

## Superior Court of the County of Kern

This document contains the court's responses to the questions we included in a survey regarding the services that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) indicates providing to the courts. Our survey asked each of the trial courts, the courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court to indicate which services that each court has used. In addition, our survey asked each court to indicate whether or not it values each service. Other questions in the survey asked about the quality of the services that AOC provides and the importance of the services to the court's operations.

After the courts responded to our survey, we identified, in consultation with the AOC, eight services in our survey that do not apply to the trial courts. We excluded these eight services from the analyses that support the survey-related tables and figures that appear in our audit report.

Finally, for a copy of the survey instrument please follow this [link](#).

**Q4: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q5: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Somewhat Important

**Q6: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) No Change

**Additional Comments**

We have excellent response from Ms. Linda McCullah who has been a valuable resource on ADA compliance issues. Our HR Department has interacted regularly with her and we have not seen a change in the service levels related to the budget crisis. Shriver has proven to be a very valuable resource for the court. While it took longer than expected to get the contract settled, the service is now available and is being utilized regularly by local constituents. Only improvement that is requested is the development of a court user survey that would collect the opinions of court users with this resource and provide a comparison with other counties that have the pilot program. The Court believes that much of these services could be developed at the local Court. This would improve/enhance access to court users by more cost effectively using a prorated share of the administrative overhead costs currently allocated at the state level.

**PAGE 6: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q7: Audit Services**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 11. Regular financial, operational, and compliance audits                                 | Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable |
| 13. Non-audit consultative reviews  | Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable |
| 14. Technical advice regarding audit, accounting compliance, and operational requirements | Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable |
| 15. Whistleblower Hotline responsibility  | Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable |

**Q8: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Excellent

**Q9: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Very Important

**Q10: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

Somewhat more important

**Additional Comments**

Mr. Judnick has proven to be a good resource for review of audit issues and compliance with internal control requirements.

**PAGE 7: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q11: Capital Projects and Facilities Services**

17. Site selection, due diligence and negotiation of acquisition agreements for capital projects and staff services to Project Advisory Groups comprised of court and justice partner stakeholders	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
24. Oversight of the design and installation of audio-visual low voltage technical infrastructure in court facilities, and development of statewide standards for use of video over the technical infrastructure	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
25. Subject matter expertise on health and safety issues and technical assistance relating to fire prevention	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
29. Negotiation and administration of AOC and court-funded leases, licenses, and other occupancy, and renegotiation of leases to generate space reduction and rent savings	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
31. Provision of deferred maintenance and functional improvements	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
36. Maintenance and administration of the Computer Aided Facility Management (CAFM) System to dispatch Service Work Order requests and authorize lease payments	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q12: Delivery of professional project management and related services for capital projects, including:**

38. Architectural and engineering design services	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
39. Environmental analyses of potential courthouse construction sites	Have used this service
40. Construction inspection services program for capital projects, facility modification, and facility management programs	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
44. Construction execution delivery including commissioning services	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
45. Completion and occupancy and transition planning	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q13: Establishment and implementation of policies for the judicial branch capital program, including:** *Respondent skipped this question*

**Q14: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Satisfactory

**Q15: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Somewhat Important

**Q16: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) Somewhat more important

**Additional Comments**

CAP Projects: The two major capital projects that were scheduled to be undertaken for Mojave and Delano were cancelled due to budget problems. Two courtroom remodel additions have been undertaken in the interim. One project was completed on time and within budget. Overall consider this to be a successfully managed project by AOC. Second project has just been initiated with the lease of a building for addition of a courtroom and additional admin. Ms. Joanne Williams has been the point person on the lease and liaison with the City. This lease process has been expeditious and managed in a professional way. Maintenance: The budget reduction in the maintenance services has had a deleterious effect on the quality and reliability of the services. A vacant Area Facilities Analyst position for Kern County has greatly impacted operations and maintenance of Kern Facilities. Various tasks and follow-up to Service Work Orders and Facility Modification Requests have been left to the court to handle with little to no support. Communications with agencies involved in operations and maintenance is lacking the necessary attention.

**Q17: Collaborative Courts Services** *Respondent skipped this question*

**Q18: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) No Opinion

**Q19: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q20: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) Somewhat less important

**Additional Comments**

Most of the collaborative courts have been scaled back in Kern County due to budget reductions. As such, interaction with legal resources for these services is not something that has been used in recent years. In the event that budget reductions are mitigated in the future, these services would be utilized to ensure the Court utilizes best practices and adheres to legal guidelines.

