, this is not conducted in a centralized manner. Instead, remote redistribution of tasks is determined based on the expertise required and the workload of each court.

o **Business Processes:** The Nebraska courts have implemented “in-court updating” for docket entries and sentencing orders and have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. The courts do remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and use remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency. In the coming year, they will begin videoconferencing hearing of detained juveniles.

The Nebraska courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. Two factors have contributed to the courts moving to a better position: (1) an ongoing Reengineering Committee formed with the help of the National Center for State Courts, (2) the State of Nebraska’s fiscal position improved.
State/Local Funding
- The Nevada Judiciary is funded both by the state and by the local funding bodies.
- The state pays for the Appellate Court, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and for the salaries of general jurisdiction trial court judges. The salaries of trial court support staff, trial court clerical staff and operating expenses, trial court technology and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Nevada’s total state and federal grant appropriation of $65.7 million remained the same in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $29.4 million to $30.05 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary rose from 0.948% to 0.969%.
- The FY13 budget includes special funding for disaster recovery of existing systems and applications and funding for analysis of replacing the state sponsored case management system.
- Over the past four years, fees have increased 5%.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
- The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
- The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide for and enhance all necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. It provides for continued access of the public to appellate court documents via the court website and the option to file electronically.
  - The Judiciary has reserved funds for the initiative to replace the state-sponsored case management system. The Nevada Judiciary has also been able to retain ongoing funding needed to maintain the appellate court case management system and to fund routine enhancements. They also have continued collaboration with justice partners in many of these areas.
- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide enhanced court services.

Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
- Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses: Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 4%. The number of central office staff has remained the same.
- Compensation: Over the past four years, and in the coming year, salaries of court staff have been and will continue to be frozen and reduced. Court staff have been and will continue to be furloughed. Longevity pay for long-term employees has been frozen. Salaries have been reduced by 2.5%, and 48 hours of furlough have been imposed on all managerial, administrative and support staff under the administration of the Supreme Court.
o **Service Reductions:**
  - Over the past four years, the Nevada courts have delayed filling vacancies in judicial support positions and have reduced the use of retired judges.
  - These measures, particularly lost productivity while staff have undergone mandatory furlough requirements, have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, increased backlogs.

o **Efficiency Measures:** The Nevada courts have implemented e-filing. They have implemented and will continue to implement an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system and electronic workflow. They have implemented e-citation by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records.

o **Restructuring:** The Nevada courts have reallocated judges to districts based upon weighted caseload.

o **Business Processes:**
  - The Nevada courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program, have implemented in-court updating for docket entries, have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings and have implemented videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles.
  - Nevada is not a unified court system. They utilize their resources to assist courts in these areas, although it is mainly a consultation/collaborative basis between justice partners. Courts can apply for grant funding from the Administrative Office of the Courts in relation to their initiatives in these and other areas.

Nevada is in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. They have experienced significant turnover because of the freeze in pay, salary reductions and mandatory furloughs. No new initiatives/improvements have been initiated to address any identified needs due to lack of funding.
State/Local Funding
- The New Hampshire Judiciary is a state funded system.
- The state pays for the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts and for the local courthouses and equipment.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- New Hampshire’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $72,156,051 million in FY12 to $74.66 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $66,643,700 million to $69.46 million, 5% of the state’s general fund.
- The FY13 budget includes special funds for additional call center staff and for jury management software.
- Fines and fees have remained the same.
- Funding for technology has increased over the past four years.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch
- The Judicial Branch does not have authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. Statutes regulate movement of funds among budget lines. Some transfers may be approved by the Joint Legislative Fiscal Committee.
- The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. A dedicated IT Fund permits the courts to upgrade and support existing hardware and software. A modest capital appropriation permits the courts to begin e-Filing in one case type. An operating budget appropriation supports the purchase of a new jury management system.
- The introduction of technologies has not yet enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
- Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
  - Over the past four years, the number of judges, trial court staff and central office staff has decreased. Spending on trial court operating expenses has also decreased.
  - In this coming year, the number of judges and trial court staff will remain the same; the number of central office staff will increase. The amount spent on trial court operating expenses will decrease. Some full time positions were restored to the Information Technology department via a staff reallocation.
Overall, the number of full-time positions has decreased; the New Hampshire Judiciary is making greater use of part-time staff.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the New Hampshire Judiciary has furloughed judicial officers and court staff.

- **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the New Hampshire courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs, and have delayed filling judicial vacancies. They have delayed jury trials. These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services and diverted resources from civil to other mandatory case types.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The New Hampshire courts have implemented e-Citations by law enforcement agencies. In the coming year, the New Hampshire courts plan to implement e-filing, electronic workflow, e-payment of fees and fines and a virtual self-help center.

- **Restructuring:** Since 2009, the New Hampshire courts have created a single tier limited jurisdiction court, consolidated the number of districts, changed jurisdiction to enable the sharing of judicial workload, expanded the use of subordinate judicial officers, consolidated and reduced the number of clerk management positions, expanded the use of part-time and off-hours workers, expanded their dictation center and created a centralized call center.

- **Business Processes:** The New Hampshire courts have implemented and will continue to implement an enhance caseflow management program, have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings and use videoconferencing to conduct arraignments of incarcerated defendants. In FY14, they will experiment with remote video interpretation.

- **Outsourcing:** The New Hampshire courts outsource language access services and the production of transcripts of court proceedings.

- **Centralization:** The New Hampshire Judiciary has established a centralized call center. The call center answers all calls to all of the state’s Circuit Courts. In FY13, they plan to centralize jury qualification and summoning.

The New Hampshire courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. Their Innovation Commission recommended ways measures identified above that are reducing costs and improving service. When and if resources are expanded, they will be allocated to technology, not to additional case processing staff.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – New Jersey

• **State/Local Funding**
  o The New Jersey Judiciary is a state funded system.
  o The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses. Courthouses and their maintenance are funded locally.
  o New Jersey’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $848 million in FY12 to $851.4 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $670.5 million to $673 million, an increase of 1%. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary decreased from 2.2% to 2.1%.
    ▪ The amount budgeted above includes a pass through amount of $25.5 million in FY 2012 and $26.5 million in FY 2013 for the New Jersey State Department of Human Services for the Executive Branches portion of funding for Drug Court patients.
    ▪ There is an increase of $2.5 million for the expansion of New Jersey’s drug court program to include mandatory entry. Of the $2.5 million, $1.0 million is to be passed through to the New Jersey State Department of Human Services of the Executive Branch and the remaining $1.5 million is for the State Judiciary to use to expand the program.
  o Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased 4%.
  o Over the past four years, fees have remained the same.
  o The budget situation in the next three years is likely to get worse.

