



**PUBLIC SERVICE AND TRUST COMMISSION**

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

**PHASE ONE IMPLEMENTATION REPORT**

**2009 REPORT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
<b>SUMMARY OF INITIATIVES</b> .....	5
<b>ACCESS</b> .....	6
Initiative: Americans with Disabilities .....	7
Initiative: Limited English Proficiency.....	11
Initiative: Information/Privacy.....	16
<b>CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS</b> .....	18
Initiative: Diversity in the Branch Workplace.....	19
<b>DELIVERY OF SERVICES</b> .....	21
Initiative: Alternatives to Court Appearances.....	22
Initiative: Case Management (Civil).....	27
Initiative: Complex Litigation.....	28
Initiative: Criminal Practice.....	32
Initiative: Family Support Magistrate Rules.....	34
Initiative: Jury .....	35
Committee: Problem Solving in Family Matters.....	42
Initiative: Self-Represented Parties.....	46
Initiative: Small Claims .....	51
Initiative: Technology Plan.....	56
Initiative: Uniformity of Court Procedures.....	58
<b>COLLABORATION</b> .....	61
Initiative: Chief Court Administrator/Attorney General.....	62
Initiative: Chief Court Administrator/Clerks and the Bar.....	64
Initiative: Criminal Justice Information System.....	66
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b> .....	67
Initiative: Civility/Decorum in the Courts .....	68
Initiative: Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team.....	70
Initiative: Court Security.....	71
Initiative: Expectations of the Public .....	72
Initiative: External Affairs Advisory Board - Speakers' Bureau, Media Campaign for Public Education; Seniors and the Law .....	78
Initiative: Judicial Performance Evaluation Program .....	82
Initiative: Public Service Excellence (PSE).....	86
Initiative: Website Enhancement.....	88
<b>INITIATIVES NOT ADDRESSED IN PHASE I</b> .....	90

## INTRODUCTION

In May of 2007, Chief Justice Rogers created the Public Service and Trust Commission and charged it with developing a plan to enhance the public's trust and confidence in the Judicial Branch by improving the services offered to the thousands of people who interact with the Branch each day. The Commission obtained and analyzed information from people who interact with the Branch and from Branch members through focus groups, public hearings and surveys. The Commission identified five major areas and developed a strategic plan with five goals and multiple strategies to address those areas.

The plan was submitted to the Chief Justice in June of 2008, who accepted the recommendations of the Public Service and Trust Commission and directed the Chief Court Administrator to develop a plan to implement the recommendations of the Commission. The Chief Court Administrator Barbara M. Quinn developed the initial implementation plan and undertook the first phase of the implementation process, addressing twenty-seven of the original thirty-six initiatives of the plan in September of 2008.

The following report on Phase I of the implementation of the strategic plan contains a summary of the results of the work undertaken by the new and existing committees and commissions in effecting the implementation of the twenty-seven initiatives. For each initiative, this report contains an overview and a listing of the recommendations of each committee and commission divided into three categories: recommendations for which implementation has already begun; recommendations that have not been reviewed or prioritized by judicial administration; and recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees.

The initiatives assigned to the committees and commissions were ambitious, and as the members explored their assigned areas, additional areas for examination and analysis often appeared, causing the already ambitious charge to expand. Consequently, even though the

committees and commissions worked intensely, they were not able to address fully every aspect of the Phase I initiatives. Some areas require further examination and development. The full reports, both final and interim, of the commissions, committees, and subcommittees are attached to this report.

In the first phase of implementation, not all initiatives of the implementation plan were addressed. The report also lists the initiatives that were not addressed in Phase I.

# SUMMARY OF INITIATIVES

# ACCESS

The Judicial Branch will provide equal access to all of its facilities, processes and information through the identification and elimination of barriers.

### **Initiative: Americans with Disabilities**

The Americans with Disabilities Act Committee was formed in response to the implementation of the first goal of the strategic plan. It was charged with evaluating what resources currently offered by the Judicial Branch to accommodate those with differing needs; assessing accessibility to that information; and recommending more effective ways to disseminate, both online and at facilities, information to people who may need an ADA accommodation.

The Committee, which includes chair Patrick Caron, vice-chair Sandra Lugo-Gines, and member Ann-Laurie Parent, conducted five public meetings between November 2008 and April 2009, and held three informal work meetings in the same period.

The Committee evaluated what information and resources are available for people with disabilities at Branch facilities and on the Branch website; conducted three focus groups for people with disabilities and people who advocate for those with disabilities; and identified and utilized resources within the Branch, as well as Executive Branch agencies and non-profit and community groups.

The combined input from external and internal resources and the Committee's evaluation and assessment of available resources as charged in the strategic and implementation plans have driven the activities already undertaken by the Committee, and form the basis for the Committee's recommendations for action by the Branch now and in future.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

1. The Committee, working with the Legal Services Unit and the Information Technology Division, designed an Americans with Disabilities Act homepage for the Branch's Internet Website. The site provides a host of links, including the names, phone numbers and email addresses of dozens of trained ADA contact people in Branch facilities and offices; information about wheelchair access (see below), available auxiliary aids and services; juror accommodations; and the Committee's home page. The Committee recommends that the site be regularly assessed to ensure it is accurate and up-to-date and that links to forms requesting assistance be added.
2. The Committee evaluated and located wheelchair access at each courthouse as well as Support Enforcement Service sites, juvenile probation, law libraries, small claims sites, housing sessions, family services, and the Supreme Court, Appellate Court, and Tax Court. Those entrances were photographed and text information about the locations has

been posted on the Branch website under “Court Locations.” The Committee recommends that Court Support Services Division evaluate 13 of its sites for which no description is listed and post that information online.

3. The Committee accompanied a state Department of Public Works building inspector on informal ADA compliance check-ups of seven state-leased buildings. The Committee recommends the Branch conduct its own ADA compliance checks, annually or semi-annually, and promptly address deficiencies that impact peoples’ access to Branch facilities. The Committee further recommends that the Branch do those inspections with an advocate for people with disabilities, using the model checklist from the federal Department of Justice ADA Compliance guidelines.
4. The Committee conducted an inventory of available auxiliary aids and assistive technologies. The committee recommends that the Branch immediately purchase assistive vision technology for every clerk’s office, Court Service Center, and Information desks in courthouses and where files are kept. Recognizing the severe budgetary constraints faced by the Branch, the Committee suggests such technology could be as simple as the common and inexpensive magnifying glass. More advanced technology has been identified by the Committee; that information is included in the fuller report and appendix.
5. The Committee identified and trained 107 ADA Contact people within Court Operations, Court Support Services and External Affairs and provided ADA training with a trainer from the New England ADA Center in Boston. The locations, phone numbers and email addresses of ADA Contact people in every G.A. and J.D., as well as those in Jury Administration, Legal Services, Support Enforcement Services, and Juvenile are listed on the ADA website. The Committee recommends that Court Support Services Division list its trained ADA contact people on the Website.
6. The Committee has developed, with its Legal Services staff attorney advisor, a new Request for Accommodation form, as well as a grievance process procedure and a grievance form for the public. The Committee recommends the Branch review and approve the forms and post them on the ADA website, as well as ensure their distribution to all Branch facilities.

## **Recommendations for review and prioritization by Judicial Administration**

1. The Branch should establish an Office for People with Disabilities that handles information, requests, complaints and grievances for both the public and its employees. The Office should include an attorney with thorough and current knowledge of the ADA as it applies to the public and labor law. The Office should include a trainer who will develop, implement and track ADA training for every Branch Judge and employee, and a coordinator charged with overseeing ADA Contact people, ADA requests and accommodations for both the public and Branch employees, and updating the Branch's existing ADA Webpage. The Office should be charged with overseeing the implementation of the ADA Committee's recommendations, and ensuring consistent and uniform handling, across the Branch, of ADA issues, and ensuring the implementation of Branch ADA policies and procedures. The Office should report annually to the Chief Court Administrator.
2. The Branch should establish an Advisory Committee that includes a representative of the Chief Court Administrator, a Judge, a staff member of each Division, a member of the Office of People with Disabilities, and members of the public with disabilities and/or their advocates. The Advisory Committee should meet biannually to review progress of the implementation of the ADA Committee's plan, as well as make recommendations on how to best accommodate people with disabilities.
3. The Branch should track every ADA complaint that it receives to monitor emerging or consistent patterns. Tracking and monitoring compliance with the ADA may also yield access to federal grant money for training on the ADA.
4. Based on the large number of responses from the participants in the three focus groups, the Committee recommends the Branch provide sensitivity training to every member of the Branch, from the Bench to the Judicial Marshal staff, using trainers with different abilities. While using in-house trainers would be cost-efficient, the Committee has identified a number of external resources, including advocates for people with disabilities, that it believes could help develop appropriate training.
5. The Branch should include information on all forms used by the public, such as jury forms, about the ADA Website and the Branch's ability to provide accommodations for people with disabilities.
6. Based on the increasing costs because of the request for and use of the vendor-provided Computer Assisted Real Time transcription (CART) service, the Branch should

investigate the feasibility and fiscal benefits of hiring, on a permanent, full-time basis, a certified CART court reporter.

7. The Committee recommends that the Branch abandon its use of text telephones (TTYs) and telecommunication devices (TDDs) in clerk's offices and other administrative office in favor of the free, national "711" telecommunications relay service for people with speech and hearing disabilities. The 711 number should be listed on every Branch form, replacing the TDD and TYY numbers.

### **Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by this committee**

1. The Committee identified the usefulness of the Microsoft Accessibility features, which provide greater ease of computer use to people with differing abilities. The Committee recommends that the Branch's Information Technology Division investigate the availability and viability of activating those built-in Accessibility features on publicly accessible computers found in Court Service Centers and public information desks.
2. The Branch's IT Division should investigate how it can make the Branch's Webpage more accessible to external users, such as the ability by viewers to change font sizes to accommodate low-vision.
3. The Committee recommends that the ADA trained Contact people be trained annually to ensure familiarity with the ADA and that a biannual newsletter be sent to the Contact people notifying them of trends, changes in equipment, policy or rules and other ADA relevant information. The Committee also recommends that the Contact people list is reviewed annually to ensure all information is up-to-date.

### **Initiative: Limited English Proficiency**

The Committee on Limited English Proficiency is the expansion of an existing Branch committee that was established to address the access requirements contained in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other federal laws. The LEP Committee was charged with eliminating language barriers to facilities, processes and information that are faced by individuals with limited English proficiency.

Led by Atty. Faith Arkin (chair) and the Honorable Maria A. Kahn and Atty. Toni Smith-Rosario (co-chairs and advisers), the eighteen-member committee, comprising judges, interpreters, court service center personnel, marshals, and judicial information system staff, formed three subcommittees to address the various aspects of its charge: Outreach, chaired by Ms. Rhonda Stearley-Hebert; Multilingual Materials, chaired by Ms. Rena Goldwasser; and Interpreter Services, chaired by Ms. Gabrielle Winter. The committee and its subcommittees have met a total of thirteen times between November 24, 2008 and March, 2009.

The Committee and its subcommittees conducted a survey of available Branch forms and signs in languages other than English; did an extensive review of the Interpreter and Translator Services unit, including its policies, procedures, and training for staff, and usage by the public; and drafted a survey, to be distributed internally, to assess how often and in what manner language assistance services are utilized by various Branch units. Additionally, the members conducted a multi-question survey for the federal judiciary and other states about LEP services and translation in the courts.

The numbers of people with limited English proficiency who access the Branch is on the rise as Connecticut's demographics become more diverse. In 2007, the Branch provided more than 104,000 direct Spanish interpretations alone, and, on average, uses the Language Line phone interpretation service 391 times per month. These numbers will surely increase and, based on its in-depth review of the data gathered and after analyzing that information, the Committee is making the following recommendations:

#### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Conduct an internal survey to assess how often and in what manner language assistance services are utilized by various units within the Judicial Branch. The survey has been drafted and piloted by the Committee.

2. Identify forms and materials that require translation services through an electronic survey of each Judicial operating unit; determine the number of 'hits' on forms and publication; ascertain which forms are most frequently filed. A phone survey was completed. The internal survey recommended above is anticipated to solicit additional information.

**Recommendations for review and prioritization by judicial administration:**

1. Consider the use of bar codes and possibly, the use of docket legend codes, to allow Court Operations to generate reports on the numbers and types of Judicial forms that are filed, as opposed to downloaded, printed, or distributed.
2. Consider other materials for translation, including: court calendar uniform instructions, into Spanish; translation of courtroom assignments that are posted on calendar and other days; interpreter/translation options when Support Enforcement Services cases are heard in front of Family Support Magistrates, especially in regards to the advisement of rights.
3. Survey community organizations to obtain information regarding the needs of LEP populations as it pertains to the Judicial Branch and review utilization data such as Webpage hits and forms used to determine translation priorities for the Branch Website.
4. Develop computer programs that will: include both 'Interpreter' and 'Language' indicators in the case-management systems where they currently do not exist; print 'Interpreter' and 'Language' indicators on all dockets; automatically generate an interpreter-service request from earliest identification of need; transfer pertinent data into the Interpreter and Translator Services (ITS) Scheduler system for every scheduled court appearance or interview throughout the duration of the case and until final completion.
5. Develop/include informational links on the existing Judicial Branch Webpage to direct LEP individuals to translated information and make other Webpage changes as determined by community organization survey results.
6. Develop a system for the efficient tracking and scheduling of interpreters through the use of current and future technology.
7. Record in case-management systems (CR/MV, Edison, etc.), at the earliest possible stage in a case involving an LEP individual: the need for interpreting services in a case, the language needed, and the type of proceeding and/or approximate duration of the interview requested.
8. Develop and establish specific criteria for prioritizing assignments of interpreting requests.

9. Permit the use of audio recordings of advisements of Constitutional rights in Spanish, recorded by certified Spanish-language interpreters.
10. Expand the scope of the Telephonic Bilingual Services (TBS), and rename it to allow this unit to provide telephonic and in-person interpreting outside of the courtroom (e.g., jail interviews, CSSD studies and interviews, Court Operations interviews, etc.)
11. Reassign suitable, permanent qualified (but non-certified) Spanish-language interpreters to TBS.
12. Modify, acquire and activate necessary telephonic infrastructure and equipment to maximize utilization of the Telephonic Bilingual Services.
13. Consider Spanish the priority language for translation of materials, with Portuguese as second and Polish as third priorities. Other translations should be determined based upon the utilization statistics and growth of minority communities.
14. Prioritize translation of materials based upon interpreter and translation event statistics and other data collected. Ensure that those pamphlets and brochures which have accompanying forms are translated in a coordinated manner. Additionally, a structured process should be developed for screening and prioritizing requests for translations.
15. Consider acquisition of terminology-management translation computer software (e.g. the Trados program) to ensure consistent state-wide translation of legal terminology on court forms for LEP individuals.
16. Acknowledge the issue regarding literacy levels of some LEP individuals and the need to identify assistance in understanding and reading materials, translated or not, to ensure that meaningful access to due process is provided.
17. Support the concept of Plain Language; need to analyze the concept of Plain Language as a cost-effective measure in forms translation.
18. Recommend additional resources for the Interpreter and Translator Services unit.
19. Establish Branch policies specifying the role and scope of duties and ethical requirements for interpreters in Connecticut Superior Courts.
20. Hire more bilingual staff for positions which directly serve LEP individuals.
21. Change organizational structure to: establish higher rates for services in hard-to-find languages so that the Judicial Branch can compete with other employers; certified temporary interpreters, and qualified temporary interpreters.
22. Change organizational structure to establish an Administrative Translator position for a person responsible for managing translation assignments; update the Interpreter II job

description for certified permanent interpreters to emphasize the professional, rather than clerical, services that interpreters provide to the courts.