**PAGE 9: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q21: Communications Services**

69. Coordination of Judicial Council Meeting communications activities, including the drafting and dissemination of pre- and post-meeting summaries to the judicial branch, drafting of leadership remarks, coordination of photography, video, and audio requirements, and web updates and tweets to promote the meeting

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

70. Research, drafting and distribution of the weekly email briefing (Court News Update) on judicial administration and related topics, and urgent updates and briefings as requested (Court News Alerts, Court News Briefs) to the judicial branch

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

73. Management and content updates on the California Courts, Serranus, and AOC Intranet websites for programs, projects, and initiatives

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q22: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q23: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Somewhat Important

**Q24: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**PAGE 10: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q25: Criminal Justice Services**

79. Technical assistance, training, legal advice, and subject matter expertise on criminal justice realignment including data collection, analysis, and information dissemination

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

80. Written and oral legal advice provided to individual trial courts on a case-by-case basis on a wide array of criminal law and procedure issues, including new statutory requirements and responsibilities

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

83. Data collection and reporting on probation revocations, sentencing outcomes, and other criminal law related issues (California Corrections Performance Incentive Act and criminal justice realignment)

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q26: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)

Excellent

**Q27: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)

Very Important

**Q28: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**Additional Comments**

Michael Giden has provided sound and timely legal opinion responses to the Court as needed. Overall the Court believes the Legal Opinion Unit is probably one of the best services that the Judicial Council/AOC provides the local courts. However, our budget reductions have prevented Kern Superior Court from hiring the appropriate number of court employed legal research staff for our workload demands. If sufficiently funded, the Court believes that in-house counsel could be hired to adequately provide this service. In-house counsel would be equally as responsive, but likely less expensive to the State by the offset of administrative overhead at the state level. Improvement on the information distribution of services--Traffic SME as an example--would be very helpful. Recommend a regular notice to courts outlining the subject matter experts and where they are located.

**PAGE 11: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q29: Education and Training Services**

88. Judicial ethics training as required for participants in the Commission on Judicial Performance Insurance Program	Have used this service
100. Judicial publications: Benchguides, Bench Handbooks, Benchbooks, Civil Proceedings Benchbooks	Have used this service
101. Development of online benchtools for judges to use, including scripts, flow charts and checklists	Have used this service
106. Meeting planning, registration and conference services for all education programs, Judicial Council meetings and other AOC meetings	Have used this service

**Q30: Statewide training for new Judicial Officers, including:**

109. New Judge Orientation	Have used this service
110. Primary Assignment Orientations (civil, criminal, probate, dependency, delinquency, family)	Have used this service
111. B.E. Witkin Judicial College	Have used this service

**Q31: Statewide education for experienced Judicial Officers and Judicial Attorneys, including:**

113. Criminal Assignment Courses	Have used this service
----------------------------------	------------------------

**Q32: Statewide Education for Judicial Leaders, including:**

121. Supervising Judges Institute	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
-----------------------------------	---

**Q33: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)	Satisfactory
------------	--------------

**Q34: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)	Neutral
------------	---------

**Q35: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

Much less important

**Additional Comments**

The quality of the training provided is considered to be excellent. However, the following sentiment has been expressed by a number of judges, if not a majority, at our court location. "I do not consider any of the above services to be "valuable" in light of the service reductions our court has been forced to implement. These reductions include denial of court reporters in civil and family law, which forecloses the right of effective appeal for economically pressed litigants. We have reduced staff, which has created filing backlogs, despite heroic work efforts by remaining staff. We have closed two regional courts and reduced counter service hours, making it substantially more difficult for our citizens to receive timely service. These reductions represent a denial of access to justice." "Most of the above functions relate to training and education for Judges undertaken by CJER. These functions are not necessities when compared to the the loss of actual access to justice by our citizens. Until all trial court services can be said to be restored, then these services should stop and all funds for this purpose should be delivered to the trial courts for restoration of services." "There are two statewide Judges Associations that can take responsibility for voluntary judicial education without public funds. Courses are taught voluntarily by Judges anyway. There is no reason for Judicial Council staff to superintend these services. Judicial education was administered for Judges by Judges for decades." "Further there is benefit to diverse providers. A single source judicial education program promotes a single point of view. It creates reliance by Judges on single source education materials. That my promote bias, and may overstate principles of decisional law to uphold a pre-existing point of view."