• **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  o The Judicial Branch does not present its budget directly to the legislature. The New Jersey State Judiciary submits its budget request to the Executive Branch’s Department of Treasury. There are then hearings with and approval from the Legislative Branch.
  o The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. With the exception of specific Special Purpose accounts, the Judiciary is allocated a set amount of funds and is responsible for the administration and allocation of those funds statewide.
  o The FY13 budget is not sufficient to enable the courts to provide or enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. The reduction in the technology budget has delayed the implementation of e-courts for all case types. The funding available is not adequate to make significant enhancements to the IT Systems.
  o The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. There have been several technological enhancements such as e-filing for landlord/tenant cases, attorney on-line registrations, and on-line juror registration that have enhanced court services.
• Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
  o Staffing Levels:
    ▪ Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same. The number of trial court staff persons decreased 2%. The number of central office staff persons increased 2%. Trial court operating expenses remained the same.
    ▪ In FY13, the number of judges will remain the same, the number of trial court and central office staff will decline 2%. The amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
  o Service Reductions:
    ▪ Over the past four years, the New Jersey courts delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in judicial support positions. They will continue to delay filling vacancies in judicial support positions in FY13.
    ▪ These actions have resulted in resources being diverted from civil to other mandatory case types.
  o Compensation: Over the past four years, the New Jersey courts have furloughed and reduced the salaries of court staff. Court executive (managers) salaries were frozen for three years, ending in FY2010.
  o Efficiency Measures: The New Jersey courts have partially implemented e-court. They have and will continue to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, electronic workflow, e-citations by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees, a virtual self-help center, and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records.
  o Restructuring: The New Jersey courts have reallocated judges based upon weighted caseload, have reallocated staff and use part-time and off-hours workers and will continue these steps in FY13.
  o Business Practices: New Jersey has implemented an enhanced caseflow management program and has transitioned and will continue to transition to digital recording of court proceedings. They are videoconferencing arraignments for incarcerated defendants and will expand in FY13.
  o Outsourcing: The New Jersey courts have outsourced the collection of fines, penalties, bail and fees. They have outsourced the provision of language access services and will expand in FY13.
  o Centralization:
    ▪ The New Jersey courts have implemented a centralized call center and will expand in FY13.

New Jersey has established a special committee to review budget and staffing issues.

The New Jersey courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice as they have put into place several technological enhancements such as e-filing for landlord/tenant cases, attorney on-line registrations, and on-line juror registration.

If additional funding becomes available, it will be first allocated towards improving e-courts and other technological improvements and then attaining a full staffing compliment as needed.
**State/Local Funding**
- The New Mexico Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
- The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and the operating expenses for the courts. Except for court facilities for general jurisdiction courts, local funding bodies provide no funding for courts.

**State Revenue and Appropriations**
- New Mexico’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $155 million in FY12 to $162.2 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $135.4 million to $141.8 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary increased from 2.49% to 2.52%.
- The FY13 budget includes $800,000 for IT infrastructure and security upgrades statewide.
- Over the past four years, court fees increased 3%.
- Over the past four years, technology funding remained the same.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to improve.

**Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
- The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
- The Judicial Branch does not have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. Judicial budgets contain too many line items and permission is required to move funds from one line to another.
- The FY13 budget is not sufficient to enable the courts to provide or enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. The courts provide free electronic access to court dockets, but not to the actual documents. The Judiciary needs funding to expand on-line assistance to self-represented litigants.
- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. Electronic filing is a boon to practicing attorneys. Replacing the 20 year-old case management system allows the courts to operate more efficiently and thus provide better service to the public.

**Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
- **Staffing Levels:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 1%, the number of central office staff persons has increased 3% and the number of trial court staff persons has decreased 8%. The FY13 budget increase has permitted hiring staff in positions left vacant for several years. In FY13, trial court operating expenses will increase 3%.
- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen and reduced. Judges’ salaries are frozen again in FY13.
o **Service Reductions:**
  - Over the past four years, the New Mexico courts have reduced hours of operation and delayed filling judicial vacancies in the clerks’ offices. They have delayed jury trials. They are continuing to delay filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices.
  
  o **Efficiency Measures:** The New Mexico courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, and electronic workflow. In the coming year they will implement e-citations by law enforcement agencies and e-payment of fines and fees.
  
  o **Restructuring:** The New Mexico courts have consolidated courthouses, consolidated clerk management positions, and reallocated staff. They will continue to reallocate staff.
  
  o **Business Processes:** The New Mexico courts have implemented and will continue to enhance their caseflow management program, “in-court updating” for docket entries and sentencing orders, videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency. They have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings.
  
  o **Outsourcing:** The New Mexico courts have outsourced the collection of fines.
  
  o **Centralization:** The New Mexico courts have centralized jury qualification and summoning.

The New Mexico courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. Technology improvements have been about 75% implemented since 2009 and appropriations have begun to rebound, from continued reductions in 2009 to a 4% increase this year. If the budget situation continues to improve, the New Mexico Judiciary will use the increase funding to implement technology improvements and likely not hire to the same employee strength as before 2009. The courts will improve pay for the fewer remaining employees.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – New York

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The New York Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and the operating expenses for the courts and for local courthouses and equipment.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - New York’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $2.536 billion in FY12 to $2.539 billion in FY13. The state general fund appropriation decreased from $2.305 billion to $2.301 billion; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at approximately 2%.
  - The FY13 budget includes additional funds for civil legal services.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to get worse.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The judicial branch presents the judiciary’s budget request directly to the legislative body without prior approval by the executive branch.
  - The judicial branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide nor enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same. The number of trial court staff has been reduced by 10% and the number of central office staff has been reduced by 10%; trial court operating expenses have remained the same. In the coming year, the number of trial court and central office staff persons will continue to be down 10%.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the New York courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs and have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
    - These reductions in court services have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services, increased delays and backlogs and court counters remained closed to the public in some districts.
The North Carolina Judiciary is a state funded system. The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts and for local courthouses and equipment.

North Carolina’s total state and federal grant appropriation was reduced from $465 million in FY12 to $458 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation was reduced from $439 million to $432 million, 2.2% of the total state general fund. The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The Judicial Branch does not have authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. Under North Carolina law, the Judicial Branch utilizes funds in accordance with the state budget act which applies to all state agencies, universities and the Judicial Branch. The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.