23. Change organizational structure to establish a Master Interpreter job classification for those staff who pass the state certification with higher scores, or who hold multiple certifications (e.g., federal, American Translators Association (ATA), interpreting certification in more than one language).
24. Periodically review ITS staffing levels to ensure sufficient coverage for LEP individuals.
25. Create a mechanism to allow candidates to pay for some testing and training which may require legislation.
26. Solicit Branch employees (including judges) who have bi/multilingual abilities to participate in the Branch's outreach objectives (to utilize their skills such as through the Speakers Bureau).
27. The External Affairs Division should create or update a list of employees and judges willing to participate.
28. Expand outreach to LEP populations by the Judicial Branch Website based upon the needs identified via community organizations and establish collaborative relationships with media organizations that have targeted non-English speaking audiences.
29. Develop public service announcements based upon the needs of the LEP population.
30. Utilize monitors in public areas or lobbies that are a source of ongoing information to the public in languages common to the LEP population.
31. Support and foster the development of bi/multilingual employees by dedicating resources to train, recognize and assist these employees.
32. Train staff to routinely record interpreter and translator information into case-management systems (e.g. CR/MV, Edison, etc.)
33. Provide foreign language instruction to employees to enable them to provide basic information to LEP individuals, such as the location of the courtroom.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committee:**

1. Review statistical information on civil court requests to Interpreter and Translator services. The ITS application is currently being updated to accept this data.

2. Utilize the experience of other states and the federal government to prioritize forms translations consistent with available resources. A survey was done by the Committee of those experiences.
3. Implement the Committee's procedural recommendations for Quality Consideration for Testing, Certification and Training for the qualification and certification process of interpreters.
4. Conduct Branch-wide training on civil rights, national origin discrimination, and services available to the LEP individuals. A pilot program training was conducted in 2008; program was refined. Branch-wide training has commenced with the judicial marshals; a schedule will be developed to reach all employees.

### **Initiative: Information/Privacy**

The Committee on Judicial Information Policy (formerly the Identity Theft Committee) is an ongoing committee. Its original charge from the Public Access Task Force in 2006 was to address issues associated with identity theft, specifically the protection of personal identifying information contained in court files.

As part of the implementation of the strategic plan, the charge of this committee was expanded to encompass a broader range of access, privacy and confidentiality concerns. The Committee is charged with increasing public access to court processes and information while ensuring that the information of those who become involved in the court process is not misused, their safety is not compromised, and their privacy is respected.

Chaired by the Honorable Joseph H. Pellegrino, the twenty-seven-member committee originally created two subcommittees: a Criminal Subcommittee, chaired by the Honorable John F. Blawie and a Family Subcommittee, chaired by the Honorable F. Herbert Gruendel, to review Judicial Branch forms and rules that require the inclusion of personal identifying information. The committee and its subcommittees met a total of nine times between November 8, 2006 and February 5, 2009.

With the expanded charge, the committee will be establishing subcommittees to address the following areas: (1) drafting a comprehensive access policy for court records, (2) reviewing Branch policies on disclosability and disposal of personal identifying or otherwise confidential information and examining existing and potential structures to permit or restrict access to that information, and (3) developing training for Judges, staff, other agencies and the public on access to court records. With the expansion of electronic filing, each of these areas will need to be addressed.

Based upon the review of Branch forms and rules and the input from the National Center for State Courts, the Committee is making the following recommendations:

#### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Forms have been revised based upon the review conducted. This process should continue to eliminate unnecessary personal identifying information and to permit the redaction before submission of personal identifying information, including redacted social security numbers, dates of birth or account number. (Specific information about the recommendations of the committee may be found in the report.)

2. A rule specifically directing filers not to submit personal identifying information in documents filed with the court was drafted and submitted to the Rules Committee as new Practice Book Section 4-7. It will be voted on by the Judges at the Annual Meeting in June.
3. Revisions to Practice Book Section 4-2 (b) to include a statement that the signature on a pleading means that the signer has complied with the provisions of Practice Book Section 4-7.
4. Revisions to the existing rules on sealing documents (P.B. Sec. 11-20A and P.B. Sec. 25-59A) to permit a streamlined process for removing or sealing personal identifying information that appears in court documents were drafted and submitted to the Rules Committee. These revisions will be voted on by the Judges at the Annual Meeting in June.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. The review of information that is currently displayed on the website and the procedures for ensuring that accurate information is posted on the web site should be referred the Court Operations Quality Assurance Unit.
2. The examination of what could be added to the website to enhance access to court processes and information (i.e., providing streaming videos of court proceedings and posting decisions online), explore other ways that the Internet can be used to increase electronic access, including interactive options (creation of an online avatar to connect public with resources based on question/answer) and other web-based services should be referred to the Committee on Self-represented Parties and to the Web Board.
3. A rule should be drafted to provide for the submission in a sensitive data form of personal identifying or other confidential information that is required for adjudicative purposes. The form would not be available to the public or posted on the Internet.
4. A comprehensive policy on access to court records should be developed by the Committee on Judicial Information Policy. That policy may be modeled on the access policy drafted by the National Center for State Courts.
5. Educational materials should be developed for the public in conjunction with the Committee on Self-represented Parties regarding the public nature of materials that are filed with the courts.

# CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

The Judicial Branch will provide a diverse and culturally competent environment that is sensitive to the values and responsive to the needs of all who interact with it.

### **Initiative: Diversity in the Branch Workplace**

The implementation plan created the Diversity in the Branch Workplace Committee and charged it with recommending an action plan to promote and ensure diversity in the hiring and retention of Branch employees, and to ensure a culturally competent workforce.

Led by Chair Linda A. Dow, the eight-member committee, which included members from Court Operations, Information Technology, Court Support Services, Human Resources and External Affairs, met seven times from October 2008 through January 2009.

The Committee gathered an extensive amount of data, including demographics of Branch employees within Superior Court Operations Division and Court Support Services Division (CSSD); demographics of the offenders and probationers served by CSSD.; and an overview of the population served by the Support Enforcement Services unit. The Committee also collected general Connecticut community data, and examined the Branch's existing recruiting and retention efforts with respect to hiring.

As charged in the implementation plan, the Committee has recommended an action plan with specific recommendations listed below.

### **Recommendations for review and prioritization by Judicial Administration**

1. Address issues of cultural competency through training for new and existing staff.
2. Conduct a survey of Judicial Branch staff to identify the areas employees think are in need of improvement in relation to cultural competency.
3. Develop and implement a cultural competency training curriculum; provide evaluations to each participant upon completion of training; provide pre- and post-training tests to measure levels of competency.
4. Develop a centralized, mandated training program for Affirmative Action Coordinators to ensure that the interview process is conducted in an appropriate and consistent manner at all times. Refresher courses should be offered biannually, and the rate of attendance tracked.
5. Assess Affirmative Action Coordinators on levels of competency through periodic self-assessments and/or post-training testing.
6. Develop and implement a system for Affirmative Action Coordinators to report any concerns regarding appropriateness of the interview processes as they occur. Also, a

system should be developed to ensure that any such concerns are investigated and acted upon prior to any action being taken on the recruitment in question.

7. Track the number of issues reported by Affirmative Action Coordinators.
8. Develop questions to include on the interview form that will measure the cultural competency of an applicant, or the ability for an applicant to become culturally competent.
9. Ensure all Branch staff involved in the interviewing process receive training regarding the inclusion of cultural competency as part of the hiring criteria and the importance it has as part of the required criteria for hire/promotion.
10. Update the existing “*Guidelines to Effective Interviews*” booklet to include cultural competency as a criteria for assessment of applicants.
11. Evaluate and develop methods to retain employees and provide opportunities to enhance their career mobility.
12. Evaluate the existing Mentoring Program to determine if it meets the needs of staff in providing increased access to career opportunities within the Branch.
13. Include a career mobility program as part of the Mentoring Program, to be developed by the Mentoring Committee in conjunction with Administrative Services Division Human Resources Management unit.
14. Assess existing materials and the extent of the Branch’s current outreach efforts to students in high schools, business and technical schools, career academies, and colleges.
15. Assemble and maintain a pool of Judicial Branch employees who would be accessible to the Volunteer/Intern Coordinators to make presentations
16. Promote careers with the Judicial Branch by developing class materials and a speakers' bureau for Connecticut high schools, business schools, technical schools, career academies and colleges. Market the speaker’s bureau, job shadow and court aide programs to high school administrators, and track the number of requests.
17. Market the Connecticut Courts Curriculum.
18. Develop a system to collect and determine distribution of Branch workforce data and data on the population served by the Branch; determine how that data can be effectively utilized to support the goal of developing and retaining a diverse and culturally competent staff.

# DELIVERY OF SERVICES

The Judicial Branch will provide effective, uniform and consistent delivery of services by enhancing the management of court practices.

## **Initiative: Alternatives to Court Appearances**

The Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances was formed as a part of the first phase of the implementation and was charged with exploring possibilities for expanding the use of video conferencing and teleconferencing for court appearances in order to make judicial proceedings and services more accessible and to promote efficient and cost effective case management.

Chaired by the Honorable Elliot N. Solomon, the forty-member committee included judges, court personnel, a states' attorney, a public defender, an attorney general, attorneys from the private sector, support enforcement staff, a representative from the information technology division, the commissioner of the state Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and a representative from the Department of Correction. The committee formed five subcommittees to address specific areas of its charge, including: Technology, chaired by Mr. Scott Rosengrant; Statutes and Rules, chaired by Attorney Jennifer O. Robinson; Purposes, chaired by the Honorable Hillary B. Strackbein; Costs and Benefits, chaired by Mr. David M. Iaccarino; and a videoconferencing pilot program exploratory committee, chaired by Judge Strackbein. The committee and its subcommittees have met a total of twenty-six times between November 2008 and May 2009.

The Committee has gathered information on the technological infrastructure of Branch facilities, identified statutes and rules that impact the use of videoconferencing and teleconferencing, explored the civil, family, juvenile, criminal and appellate areas to identify where videoconferencing and teleconferencing could be effectively used, and analyzed the potential costs and benefits of video and telephone conferencing. Members of the committee also benefited from meeting with staff and observing the video courts in Newark, New Jersey.

After extensive evaluation and discussion, the Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances has developed the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for review and prioritization by judicial administration:**

1. Civil Matters: Teleconferencing should be allowed, at the discretion of the court and after reasonable notice, for status and scheduling conferences; arguments, not including short calendar, where testimony is not required (including such matters for self-represented inmates); and such other matters upon which the parties may agree.

2. Civil Matters: Videoconferencing should be permitted, at the discretion of the court and after reasonable notice, for: short calendar arguments not involving the testimony of witnesses; trial testimony of any witnesses; inmate proceedings; habeas corpus proceedings alleging claims regarding conditions of confinement; and such other matters upon which parties may agree.
3. Civil Matters: Videoconferencing should not be used for pretrial conferences.
4. Criminal Matters: Teleconferencing should be allowed, at the discretion of the court and upon reasonable notice, for status and scheduling conferences.
5. Criminal Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed, at the discretion of the court and with the consent of all parties, for second-stage extradition proceedings; and competency proceedings (C.G.S. 54-56d) in which there is no dispute that the defendant, at such time, is “incompetent but restorable.” Additionally a member of the evaluation team may testify by videoconference in support of the recommendations made by the team (videoconference equipment in the courthouse and at Connecticut Valley Hospital must be compatible). And videoconferencing should be allowed at the discretion of the court and with the consent of all parties for such other matters as to which both parties may agree.
6. Criminal Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed without the consent of the parties for Court Support Services Division interviews of inmates in connection with pre-sentence investigations, the jail re-interview program, and level of service inventories.
7. Criminal Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed without the consent of the parties for Sentence Review hearings.
8. Criminal Matters: A pilot program should be established for the videoconferencing of arraignments between the holding area and a courtroom in Geographical Area 14 (Hartford).
9. Criminal Matters: Transporting of inmates to court for matters when appearances before the judge is not necessary (Callbacks): In any courthouse which has videoconference facilities for private conferences between counsel and an incarcerated defendant, the following should apply: Defendants in Part A in the Hartford Judicial District shall not be transported to court unless specifically requested by the State or the defendant’s counsel and approved by the Court in its discretion. In Part A other than in the Hartford J.D., the defendant shall not be transported to court unless specifically requested by the State or defendant’s counsel. In Geographic Areas, defendant will be transported to court unless both the State and defendant’s counsel agree otherwise.

10. Juvenile Matters: Videoconferencing or teleconferencing should be allowed in Child Protection proceedings, at the discretion of the court and upon reasonable notice, for: status and scheduling conferences; the testimony of a person on whose behalf a protective order, restraining order or standing criminal restraining order has been issued and the subject matters of the proceeding involves the person against whom such order has been issued; participation by an out-of-state parent in a child protection matter under the Interstate Compact for Placement of Children; participation in a child protection case by a parent incarcerated in Connecticut whose presence in court poses a security risk, limited to certain proceedings; use of non-English language interpreter if not readily available in Connecticut; the testimony of a foster parent regarding the placement or revocation of commitment of a foster child living with such foster parent or a sibling regarding visitation with or placement of a child committed to DCF; by agreement of the parties and their attorneys, participation in discussions by treatment service providers and evaluators in case status conferences, child protection mediation and in court proceedings; and conferences with a judge of another state as required pursuant to the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act.
11. Juvenile Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed in delinquency proceedings, at the discretion of the court and upon reasonable notice, for initial detention review hearings where the detention facility is not located in the child's home juvenile district.
12. Family Matters: Teleconferencing should be allowed, at the discretion of the court and upon reasonable notice, for: status conferences not pertaining to custody and visitation issues; scheduling conferences, including issues regarding trial management orders; conferences with a judge of another state as required pursuant to the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act; pretrial conferences where a party lives at such a remote distance that the court finds teleconferencing to be appropriate; and arguments that do not require the taking of evidence.
13. Family Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed, at the discretion of the court and upon reasonable notice, for: participation by a party incarcerated at an out-of-state or federal facility; arguments that do not require the taking of evidence; the taking of testimony from an out-of-state witness; hearings on post-judgment motions as permitted by existing law; and interviews by Family Relations and Support Enforcement Officers of out-of-state and incarcerated individuals necessary for the completion of a service ordered by the court.

14. Administrative and Other Matters: Teleconferencing and/or videoconferencing should be allowed for: administrative meetings; use of non-English language interpreters working from a remote location; subject to Judicial approval, communication with juvenile detainees or incarcerated individuals; communication between inmates and state operated medical facilities regarding medical needs of an inmate while in the care and custody of Judicial Marshals; and probate proceedings at such times as the teleconference and/or videoconference equipment is available for use.
15. Administrative and Other Matters: Videoconferencing should be allowed as appropriate for training sessions with Branch personnel.
16. Administrative and Other Matters: Videoconferencing systems used in criminal matters for private conferences between counsel and incarcerated defendants may be used by counsel to communicate with inmates on Civil, Family, and Juvenile matters when equipment is available.
17. Administrative and Other Matters: Absent exigent circumstances and court approval, an inmate should not be transported to court on a day when no necessary court appearance is scheduled in his or her case.
18. Technology: Subject to fiscal constraints and prioritization within the Criminal, Civil, Juvenile and Family divisions, each Judicial District (J.D.) and Juvenile courthouse should be equipped with videoconference capability in at least one courtroom; each J.D., Geographical Area (G.A.) and Juvenile courthouse should be equipped with a videoconferencing capability for confidential communication between attorneys and incarcerated clients; each J.D. courthouse should be equipped with a portable videoconference unit.
19. Technology: Subject to fiscal constraints and prioritization, the Branch should implement a VOIP teleconferencing system that can accommodate all Branch locations; C.S.S.D. should be equipped with videoconferencing and teleconferencing capabilities in order to conduct inmate interviews (PSI's, LSI's, jail re-interview, etc.) and engage in adaptable administrative functions such as training sessions and meetings that require travel; and appropriate equipment shall be provided for continuous non-English language interpretation as needed.
20. Statutes and Rules: The Committee recommends the adoption of new rules and the revisions of existing rules and statutes to provide for the expanded use of these technologies for the purposes recommended in all practice areas. The use of teleconferencing and videoconferencing should, in most instances, be at the discretion of

the judicial authority and the rules should reference this discretion. Generally, it is contemplated that rules regarding teleconferencing and videoconferencing in a particular subject matter should be set forth separately, as described more specifically in Appendix B of this Committee's full report.