**PAGE 12: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q36: Family Services**

122. AB 1058 Legal, Program Support and Funding and Administration for Child Support Commissioners and Family Law Facilitators

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

124. Information and technical assistance to Family Courts

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

126. Family Law websites (including Families Change and Parent Orientation video) content, maintenance and administration

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

131. California Courts Protective Orders Registry

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q37: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)

Satisfactory

**Q38: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)

Very Important



**Q39: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**Additional Comments**

The Family Law staff have utilized the services of the AOC in developing policies and procedures in response to the Elkins Task Force Requirements. Overall they are satisfied with the quality of services provided. As is the case in some of the other survey responses, staff reports they were unaware of some of the services that were included in the survey. Therefore local court staff have not used and could not comment on them. Facilitator: Ms. Hough and Mr. Wright are very responsive to requests for help and advice. They have been very helpful in developing intercommunication between facilitators and staff from around the state. This has enabled local staff to review and implement best practices. The Self Help web site is an excellent and a regularly used resource by litigants and staff alike.

**PAGE 13: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q40: Fiscal Services**

132. Budgeting

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

139. Financial policies and procedures

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

141. Grants Administration

Have used this service

142. Enhanced Collections guidelines and assistance for courts and counties

Have used this service

**Q41: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)

Good

**Q42: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)

Somewhat Important

**Q43: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) No Change

**Additional Comments**

Accounting: Kern has not utilized the services of the AOC in accounting because we have a good deal of the infrastructure in place that meets our needs. Our relationship with the County Auditor has been good and cost competitive. Therefore, we have not looked at replacing them with alternative services. There were some initial problems with the activation of the state-wide financial reporting system, but those issues have been resolved and overall the system seems to work well. Collections: Revenue Recovery in Kern was established well before much of the state-wide efforts to require revenue collections. As such, most of our improvements have been garnered by collaborating with other courts who have new technology and procedures that we have been able to utilize to improve our collections efforts. Grants: The Kern Superior Court had a bad experience with grants administration when developing a civil mediation effort. Secondly, the sustainability of grant programs after the initial grant money has dried up has been a problem. As such, our utilization of grants administration has not been as much as other courts.

**PAGE 14: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q44: Human Resources Services**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 144. Labor relations and collective bargaining services                         | Have used this service                                  |
| 146. Judicial payroll and benefits  | Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable |
| 150. Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation program oversight and administration | Have used this service                                  |

**Q45: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q46: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q47: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) No Change

**Additional Comments**

Labor Relations: The Kern Superior Court had a very bad experience with an AOC provided labor negotiator. As such, we have consistently used outside counsel for our negotiations, technical HR questions, and one PERB complaint. Investigations: Most of our investigations have been handled internally. AOC HR Staff have been very helpful in responding to DFEH responses and case management. JBWC: The vendor provided by the AOC has proven to be a good transition from County provided service. Some concerns about AOC direction on OSHA Reporting requirements. Judicial Salary and Benefits Administration: The AOC staff is responsive to local requests for help with Judicial compensation issues.

PAGE 15: Section 3: Evaluation

**Q48: Information Technology Services**

152. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
153. Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS)	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
154. Phoenix Financial, procurement and HR/Payroll System	Have used this service
155. Computer- Aided Facilities Management System (CAFM)	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
157. Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS)	Have used this service
159. California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) including disaster and security services and data integration services	Have used this service
161. Technology hardware updates program	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
163. Support to California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
164. Development and maintenance of the judicial branch public website, Serranus, and other judicial branch websites	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q49: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q50: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Very Important

**Q51: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**Additional Comments**

Tech Refresh: The tech refresh have been very helpful in improving the Court's IT infrastructure and improving the responsiveness of our systems for end users. This is the single category that warrants a "very important" rating. ACCMS: The Court has had a four month problem with the vendor who has provided the digital online appellate submission for the 5th District (TAPP). The vendor has been slow to respond to concerns which has generated increase manual workload. Listserve: The ability to interact with other courts on operations, HR, and other similar issues has proven to be very valuable. This service has been very helpful in addressing both technical question in Court operations and administration and sharing ideas for maintaining service levels in the face of the severe budget cuts that have impacted the quality of services provided by the Courts. CCPOR: Utilized by the Court for entry of protective orders. It is beneficial for law enforcement to have readily accessible images of active orders for enforcement purposes. It would be a greater asset to the Court, if all the courts in California were able to participate, even if only as a repository for images of orders. CLETS: Utilized by the Court for retrieval of information from various data bases. CLETS access have been very important to the courts that receive the information needed for orders and hearings. This data base has enabled the Court to clear up missing adults and children (MUPS), have received notices about registered sex offenders who have tried to change addresses, and have helped the Court protect persons seeking restraining orders. CCTC: Do not use and have not seen any benefit to the Disaster Recovery Services. The Court does not understand the necessity and costs for this service and therefore question the necessity for it when most IT infrastructure is being decentralized to server based systems. CAFR: The Computer-Aided Facilities Management System (CAFM) is a valuable service to have available. The Court Facilities Supervisor has been using the system for approximately 5-years. During that time, CAFM has improved considerably. The first year of CAFM, approximately 20% of the local court SWO's had issues. This year-to-date (2014), only 5% of the local court SWO's have issues. Overall there is still room for improvement in the CAFM, but it is a good service.