In this fiscal year, the number of judges, trial court clerical staff and central office staff and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.

Over the past four years, salaries of court staff have been frozen. Over the past four years, the North Carolina courts have had staff layoffs, and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges, delayed jury trials and reduced operational expenditures by restricting travel and by limiting the purchases of supplies and equipment. These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to the courts and increased delays and backlogs.

The North Carolina courts have implemented an electronic document management system, e-citations by law enforcement agencies and e-payment of fees and fines.

The North Carolina courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – North Dakota

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The North Dakota Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the AOC, salaries of judges and their support staff and for trial court clerical staff, operating expenses and technology. The expense of local courthouses and equipment is shared with local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - North Dakota has a biennial budget.
  - State and federal grant appropriations for the two years ending 2013 are $85.7 million, roughly a $2 million increase over the previous biennium. The state general fund appropriation for the two years ending in 2013 is $83.5 million.
  - Local funding bodies have made small funding increases every budget cycle since 2002.
  - Technology funding has increased 20% over the past four years.
  - The Judicial Branch budget situation over the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents its budget directly to the Legislature.
  - The Judiciary has the authority to move funds between line items.
  - North Dakota’s budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology.
  - The introduction of technology has enabled the litigants, attorneys, others in government and the public to receive enhanced court services.
    - Secure public access allows attorneys and justice system partners to access and print documents via the internet at no cost to them.
    - E-Service allows attorneys to electronically serve documents on others even if a case has not been initiated or they are not e-filing a document at the same time they are serving the other side.
    - Web payments and Interactive Voice Response payment systems allow litigants to make payments faster and on a 24/7 schedule.
    - Public Access via the internet is near real-time and allows litigants, attorneys, the media, and other interested persons to monitor case updates and account balances at any time.
    - Report functionality in the case management system allows the system to automatically compile specific information, create a report, and email the report to specific individuals at specified times. Examples include court calendars, persons placed on probation, cases in which a pre-sentence investigation report has been ordered and entry or modification of money judgments.
• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges and trial court staff has increased. The amount spent on trial court operating expenses has increased.
  o **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, there have been no budget related service reductions. However, the North Dakota courts have had to reduce hours of operation and are experiencing delays in processing cases due to chronic judge and staffing shortages that are unrelated to the budget situation and which have been exacerbated by the recent, rapid development of energy sources throughout the state (including oil, natural gas, wind and biofuels).
  o **Efficiency Measures:** The North Dakota courts have implemented e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow and e-payment of fees and fines. They have implemented a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records. They have enabled law enforcement to file e-citations. They plan to implement a virtual self-help center in the 2013-2015 biennium.
  o **Restructuring:** Restructuring of the court system has been occurring since the mid-1980s and was completed in 2001. The North Dakota Judiciary has used weighted caseload studies and workload assessment studies since 2001 for the purpose of reallocating judicial officers and court staff.
    ▪ The Judiciary has not consolidated courthouses within a county or region and there are no plans to do so in the foreseeable future.
  o **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented a new case management program and have implemented in-court updating for docket entries and orders. Additional processes were improved prior to 2009, unrelated to budget restrictions.
  o **Outsourcing:** Network services are provided by the Executive Branch. Language interpreters are outsourced.
  o **Centralization:** Since 2009, North Dakota has centralized collection processes in one district and has centralized jury qualification and summoning in two districts. End-to-end electronic citation processing is used in 80% of the state.

The North Dakota Judiciary is in a better position than they have ever been to provide access and timely justice. However, they have increasing backlogs in some areas of the state due to chronic staffing shortages that have been exacerbated by exploding caseload in the last three to five years.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Oklahoma

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Oklahoma Judiciary is a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment and operating expenses for the courts. Local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.
  - The Chief Justice of the Oklahoma Supreme Court has superintending control over the budgets of the 77 local district courts. In both FY 11/12 and FY 12/13, these courts were authorized to pay approximately $40,000,000.00 in local trial court expenses from fines, fees, costs, and other assessments. These expenses are not reflected in the attached summaries of "state" expenses. The balance of the district court collections (fines, fees, costs and judicial assessments) are sent to the Administrative Office of the Courts for state expenses and are included in the figures that are attached.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Oklahoma’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $97.7 million in FY12 to $100.5 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $24.9 million to $25.9 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at less than 1%.
  - General fund appropriations for the Supreme Court have been reduced approximately 12% over the last four years. However, the court has continued to perform all of its work in a timely manner. General fund appropriations to the District Courts have been reduced by over 60% over the last four years. However, the Chief Justice and Administrative Office of the Courts have worked with the judges and clerks in the District Courts to reduce their operating expenses and substantially increase their collections during this same period of time. As a result, the District Courts still have adequate funding to perform their work.
  - Over the past four years, funding for technology has increased 8%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.
• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges and trial court staff has remained the same. The number of central office staff has increased by 25%. Spending on trial court operating expenses has been reduced by 12%.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges, staff persons and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
  
  o **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen; judges’ salaries will continue to be frozen in the coming year.

  o **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Oklahoma courts have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions.
    - In the coming year, they will continue to delay filling vacancies.
  
  o **Efficiency Measures:** The Oklahoma courts have enabled law enforcement to issue e-citations. In the coming year, the Oklahoma courts will implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow, and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. They will implement e-payment of fines and fees.

  o **Business Processes:** The Oklahoma courts have implemented remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants. In the coming year, they plan to implement an enhanced caseflow management program and remote videoconferencing of detained juveniles.

  o **Outsourcing:** The Oklahoma courts outsource the collection of fines.

The Oklahoma courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. Budget shortfalls have encouraged the Judiciary to take a closer look at the local expenses of the District Courts and to focus on their needs vs. their wants. The Judiciary believes that they have accomplished that goal even though some of the staff reductions that occurred may have placed additional work on others. Their increased emphasis on collections has held more criminal defendants accountable for their judicial debt and forced them to comply with judicial orders.