21. Statutes and Rules: The Committee recommends a rule that: (1) defines teleconferencing, (2) defines videoconferencing, (3) authorizes, in most instances, the use of videoconferencing if available where teleconferencing is permitted and (4) permits remote non-English language interpreting services, including continuous, word for word interpretation in appropriate situations.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of the Phase I committee:**

1. A Standing Committee on Technology for Videoconferencing and Teleconferencing should be formed to continue the work of this committee. The purpose of the Standing Committee will be to monitor the implementation of these recommendations, to educate users as to the availability and use of new technologies, and to measure the outcomes of the changes as they are implemented.
2. An individual should be designated whose sole responsibility would be the management of Branch teleconference and videoconference resources. Existing and anticipated teleconference and videoconference resources are substantial and the field will change considerably in the years to come. Consequently, it is appropriate that one individual be charged with providing direction in this field.

Further study should be done into the feasibility of using videoconference technology to create and preserve the court record. Although this has been discussed in the course of this Committee's work, a full examination is beyond the scope of this analysis.

## **Initiative: Case Management (Civil)**

The Civil Commission is an ongoing commission that was formed in 2000 by the former Chief Justice, the Honorable Francis M. McDonald, Jr. The Commission was originally charged with the review of the civil docket and the development of practices that would improve the administration of judicial services and promote the resolution of cases in a fair, timely, open and cost-effective manner. This Commission has now been charged with to examining issues associated with case management practices and procedures to ensure that they are designed to address the changing numbers, types and complexity of cases, incorporate new technology, and serve all who interact with the courts.

Chaired by the Honorable Arthur A. Hiller, the twenty-seven-member committee, which includes members from the Bench and the Bar, formed two subcommittees to address specific areas of its charge, including: Case Processing, co-chaired by the Honorable Marshall K. Berger, Jr. and Attorney Catherine Smith Nietzel, and Discovery, chaired by Attorney Charles A. DeLuca. The committee and its subcommittees have met several times, and will continue to meet, to consider the issues assigned to them

The Committee reviewed and grouped the many issues that were obtained from the focus groups conducted during the development of the strategic plan and its subcommittees are discussing issues connected with discovery, including examining enforcement of discovery rules and examining the possibility of implementing a special masters program and issue associated with case processing, including ways to make the pretrial process more effective and examining the feasibility of individual scheduling or staggered hours for motions and short calendar hearings.

The Commission is not yet at the point of making specific recommendations, but its subcommittees are developing recommendations that will be submitted to the full commission in the near future. The Commission will submit recommendations as they are completed.

## **Initiative: Complex Litigation**

Several of the concerns raised in the focus groups conducted as part of the development of the strategic plan concerned the complex litigation program. To accelerate the review of the Complex Litigation Program and address these areas of concern, the Complex Litigation Committee was created. It was charged with the review and evaluation of the Complex Litigation Program, including the program's criteria and standards, and identifying possible areas of improvement.

Chaired by the Honorable Dennis Eveleigh, the fifteen-member committee included judges and members of the bar. The committee formed three subcommittees to address specific areas of its charge: Administrative, chaired by Attorney Richard A. Silver, Procedural, chaired by Attorney Richard Weinstein, and Standards, chaired by Attorney William Prout. The committee and its subcommittees met a total of seven times between April 25, 2008 and August 27, 2008.

Each of the subcommittees met to review current practices in their respective areas and to address the concerns expressed regarding the Complex Litigation docket (CLD), including the need for clarification and dissemination of standards for referral to the docket, the suggested input from the bar into the assignment of complex litigation judges, and the streamlining of procedures within the complex litigation docket.

As a result of the review and analysis of the information gathered by the focus groups and extensive discussions of possible improvements, the committee developed and submitted the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

1. A practice should be established which provides the Bar with input on the selection of CLD Judges; it was suggested that a representative group of the Bar meet with the Chief Court Administrator to give candid appraisals of potential for service on the CLD. (Members of the Bar met in April of this year to provide input into the selection of CLD judges.)
2. Criteria used to determine whether a case should be referred to the CLD should be elucidated more clearly. (Revisions have been made to the *Facts About the Connecticut Judicial Branch Complex Litigation Docket* (Information Sheet) to clarify the criteria.)
3. A judge's assignment to the CLD may be extended beyond three years to permit the judge

to manage cases through trial in accordance with the principles of an individual calendar method of case management. However, an interim review should be conducted after two years to evaluate each CLD judge's performance. (Some judges are permitted to continue on the docket for a period longer than 3 years, but a CLD judge's individual preferences also need to be taken into account. An interim review cannot easily be undertaken unless there are an adequate number of evaluations for a statistically meaningful review.)

4. The application process should be streamlined. The application for case referral should be filed early in the case and the form should be redrafted in order to provide a box which clearly identifies whether all parties consent to the referral. (JD-CV-39 has been revised and posted online.
5. Any objection to the referral of a case to the CLD must be filed after a specified time period following the filing of the application, rather than after the decision is rendered on the application. The present application form which allows an objection to come in after the decision of the judge shall be amended to reflect this change. (Form JD-CV-39 has been amended.)
6. Language contained in the document entitled *Facts About the Connecticut Judicial Branch Complex Litigation Docket* (Information Sheet) should be rewritten to more clearly reflect that cases are considered for placement on the CLD on the basis of their individual merit, in the exercise of sound discretion, on a non-formulaic basis.
7. In the section of the Information Sheet entitled "How Does a Case Get Referred to the Complex Litigation Docket?", the following language should be inserted immediately following the reference to the Judicial Branch website:

"The Chief Administrative Judge of the Civil Division has discretion to schedule a hearing to consider whether referral to the Complex Litigation Docket is appropriate."
8. In the section of the Information Sheet entitled "What Factors Will Be Considered in Determining Eligibility?", the language should be as follows:
  - The number of parties
  - The number of counsel
  - The amount of the claim and the nature of the relief requested
  - The anticipated length of trial
  - The complexity of the issues presented for resolution
  - The extent and complexity of pretrial proceedings, including discovery matters, motion practice, and special proceedings

- The overall need for the special oversight and management that the Complex Litigation Docket may provide
  - Whether alternative case management approaches are available in the judicial district where the case has been brought
9. In the section of the Information Sheet entitled "What Types of Cases Will Be Considered as Complex Litigation?", the following introductory sentence should be inserted: "While each case proposed for the Complex Litigation Docket will be evaluated on its individual merits, the following types of cases often have been found to be appropriate for assignment to the Complex Litigation Docket."

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees**

1. The evaluation form for all Superior Court Judges should contain a check-box inquiring of counsel whether that judge should be considered for assignment to the CLD. (Referred to Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee)
2. It is recommended that the evaluation form should not contain a case caption or docket number and should be distributed with an internal and external envelope. The wording of the form should give the Bar assurance that the information is not attributable to a specific lawyer. (Referred to Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee)
3. The juror administrative processes should be reviewed in order to identify areas that are contributing to the lack of a sufficient number of jurors for a full day of jury selection, and to provide solutions. Stamford appears to be a particular problem. (Referred to Jury Committee)
4. Examine the potential for utilization of Judge Trial Referees in cases where no CLD judge is available.
5. If Judge Trial Referees were to be utilized, due to the statutory requirement that they cannot preside over civil jury trials without the written consent of all parties, a mechanism would have to be developed to provide for parties' agreement.
6. An alternative to the referral of cases to the CLD based upon the length of trial would be the transfer of the case to another judicial district by the Chief Court Administrator.
7. In order to prevent delay, the Request for Adjudication form should be modified to address the difficulties in reaching opposing counsel and obtaining the necessary information to complete the form. (This form is being revised.)
8. Procedures should be developed for the processing of this form based upon the

differentiation of the types of motions in order to provide for prompt adjudication of discovery motions.

9. To expedite the processing of these motions, different methods such as telephonic scheduling conferences should be explored.
10. System changes should be considered in order to provide the capability of readily identifying the filer of a motion/objection on the Case Detail page of the Branch's website.
11. Procedural requirements for filings should be adopted, such as the inclusion of the party number on all CLD filings to facilitate the process.
12. Efforts should be made to provide for the availability of Wi-Fi access in the courthouses. (Referred to Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances)
13. The scheduling of CLD events should be entered into the Edison system so that this information may be available for viewing on the Branch's website.

**Recommendations that were not accepted by the Chief Justice**

1. A Presiding Judge should be appointed in order to provide better coordination of resources between the CLDs and the regular dockets and among the CLD judges, particularly regarding the transfer of cases between CLD areas if the assigned judge is not available for trial or hearing. (Chief Administrative Judge (CAJ) of Civil serves this function)
2. Additional CLD locations would provide synergy and flexibility to assist in the reassignment of a CLD trial that could not proceed as scheduled. (Not accepted due to significant budgetary constraints, but Branch will continue to evaluate these recommendations as available resources permit.)
3. The creation of additional CLDs in New Haven, Bridgeport and the eastern part of the State is recommended if possible, given the constraints of the available Judicial Branch courthouses in those locations. The Committee supports an expedited schedule for addressing the completion of new facilities in these locations, particularly New Haven and Bridgeport. (Not accepted due to significant budgetary constraints, but Branch will continue to evaluate these recommendations as available resources permit.)
4. Identify those Judicial Districts that may have available courtrooms and space for support staff for locating additional CLDs. (Not accepted due to significant budgetary constraints, but Branch will continue to evaluate these recommendations as available resources permit.)

## **Initiative: Criminal Practice**

The Criminal Practice Commission, which is an ongoing commission, is an extension of the prior Ad Hoc Criminal Practice Committee. That committee was originally created to provide a forum to discuss issues related to the process of the criminal justice system in order to improve the system. One of the implementation initiatives has more specifically charged the Criminal Practice Commission with addressing a wide range of issues that were identified by the focus groups that were conducted during the development of the strategic plan.

Chaired by the Honorable Patrick L. Carroll III, the twenty-one-member commission, which includes members from the Bench and the Bar, formed five committees and a subcommittee to address specific areas of its charge, including: Discovery/Practice Book, co-chaired by the Honorable Patrick Clifford and Attorney Kevin Kane; Habeas Reform, co-chaired by the Honorable Gary D. White and Attorney M. Elizabeth Reid; Proposed Revisions to the Rules of Professional Conduct, Immigration, co-chaired by the Honorable Joette Katz and the Honorable David Gold; Professionalism/Civility, co-chaired by the Honorable James Ginocchio and Attorney Raymond Hassett; and its subcommittee on Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers Association (CCDLA) Submissions to the Judicial Selection Commission and the Judiciary Committee, also co-chaired by the Honorable James Ginocchio and Attorney Raymond Hassett. The commission has met four times, and will continue to meet, to consider the issues assigned to it.

The Committee reviewed and grouped the many issues that were obtained from the focus groups conducted during the development of the strategic plan and issues that arise, including the notification of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the release of certain information by the prosecuting authority in a criminal case, including law enforcement reports, affidavits and statements and the examination of the habeas process and procedures.

The Commission is not yet at the point of making specific recommendations in all areas. It will continue to examine and evaluate the issues associated with the criminal justice system. Currently, the Commission has the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

1. The Commission has proposed revisions to Practice Book Sections 40-10 - Custody of Materials; 40-11- Disclosure by the Prosecuting Authority; 40-13 – Names of Witnesses; Prior Record of Witnesses; Statements of Witnesses; 40-14 – Information Not Subject to

Disclosure by Prosecuting Authority; and proposed a new Section 40-13A – Law Enforcement Reports, Affidavits and Statements. These revisions and the new rule, drafted by the Discovery/Practice Book Committee of the Commission, are a milestone in resolving significant and long-standing disputes between the State and defense counsel in the area of discovery. They were published in the Connecticut Law May 19, 2009 and the public hearing on these rules was held on June 1, 2009.

2. A meeting with members of the Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers Association (CCDLA) to discuss the Association's submissions to the Judicial Selection Commission and the Judiciary Committee regarding Judge's reappointments took place in May. This issue will continue to be discussed and information will be shared with the committee addressing judicial performance evaluation.
3. The Habeas Reform Committee is reviewing the existing procedures for habeas matters and is considering revisions to the process.

### **Initiative: Family Support Magistrate Rules**

The Family Support Magistrate Rules Subcommittee is a new subcommittee of the Family Commission. It was charged with developing rules for the Family Support Magistrate Division, which was created by statute in 1986 in response to federal law requiring expedited hearings for the establishment, enforcement and modification of child and spousal support cases.

The eleven-member Subcommittee is co-chaired by the Honorable Lynda B. Munro, Chief Administrative Judge of Family, and the Honorable Sandra Sosnoff Baird, Chief Family Support Magistrate. The Subcommittee met twelve times between October 2008 and June 2009.

The Subcommittee conducted an extensive review of the existing Practice Book Rules to determine which of those rules should apply to Family Support Magistrate matters and identify areas where rules should be drafted. The members focused on Chapter 25 of the Practice Book, the general provisions for *Superior Court Procedure in Family Matters*, and on Chapter 13 of the Practice Book, *Discovery and Depositions*. Areas reviewed included case management, automatic orders, discovery, and expedited modifications. Relevant to the Subcommittee's work is the fact that 95 percent of litigants appearing in family support magistrate matters are self-represented and identifying and clarifying the rules that apply will enhance litigants' understanding and allow them to participate in a more meaningful way.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

The Family Support Magistrate Court (FSM) Rules subcommittee has completed the work it commenced last fall. It has drafted proposed rules for FSM court. The Family Commission is now reviewing the draft of those rules, and it is anticipated that the final form of these comprehensive proposed rules will be forwarded to the Rules Committee of the Superior Court over the summer.

## **Initiative: Jury**

With nearly one in three Connecticut adults being summoned annually for jury duty, the Branch wants to ensure the best possible service for jurors to help bolster the public's trust and confidence in the court system. The Jury Committee was formed to evaluate the Branch's overall juror system, from the initial contact through the utilization of jurors for service and beyond. The Committee was charged with recommending new approaches and initiatives, after an evaluation of the existing system and comparing the practices of other states and the federal judiciary. To further the Branch's goal of ensuring uniformity in its delivery of services, the Committee was also charged with identifying the different practices used in each of the nineteen court locations that summon jurors.

The Committee of twenty-nine members was co-chaired by the Honorable Linda K. Lager and the Honorable Frank M. D'Addabbo. Four subcommittees were created: Arrival, Before Court Appearance, Selected Jurors, and Voir Dire. In all, the Committee and its subcommittees met twenty-three times between December 2008 and May 2009.