**PAGE 16: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q52: Juvenile Services**

168. Local Blue Ribbon Commissions training and technical assistance	Have used this service
170. Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program	Have used this service
171. Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Programs	Have used this service
173. Judicial Resources and Technical Assistance Program for dependency cases	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
174. Information and technical assistance to juvenile courts	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
176. Chief Justice's Keeping Kids in School and Out of Court Initiative	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
177. California Dependency Online Guide (CalDog)	Have used this service

**Q53: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q54: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q55: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) No Change

**PAGE 17: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q56: Language Services**

182. Statewide Language Coordination	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
184. Court Interpreter Database Collection System (CIDCS)	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
185. Certified and Registered Master List Maintenance of Court Interpreters	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
186. Cross-Assignment of Court Interpreter Employees	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q57: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q58: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Somewhat Important

**Q59: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

Somewhat less important

**Additional Comments**

Interpreters: The primary issue with interpreters is the lack of certified interpreters. It appears that efforts to develop this area of court classification has stalled and there does not seem to be any effort at the state level to work with Community Colleges or other educational institutions to develop increased interpreter resources to meet the needs of the Courts. This will only worsen as the courts strive to expand interpreter services to the civil case types per the DOJ mandate. Testing remains a very difficult hurdle. Online training and other resources should be developed to improve the rate of success for passing the requisite certification written and oral tests.

**PAGE 18: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q60: Legal Services**

192. Litigation management, including selection and direction of outside counsel to defend courts, judicial officers, court employees, and council members

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

194. Legal advice and consultation on a broad spectrum of judicial administration matters

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

197. Assistance with responding to subpoenas and disqualification statements

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q61: Subject matter expertise and technical assistance with issues, including:**

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q62: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)

Good

**Q63: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)

Very Important

**Q64: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**Additional Comments**

Litigation Management: The Court has utilized these services on a regular basis. They are responsive, timely and provide good information in general to the legal questions that arise for litigation. Of particular note, the AOC has provided outside counsel for responding to judicial subpoenas. Outside Counsel have been professional and very helpful to judicial officers in their efforts to respond to these subpoenas. Legal Opinions: As noted earlier, the Legal Opinion unit is one of the best services provided by the AOC. The Court believes that much of these services could be developed at the local Court level. This would improve/enhance service to Judicial Officers and other court users. An in-house resource should be more cost effective, if a prorated share of the administrative overhead costs currently allocated to the AOC were distributed at the local level.

**PAGE 19: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q65: Legislative and Budget Advocacy Services**

215. Advocacy for Judicial Council positions on pending legislation and technical assistance to legislators, staff, and justice partners, on court-related legislative issues

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

216. Expertise and assistance with strategy, advice, and recommendations on judicial branch budget discussions

Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q66: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label)

Satisfactory

**Q67: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label)

Neutral

**Q68: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label)

No Change

**Additional Comments**

The Court has not directly requested help with any legislative issues. The Leg group provides thorough analysis of pending legislation that may impact the courts, review of changes to fees, and advocacy for budget related concerns. In recent years communication on state-wide legislation and concerns to the Judicial Branch budget reductions have improved.

**PAGE 20: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q69: Mandated Reporting**

223. Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
225. Demographics of the Bench	Have used this service
232. Purchase and Lease of Electronic Recording Equipment	Have used this service
240. Criminal Justice Realignment Data	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
242. Quarterly & annual reports on facility modification budgets, projects, and expenditures	Have used this service

**Q70: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Satisfactory

**Q71: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q72: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) Somewhat less important

**PAGE 21: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q73: Operations Support Services**

243. Assigned Judges Program	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
244. Appellate Court-Appointed Counsel Program administration and support	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
250. Vexatious Litigants List administration	Have used this service
255. Data gathering and recommendations for court operational and administrative issues	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q74: Analytical and administrative support to:**

264. Court Executives Advisory Committee	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
--	---



**Q75: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Satisfactory

**Q76: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q77: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) Somewhat more important

**Additional Comments**

CEAC: Regular meetings of CEAC facilitates communication, teamwork and other important sharing of information on the efforts of the Court's to cope with severe budget reductions. Budget reductions eliminated the Regional AOC centers. The Regional Centers were helpful in accessing information, but their loss has been replaced, in most part, by direct access to information from the AOC or the other trial courts via listserve and other means as needed.