If and when the budget situation improves, the additional moneys will not be used to restore the cuts that have been made. Most of Oklahoma’s judicial staff (and other support personnel) have not received any salary increases or cost of living benefits since 2006. Many feel that this situation needs to be addressed if and when the Judiciary has sufficient funds to do so. The Oklahoma courts have been doing more with less for several years.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Oregon

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Oregon Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - The state pays for the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff and for trial court technology and operating expenses. Courthouses and equipment are paid locally.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Oregon’s total state and federal grant appropriation for the judicial system increased from $369.6 million for the two years ending in June, 2011 to $425.3 million for the two years ending in June, 2013, an increase of greater than 8%. The state general fund appropriation increased from $283.8 million to $367.9 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the judiciary increased from 2.4% to 2.67%.
  - There have been no additional resources from local funds.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to improve.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Chief Justice presents the Judiciary’s recommended budget directly to the Legislature.
  - The Judicial Branch has flexibility to move funds between budget line items, but the current budget has more dedicated appropriations than in the past.
  - The FY13 budget provides for the technology necessary to meet the demands of the public and to make needed enhancements. The Oregon courts have been provided with significant resources to develop and implement new integrated systems.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same while the number of trial court staff and central office staff has been reduced by more than 8%. The Oregon courts have lost 12% of staff over the past four years. In the coming year, the number of judges will be increased by 2%.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Oregon courts have reduced hours of operation, imposed staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges and have delayed jury trials.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries have been frozen for judicial officers and court staff. Court staff have been furloughed. Court staff are now picking up pieces of health care costs and could in the future pick up a greater share of health care and pension costs.
  - **Efficiency Measures:** The Oregon courts have implemented e-filing along with an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system and electronic workflow. Law enforcement can file e-citations. Litigants can make e-payments of fees and fines. The courts created a virtual self-help
center and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records.

- **Re-Structuring:** The Oregon courts have consolidated courthouses, have consolidated clerk management positions, have reallocated staff and have used part-time and off-hours workers.

- **Business Processes:** The Oregon courts have:
  - Implemented enhanced caseflow management programs
  - Created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors
  - Implemented in-court updating for docket entries and other orders
  - Transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings
  - Implemented videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants

The Oregon courts have outsourced the collection of fines, penalties, bail or other fees and in the coming year plan to outsource electronic filing.

- **Centralization:** The Oregon courts have implemented:
  - A centralized call center
  - A centralized payable center
  - Centralized traffic citation processing

They plan to implement centralized jury qualification and summonsing in the coming year.

A Joint Statutory Committee on State Court Revenue Structure was created by the 2010 Legislature.

The Oregon courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The courts have implemented extensive performance and efficiency measures, but extensive staffing reductions have impacted court operations. Service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services and increased delays and backlogs.
• **State/Local Funding**
  - The Pennsylvania Judiciary is funded both by the state and by the local funding bodies.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts, trial court technology and for the salaries of trial and minor court judges. The salaries of those judges’ support staff, and operating expenses and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

• **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Pennsylvania’s total state and federal grant appropriation of $300.5 million in FY12 increased to $310.4 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $298.9 million to $308.2 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary increased by 3%.
  - Supplementing the amount shown above for FY 11-12 were revenues from the temporary surcharge on court filings (excluding summary traffic offenses) of $25 million. PA anticipates spending approximately $24.6 million from the Act 49 (2009) surcharge fees and $5 million from the dedicated Judicial Computer System account to supplement the FY 12-13 funds. Additionally, in FY 11-12 and FY 12-13, the Judicial Computer System was appropriated $57,048 from its dedicated (restricted revenue) account to fund computer operations. This account is funded from fines, fees, and costs and not state taxpayer funds.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased 7%.
  - Over the past four years, fees have increased by 100%.
  - The Judicial Branch budget situation over the next three fiscal years is expected to stay relatively the same.

• **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judiciary submits its proposed budget to the Governor for Executive Branch review and then directly to the Legislature for additional review.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer line item appropriations and to transfer funds between line items in most instances.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide for necessary technology to meet the demands of the public but revenues decline in future years.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, and in this fiscal year, the number of judges and the number of central office staff has largely been static.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the salaries of state court staff persons have been affected by a freeze, delays in increases, and/or caps on increases.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Pennsylvania courts have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in judicial support positions.
Senior judge usage increased due to not filling judicial vacancies. Because of statutory payment restrictions, some jurists have served gratis beyond the monthly allocation caps.

- **Efficiency Measures:**
  - The Pennsylvania courts have implemented an electronic document management system, and an enhanced case management system. They have implemented e-citation by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to court records. In the coming year, they plan to implement e-filing.
  - Enhanced case management programs were completed since FY 08-09. Magisterial District Judge System rewrite and enhancements were completed in December 2011. The system now includes e-pay and limited e-filing of criminal complaints by police. They have completed a dependency case management module as a component of the Common Pleas Criminal Case Management System in all counties in 2010. They added new document management features to the appellate courts case management system in 2010. They began piloting an e-filing system in the spring of 2012 for appellate courts, beginning with the Supreme Court. They will extend capability to the other two appellate courts in coming months. Completion of a state-wide management information system to allow counties to better manage problem solving courts and allow for the collection of uniform data is expected by the spring of 2013.

- **Restructuring:** The Pennsylvania courts plan in this fiscal year to consolidate a number of minor court districts, which will result in reallocating staff. It also plans to review methodologies to right-size the number of trial court judges based upon weighted caseload.

- **Business Processes:** The Pennsylvania courts have implemented an enhanced case flow management program and have implemented videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants.

- **Centralization:** The Pennsylvania courts have implemented a centralized call center. The center responds to questions from users of the various case management and web-based systems.

The Pennsylvania courts are in a worse position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. They are “holding their own” despite increasing financial constrictions.
State/Local Funding
- The Judiciary of Puerto Rico is a state (territorial) funded system.
- The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for technology equipment for the courts, courthouses and equipment.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Puerto Rico’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $353.5 million in FY12 to $358.3 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $342.8 million to $347.8 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary increased from 3.7% to 3.8%.
- In 2002, the Puerto Rico Legislature approved a bill to determine the budget that would be assigned to the Judicial Branch. The formula represents 4% of the average the State General Fund revenues during the two most recent fiscal years. The Special Funds revenues source is mostly the fees and fines charged to civil cases. The Federal Grant included funds authorized during the FY 2011-2012 and FY 2012-2013.
- The FY13 budget includes $10 million in state special funds. The Puerto Rico Judicial Branch developed a Strategic Plan for 2012 to 2015. The strategic plan is the result of a broad consultation process to agree in the actions that best improve the judicial services. The special initiatives are grouped in four general categories: ethics and judicial independence; administration of justice; access to justice; and institutional and human capital development. Some of the initiatives that will be pursued during FY 2012 to 2013 are the expansion of the Domestic Violence Court in eight of the 13 judicial regions, the operation of a Unified Case Management and Administration System (SUMAC) for civil matters, the development of a curriculum for gender equity and a pilot project to incorporate volunteers and retired personnel to support some judicial services.
- Over the past four years, fees have increased 18%.
- Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 19%.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
- The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
- The FY13 budget will enable the courts to provide necessary technology to meet the demands of the public, but is not sufficient to make the planned enhancements.
- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.
• The technology has allowed attorneys and citizens to access information about the case hearing schedule and the designated courtroom. The Automatic Order of Protections in Domestic Violence Cases has expedited the issuing of protection order and maintains statistical information about the number of petition and orders issued by the courts.

- Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
  - Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 1%, the number of trial court staff has increased 8% and the number of central office staff has increased 8%; trial court operating expenses increased 9%. In November, 2010, legislation was enacted to increase the amount of Supreme Court Judges from seven to nine in order to expedite the resolution of cases. The increase in court and central office staff was required to improve the judicial service and enhance assistance to the judges. Additional staff was also required for the implementation of new initiatives, such as the expansion of specialized courts, technological support services and projects to improve information management systems.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges and staff and the amount spent on trial court operating expenses will remain the same.
  - Service Reductions: In the coming year, the courts in Puerto Rico will delay filling vacancies in judicial support positions. They are also reducing the amount of temporary employees, freezing reclassifications and the hiring of vacant positions and reducing private service contracts and consultants.
  - Efficiency Measures: The courts of Puerto Rico have implemented and will continue to implement an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. In the coming year, they will implement e-payment of fines and fees, will update the electronic library system, will introduce videoconference technology to allow technical resources from the Forensic Science Institute to appear in court and to allow technical resources from the Diagnostic Clinic to appear in court, will extend the Unified Case Management Administration System (SUMAC) in civil matters to additional judicial regions, and will complete the For The Record (FTR) system in the Superior Court, and courtrooms for preliminary hearing and alimony cases.
  - Restructuring: The Puerto Rican courts have reallocated judges and staff to districts based upon weighted caseload and have changed venue to share judicial workload. To reduce operating costs, courthouses with a minimum workload have been closed and relocated. The court has reengineered some work process to increase efficiency and expedite workflow. This has been implemented specifically in the court clerk’s office. Flexible work schedules have been implemented in the investigation unit to provide after hours services on nights and weekends.
  - Business Processes: The Puerto Rican courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program, and have transitioned to digital recording of court
proceedings. The courts will in the coming year introduce remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and use remote videoconferencing of detained juveniles.

- **Commissions:** The Coalition to Preserve Puerto Rico’s Justice System was formed to present a unified front at the Legislature for purposes of seeking/maintaining funding for the justice system to ensure access to justice.

The Puerto Rican courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. The Judicial Branch has implemented projects to increase efficiency, to improve access to justice and work performance. An intensive maintenance and improvement plan for the court’s building structure have been implemented. The repairs have enhanced accessibility to the physically impaired, and the distribution of office space to provide for privacy and adequate office space. Investments have also been made to provide for waiting areas and the implementation of security technology to guarantee the safety of employees and visitors. In addition, citizen educational programs and plaintiff orientation have been implemented to improve access to justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – South Carolina

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The South Carolina Judiciary is funded by the state and by local funding bodies.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts, for the salaries of trial court judges and support staff and for trial court technology. Trial court clerical staff and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - South Carolina’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $63.1 million in FY12 to $67.8 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $37.6 million to $43.5 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at less than 0.7%.
  - The amounts in FY11/12 do not reflect a one-time allocation of $5 million for a special project (including that amount would have resulted in unrealistic skewing).
  - The FY12/13 budget includes special funding for nine new judges and staff. It also includes start-up funding for an e-filing initiative.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The budget is first submitted to the Executive Branch who will make their recommendations. If any are made, the Judicial Branch then has the opportunity to present its unabridged budget request directly to the Legislature.
  - The Judicial Branch does not have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. The Judiciary has authority to administer its budget within broad guidelines. However, it does not simply receive “lump sum” funding.
  - The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide and enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges, trial court staff and central office staff has remained the same. Spending on trial court operating expenses has increased by 2%.
    - In the coming year, the number of judges and trial court staff will increase by 8%. The amount spent on trial court operating expenses will increase by 4%.
    - The increase in operating expenses has mostly restored funding for travel.
**Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff had been frozen. Salaries did not increase for several years. Judges and staff received a 3% increase in FY12/13.

**Service Reductions:**
- Over the past four years, the South Carolina courts have reduced hours of operation and have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
- These service reductions have resulted in increased delays and backlogs. South Carolina has remained a proactive Judicial system in spite of the bad economy and they have actually implemented programs to improve access to justice during this time period.

**Efficiency Measures:** The South Carolina courts have implemented an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, electronic workflow, e-payment of fines and fees, a virtual self-help center and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. In the coming year, they will implement e-filing and e-citations by law enforcement agencies.

**Business Processes:** The South Carolina courts have implemented and will continue to implement an enhanced caseflow management program. They have created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors and have implemented remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants. In the coming year, they plan to transition to digital recording of court proceedings.

**Centralization:** The Judiciary has expanded centralized courts at the magistrate level, primarily in Criminal Domestic Violations, DUI and Traffic Courts.

The South Carolina courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice, primarily due to improvements in technology.
State/Local Funding
- The South Dakota Judiciary is primarily state funded.
- The state pays for the appellate courts, the administrative office of the courts, technology, trial court operating expenses and the salaries of the trial court judges, trial court support staff, and clerical staff. Courthouses and equipment are funded locally, as are program costs such as interpreter expenses, prosecution, expert witnesses, and court-appointed attorneys for the indigent.
- Total state and federal grant appropriations for the South Dakota judicial system increased from $43.9 million in FY12 to $46 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $33.1 million to $33.7 million. The percent of state general funds allocated to the Judiciary remained at 2.7%.
- Since FY09, to enhance revenue, fees have increased 5%.
- Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 33%.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch submits its budget simultaneously to the Executive and Legislative Branches. The Governor does make recommendations regarding the Court budget, but the Court has the opportunity to advocate for its original request.
- The Judiciary has the authority to move funds between line items.
- The budget enables the court to provide and enhance needed technology. The Court Automation Fund was created by the Legislature in 1990 and various surcharges and fees are deposited into this fund to pay for all technology related expenses.

Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times
- Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:
  - Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 3%, the number of trial court staff has increased 2% and the number of central office staff has increased 2%. Funding for trial court operation expenses have been reduced by 10%.
  - This coming year, the number of judges will remain the same, while the number of trial court staff will increase by 2%, the number of central office staff will increase by 4% and funding for trial court operating expenses will increase by 7%.
- Service Reductions: Over the past four years, the South Dakota courts have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
- Compensation: Over the past four years, the courts have frozen the salaries of judicial officers and court staff.
- Efficiency Measures: The South Dakota courts are implementing an electronic document management system.
- **Business Processes:** The courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program. They will be implementing in-court updating of docket entries and sentencing orders and will begin remote videoconferencing of interpreters.

- **Centralization:** The courts have piloted a project to centralize traffic citation processing and will be piloting centralized collections processing.

The South Dakota courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. They are in the middle of a conversion to a new electronic case management system which will allow them to provide better access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Tennessee

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Tennessee Judiciary is funded by a mix of state and local funding.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges and for the judges’ support staff. The state pays for technology equipment for the trial courts. Trial court clerical staff, local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Tennessee’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $126.2 million in FY12 to $129.6 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $120.2 million to $123.9 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 0.4%.
  - The FY12/13 budget includes $2 million in new funding to provide interpreter services to persons with limited English proficiency who have a matter before the courts.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding decreased by 50%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch does have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. They do not have to adhere to strict line item budgets; however, some restrictions do exist, based on allotment purposes.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. The public would like e-filing and a variety of online services; the Judiciary does not have the required funding.
  - The FY13 budget does have some reserve funding to make some of the planned technology enhancements deemed necessary and a priority by the Supreme Court.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. An online claims entry system for appointed counsel enables attorneys to submit claims for reimbursement from the indigent defense fund.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Costs:** Over the past four years, while the number of judges has remained the same, the number of trial court staff has decreased 25% and the number of central office staff has decreased 17%. Trial court operating expenses have remained the same. In the coming year, the number of judges and staff and the amount spent on operating costs will remain the same.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of court staff have been frozen.
  - **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the courts have had staff layoffs.
- **Efficiency Measures:** The Tennessee courts have implemented a virtual self-help center. In the coming year, they plan to implement an enhanced case management system, a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records and e-citations by law enforcement agencies.

- **Business Processes:** The Tennessee courts have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. In the coming year, they plan to implement remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

The Tennessee courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. The Supreme Court has implemented an Access to Justice program that provides additional programs and resources to the public.

If additional funds are restored, the Tennessee courts would use the funds to help restore some of the deep cuts in technology. Most of their budget cuts are considered permanent.
• **State/Local Funding**
  o The Texas Judiciary is primarily a locally funded court system.
  o The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and for the salaries of trial court judges. Trial court judge support staff, trial court clerical staff, trial court technology, trial court operating expenses, and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

• **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  o Total state and federal grant appropriation for the Texas Judiciary was reduced from $336.6 million in FY12 to $321.2 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation was reduced from $219.3 million to $191 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary was reduced from 0.49% to 0.43%.
  o As a percentage of all state funds, the Judiciary accounted for 0.38% in FY11 and 0.34% in FY12.
  o The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

• **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  o The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  o The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  o The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide necessary technology to meet the demands of the public, but not to enhance that technology.
    ▪ For the FY 2012-13 biennium, the Texas Office of Court Administration received only $50,000 per year in its capital budget for information technology. This allows OCA to marginally support the state's 16 appellate courts, plus state judicial agencies, in the event their almost 900 computers and related equipment need to be repaired or replaced. The OCA was also cut to two programmers to maintain OCA-supported software. While the OCA can marginally support the courts at this level through the end of the current biennium, it cannot continue in the future without significant consequences to the Judiciary.
  o The introduction of technologies has not enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses**: Over the past four years, the number of judges and central office staff has remained the same. In the coming year, the number of judges and central office staff will continue to remain the same.
  o **Compensation**: Over the past four years, salaries of court staff have been reduced.
o **Service Reductions:**
  - Over the past four years, the Texas courts have delayed filling vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges.
  - These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services and increased delays and backlogs.

o **Efficiency Measures:** The Texas courts have implemented an enhanced case management system and electronic workflow. In the coming year, they plan to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, a virtual self-help center and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records.

o **Business Processes:** The Texas courts have implemented and will continue to implement remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

o **Centralization:** The Judiciary has implemented regionalized public defender services for capital murder cases.

The Texas courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice, primarily due to improvements in technology. They now have on-line court documents at the appellate courts and internal performance measurement at the Supreme Court. Intermediate appellate courts now have deadlines on new expedited cases.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Utah

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Utah Judiciary is primarily a state funded system.
  - In its appellate, general jurisdiction and juvenile courts, the state pays the salaries of judges, support staff and clerical staff. The state pays for all technology, all operating costs, and court facilities for all state courts.
  - Local Justice Courts are funded by individual municipalities. Relatively few of the Justice courts have experienced any significant budget reductions.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Utah’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $128.8 million in FY12 to $132.6 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $105.5 million to $108.7 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary fell from 2.2% to 2.1%.
  - Over the past three years, court fees increased by varying amounts, depending on the fee, for an average increase of approximately 50%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch.
  - The Judicial Branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. The court budget is essentially two line items: (1) operations, and (2) facilities. The Judicial Council has the ability to move and administer funds appropriated within these line items.
  - The Utah courts have the authority to carry forward funds to the next fiscal year.
  - The FY13 budget will enable the courts to provide for necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. The on-going budget was protected during the budget reductions. One time funding was moved from other budgets into Information Technology to help accelerate the move to the electronic record. The Judiciary has revisited all expenditures and contracts and has made significant adjustments in order to maximize available funds. The courts have sufficient funding to enable them to make needed enhancements in the coming year.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services. The introduction of technology has been predicated on increased system efficiency and improved public service. Remote filing and access to all court records improves services for all, as does e-payments. For example, the use of state-wide e-warrants saves time for law enforcement, prosecution, social services, attorney general's staff, and judges. Mandatory e-filing of civil cases (effective 4/1/13) will allow for further downsizing and redeployment of clerks’ office staff.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses**: Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased by 1% while the number of trial court staff has been
reduced by 9% and the number of central office staff has been reduced by 15%; trial court operating expenses were reduced by 4%. The budget for central office staff is expected to increase by 3% in the coming year to fund a state wide self service center in the state law library.

- **Compensation:** With the exception of a 1% cost of living increase in FY2013, salaries for judges and staff have been frozen.

- **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the Utah courts have had staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions.