With respect to each of their areas, the subcommittees reviewed Branch practices, forms, brochures and other existing media, including the Jury Handbook and the Jury Information page on the Branch Website. A survey of the jury clerks was conducted, and the American Bar Association's 2005 report *Principles for Juries and Jury Trials* was consulted, along with the ABA's best practices recommendations.

As a result of the members' reviews and analyses of existing practices, the Committee has developed a number of recommendations.

### **Recommendations for review and judicial prioritization:**

#### **Before Court Appearance (BCA) Subcommittee**

1. Permanent Master File - Maintain the current practice of annually creating the Master File. Study ways to improve the quality of the data received from the source list provider agencies. Study whether technology could overcome the disadvantages of a Permanent Master File.
2. Improve Juror Utilization - Implement techniques statewide based to reduce daily number of requested jurors to achieve a utilization rate of 60% based on practices of court

locations with high utilization rates, cancellation rates and scheduled trials and monitor the impact of reducing daily numbers.

3. Improve Information re Employment Issues - Expand and update information about rights of employed and unemployed jurors. Hold focus groups of former jurors to determine what information would be helpful. See also BCA Recommendation 5.
4. Jury Service - Substitute the term “jury service” for “jury duty” and ensure all forms of communication (summons, notices, publications, website, videos and oral) conform to the changed terminology. Also see BCA Recommendation 5.
5. Maintain and Update Forms, Publications, Website, Video and Orientation Materials - Create a formal mechanism (a committee, dedicated staff or a combination) to develop procedures and to review, maintain, update and recommend revisions, according to an established schedule, of forms, publications, website, video and orientation remarks and materials in order to provide accurate and timely information regarding jury service, to ensure accurate translations into languages other than English, to ensure uniform and proper use of terminology throughout the cycle of jury service and to respond to jurors’ questions. Hold focus groups of former jurors to determine what information would be helpful. See also BCA Recommendation 3, Selected Jurors Recommendation 1.
6. Refinement of Summoning Procedures - Study the legality of changing the summons calculation formula based on population within a zip code and the stability of population within a zip code. If studies prove favorable, pursue legislative changes to implement such a change in order to enhance the representativeness of the array.
7. Addressing Specific Juror Concerns About Service - Create a uniform process for jurors with specific concerns about their ability to serve, such as economic hardship or past experiences, by which those concerns can be confidentially communicated to jury administration staff before appearing and to a judge on the day of appearance. See also BCA Recommendation 5, Arrival Recommendation 1, 2.
8. Excusing Jurors Who Have Served on Exceptionally Long Trials - Continue to permit judges to exercise their discretion to excuse jurors from future service for a period greater than three years if the circumstances warrant and the juror wishes to be excused.

### Arrival Subcommittee

1. Juror Orientation - Create and provide a uniform outline of points to be covered in the orientation remarks made by judges to jurors who have arrived for jury service. See also BCA Recommendation 5, 7.
2. Pre-Screening - Implement a pre-screening process to be used upon arrival or during the orientation process that identifies prospective jurors with bona fide reasons to be excused from service before they are selected for a voir dire panel. See also BCA Recommendation 7, Voir Dire Recommendation 1 and 2.
3. Facilities and Logistics - Ensure comfortable seating arrangements and quiet areas for waiting jurors. Explore providing wi-fi or internet access, with instructions as to proper use during jury service. Consider these needs in planning construction of courthouses in the future. See also Voir Dire Recommendation 6, Selected Jurors Recommendation 16.
4. Orientation Video - Create a new updated video, approximately 20 minutes long, that includes relevant points culled from the existing videos. Mandate that the video be shown in all locations. See also BCA Recommendation 5.

### Voir Dire Subcommittee

1. Judicial Supervision of All Voir Dire - Require that a judge, either the assigned trial judge or a judge trial referee, preside over voir dire in civil cases in the same manner that judges presently preside over voir dire in criminal cases.
2. Pre-screening - Require that all jurors be pre-screened by a judge prior to individual questioning by counsel in order to excuse jurors who have hardships, conflicts or special difficulties hearing the case of the type on trial or who otherwise satisfy the requirements for an excusal for cause. See also BCA Recommendation VII, Arrival Recommendation 2, Voir Dire Recommendation 1, 3, 5, 6.
3. Voluntary Use of Panel Voir Dire - Allow and facilitate the use of panel voir dire on a purely voluntary basis in any case in which all the parties request it and pertinent statutory and constitutional rights are properly waived.
4. Retention and Destruction of the “Confidential Juror Questionnaire” - Adopt a specific formal and uniform policy, as recommended by the subcommittee in 4.3, regarding the retention and destruction of the statutorily required “confidential juror questionnaire.” Require judges to inform prospective jurors about the use and privacy of the

- questionnaires and the retention and destruction policy. See also Voir Dire Recommendation 6.4, Selected Jurors Recommendation 15.
5. Reusing Excused Jurors - Adopt a uniform policy that requires jurors who are excused, following either pre-screening or voir dire questioning, to return to the jury assembly room to be available for inclusion on a panel for another case, taking into account, among other things, the time of day and the basis for the excusal. See also Voir Dire Recommendations 1, 2, 3. Re-use of jurors for another voir dire panel should enhance overall juror utilization. See BCA Recommendation 2.
  6. Improving Juror's Comfort - Provide an adequate and suitable environment for jurors awaiting questioning. See also Arrival Recommendation 3. Minimize waiting time by implementing methods to expedite the process such as photocopying the confidential juror questionnaire for counsel, using pre-screening techniques, and allowing venire members to report at specified times for questioning. See also Voir Dire Recommendation 2, 3, Selected Jurors Recommendation 12.
  7. Alternate Jurors - Study methods for selection and better use of alternate jurors that are more consistent with ABA Principles for Juries and Jury Trials, Principle II.G.2 and G.3. Conform the practices used in civil and criminal cases and seek appropriate legislative changes to do so. See also Selected Jurors Recommendation 13.

#### Selected Jurors Subcommittee

1. Post-Selection Orientation - The trial judge should provide specific orientation materials to selected jurors that address important aspects of trial service including juror conduct requirements and other key information. See also Selected Jurors Recommendation 12, 16.
2. Juror Note Taking - Permit jurors to take notes during the evidentiary stages of a trial with the trial judge providing appropriate instructions about the procedures to be used.
3. Clear Jury Instructions - Instruct jurors in plain and understandable language regarding the applicable law and the conduct of jury deliberations and make the formulation of such clear language instructions a priority for the civil and criminal jury instruction committees.
4. Copies of Instructions - Provide jurors with a copy of the jury instructions for use while the jury is being instructed, or alternatively use technology to display the instructions,

- and also provide each juror with a written copy of the instructions to use during deliberations.
5. Exhibit Index - Provide an appropriately redacted index of full exhibits for use during deliberations.
  6. Responding to Juror Questions and Requests for “Readback” of Testimony - Continue to follow the current practice, as set forth in relevant practice book sections, with sensitivity to concerns of fairness, completeness and accuracy of responses.
  7. Innovative Trial Practices – Recommended: With agreement of counsel and the court, use juror exhibit binders/notebooks and/or expanded preliminary instructions in appropriate cases.
  8. Innovative Trial Practices – Not Recommended: Do not permit the use of the following innovative trial practices – discussion of evidence during the trial of civil cases, sequential expert testimony; specific suggestions regarding the selection of a foreperson and the conduct of deliberations.
  9. Juror Questions for Witnesses - Permit jurors in civil cases to submit questions to witnesses with agreement of counsel and the court, in a prescribed manner and as currently permitted by Connecticut law. Although Connecticut law also permits the practice in criminal cases, the subcommittee recommends against that practice.
  10. Counseling for Jurors in Stressful Cases - Provide free appropriate counseling to jurors who report mental health challenges as a result of their jury service.
  11. Jurors’ Certificates of Appreciation - Prepare a standard letter of appreciation to be sent to jurors at the conclusion of the case.
  12. Efficient Use of Jurors’ Time and Communications regarding Scheduling - Manage trials in a manner that avoids wasting jurors’ time and keep jurors apprised of the trial schedule, any necessary changes to the schedule and the reasons for necessary delays. See also Selected Jurors Recommendation I, Voir Dire Recommendation VI.
  13. Alternate Jurors - Conform the practices used in civil and criminal cases. See Voir Dire Recommendation 8.
  14. Juror Privacy: Post-Verdict Instructions - Require judges to instruct jurors about post-service contacts from others and to explain their rights regarding speaking about their service. Consider establishing a secure juror service phone line for post-discharge complaints and issues. See also Selected Jurors Recommendation 10, Voir Dire Recommendation 4.

15. Juror Privacy: Juror Questionnaire and Personal Information - Conduct a study to determine if juror privacy may be protected in ways consistent with the ABA's Principles. See also Voir Dire Recommendation 4 for a more specific proposal regarding the confidential juror questionnaires.
16. Use of Smartphones (E-Mail, Voice Mail) - Prohibit use of smartphones and similar electronic devices in the courtroom and during trial for specific purposes (conducting research, gathering information, communicating with others about the case). Study whether the prohibition should be extended to recesses and lunch breaks. Provide explicit guidance about the use of such devices and the reasons for any restrictions the court may impose. See Selected Jurors Recommendation 1, Arrival Recommendation 3.

### **Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees**

1. The chairs recommend the creation of a small standing committee, consisting of the Jury Administrator, three judges and a chief clerk, for following purposes: to assist in implementing adopted recommendations, to supervise any future studies, surveys or focus groups, to assist in establishing educational programs, to review general instructions drafted by the standing civil and criminal jury instruction committees, to review revisions of juror publications, orientation remarks, web site information and juror video, to coordinate with other committees regarding media issues, and to recommend the creation of task forces where appropriate to address on-going jury service issues. The chairs propose that this standing committee be constituted as an internal Judicial Branch committee without public membership, but that any task force that may be created may include members of the public.
2. The chairs recommend a review of the job description and compensation for those individuals who serve as jury clerks so that the description and compensation are commensurate with the size of the location in which the clerk serves and the caseload.

#### **Recommendations on Training:**

1. Train jury staff and clerks' offices on how to interpret utilization statistics for more accurate assessment of number of jurors needed
2. Train jury staff to assess jurors' specific concerns about serving
3. Train judges to assess jurors' specific concerns about serving

4. Train judges and staff regarding appropriate pre-screening practices
5. Train judges, attorneys on how to conduct panel jury selection
6. Train judges, attorneys, staff on preservation of juror privacy and confidentiality

#### Recommendations on Post-Report Projects

1. Creating, maintaining and updating forms, publications, website, video and orientation materials and conforming them for consistency
2. Creating a uniform process to address jurors specific concerns about their ability to serve
3. Training programs for judges and staff on adopted recommendations
4. Creating a new jury orientation video
5. Adopting recommended appropriate practices for pre-screening jurors in civil and criminal cases
6. Exploring methods by which post-verdict counseling can be provided for jurors who served in stressful cases without cost to them
7. Establishing a secure statewide juror service line for post-discharge complaints/issues

#### Recommendations for: Further Study and Focus Groups or Surveys

1. Study ways to improve quality of source list data received
2. Study whether technology can overcome disadvantages of permanent master file
3. Study juror utilization practices in different locations statewide
4. Study efficiency of the size of venire panels
5. Study whether a need exists to translate sections of the website and juror publications into languages other than Spanish
6. Conduct focus groups with former jurors on what information would be helpful both in advance of service and during service
7. Study legality of changing summons calculation formula (this would be a major study and requires a legal opinion first before the demographic data is examined)
8. Study constitutional ways in which to protect juror privacy following jury selection and trial
9. Exit survey of jurors regarding improvements to the voir dire experience
10. Study restrictions as to jurors' use of personal electronic devices during jury service

## **Committee: Problem Solving in Family Matters**

The Committee on Problem Solving in Family Matters is a new committee established in connection with the implementation of the strategic plan under the third strategy of the Delivery of Services outcome goal, which requires the Branch to increase efficiency of case management and court practices.

The Committee was charged with assessing the applicability of a problem-solving justice model to child support dockets for the Family Support Magistrate Division and to make recommendations to the Chief Court Administrator.

Chaired by the Honorable Lynda B. Munro, the twenty-three member committee formed two subcommittees to address different aspects of its charge: the Work Group on Identification, Assessment and Recommendation, and the Overlap Work Group. The Committee also formed a Funnel Work Group to consider the information uncovered by the subcommittees. In all, the Committee and its work groups met fourteen times, between January and June 2009.

The Committee and its subcommittees include members of the Branch's various divisions, as well as the Department of Correction (DOC), the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the State departments of Labor and Social Services. The members have collected data and identified service providers, with an emphasis on identifying and assessing the challenges of inmates who will be reentering society to meet their responsibilities as parents.

After analysis of the variety of information gathered from multiple sources, the Committee is making the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for review and priority by judicial administration**

1. Recommend that in every Offender Accountability Plan there be a provision for Fatherhood program participation or parenting education for inmates with IV-D child support cases;
2. Require Department of Correction (DOC) intake and assessment include self report of existence or possibility of child support obligation;
3. Recommend that the DOC Fatherhood programs (excluding the program managed by Family In Crisis) be deemed certified by the Department of Social Services for purposes associated with the Arrears Adjustment Program;

4. Recommend education of 6 certified sites regarding acceptance of program participation at facility;
5. Recommend that DOC establish participant priority schedule to increase access to certain programming for inmates with child support orders and/or IV-D child support cases;
6. Recommend that Support Enforcement Services (SES) proactively match data with DOC to allow SES initiation of communication regarding modification while incarcerated;
7. Recommend that payment coupons include docket information or other case identifying information;
8. Recommend that each person released from a facility with continued DOC monitoring identify if child support order and process to modify;
9. Develop means for DOC and SES capias cross check and process for addressing capias while incarcerated;
10. Public capias information: website or lodging location: like the Judicial Branch website;
11. Develop link with Probation to check if outstanding capias and provide information on how to resolve;
12. Develop education informational session with probation to address capias turn ins;
13. Develop written materials/handouts on capias turn in with contact information for clerk's office and marshal information;
14. Develop policy on procedure if obligor on probation;
15. Consult with SES if they wish to be point of capias turn ins and policy for instructing on procedure;
16. Recommend education and communication to DOC and other partners concerning regulations for adjustment and liquidation.
17. Enter into communications between DSS for RAP certificates and other state Section 8 funding;
18. Utilize and intern based system of identifying and collating local housing options and make available to local resources, such as court service centers of SES;
19. Recommend to explore and develop communication for referrals to DMHAS for mental health and addiction through SES intake, court service centers or other;
20. Recommend and develop means to resume benefits (SSI-federal) or state (SAGA) upon release through DOC and Social Security and DSS;
21. Recommend direct referrals to DMHAS for mental health and addiction through SES intake, court service centers;

22. Recommend to identify services available for “Food Stamp” eligible person and disseminate to SES intake and Court Service Centers;
23. Clarify terms of probation that may prohibit computer access or online job application process;
24. Recommend to link DOL and DOC;
25. Recommend Uniform Referral Form and possible Link between DOL and Court;
26. Review Memoranda of Agreements, statutes, etc. to assess the type, and the degree, of access each agency has to other agencies’ information.
27. Identify obstacles each agency has to access information from other agencies.
28. Pursue additional Memoranda of Agreements that will provide agencies with access to other agencies’ information.
29. Explore the possibility of an agency permitting access to its information based on a disclosure form that has been signed by an individual who agrees to follow the problem solving pathway.
30. Review existing law and ethical standards and develop a procedure or mechanism consistent therewith to make information available to the Judicial Authority for decision making where appropriate.
31. Continue to collect and analyze data of parties crossing-over to determine in which courts, and in what frequency, the overlapping of experience is likely to occur.
32. Develop a mechanism to improve the scheduling of cases by having a greater awareness of parties’ cases scheduled in other courts to minimize the inconvenience to the parties and avoid competing or conflicting orders.
33. Provide scheduling information on the public internet site related to printed and write-on Family Support Magistrate matters to increase awareness, attendance, and compliance.
34. Identify and utilize local court options for evaluation services that are relevant and available.
35. Create a pilot program to formally refer parties from the Family Support Magistrate docket to existing resources. Perhaps an invitation from the Community Court in Hartford to utilize services might be helpful.
36. Continue to survey additional judicial authorities to determine the data elements that might be helpful in decision making.