**PAGE 22: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q78: Research and Data Services**

265. Annual Court Statistics Report	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
266. Judicial Branch Statistical Information System technical assistance, maintenance and reporting	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
267. Workload-based Allocation Funding Methodology research support	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
268. Judge and staff workload measures and analysis	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable
270. Conversion of Subordinate Judicial Officer positions to judgeships	Have used this service, Consider service to be valuable

**Q79: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Good

**Q80: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Somewhat Important

**Q81: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) No Change

**PAGE 23: Section 3: Evaluation**

**Q82: Security Services**

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| 275. Judicial Online Privacy Protection Program                                 | Have used this service |
| 276. Threat and incident coordination and consultative services                 | Have used this service |
| 277. Emergency planning and preparedness/continuity of operations planning      | Have used this service |
| 278. Physical security consultation, assessment, site surveys and risk analysis | Have used this service |
| 279. Screening Equipment Replacement Program                                    | Have used this service |

**Q83: Please select the rating that best reflects the overall quality of service that you have received for this group of services. If you have not used any of the above services, please select the "no opinion" option.**

(no label) Fair

**Q84: How important, overall, is this group of services to your trial court operations?**

(no label) Neutral

**Q85: Have cuts to your budget made this group of services, overall, more important or less important to your operations?**

(no label) Somewhat more important

**Additional Comments**

Security for Judicial Officers: The AOC has provided information about web sites that may contain personal information about a judge. This information is generally timely and helpful. However, a lack of resources at the AOC have basically relegated follow-up to the local courts. Given its importance, Court administrative staff have been delegated the responsibility to coordinate responses to threats to judicial officers, maintenance of the Online Privacy, and other judicial security requirements. Administrative staff coordinate and notify local law enforcement on any judicial security issue. According to the AOC, they have insufficient resources to deal with the large number of judicial officers in the state. Therefore, the courts--with some exceptions like screening equipment, camera equipment, and holding cell requirements-- have been left to their own devices to provide security for judicial officers.

**PAGE 24: Section 4: Conclusion**

<b>Q86: Were you aware that the AOC provides to the trial courts all of the services included in this survey?</b>	No
<b>Q87: Are there any services that the AOC does not provide that you believe would be useful to the trial courts?</b>	No

**PAGE 25: Section 4: Conclusion**

<b>Q88: Please list any additional services, not currently offered by the AOC, that you believe would be useful to the trial courts.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q89: So that we can better understand the extent to which trial courts are currently obtaining support services from entities other than the AOC, please tell us: do you contract with other courts, or have any other working relationships with other courts, in order to receive services?</b>	No

**PAGE 26: Section 4: Conclusion**

<b>Q90: Please list all of the services that you receive through a contract, or other working relationship, with another court(s):</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
--	---

**PAGE 27: Section 4: Conclusion**

**Q91: The following is an alphabetized list of all AOC offices. Please evaluate the services that each office provides according to their overall importance to the operations of your court.**

Center for Families, Children & the Courts	Neutral
Center for Judiciary Education and Research	Somewhat Important
Court Operations Special Services Office	Neutral
Criminal Justice Court Services Office	Neutral
Executive Office	Neutral
Fiscal Services Office	Very Important
Human Resources Services Office	Somewhat Unimportant
Information Technology Services Office	Somewhat Unimportant
Internal Audit Services	Somewhat Important
Judicial Branch Capital Program Office	Somewhat Important
Judicial Council Support Services	Unaware of this office
Legal Services Office	Somewhat Important
Office of Administrative Services	Neutral
Office of Appellate Court Services	Neutral
Office of Communications	Neutral
Office of Governmental Affairs	Somewhat Important
Office of Real Estate and Facilities Management	Somewhat Important
Special Projects Office	Unimportant
Trial Court Administrative Services Office	Neutral
Trial Court Liaison Office	Neutral

**Q92: Additional Comments**

As noted in the earlier comments, there are aspects of these offices that provide timely, professional and responsive service. The Court believes that some of these services could be developed at the local Court. This would improve/enhance access to court users by more cost effectively using a prorated share of the administrative overhead costs currently allocated at the state level.

While the Court appreciates the opportunity to respond to this survey, a major flaw in its format raises concerns about its usefulness. The survey assumes that these services during these difficult budget times are valuable without considering two very important concerns. One, are they necessary given the fiscal constraints that have been imposed on the Judicial Branch. Two, are they cost effective given that if provided sufficient funding the Court could provide many of these same services in an efficient and beneficial way for both internal and external court users.