- **Efficiency Measures:** The Utah courts have implemented efficiency measures (e.g., electronic record) and alternate business practices (e.g., moving to an all digital record in place of court reporters) in order to avoid service reduction. They have increased the use of senior judges to cover judicial vacancies, and to address any backlogs. They have initiated case management improvements to avert delay. Performance measures indicate improved system performance over FY 2008.

- **Restructuring:** The Utah courts have reallocated judges to districts based upon a weighted caseload, have changed jurisdiction to share judicial workload, have expanded the jurisdiction and use of subordinate judicial officers, consolidated clerk management positions and have reallocated staff.
  - The courts have moved significant judicial resources across districts to deal with heavy dockets and delay in other districts. By rule, the Utah Judiciary changed the filing of all small claims actions to Justice Courts to help reduce clerical work in the general jurisdiction courts. Clerical reorganization and the move to team management have resulted in the elimination of the traditional hierarchical structure in the clerks’ offices. Vacancies have and will be moved to areas of the state where the need is greater.
  - As part of clerical restructuring, Utah has moved to competency based advancement and has instituted an online training program with 150 training modules. This technology is now being more widely deployed to other orientation and training needs.
  - A centralized transcript management system was instituted in conjunction with the move to an all digital recording environment, significantly reducing transcript delivery time, staff time, and costs.

- **Business Processes:** The Utah courts have implemented an enhanced caseflow management program, have implemented “in-court updating” for docket entries and sentencing orders and have transitioned to digital recording of court proceedings. The courts use remote audio conferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

- **Outsourcing:** The Utah courts outsource electronic filing. It is based on a model in which private sector vendors, if certified by the Administrative Office of the Courts, market to attorney e-filing services which interface with the AOC case management system.

- **Centralization:** The Utah courts have a centralized payable center and centralized collections processing. E-payments are available for all levels of
courts, including juvenile. E-payments are processed as a banking transaction, eliminating cash receipting and reconciliation by the clerks staff. Juror summoning and qualification have long been centralized.

The Utah courts are in a better position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice. This has been accomplished by changing their business model, accelerating implementation of the electronic record, taking reductions where direct services were not impacted or where caseloads reductions warranted (juvenile probation), moving judicial and staff resources to where the need was greatest, and putting increased emphasis on management information and case management practices. These steps have resulted in improved performance, despite downsizing.

The Utah courts are trying to position their operations to their allocated budget and reduced staffing levels. When and if the budget situation improves, additional funds would be used primarily for addressing future growth or new initiatives, rather than restoring cuts.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Virginia

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Virginia Judiciary is funded primarily by the state.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts, for the salaries of trial court judges and trial court clerical staff and for trial court technology and operating expenses. Trial court judicial support staff and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Virginia’s total state and federal grant appropriation was increased from $373.5 million in FY12 to $381.3 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $362.8 million to $370.6 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary dropped from 2.23% to 2.15%.
  - The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The Judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The appropriation for the Judicial Branch is included in the Governor’s Budget Bill. The Chief Justice and Executive Secretary meet with the Governor and Legislative money committee chairs to advocate for the Judiciary.
  - The Judicial Branch does have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. The Judicial System is required, however, to request approval to move funds between courts/agencies, i.e., between the circuit courts and the district courts.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide nor enhance necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
  - The introduction of technologies has not enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:**
    - Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same; spending on trial court operating expenses has been increased by 1%.
    - In the coming year, the number of trial court staff will increase by 4%. The amount spent on trial court operating expenses will increase by 2%.
  - **Compensation:** Over the past four years, salaries of judges and court staff have been frozen and will continue to be frozen in the coming year in FY12/13.
  - **Service Reductions:**
    - Over the past four years, the Virginia courts have had staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices. In the coming year, they will delay filling judicial vacancies.
    - These service reductions have resulted in increased delays and backlogs and in resources being diverted from civil to other mandatory case types.
- **Efficiency Measures:** The Virginia courts have implemented an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, e-citations by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees and a virtual web-based information center to provide public access to records. In the coming year, they will implement e-filing.

- **Business Processes:** The Virginia courts have implemented remote videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles and remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

The Virginia courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice, primarily due to improvements in technology. If the budget situation improves, they will fill existing judicial vacancies.
State/Local Funding
- The Washington Judiciary is funded primarily by the local funding bodies.
- The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and for trial court technology. The salaries of trial court judges, trial court support staff, trial court clerical staff and operating expenses and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

State Revenue and Appropriations
- Washington’s total state and federal grant appropriation increased from $137.9 million in FY12 to $143.4 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation decreased from $111.4 million to $110.8 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 0.5%.
- The change in the State General Fund (SGF) appropriation is solely due to one-time fund swaps, whereby the appropriation for the SGF was reduced and the appropriation for state special funds was increased by a like amount. This occurred in four out of seven state judicial branch agencies.
- The amounts noted represent appropriations to the state judicial branch. There are a few executive branch agencies that allocate state funds to local courts, most notably the Department of Social and Health Services Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (DSHS/JRA). Total annual funds distributed by DSHS/JRA to local courts are approximately $17,000,000 (not included in the figures above).
- The FY13 budget includes funding for a statewide superior court case management system. The appropriation is from a dedicated information technology funding source.
- Over the past four years, technology funding has increased 23%.
- The budget situation in the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

Funding Principles for Judicial Administration
- The Judicial Branch presents the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The state Judicial Branch budget is submitted through the Executive to the Legislature. The Executive Branch cannot amend the Judicial Branch budget request.
- The Judicial Branch does have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items. However, the Legislature does have the authority to create budget provisos directing the Judicial Branch to expend the appropriation solely for expressed purposes. Often these provisos are one-time in nature or project specific.
- The FY13 budget enables the courts to provide for and enhance some, but not all necessary technology to meet the demands of the public.
- The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.
• **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  o **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has remained the same. Central office staff has increased in the area of information technology.
  o **Compensation:** Over the past four years, at the state level, the Legislature has implemented furloughs and salary reductions for non-judicial staff (all but judges). In addition, across-the-board budget reductions have also resulted in salary freezes (beyond the furlough and salary reductions). At the local level, budget reductions have resulted in salary freezes and furloughs for non-judicial staff.
  o **Service Reductions:**
    ▪ Over the past four years, at the state level, across-the-board budget reductions have resulted in staff layoffs and delayed hiring. At the local level, budget reductions have resulted in reduced hours of operation, staff layoffs and delays in filling vacancies.
    ▪ These service reductions have resulted in reduced service to the public, limited access to court services and increased delays and backlogs.
  o **Efficiency Measures:** The Washington courts have implemented and will continue to implement e-citations by law enforcement agencies. In the coming year, they plan to implement e-filing, an electronic document management system, an enhanced case management system, and electronic workflow.
  o **Business Processes:** The Washington courts plan to implement in the coming year an enhanced caseflow management program, the transition to digital recording of court proceedings and remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.
  o **Outsourcing:** The Washington courts have outsourced the collection of fines and the provision of language access services.
  o **Centralization:** Washington currently has five judicial districts that allow for efficient case processing as well as other combined functions.