**Recommendation for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees**

Extend the Committee's work by the formation of a work group to further research, implement, and assess on-going problem solving methods. Representatives from the principal agencies within the Committee would be valuable to this effort.

## **Initiative: Self-Represented Parties**

The Committee on Self-Represented Parties was formed as a part of the first phase of the implementation and was charged with examining ways to assist self-represented parties in effectively participating in the court process by enhancing the guidance and assistance provided by the Branch to those who interact with the court without representation either by choice or by necessity.

Chaired by the Honorable Raymond R. Norko and the Honorable Elizabeth A. Bozzuto, the twenty-seven-member committee included judges, magistrates, court service center staff, attorneys from the private sector, law library staff, and attorneys from the legal aid community. The committee formed five subcommittees to address specific areas of its charge, including: Training, chaired by the Honorable Jonathan E. Silbert, Support Services, chaired by Attorney Hugh C. Macgill, Forms, chaired by the Honorable Elizabeth A. Bozzuto, Technology, chaired by the Honorable Raymond R. Norko, and Legal Services, chaired by the Honorable Henry S. Cohn. The committee and its subcommittees met a total of twenty-three times between December 5, 2008 and May 12, 2009.

The Committee gathered information on the available services, forms and self-help materials offered by the Branch and looked at ways to clarify, simplify and improve them. It also investigated various areas to assist self-represented parties, including unbundled legal services, advice days, a dedicated self-represented party docket, upgrading the technology and infrastructure of the court service centers and public information desks and developing a partnership with the legal services network in establishing a web-based system for making legal information available to self-represented parties.

After extensive evaluation and discussion, the Committee on Self-Represented Parties has developed the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

1. Rename the Quick Link on the Judicial Branch homepage from “Court Forms” to “Forms” to provide greater access to forms and allow self-represented parties to locate forms on-line with greater ease. This recommendation was referred to the Judicial Branch Web Board for consideration at the March 6, 2009 meeting, and was subsequently approved. The change to the website Quick Links has been made.

2. Create a plain language hand-out regarding the short calendar marking procedures and provide a copy to all self-represented parties when they obtain their writ, summons and complaint. A brochure regarding short calendar procedures is in the process of being developed by E-Services for distribution to Clerk's Offices and Court Service Centers.
3. Create a letter to all self-represented parties. The purpose of this letter is to provide self-represented parties with contact information for local legal aid and lawyer referral services, and to make self-represented parties aware of the court's available resources and services. Two versions of the letter were drafted; one intended for distribution through Clerk's Offices, law libraries and court service center locations, and the other to be automatically computer generated to all appearing parties and counsel of record each time an appearance is filed in a case. (drafts have been completed)
4. Create a handout for judges outlining the role of the Court Service Centers and Public Information Desks by explaining the types of services the Centers and Desks can and cannot provide. This publication has been submitted to and approved by the Judicial Branch Legal Services and External Affairs Divisions.
5. Create a poster for distribution and display in all Clerk's Office, Court Service Center, Public Information Desk and law library locations outlining the role of the Court Service Centers and Public Information Desks by explaining the types of services the Centers and Desks can and cannot provide. Both the handout and the poster will be created utilizing the web pages located at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/csc/services.htm> and <http://www.jud.ct.gov/pid/services.htm>. This publication has been submitted to and approved by the Judicial Branch Legal Services and External Affairs Divisions. The posters have been referred to the Judicial Branch Court Interpreter's Office for Spanish translation.
6. The Committee is concerned about the huge reduction in funding for Connecticut's legal aid network that took effect January 1, 2009. The Committee recommends that the Branch do everything it can to support funding for legal aid.

#### **Recommendations for review and prioritization by Judicial Administration**

1. Bundle, or organize, forms by subject matter in all clerk's office and court service center locations, as well as on the Judicial Branch website.
2. Convert the most commonly used Judicial Branch forms and publications to plain language, and expand access to these publications to include non-judicial facilities.

3. Create a letter to all self-represented parties. The purpose of this letter is to provide self-represented parties with contact information for local legal aid and lawyer referral services, and to make self-represented parties aware of the court's available resources and services. Two versions of the letter were drafted; one intended for distribution through Clerk's Offices, law libraries and court service center locations, and the other to be automatically computer generated to all appearing parties and counsel of record each time an appearance is filed in a case.
4. Create a video-taped family support magistrate advisement of rights in English and Spanish. The advisement would run in a continuous loop in a designated area in the courthouse. Meriden JD is under consideration as the pilot site.
5. Create a small number of brief (five minutes or so) "how-to" videos, accompanied by easy to follow checklists that will guide self-represented parties through some of the basic procedures involved in civil and family litigation.
6. Create a pilot program for Advice Days in a judicial district family court location to be determined where volunteer attorneys will provide legal advice to self-represented parties in court.
7. Create a pilot docket dedicated to self-represented parties to be implemented only under optimal staffing conditions. The administration of the dedicated dockets would be done in concert with Court Service Center and Family Relations staff.
8. Recommending that the Branch not pursue the implementation of dedicated clerks at the trial and appellate levels; but instead, establish a Court Service Center and/or a Public Information Desk in every court location that lacks one now.
9. Create a pilot courthouse greeter program to be implemented in one courthouse, where congestion and intake delays are particularly burdensome. The greeter (or greeters) may be veteran clerk's office staff, e.g., the chief clerk or his or her designee, or some other court employee who is very familiar with the courthouse and the court's business. This pilot program should be evaluated for its effectiveness in reducing delay, congestion and confusion not later than the end of one year's operation.
10. Create an effective marketing plan to better promote existing mediation programs so that self-represented parties are aware of available mediation options at the earliest possible stage.
11. Create, where applicable, plain language publications about new and existing mediation programs to be displayed in all Judicial District clerk's office, Court Service Center and law library locations, as well as in non-judicial facilities such as local libraries, senior centers and community centers.

12. Create a link called “Mediation Programs” to be added to the Judicial Branch Home Page under Quick Links thereby providing self-represented parties with the ability to access information about mediation programs from their home computers or from any Court Service Center or law library computer.
13. Expand the mediation services administered by the Community Mediation, Inc., formally known as Fair Haven Community Mediation Center, Hartford Area Mediation and the Dispute Settlement Center to include an increased number of Geographical Area court locations, where feasible.
14. Establish a Court Service Center and/or a Public Information Desk in every court that lacks one now. Every court, including all Judicial District and Geographical Area courthouses, and all Juvenile Court facilities new and existing, shall be equipped with a Center and/or Desk as space and resources allow. In all court locations where space is at a premium, form and/or pamphlet walls are recommended to assist self-represented parties. This recommendation is made with the support of the Chief Administrative Judge for Juvenile Matters, Christine E. Keller.
15. Make wireless access readily available in courthouses and upgrade infrastructure and equipment for all Court Service Center and Public Information Desk locations.
16. Permit the Legal Services network to access the Judicial Branch website, and in turn, the Judicial Branch shall be permitted to link to the legal services’ website. This collaborative effort will assist self-represented parties in gaining access to educational tools, as well as informing parties of available services and how to best access those services.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by this committee**

1. Apply plain language and readability principles to the Connecticut Practice Book so it is clearer and more easily understood by self-represented parties. The Subcommittee on Forms recognizes the enormous undertaking this may be, and therefore, recommends that this be a long-term goal for the Judicial Branch to pursue.
2. Continue to provide quality and ongoing training for judges and staff in delivering the highest quality of service to the public, especially in the area of dealing with self-represented parties. To that end, the Subcommittee will refer this recommendation to the committee(s) to be created under the Training goal in the Strategic Plan.
3. Form an ongoing Technology workgroup to continue the work of the legal services’ web project. This project will not be completed within the life of the Committee and the success

of the web project is an important step in helping to ease the plight of the self-represented individual. The work of the Technology workgroup shall continue until the completion and implementation of the Legal Services web project.

4. The Committee on Self-represented Parties believes that the Judicial Branch should establish an ongoing collaborative relationship with Probate Court administration to discuss ways both entities can continue to improve resources and services available to self-represented parties.
5. The Committee recommends the formation of a Probate Court work group with representatives from the Judicial Branch and Probate Court administration. The work group will be charged with creating long term plans and improvements to new and existing Judicial Branch and Probate Court services.
6. Develop a very limited unbundling pilot project (in the area of family law, and in one court) with a strong evaluation component to explore both what unbundling could do for self-represented parties, courts, and lawyers, and what unintended consequences may result and need to be addressed. An ongoing unbundling work group will be formed to plan the family pilot project and push for any necessary rule changes. An in-depth discussion of the composition of the unbundling work group can be found in the final Subcommittee on Legal Services report.
7. Develop a second unbundling pilot project in the area of foreclosure law. An unbundling work group will be formed to plan a pilot project and push for any necessary rule changes. The pilot project will assist self-represented parties, on a limited basis, with filing an appearance in the foreclosure and negotiating the debt. An in-depth discussion of the composition of the unbundling work group can be found in the final Subcommittee on Legal Services report.

## **Initiative: Small Claims**

As a result of information obtained at focus groups during the development of the strategic plan, the Bench/Bar Centralized Small Claims Committee was formed to study the small claims court and to make recommendations for its future success. The committee was charged with reviewing Practice Book Rules, recommending uniform practices throughout the state, considering legislative proposals to improve small claims process, and examining whether any changes should be made in the small claims process.

Chaired by the Honorable Clarence J. Jones, the twenty-seven member committee, comprising judges, magistrates, court personnel, members of the creditors' and consumers' bars, and legal service providers, formed three subcommittees to address the different aspects of its charge: Access & Quality of Service, chaired by the Honorable James W. Abrams, Operational Process, chaired by Attorney Maureen Finn, and Legal Issues, chaired by Attorney Joanne Faulkner. The committee and its subcommittees have met a total of twenty-three times between June 2008 and March 2009.

The committee and its subcommittees explored the challenges facing the small claims court, including the increasing number of filings, the declining economy, and the decreased availability of court personnel. It sought to balance the needs of plaintiff's attorneys with those of self-represented defendants in a system in which attorneys represent 80% of the plaintiffs, but only 4% of the defendants. The committee also sought to protect the integrity of the judicial process with changes intended to reduce the number of defendants who fail to respond to the small claims complaint.

After intensive analysis and discussion, the Committee is making the following recommendations to clarify and improve the small claims process and ensure that all disputes are resolved in a just, inexpensive and expeditious manner.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Practice Book revisions have been drafted and submitted to the Rules Committee of the Superior Court. These revisions represent a significant change in the way that small claims cases are initiated and processed. Court Operations staff are working with a subcommittee of the Rules Committee to address the concerns presented by these significant changes. These revised rules address various facets of the small claims process, including filing and venue issues, notice and service requirements to appearing

- and non-appearing parties, verification of current address, extension of the answer date parameters, elimination of the requirement for a military affidavit in the small claims writ, expanded requirements for the inclusion of information in small claims writs and affidavits or debt (i.e., last payment and date in the writ, itemization of items in the affidavit), provision for the filing of an answer on the date of the hearing in damages, listing of allowable filings in small claims, requirements for written decisions by magistrates after a contested hearing, and changes to post-disposition remedies and filings. (Practice Book Revisions are attached to the Committee report as Appendix A.)
2. Send copy of defendant's answer to plaintiff upon receipt instead of including it with the notice of hearing.

**Recommendations that have not been reviewed or prioritized by judicial administration:**

1. Require the institution of the proposed 'Small Claims Judgment Checklist' for Magistrates which sets forth a tickler series of questions for Magistrates to review and verify before judgment is rendered. (Attached to the Committee report as Appendix B)
2. If service by the plaintiff is not adopted, then (a) require the plaintiff to provide the clerk with sufficient copies of the complaint for each defendant [Sec. 24-9], (b) prohibit the use of an indifferent person to serve the writ [Sec. 24-10 and 24-11], and (c) require a marshal making abode service to state an independent basis for the belief that the address is correct [Sec. 24-11 and 24-13 (b)].
3. Develop and implement a uniform stipulation form in carbon triplicate, with detailed information including the docket number, due date, amount agreed upon, and contact telephone numbers. (Attached to the Committee report as Appendix C)
4. Revise the judgment form to clarify the format and the information provided and eliminate repetition of information. (Attached to the Committee report as Appendix D)
5. The Judicial Branch should give top priority for implementation of an automated bulk e-filing system designed in a judicial format that makes data entry by judicial personnel for processing small claims cases unnecessary.
6. Begin with voluntary use of the bulk e-filing system. After twelve (12) months, require plaintiffs and attorneys who file more than 50 cases per year to use bulk e-filing.
7. Require plaintiffs to begin retaining affidavits until judgment is satisfied, the action is withdrawn, or judgment expires by operation of law.
8. Require plaintiffs to send copies of all filings to non-appearing defendants.

9. Require the small claims court to send hearing notices to non-appearing defendants.
10. The small claims office should make every effort to schedule all cases of large filers in each court on a single docket, to be heard after unrepresented party cases. Recommended scheduling order is as follows: (1) single-party unrepresented plaintiffs; (2) single-party large filers; (3) multiple-party unrepresented plaintiffs; (4) multiple-party large filers.
11. Preclude entry of default on a case for a minimum of 20 minutes after the calendar is called.
12. Eliminate hearings on amounts for weekly payments orders when the defendant admits liability and does not propose an alternative to the \$35 standard weekly payment order. Include a procedural notice to this effect on the defendant's answer form.
13. Allow ALL fees to be paid by credit card and develop pre-paid accounts for large filers against which entry fees can be credited.
14. Small claims housing cases should either (a) be returned to the housing courts or (b) separated from other cases upon filing and fast-track them for processing. If housing cases cannot be heard in a Housing Session, they should be held at least be held in the same building as the Housing Session clerk's office.
15. The receipt of three formal complaints, in a twelve-month period against a magistrate shall trigger a review process in which a reviewing party will observe a magistrate at a docket of at least ten matters. The review is to be conducted using a pre-approved checklist. However, nothing prohibits the review process from taking place in response to any single complaint.
16. Provide a user number or other mechanism so non-attorneys can participate in bulk e-filing.
17. Create a settled but not withdrawn list so these cases can be kept off the active dockets but managed to a complete disposition by withdrawal or dismissal.
18. Adopt a standard magistrate script for opening court which makes clear that the plaintiff attorneys are not magistrates and that a settlement is not required. Post the magistrate script on the internet and provide copies for litigants in court. (Attached to the Committee Report as Appendix E)
19. Adopt standards for magistrate canvass of stipulations and mandate and include reference to hospital cases. (Attached to the Committee Report as Appendix F)
20. Place information on the website in the 'Frequently Asked Questions' section on how to file a complaint, and make complaint forms available in the clerks office. Require that the

- complainant receive notice of the result of the investigation. (Attached to the Committee Report as Appendix G)
21. Replace the magistrate training binders with a more extensive magistrate bench book, containing procedures, forms, scripts, authority, and case law, including substantive case law on frequent small claims issues.
  22. Create easier access to links for small claims information on the judicial branch website.
  23. Add a separate judicial branch website section for small claims forms.
  24. Improve the small claims related information available, including the ‘Frequently Asked Questions’ section. Add to website, “Tips when you are sued”. (Attached to the Committee Report as Appendix H)
  25. Create an online tutorial on how to file a small claims case. With internet access, anyone can download the forms and complete them using the online tutorial, without leaving home and without a need to contact small claims personnel.
  26. Permit the use in small claims court of family members and friends as interpreters, but require any member of the public who engages in performing interpreting services for a litigant during a court hearing to be sworn to take the Interpreter’s Oath as set forth in Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 1-25.
  27. Revise the Small Claims Process booklet. Add more user-friendly sections and text. Combine sections in the booklet and include more housing matters small claims information.
  28. Create a Spanish version of the Small Claims Process booklet.
  29. Include a fee waiver form in the small claims forms section of the judicial branch website and strengthen reference in other informational sections on the web and in the Small Claims Process booklet.
  30. Revise the answer form to clarify the information requested. Include the answer form on the judicial branch website. (Attached to the Committee Report as Appendix I)
  31. Prohibit financial institution executions from issuing during compliance with payments.
  32. Prohibit the issuance of one type of execution (e.g., financial institution execution) at the same time that another execution (e.g., a wage execution) is in effect.
  33. Revise the small claims disposition form to include plainer language.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. A decision must be made regarding who is to bear the burden of service in small claims matters. The committee did not make a recommendation on this issue, but included statements of the supporting and opposing sides of the issue as Appendix J and Appendix K in its report.
2. Magistrate training should include instruction in regard to standards for use of the sanctioning power set forth in Practice Book Section 24-33, specifically in regard to the discretionary award of costs not to exceed \$100.00.
3. Establish a committee specifically to develop a magistrate bench book. Include members of the public on the committee.
4. Establish a judicial website specifically for magistrates that would include procedures, forms, and other information for their access only. Review the recommendation with the Legal Services unit.
5. Allow the option for small claims cases to be mediated on a pro bono basis utilizing the services of retired judges, attorneys, a mediation panel or small claims mediators. Begin with a pilot program.
6. Develop a pilot in a courthouse with two available courtrooms in which two magistrates are assigned to the same docket. In one courtroom hear only stipulations and other non-contested cases. In the other courtroom hear only contested cases requiring a trial. When the first magistrate is finished, he or she can then take any remaining contested trials.
7. Provide greater instruction to self-represented parties litigants to increase understanding and compliance with the requirements of the Act (Civil Relief Act).

## **Initiative: Technology Plan**

One of the initiatives in the Implementation Plan was a charge to the Branch's Information Technology Division (ITD) to develop a three-year technology plan that addresses infrastructure requirements. The purpose of such a plan is to ensure that the technical infrastructure is in place to support on-going Branch operations as well as any new initiatives anticipated over the next three to five years.

Key ITD staff representing all areas of the division: applications, Internet services and database support, projects and planning, network and system services, desktop services, standards and architecture, training, administration and the Commission on Official Legal Publications (COLP), met to identify the existing and new infrastructure that needed to be included in the Plan. The group worked on describing, defining and prioritizing over 41 infrastructure projects that were identified.

After extensive analysis and discussion, the list for inclusion in the Technology Plan was reduced to 20 items (13 existing infrastructure items and seven new infrastructure items). The Plan also reflects a schedule for initiating all 20 items during the three-year period but because of the constraints of time and resources anticipates the completion of 13 of the items during the plan period with the remaining seven continuing on beyond the summer of 2012.

### **Recommendations for review by Judicial Administration (Prioritization is set forth in the full plan.)**

1. Upgrade the network infrastructure of the Judicial Branch Data Center
2. Issue an Request for Proposal (RFP) and contract for Security Auditing Services
3. Expand the use of virtual servers to allow more efficient use of servers
4. Upgrade/replace all field switches
5. Implement a video conferencing solution in each region of the state
6. Purchase and install Enterprise Storage Area Networks (SAN) for the main data center and for the Alternate Processing Center
7. Secure the Judicial Network and Protect Judicial Information through advanced network security technology
8. Update the Identity Lifecycle Manager software that manages user IDs, passwords and access to Branch applications and data
9. Migration to "For the Record" (FTR) Version 5.2

10. Upgrade Wide Area Network connections
11. Purchase and install additional Alternate Processing Center (APC) Phase II Servers and Software for mission-critical applications
12. Upgrade Windows Server 2003 to Windows Server 2008
13. Replace the current manual user support functions with a portal that will allow self service for such things as resetting passwords and acquiring access to Branch applications.
14. Upgrade the hardware platform for mission-critical applications (for example, JASMIN, Barmaster and CRMVS)
15. Continue on-going server replacement
16. Implement wireless access statewide
17. Accelerate the "For the Record" (FTR) statewide deployment
18. Purchase and implement Automated Regression Testing tools
19. Purchase and implement tutorial development software
20. Replace the Criminal Motor Vehicle System (CRMVS) and the Centralized Infractions Bureau (CIB) System

## **Initiative: Uniformity of Court Procedures**

The Committee on Uniformity of Court Procedures was created as part of the implementation of the strategic plan and was charged with examining practices and procedures in civil, housing, family and juvenile courts in Judicial Districts statewide to facilitate practice in multiple jurisdictions for attorneys and support staff.

Led by the co-chairs, the Honorable Douglas C. Mintz and Attorney Frederic S. Ury, the twenty-nine-member committee included judges, court operations personnel, attorneys from family and civil bars and legal support staff. The committee formed two subcommittees to address the broad areas of its charge: Civil, chaired by the Honorable Arthur A. Hiller, and Family, chaired by the Honorable Marylouise Schofield. The Civil Subcommittee formed two work groups: one on Administrative Appeals, chaired by the Honorable John J. Langenbach, and Trial Management Orders/Pretrials, chaired by the Honorable James T. Graham. The Family Subcommittee created a work group on Trial Management Orders/Pretrials. The committee, its subcommittees, work groups and focus groups have met a total of sixteen times between November 2008 and June 2009.

The Committee reviewed current practices and procedures, including short calendar notices and processes, existing standing orders on pretrials, trial management and case management, and current procedures for land use appeals. It conducted three focus groups, in New Haven, Wethersfield and Bridgeport, with members of the family and civil bars and legal staff to identify areas where a lack of uniformity impacts the Bar. The Committee has also discussed the development of mechanisms to disseminate information on uniformity of court processes and procedures to the counsel and self-represented parties.

After extensive discussion, the Committee on Uniformity of Court Procedures has developed the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. A uniform special proceedings process, which will follow the procedures currently in place in New Britain, Waterbury and Hartford, should be adopted. A notice to be attached and served with the case initiation papers has been drafted.
2. A uniform Courtside Trial Management Orders should be adopted. A Courtside Trial Management Order has been drafted.

3. A uniform Jury Trial Management Order should be adopted. A Jury Trial Management Order has been drafted.
4. A uniform Land Use Appeals Standing Order should be adopted. A Land Use Appeals Standing Order has been drafted.
5. A uniform Case Management Order should be adopted for family matters. A Case Management Order has been drafted.
6. A uniform Pretrial Order should be adopted for family matters. A Pretrial Order has been drafted.
7. A uniform Trial Management Order should be adopted for family matters. A Trial Management Order has been drafted.

**Recommendations that have not been reviewed or prioritized by judicial administration:**

1. The Chief Administrative Judges should discuss orders and procedures to increase awareness of existing uniformity at meetings with the Presiding Judges each year.
2. A three-phase process for civil jury trials should be implemented. That process would include a pretrial conducted early in the process to discuss settlement and select trial dates; a trial management conference conducted within two weeks prior to trial focused on settlement and the basics of trial logistics; and a brief settlement conference conducted on the day of jury selection, if such a conference appears to be warranted.
3. The form for requesting a transcript (non-appeal) that is contained in the publication on **Procedures for Ordering a Court Transcript** should be developed as an official form and provided online.
4. The Notice of Appeal Transcript Order (form JD-ES-38), which is used to request a transcript for an appeal, should also be made available on-line.
5. The current publication, **Procedures for Ordering a Court Transcript** should be displayed online under the Publications link.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. Court Operations should establish a procedure for monitoring and posting any changes to standing orders to ensure that accurate and current information is provided on the website and made available to the public at all times.

2. The judicial marshals should develop and post a policy on procedures for screening attorneys and legal support staff bringing equipment and exhibits into the courthouse on a daily basis during a trial.
3. Court operations staff should review the advisability of suggesting legislation to invest the Court with discretion in allowing fee waivers in civil causes of action.

# COLLABORATION

The Judicial Branch will improve its communication and collaboration with the Executive and Legislative branches of government and their agencies, the Bar, other partners, and the public, as well as within the Branch, to better serve the needs of all who interact with it.

### **Initiative: Chief Court Administrator/Attorney General**

This initiative was developed in response to a focus group conducted with attorneys from all departments within the Office of the Attorney General, who frequently interact with the Judicial Branch. The information from that focus group highlighted the need for the creation of a mechanism to facilitate ongoing communication between the Judicial Branch and the Office of the Attorney General.

The Chief Court Administrator, the Deputy Chief Court Administrator and Judge DiPentima met for a lunch and discussion with members of the Office of the Attorney General in November to discuss the issues that the attorneys general had encountered in their interactions with the branch. A follow-up discussion was held in December.

As a result of those two sessions, the following recommendations have been made:

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. An attorney general was appointed to the Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances
2. Access to computers maintained in the courthouses outside or near the magistrate courts has been restored
3. Changes to the short calendar write-in process have been suggested to the clerks so that write-in will appear on the Judicial Branch website.
4. Training was developed and presented in three sessions to the assistant attorneys general in December, emphasizing information that is available online and through E-Services, including scheduling, short calendar, judicial notices and case detail information.

### **Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. The Rules Committee and the Civil Commission should consider developing a rule that would permit the court to screen matters prior to the granting of a fee waiver to eliminate frivolous lawsuits.
2. The Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances should look at the procedures on video conferencing and telephonic conferencing procedures in and among districts in connection with matters involving inmates.

3. The Committee on Uniformity should look at the scheduling of matters involving inmates on civil short calendars and the notice provided to the Attorney General's office. (In at least one district a "prisoner docket" is held.) A staggered docket for Monday short calendar would assist the assistant attorneys general in providing the state with adequate and timely representation in each district.

### **Initiative: Chief Court Administrator/Clerks and the Bar**

The implementation of this initiative was undertaken by a work group that was charged with improving communication and enhancing the relationship between and among the clerks' offices, local bar associations and members of the bar as a whole. Specifically, the work group was charged with developing a program to be followed in all judicial districts for periodic meetings between judges, court staff, bar associations, members of the bar and legal support staff. The meetings will provide a forum for the discussion of local issues, providing information about new statutes, rules or policies and addressing problems as they arise.

The three-member work group, First Assistant Clerk Wendy Kergaravat, First Assistant Clerk Lorin Himmelstein, and complex litigation court officer Rose Ann Rush, met over twenty times between November 2008 and May 2009 to develop the Legal Exchange Program. Members of the work group have also worked with chief clerks in each district in preparing for their initial Legal Exchange programs.

The work group developed the concept and name for the program, created a website and email address to facilitate statewide communication, solicited input from bar groups for ideas for the initial program, developed templates for correspondence, agendas, exit surveys, and flyers for use by the clerks in organizing and conducting these meetings, contacted clerks to arrange dates and times for the meetings, and worked to launch the pilot program in Bridgeport.

Legal Exchange programs have been held in almost all judicial districts. Based upon the programs and feedback from those programs, the work group is making the following recommendations:

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Conduct survey/focus group of Bar and legal support staff to assess needs/wants/identify problems in advance of meetings and use to set agenda.
2. A specific agenda should be created in each JD and should include topics submitted from the Bar/Legal support staff and from Judges and staff. This will help to establish a framework for discussion and to attract the Bar and legal support staff to the event. Topics on statewide programs/initiatives may be included at all locations, e.g., developments in e-filing.
3. The use of technology can be helpful at these programs. Prepare a list of aids available to the Chief Clerks when developing future programs. For example, a cordless microphone

would be helpful for the presenters and to those asking questions from the audience. Also, the use of live internet can be helpful to those presenting a new initiative.

**Recommendations to be reviewed or prioritized by judicial administration:**

1. These programs should be held twice a year, once in the fall after the October Practice Book and statutory changes go into effect and a spring session with dates starting in late March/early April.
2. The goal is to enhance communication and collaboration amongst the Bench, the Bar and the Clerks' Offices; however, there are additional units within the Judicial Branch that are involved in providing services which impact the relationship between the court and the Bar. Participation and input at the Legal Exchanges from these groups could prove to be meaningful. For example, the role of Family Relations would be best addressed by the head of Family Relations in any given JD.
3. Consider drafting a letter for the Chief Court Administrator to send to all judges at the beginning of the new term re-emphasizing this initiative, to encourage support and involvement of this program.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. This committee should work closely with the Committee on Uniformity of Court Procedures. The Committee on Uniformity of Court Procedures can use the Legal Exchange, where appropriate, as a forum to disseminate information.
2. As a follow-up to the Legal Exchange Program there should be a portion of the web page on the Judicial Branch internet where "frequently asked questions and answers" can be compiled and posted. In the alternative, this type of information can be provided under the "Civil Procedures" section of the web site.
3. Consider scheduling programs based on needs/request of Bar on a specific topic(s) within civil, criminal, family, juvenile or housing to allow for detailed presentations to smaller groups.

## **Initiative: Criminal Justice Information System**

The Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Governing Board was created by state statute with the passage of the 2008 criminal justice reform Public Act 08-01. The Act mandated the development and implementation of a centralized information technology system capable of providing “immediate, seamless and comprehensive sharing” of information to all state agencies, departments and boards central to the criminal justice system.

The Governing Board is representative of the collaboration among the three co-equal branches of government that will be necessary to ensure the successful development of such a comprehensive data sharing system. Deputy Chief Court Administrator Judge Patrick L. Carroll III is the Governing Board’s co-chair with Lieutenant Governor Michael Fedele, and the nineteen-member Board includes Legislative Branch representatives.

Judge Carroll served on the Governing Board’s search committee formed to recruit for the CJIS Executive Director position. The position was filled in the fall of 2008 after an extensive search.

The Branch has numerous automated criminal justice applications and its history shows its commitment to information sharing with its criminal justice partners. For more than 15 years, the Branch has shared, electronically, information with local and state police and the departments of Motor Vehicles and Correction. The Branch has taken the lead in the development of the Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification System (SAVIN). This system, when completed, will provide crime victims with near real-time access and notification of criminal justice events from the Branch, the Division of Criminal Justice, the Department of Correction, and the Office of the Victim Advocate. The Branch has also developed real-time event interfaces from its applications to the Offender Based Tracking System, or OBTS, the cornerstone of CJIS. Branch staff from virtually all divisions have been involved in actively sharing information with the Governing Board and the member partners’ agencies. The Branch is a critically important partner in the CJIS initiative and is committed to its success. Several Branch staff are actively participating in this effort.

# ACCOUNTABILITY

The Judicial Branch will ensure a judicial system where all participants can expect and experience clear, fair and consistent justice from an independent and impartial judiciary.

### **Initiative: Civility/Decorum in the Courts**

The implementation of this initiative was undertaken by a group that was charged with enhancing the relationship between the Judicial Branch and the Standing Committee on Professionalism of the Connecticut Bar Association. Specifically, the group was charged with exploring ways to formalize the Branch's relationship with the Standing Committee on Professionalism as one means to address issues of civility and decorum.