Washington has established a commission to address court funding.

The Washington courts are in a worse position than in FY09 to provide access and timely justice, primarily due to improvements in technology. If the budget situation improves, in those areas where quality services are being provided at lower costs, additional monies will not be used to automatically restore cuts on a one-to-one basis.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – West Virginia

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The West Virginia Judiciary is primarily state funded.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Court, the Administrative Office of the Courts, for the salaries of trial court judges, judge support staff, and clerical staff, and for trial court technology and operating expenses.
  - Expenditures for local courthouses and equipment are almost evenly split between state-funded items/services and county-funded items and services. Just over 50% of local expenditures are provided by local funding bodies. Local funding pays for courthouse remodeling or updating to meet ADA and other requirements, but not for any court operations.
  - Special initiatives include increases to the number of drug courts and truancy-based probation officers. The West Virginia courts are also contracting for a number of trainers to assist on the installation of the newly complete unified judicial application information system.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - West Virginia’s total state and federal grant appropriation declined from from $130.5 million in FY12 to $128.6 million in FY13. The state general fund appropriation increased from $120.5 million to $122.3 million in FY13. The percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary remained at 3%.
  - Additional funding will pay for longevity pay increases for staff.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased 24%.
  - The budget situation over the next three years is likely to stay relatively the same.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The judicial branch presents the judiciary’s budget request directly to the legislative body without prior approval by the executive branch.
  - The judicial branch has budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget has some funds to provide for technology necessary to meet the demand of the public. They are enhancing on-line access for the public in the unified system. As on-line access rolls out, access will be more robust.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to implement their ten year plan to provide and enhance court services.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others in state government to provide or receive enhanced court services. Though the unified system is in its infancy, it has already received high marks in the pilot counties for enhancing access for all parties who desire it.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses:** Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 1%. The number of trial court staff has increased 1%. The number of central office staff has increased 4%. Funding for trial court
operating expenses has increased 1%. In FY13, the number of judges and staff will remain the same. Trial court operating expenses will increase 3%.

- **Compensation:** Over the past four years, the West Virginia courts have not taken any steps that have resulted in salary freezes or reductions.

- **Service Reductions:** Over the past four years, the West Virginia courts have not taken any steps that have resulted in service reductions.

- **Efficiency Measures:**
  - The West Virginia courts have implemented E-filing, an electronic document management system and an enhanced case management system. They have implemented E-citation by law enforcement agencies.
  - The West Virginia courts have instituted a very limited e-filing system for mass litigation cases only. They are almost finished developing a unified case management system. E-citations are brand-new; they are only now being used in a few pilot counties.

- **Business Processes:**
  - Over the past four years, the West Virginia courts have implemented and will be implementing an enhanced caseflow management program.
  - Prior to 2007, the West Virginia courts have created a statewide fine schedule for petty misdemeanors, implemented in-court updating for docket entries and sentencing orders, started videoconferencing of arraignments of incarcerated defendants and detained juveniles, and have done remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency.

- **Outsourcing:**
  - The West Virginia courts outsource the provision of language access services.

The West Virginia courts are in a better position than four years ago to provide access and timely justice. The roll-out of the unified case management information system is beginning to enable the courts to provide better access and timely justice.
COSCA Budget Survey, 2012 – Wisconsin

- **State/Local Funding**
  - The Wisconsin Judiciary is funded both by the state and by the local funding bodies.
  - The state pays for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts, trial court technology and for the salaries of trial court judges and trial court support staff. The salaries of trial court clerical staff and operating expenses and local courthouses and equipment are paid by local funding bodies.

- **State Revenue and Appropriations**
  - Wisconsin’s total state and federal grant appropriation of $130.5 million in FY12 remained the same in FY13. The state general fund appropriation decreased from $113.69 million to $113.62 million; the percent of the state general fund appropriation allocated to the Judiciary dropped from 0.81% to 0.77%.
  - Over the past four years, technology funding has decreased by 10%.
  - Increases or reductions of funds by local funding bodies vary by county.

- **Funding Principles for Judicial Administration**
  - The judicial Branch does not present the Judiciary’s budget request directly to the Legislative body without prior approval by the Executive Branch. The court budget proposal is submitted simultaneously to the Governor and Legislature, but the Governor decides which court requests to include in the biennial budget bill forwarded to the Legislature.
  - The Judicial Branch does not have budget authority to manage and administer appropriated funds without restrictions of detailed budget line items.
  - The FY13 budget does not enable the courts to provide for and enhance all necessary technology to meet the demands of the public. Revenues have decreased and put a strain on the Information Technology budget.
  - The introduction of technologies has enabled the courts and others to provide and receive enhanced court services.

- **Steps Taken to Address Tough Economic Times**
  - **Staffing Levels and Operating Expenses**: Over the past four years, the number of judges has increased 1%. The number of trial court staff has increased 1%. Central office staff has decreased 1%. In the coming year, staffing will remain the same.
  - **Compensation**: Over the past four years, salaries of judicial officers and court staff have been frozen. Court staff have been furloughed. Some retirement and health insurance costs have been moved from the state to the employees.
  - **Service Reductions**: Over the past four years, the Wisconsin courts have reduced hours of operation, had staff layoffs and have delayed filling judicial vacancies and vacancies in the clerks’ offices and in judicial support positions. They have reduced the use of retired judges and have delayed jury trials.
  - **Efficiency Measures**: The Wisconsin courts have implemented e-filing, electronic workflow and in-court updating for docket entries and sentencing orders. In the coming year, they plan to implement an electronic document
management system and an enhanced case management system. They have implemented e-citation by law enforcement agencies, e-payment of fines and fees and virtual self-help centers.

- **Business Processes:** The Wisconsin courts have implemented videoconferencing of incarcerated defendants and remote videoconferencing of interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency on a limited basis. In the coming year, they plan to implement an enhanced caseflow management program.