Chief Justice Chase T. Rogers, Chief Court Administrator Barbara M. Quinn, Deputy Chief Court Administrator Patrick L. Carroll III, the Honorable Alexandra D. DiPentima, chair of the Public Service and Trust Commission, Attorney Louis R. Pepe, chair of the Standing Committee on Professionalism of the Connecticut Bar Association, and Attorney Joseph D. D'Alesio, Executive Director of Superior Court Operations met in October 2008 to discuss the issues.

This group will meet on a regular basis to continue to develop ways to enhance the level of professionalism and civility in the courts.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. The Honorable Alexandra DiPentima and the Honorable Salvatore C. Agati, who brings the trial court perspective, have become members of the Standing Committee on Professionalism;
2. Attorney Pepe worked with the Judges to develop a program for a plenary session of the June 2009 Connecticut Judges' Institute (CJI) on imposing sanctions.
3. The group referred issues arising out of discovery disputes to the Civil Commission, whose chair, the Honorable Arthur A. Hiller, has taken implemented streamlined procedures for addressing such issues, and the order has been posted on the website.
4. Chief Justice Rogers met with the deans of the four Connecticut law schools to discuss ways to assist law schools in their efforts to teach professionalism and ways to inculcate in law students the high ideals of the legal profession, including the possibility of having Judges speak to law students on these issues. This would be an expansion of the Branch's Speaker's Bureau.
5. A notice regarding the upcoming Professionalism Symposium to be held in Hartford on November 7, 2008 was placed on the Judicial Branch website.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. This group should continue to work closely with the Standing Committee on Professionalism of the Connecticut Bar Association, including meeting periodically to discuss appropriate programs and efforts to advance civility and decorum.
2. The Branch should continue to cooperate with the Standing Committee on Professionalism in its annual Bench/Bar Symposium on Professionalism, which provides a useful forum for addressing the civility and decorum issues.
3. Group should consider ways to increase more formal mentoring of new members of the Bar.
4. The Branch should collaborate with the Civil Commission, the Criminal Practice Commission and bar association in developing civility workshops and forums for members of the Bar and the Bench.

## **Initiative: Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team**

In July 2008, the Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team was chartered. The formation of this team was in response to feedback gathered from more than 90 focus groups conducted during the development of the strategic plan. Feedback from participants in the focus groups identified a lack of consistency in the quality of the delivery of services from one courthouse to another. The charge of this team was to visit courthouses throughout the state as if they were members of the public and note any opportunities for improvement of service delivery and observe staff “doing things right.”

The Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team includes twenty members, who are drawn from each of the Superior Court Operations units. Between July 2008 and June 2009, members conducted approximately 50 site visits at courthouses and support enforcement offices in almost half of the state’s judicial districts. Observations of the seven remaining judicial districts will be completed by December of this year.

The team has noted areas where improvements could be made in such areas as directions to facilities and signage within facilities. In interactions with staff, the team has experienced and observed mostly friendly, professional and courteous interactions between court staff and members of the public, but it has also observed some less pleasant encounters with members of the public and staff.

All of the information that is gathered by the Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team has been presented to the executive director of Superior Court Operations, for use in improving the services provided to all who enter court facilities and interact in any way with the Judicial Branch.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

Regular observations of court facilities of all types should be conducted to assess the quality of service delivery, the effectiveness of service excellence training, and the need for any subject matter education for staff.

### **Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees**

The Courthouse Observation and Simulation Team should continue its observations.

## **Initiative: Court Security**

The Committee on Court Security is newly established and a permanent committee. It was charged under the Accountability prong of the implementation plan with making recommendations to address courthouse security, focusing on issues related to the safety and well-being of all individuals within the courthouse; emergency preparedness, including planning for and responding to emergencies when they arise; and continuity of operations, including plans that should be implemented following an emergency to allow the resumption of normal operations.

The twenty-nine member committee is co-chaired by the Honorable Patrick L. Carroll III and the Honorable Gary J. White. The Committee includes Judges, members of the Bar, states attorneys, local law enforcement personnel, the Department of Corrections, executive directors each of the Judicial Branch divisions, appellate court staff, and judicial marshals. It will form subcommittees in order to address all areas of its charge, including a subcommittee to update and revise the security manual. To date, the Committee has met twice; first, in December 2008 and again in May 2009.

The Committee has reviewed the current state of security in the Judicial Branch, the Emergency Response plan, the plan for the continuity of court operations, the current Security Manual and discussed potential security issues that arise at Branch facilities.

The Committee is not yet ready to make specific recommendations. It considering recommending periodic local security committee meetings in each district, the development of a template for fire drills, and it will be developing a courthouse security survey. As recommendations are developed, the Committee will submit them.

### **Initiative: Expectations of the Public**

The Committee on Expectations of the Public was created as a result of the strategic plan and was charged with examining and recommending ways to define and to communicate clear and consistent information about expectations and court processes for and to all who enter Judicial Branch facilities or interact with the Branch.

Led by the co-chairs, the Honorable Robert E. Beach Jr. and the Honorable James W. Abrams, the twenty-two member committee included judges, family magistrates, attorneys and court operations personnel. The committee formed five subcommittees to examine those areas identified in the charge: criminal/motor vehicle matters, chaired by the Honorable Robin A. Pavia, housing matters, chaired by the Honorable James M. Bentivegna, juvenile matters, chaired by the Honorable Mark T. Gould, small claims matters, chaired by the Honorable James W. Abrams and support enforcement/family matters, chaired by the Honorable Kenneth L. Shluger. The committee and its subcommittees have met a total of twenty times between late November 2008 and May 2009.

For each specific area, the subcommittees reviewed the Judicial Branch website and existing Branch programs, services and publications that assist the public and identified ways to improve and expand the information that was provided to reduce the public's confusion and anxiety and enhance their understanding of the process. The subcommittees also discussed ways to provide information to the public.

As a result of the review and discussions, the committee made the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Publish tri-fold brochures in the areas of Criminal/Motor Vehicle Matters, Housing, Small Claims, and Support Enforcement that provide information on what to expect when a person goes to each of these courts, including general information (i.e., what time to get to the court, where to park, what to call a magistrate or judge, and the procedures at the metal detectors) and area-specific information (i.e., how to pay a fine, what a housing specialist does, or why it is important to remain in court until a matter is resolved.) (Drafts have been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
2. All brochures, letters and notices should be tested at several courts. The drafts, as approved by Legal Services, should be provided to court service centers, public

- information desks and clerks' offices in several locations along with a brief survey to assess whether the information is helpful to the public and that the materials are clear and understandable.
3. Revise the language of the "Not Guilty" letter that is sent to people who plead "Not Guilty" in order to incorporate information on what will happen on the initial hearing date. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  4. Provide a "Dear Litigants" letter, containing information on what will happen in Housing Court on the day of the hearing, to be given to people when they come to court to file an appearance or on the day of the hearing. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  5. Implement the reading of a Greeting/Announcement at the beginning of the day by the clerk or a Judge in the Housing Court. The announcement would provide an oral overview or roadmap of what would happen during the day in the housing court, emphasizing important points, such as not leaving the court until instructed to do so by a clerk, a Judge, or a housing specialist. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  6. Revise the housing court notice of hearing to include language making it clear to litigants that failure to come to court can result in the entry of a judgment. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  7. Develop information packets in a question and answer format on specific topics in the area of juvenile law. Three publications have been drafted by the subcommittee and approved by Legal Services: Emancipation, Post-disposition Change of Guardianship, and Juvenile Delinquency and Families with Service Needs Records. Additional publications should be developed.
  8. Provide bus schedule information, where applicable, in the Juvenile Court Clerks' Offices. A guide for obtaining this information has been developed for distribution. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  9. An information sheet entitled "What to Expect on the Day of Your Small Claims Hearing" should be sent to each litigant along with the Notice of Hearing. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)
  10. Revise the Notice of Hearing sent to litigants in small claims matters to incorporate plain language principles, emphasize important information, and update or correct court directions. (Draft has been completed and approved by Legal Services.)

11. Include questions and answers containing information on the postjudgment process and the consequences of a small claims judgment with the notice of judgment sent by the court in small claims matters. (Drafts have been completed and approved by Legal Services.)

### **Recommendations for review and prioritization by Judicial Administration**

1. Make Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and all other publications available in multiple locations: on the Judicial Branch website, in Court Service Centers and at Public Information Desks, at clerks' offices, in courtrooms, in law libraries and in public libraries. Publications should also be made available through Legal Services, legal clinics at the University of Connecticut, Quinnipiac University and Yale University, and through the 211 information line for the state.
2. Make information available to the public in multiple formats to the greatest extent possible and provide links to all available formats.
3. Group all materials, including relevant forms, publications, and available audiovisual resources, and display them together online to make it easier for the public to locate and access these materials. Consideration should also be given to including a link to the law libraries' "Pathfinder" series.
4. Include links to outside resources, including the Department of Motor Vehicles website so the public has access to related information on such questions as license suspension and assignment of points on a license as a result of a motor vehicle matter and the Department of Social Services website so the public has access to information on paternity, for example.
5. Make Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and all other publications available in multiple languages based upon the recommendations from the Committee on Limited English Proficiency, which is analyzing data to determine the language needs in the state. Currently, only four subject matter areas have FAQs in Spanish: Landlord/Tenant, Jury Duty, Traffic Tickets, and Child Support. Only sixteen out of approximately 70 Branch publications online are available in Spanish, and only one is available in Chinese, one in Polish and one in Portuguese.
6. Review and update the directions to court facilities on the website to ensure that all directions provided are accurate and complete.

7. Review and revise all publications and online information to ensure that material for the public is written at a level and in a way that is understandable for the large percentage of court users, avoiding or explaining court jargon and Latin phrases used in court proceedings.
8. Review and update the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Traffic Violations.
9. Review and revise the “Not Guilty” letter for Criminal/Motor Vehicle matters to be certain that the information provided is accurate.
10. Review the notice of hearing that is sent and consider adding material to assist the public as they come into the motor vehicle court on the day of their hearing.
11. Assess the way that criminal dockets are labeled and displayed in criminal/motor vehicle courts and investigate other methods of providing the information to the public on where a case will be heard.
12. Make interpreters available on some basis for Housing Matters, for example, at a designated time and date at a courthouse.
13. Add the following key topics to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) section on the Judicial Branch homepage: Domestic Violence, Family, with subheadings for Divorce, Custody, Visitation or Access, and Paternity. Specific suggestions for each topic are set out in the full committee report. In general, each topic area should include links to relevant Branch forms, publications, or audiovisual materials.
14. Convene a group of court service center staff and clerks’ office personnel to develop a list of the most frequently asked questions and answers in each of these areas. Input from the Court Operations webmaster should also be solicited to identify the questions most frequently asked on the web.
15. Add links to the existing Child Support section for the newly drafted brochure on What Happens When You Go to Family Support Magistrate Court, provide a summary of the main elements of the Advisement of Rights that is read from the bench, add a section called “What to Expect in Family Support Magistrate Court” drawing content from the draft publication, and add a link in the FAQ section on resources for self-represented litigants to the draft publication.
16. Revise the notices generated by the child support automated system (CCSES) served on the defendants at their last known address, two to three weeks before any court date, advising them of the court date, time and place to include information to help litigants better prepare for court and know what to expect from their court experience.

17. Review and revise the following publications on family matters as suggested in the full report:

- **The Do It Yourself Divorce Guide** (JDP FM 179, Rev. 5-05)
- **The Do It Yourself Divorce Guide Supplement** (JDP FM 180, Rev. 10- 05)
- **The Procedures for Relief from Abuse Process** (JDP-FM 142, Rev. 8-07)
- **The Parenting Education Programs** (JDP-Fm-151, Rev. 6-07)

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. Convene a smaller group that includes representation from the Committee on Public Service Excellence to discuss and draft a “Statement of Rights and Responsibilities” for people who interact with the Judicial Branch. The statement should include information on the standards of service and performance that people can expect when interacting with the Branch and the steps to take when those standards are not met. It should also contain information regarding the standards of courtroom decorum expected from those who interact with the Branch. The Committee was not able to address this aspect of its charge in the time available, but it recognizes that such a statement is important. It should be posted online, displayed prominently in clerks’ offices, court services centers, and at public information desks.
2. Two scripts for videos providing general information on matters that would be heard in family court (short calendar hearings, uncontested dissolutions, contested dissolutions, and contempt hearings) and on matters that would be heard by the family support magistrate (paternity, support, contempt, and modification) were developed by the subcommittee on Support Enforcement/Family Matters. (Drafts are attached to the full committee report.)
3. These scripts should be referred to the Committee on Self-represented Parties, which is developing a series of videos about various areas of the law, including family law, for further development and production.
4. Consideration should be given to developing an informational video presentation on a day in Criminal/Motor Vehicle Court, following a person from the time they enter the courthouse through the metal detector through the meeting with the prosecutor and into

- the courtroom. This videotape could be run at the courthouse in the Court Service Centers or Public Information Desks, provided to public access television stations for broadcast and accessible from the Judicial Branch website.
5. Improve signage at Housing Courts to provide clearer direction and information to the public, and to provide signage in multiple languages. This recommendation should be directed to the committee that will be formed to review existing signage and make recommendations for changes.
  6. Develop a simplified procedure and a fillable form to permit a defendant to request that a satisfaction of judgment be entered by the court in the event that a plaintiff fails to file the satisfaction of judgment with the court.
  7. Investigate the possibility of implementing a modified children's center, perhaps partnering with a college or school with an early education program.

**Initiative: External Affairs Advisory Board - Speakers' Bureau, Media Campaign for Public Education; Seniors and the Law**

The External Affairs Advisory Board was formed as a part of the first phase of the implementation process to oversee three of the initiatives contained in the implementation plan: the Seniors and the Law program, the Media Campaign for Public Education and the Speakers' Bureau. The charge of the board overall is to enhance the public's understanding of the role and function of the Branch. Specifically the Board was charged with enhancing the Speakers' Bureau both in terms of the groups that participate and the topics that are covered, enhancing and executing a communications campaign to better educate the residents about the judiciary, and evaluating the seniors and the law program to determine its effectiveness and utility.

Chaired by the Honorable Susan B. Handy, the four-member board decided to address the three initiatives through a comprehensive plan to educate the public, including senior citizens, members of community organizations, students and members of the general public about the role and function of the Connecticut Judicial Branch. The committee met four times between December 2008 and the end of April 2009. The task of the Advisory Board is ongoing. It will continue its efforts after the submission of its report and reconvene in the fall of 2009.

The committee conducted focus groups with judges, branch employees and educators, distributed a survey to community groups to solicit feedback on the Speakers' Bureau, and researched other states' programs.

As a result of its discussions, research, and review of input from focus groups and surveys, the Advisory Board is making the following recommendations:

**Recommendation for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Invite senior citizens to go to their local courthouse to observe proceedings and to meet with a judge.
2. As part of the Speakers Bureau, ask senior centers if they would like to have a judge come and address their group.
3. Publicize the availability of the Speakers Bureau to community organizations.
4. Develop a bank of resources such as statistics that are readily available for judges who are part of the Speakers Bureau.
5. Market the Speakers Bureau to the judges themselves.

6. Encourage judges to inform the Speakers Bureau whenever they speak to a community group and provide an e-mail form for them to do so.
7. Send an e-mail to all judges once a year asking them to provide External Affairs with information about the number of groups they spoke to, the topics that were addressed, where the engagement took place and their comments on how the event went.
8. Provide evaluation forms to the judges and to the community organizations each time that a judge addresses an organization.
9. Send a list of Judicial Branch publications to every public library advising them that these resources are available upon request.
10. Cultivate relationships with educational organizations, particularly those involving social studies teachers.
11. Tape a day in court with a teacher and class present. This DVD will be made available to other teachers and could be presented to them at a professional development day.
12. Have judges visit schools and talk with students about the consequences of criminal behavior.
13. Inform guidance departments about the resources available through the Judicial Branch.
14. Send out notices to judges in March of each year asking if they would be willing to speak to high school students in conjunction with Law Day. Make arrangements for judges to speak to the schools identified.
15. Contact every high school in the state and ask the school to designate a liaison who will receive educational materials about the Judicial Branch and then distribute the materials to the appropriate teachers.
16. Contact Sunday morning talk shows and radio stations about Judicial Branch-sponsored programs (like the Foreclosure Mediation Program). Explore the feasibility of developing a DVD with judges discussing how these types of programs work.
17. Incorporate into every speaking engagement a request, if approved by both the judge and the organization, to contact the local media about the event.
18. Encourage judges to let the External Affairs Division know when they are engaged in an activity that could educate the public about the courts and its programs.
19. In an era of diminishing resources for the media, provide ways to educate them about the courts, absent the day-to-day court beat reporter, such as using the website to its full potential (i.e. statistics) and providing opportunities for judges to educate the media about the courts (i.e. having judges visit media organizations to assist them in learning about the courts).

**Recommendations that have not been reviewed or prioritized by judicial administration:**

1. Discontinue the Seniors and the Law program, as most of the issues affecting seniors are not within the purview of the Superior Court.
2. Suggest to Judge Paul Knierim, Probate Court Administrator, that the Probate Court consider taking over the Seniors and the Law program, as the topics discussed, for the most part, more closely relate to the Probate Court.
3. Expand the Speakers Bureau to include family support magistrates and Judicial Branch employees.
4. Ensure that there are accurate Branch-wide statistics available about the number of judges and employees who speak to community organizations, and require the administrative divisions to inform the Speakers Bureau when employees speak to community groups.
5. Urge the Chief Justice and the Chief Court Administrator to continue their efforts to remind judges that speaking to the community is one of the most important ways to educate the public about what we do and who we are.
6. Recommend to the members of the Pre-Bench Orientation Committee that they inform new judges about the importance of the Speakers Bureau and in going out into the community.
7. Attend social studies teachers' conferences and consider doing a workshop.
8. Develop a program for judges to use when either teachers visit courts or judges visit schools as part of a professional development day.
9. Distribute notices in late July/early August to the designated school liaisons about resources that the Judicial Branch can provide.
10. Establish a "regional judge liaison" to work between the court and schools in a particular area.
11. Work with CT-N to get footage of the Cipriani trial and discuss with CT-N the possibility of creating a DVD with excerpts from the trial interspersed with judges talking about the process and what the students are seeing.
12. Explore with CT-N the option of a media/interactive learning project for students through the Connecticut Education Network.
13. Ask the Chief Administrative Judges if they would be willing to write a column for the Connecticut Law Tribune. Also, continue encouraging judges to take advantage of opportunities to educate the public about the courts and the judiciary through the media.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. Complete the workbook for upper elementary students.
2. Continue co-sponsoring yearly events with judges and members of the media to educate each other about our respective roles with the assistance of the Judicial Media Committee (i.e. Law School for Journalists and Journalists School for Judges).
3. Continue monitoring of inquiries from the news media and stories about the Judicial Branch.
4. Continue marketing positive stories about the judiciary and the Judicial Branch to news organizations.
5. Continue contacting editorial boards when necessary to present the Branch's position on an issue.
6. Develop a plan to cultivate minority news organizations including predominantly non-English speaking media organizations.

## **Initiative: Judicial Performance Evaluation Program**

The Judicial Performance Evaluation Program Committee is a newly established committee. It was charged with not only examining the Branch's existing judicial performance evaluation program, but to consider the feasibility of establishing evaluation programs for judges who preside over high volume courts, family support magistrates, judge trial referees, magistrates who preside over small claims and motor vehicle dockets, and quasi-judicial officials such as attorney trial referees, factfinders, and arbitrators.

The Honorable Alexandra D. DiPentima and the Honorable Joseph M. Shortall co-chair the thirty-nine member committee, which included members of the Bench, the Bar, the legislative branch and academia. As a result of the charge, the committee formed four subcommittees: Evaluating Judges Assigned to High Volume Court as Presiding Judges, Evaluating Judge Trial Referees, Evaluating Supreme Court Justices and Appellate Court Judges, and Improvement of the Existing System for Evaluating Trial Judges. The committee and its subcommittees met, collectively, fifteen times between December 2008 and June 2009.

The information considered by the Committee and its subcommittees was extensive. The members were given a presentation on the Branch's current evaluation program, which is administered within the Judge Support Services Unit, and, over the course of their meetings, evaluated and discussed other states' evaluation programs; the American Bar Association's (ABA) guidelines for judicial performance; a study done for the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System (IAALS) ; Branch attorney and juror questionnaires; model evaluation questionnaires; the ABA's Appellate Attorney Survey form and the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System's (IAALS) evaluation form; and Connecticut Statute Sec. 2-40a, regarding disclosure of performance evaluations of judges.

As a result of the Committee's research, evaluation, and analysis, the members have developed a number of recommendations on judicial performance evaluation.

### **Recommendations for review and prioritization by judicial administration**

#### **Subcommittee on Evaluating Supreme Court Justices and Appellate Court Judges**

1. To evaluate the performance of Supreme Court Justices and Appellate Court Judges.

2. To adopt a questionnaire, as amended, (see Attachment XX in the full committee report ) for evaluating the performance of Supreme Court Justices and Appellate Court Judges, and to have the questionnaire be reviewed by an expert for statistical validity.

#### Subcommittee on Evaluating Judge Trial Referees

1. To evaluate the performance of Judge Trial Referees similarly to Judges doing the same work.
2. To make available any and all review and recommendation information to the Chief Court Administrator for her use in recommending to the Chief Justice the appointment of a Referee to become a Judge Trial Referee.
3. To review recommendations for Judge Trial Referees on a calendar year basis in order to allow sufficient time for any necessary performance improvements.
4. To provide regular and timely review of concerns with Judge Trial Referees through meetings and discussions.

#### Subcommittee on Evaluating Judges Assigned to High Volume Court and as Presiding Judges

1. To expand the pool of those who evaluate judges who are assigned to high volume courts and as presiding judges to include court staff.
2. To expand the categories of judges subject to evaluation to include but not be limited to presiding judges, high volume criminal court judges in both Parts A and B, judges assigned to special proceedings, specialty court dockets, civil and family sessions, juvenile delinquency sessions and housing court, as well as family support magistrates/family support referees.
3. To develop a peer review process for judges, with the details of the process to be determined later.
4. To develop an attorney evaluation questionnaire which includes the following items and refer the questionnaire to an expert for consideration of its statistical validity:
  - Decisiveness during Proceedings
  - Courtesy of the Judge
  - Patience during Proceedings
  - Courtroom Decorum
  - Demonstrates Respect During Proceedings
  - Efficient Pace of Proceedings

- Control of Courtroom
- Impartiality of Conduct
- Consistency of Rulings
- Explanation of Rulings
- Ability to Effectively Settle Cases (For presiding judges)
- Facilitation in Development of Options for Settlements/Pleas (For presiding judges)

Please indicate the number of years you have practiced law: 1-5, 6-10, more than 10.

Subcommittee on Improving the Existing System for Evaluating Trial Judges

1. To solicit input for the evaluation system for trial judges from other constituents in the judicial process in addition to jurors and attorneys, as is presently the case.
2. To modify the present Attorney Questionnaire (Rev. 3/07) so as to provide the opportunity for a fair, proper and comprehensive evaluation of the judge.
3. To supplement the information concerning the respondent that is currently required (e.g., years of practice, type of practice, etc.) with an optional question asking whether the outcome of the trial or hearing was favorable or unfavorable to the respondent's position.
4. To modify the current Attorney Questionnaire to add the following questions:

"What, if anything, did the judge do that you found particularly commendable or admirable?"

"What, if anything, did the judge do that you found could be improved?"

Further, the Judicial Branch should use said comments in the mentoring and professional development of its judges and, in so doing, not necessarily wait until the minimum number of questionnaires required for review have been returned.

5. To refer both the Attorney Questionnaire and the Juror Questionnaire -- either in their current form or as modified with any of the recommendations that may be adopted by the Judicial Branch -- to an appropriate expert for an overall evaluation as to: (i) their adequacy for measurement of a judge's performance of his/her duties and the production of useful information for the judge's education and professional development; and (ii) the number of responses required to produce statistically reliable and meaningful data.

6. To encourage the Judicial Branch to provide for the more frequent distribution of Attorney Questionnaires and to consider the electronic distribution of and response to such questionnaires.
7. To support the concept of evaluating judges after a settlement conference or mediation, recognizing that how and whether it can be done are to be determined at a later time.
8. To encourage the Judicial Branch to engage in a joint effort with the Bar to educate the Bar more widely and effectively on the policies, practices and procedures presently in place to protect and preserve the anonymity of attorneys completing and submitting an evaluation questionnaire.
9. To use a periodic evaluation of a judge by independent observers as a supplement to the appraisals provided by the Attorney Questionnaire, Juror Questionnaire.
10. To encourage the Judicial Branch to make use of the reports of the independent evaluators to develop and provide appropriate training programs and guidelines for the professional development and education of all judges.
11. To refrain from seeking input for the evaluation program from litigants and self-represented litigants.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I Committees (These recommendations come from the co-chairs of the Committee.)**

1. Reestablish an advisory board on judicial performance evaluation as soon as possible.
2. In addition to the implementation of the committee recommendations accepted by the Chief Justice, the advisory board could address two of the tasks that the committee did not reach: 1) how the branch should evaluate the performance of non judicial officers, and 2) how the website can be used to inform the bar about the judicial performance evaluation program as well as the efficacy of electronic distribution and execution of evaluation questionnaires.
3. Retain an expert to examine the evaluation questionnaire for trial court judges, to examine the proposed questionnaire for appellate judges and justices and to develop a questionnaire for high volume and presiding judges.

## **Initiative: Public Service Excellence (PSE)**

The implementation of this initiative was undertaken by a work group that was charged with advancing and fostering a service excellence culture throughout the entire Branch. Specifically, the group was charged with identifying existing service excellence efforts and programs, assessing their effectiveness and finally weaving those existing programs into a Branch-wide effort reflecting a unified philosophy and a culture committed to the principles of exceptional service.

The work group included representatives from the support enforcement unit, court operations and, chief clerks. The group met frequently between November 2008 and June 2009 to develop the phases of the public service excellence program.

The foundation of the four phase program being developed by the work group is five public service excellence principles: to be professional, to be empathetic, to address people directly with courtesy and respect, to provide fair and equal treatment, to provide and timely explanation and creative problem resolution. The first phase of the program is the Covey training, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, which promotes personal and interpersonal effectiveness. The remaining three phases will build from the Covey training.

Almost all managers and supervisors have now gone through the first phase – *The 7 Habits of Highly Successful People* (Covey). The second phase, **Applying the 7 Habits in the Workplace**, is in development. This phase will take advantage of supervisors and managers as agents for change in transforming the work environment. The remaining phases will include Public Service Excellence training for Supervisors, **Public Service Excellence: Leading by Example**, stressing the responsibility and accountability of supervisors for the staff whom they supervise, and division specific Public Service Excellence programs that will promote the principles of public service excellence.

## **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun**

1. Provide the Covey training, *The 7 Habits of Highly Successful People*, to all supervisors and managers.
2. Develop a second phase of training, **Applying the 7 Habits in the Workplace** for supervisors and managers.

**Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by the Phase I committees:**

1. Develop Public Service Excellence training for Supervisors, **Public Service Excellence: Leading by Example**, stressing the responsibility and accountability of supervisors for the staff whom they supervise.
2. Develop division specific Public Service Excellence training for all branch staff in every division.

## **Initiative: Website Enhancement**

Many of the activities that are part of the strategic plan involve the Judicial Branch website. The Judicial Branch Web Board, which is comprised of representatives from each administrative division of the Branch and a representative from Legal Services, was charged with reviewing the content of the website, ensuring adequate site navigation, and enhancing the website to allow users to conduct business on-line.

Chaired by Attorney Melissa A. Farley, the twelve-member Web Board established a subcommittee to review the site design and navigation issues and to recommend improvements. The Web Board and its subcommittee met a total of seven times between October 2008 and April 2009.

The Web Board conducted informal surveys of web users, looked at ways in which the website can feature its self-help areas more clearly, make court forms easily accessible, improve performance of on-line court tasks and offer more guidance to those not familiar with the website or court procedures in general. In addition, the committee reviewed information currently available on the Judicial Branch website, the ability to conduct web-based transactions, and website accessibility.

After extensive review and discussion, the Judicial Branch Web Board has recommended the following:

### **Recommendations for which implementation has already begun:**

1. Appellate System case look-up section - Development is underway for a web inquiry application that will make it possible for the public to look up current information about cases on appeal. The goal is to provide information similar to that currently available for civil and family trial court matters, including case status.
2. Information in different languages – A number of sections of the website have already been translated into Spanish and efforts are underway to translate additional sections.
3. Foreclosure notices – The Bench/Bar Foreclosure Committee has recommended that the Judicial Branch provide committees of sale and judges with the option of advertising foreclosures on its website to save homeowners the cost of this advertising. An application is currently being developed and should be available in the fall of 2009.
4. Jury postponements – Efforts are underway to allow jurors to postpone their jury service by way of the Judicial Branch's website.

## **Recommendations for the continuation or expansion of work begun by Phase I committees**

1. Attorney Disciplinary Records - This section of the website will be expanded to include attorneys' past disciplinary histories as well as discipline that has been imposed in the form of written court opinions or Statewide Grievance Committee decisions.
2. Court forms - New interactive forms will also be created in conjunction with Legal Services and the Court Service Centers that will assist individuals with completing court forms. The appearance form, one of the most commonly used forms in the court system, is the first form around which the application is being built.
3. Information about the Court Support Services Division - The Web Board will include information on the website about the Court Support Services Division and the programs it administers.
4. Self-help in the areas of juvenile, family and probation - The Web Board, with the assistance of the Court Support Services Division, will post information about adult, juvenile and family services in its frequently asked questions section.
5. Streaming videos - The number of streaming videos to explain various court processes will be expanded.
6. E-filing - The capability to conduct transactions by enhancing existing applications such as Civil E-Filing will be expanded.
7. Appellate System - Supreme Court briefs filed electronically will become available online through a cooperative endeavor between the Connecticut Judicial Branch and the Connecticut Bar Association (CBA). The long-term plan is to make the briefs available on the Judicial Branch's website.
8. Navigation - Where navigation links are repeated, the Web Board will provide a method for the user to skip these repetitive links.
9. Plain language - The Web Board will make the changes suggested by Court Service Center staff to change the text in the Self-Help sections of the website for plain language and readability compliance.
10. Site design and navigation - The Web Board will continue to look for ways to feature its Self-Help areas more clearly, make forms easily accessible, improve performance of on-line court tasks and offer more guidance to those not familiar with the website or court business in general.

## INITIATIVES NOT ADDRESSED IN PHASE I

### ACCESS

Facilities (Administration)

Intellectual/Psychiatric Disabilities

Physical Access (Signs)

Utilization of Facilities

### COLLABORATION

Chief Court Administrator/Information Sharing

### ACCOUNTABILITY

Assignments/Allocation (Judges)

Career Paths

Judges' New Assignment Assessment/Orientation

### ALL GOALS

Training