

CR-5011
5-9-89

ICPSR
Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research

Use of Adjuncts to Supplement Judicial
Resources in Six Jurisdictions, 1983-1986:
[United States]

115297

Alexander Aikman,
Mary Elsner Oram, and Frederick Miller

ICPSR 8979

115297

USE OF ADJUNCTS TO SUPPLEMENT JUDICIAL RESOURCES
IN SIX JURISDICTIONS, 1983-1986: [UNITED STATES]

(ICPSR 8979)

Principal Investigators

Alexander Aikman, Mary Elsner Oram
and Frederick Miller

NCJRS

JAN 30 Rec'd

ACQUISITIONS

First ICPSR Edition
Fall 1988

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

115297

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material in microfiche only has been granted by

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Acknowledgement of Assistance

All manuscripts utilizing data made available through the Consortium should acknowledge that fact as well as identify the original collector of the data. The ICPSR Council urges all users of the ICPSR Data facilities to follow some adaptation of this statement with the parentheses indicating items to be filled in appropriately or deleted by the individual user.

The data (and tabulations) utilized in this (publication) were made available (in part) by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data for USE OF ADJUNCTS TO SUPPLEMENT JUDICIAL RESOURCES IN SIX JURISDICTIONS, 1983-1986 [UNITED STATES] were originally collected by Alexander Aikman, Mary Elsner Oram and Frederick Miller. Neither the collector of the original data nor the Consortium bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

In order to provide funding agencies with essential information about the use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, each user of the ICPSR data facilities is expected to send two copies of each completed manuscript or thesis abstract to the Consortium. Please indicate in the cover letter which data were used.

Aikman, Alexander, Mary Elsner Oram, and Frederick Miller
USE OF ADJUNCTS TO SUPPLEMENT JUDICIAL RESOURCES IN SIX
JURISDICTIONS, 1983-1986: [UNITED STATES] (ICPSR 8979)

SUMMARY: This multi-site study, conducted in Pima County, Arizona, Multnomah County, Oregon, King County, Washington, Hennepin, County Minnesota, Phoenix, Arizona, and the state of Connecticut, evaluates the impact of judicial adjunct attorneys and referees on the court system at the county and state levels. There are three different units of observation in this study: (1) civil trial cases, (2) trial judges, including regular judges and adjunct attorneys, and (3) litigating attorneys. The court case data include information on type of case, date of trial, type of judge, type of disposition, and date of disposition. For the questionnaire data obtained on judges, adjuncts, and litigating attorneys, information includes experience with the program, satisfaction, and ideas for changes. CLASS IV

SAMPLING: Sampling procedures varied by site. In Tucson all the civil court trial cases disposed by judicial adjuncts or regular judges between January 1984 and March 1985 were selected. The first 50 civil cases disposed each quarter that requested jury trials also were included in the sample. In Portland 10 percent of the cases with motions for summary judgments heard by judicial adjuncts and regular judges between January 1983 and December 1985 were selected for the sample. In Minneapolis the sample consisted of all the civil cases referred to arbitration hearings conducted by adjunct attorneys from September 1985 to June 1986. In Seattle the sample included regular judges, adjunct attorneys, and litigating attorneys who responded to a mailed questionnaire. In Phoenix the sample included civil appeals that were disposed by adjunct attorneys and judges between 1983 and 1985. In Connecticut a sample was selected from all the civil cases referred to the trial reference program in three Superior Courts from January 1984 through June 1985. For Connecticut there is also a sample of regular judges, trial adjunct attorneys, litigating attorneys, and clients who responded to a mailed questionnaire.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION: 10 data files + SPSS Control Cards

PART 1: Hennepin County Civil
Case Data

FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular

CASES: 1,181

VARIABLES: 37

RECORD LENGTH: 80

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 2: Phoenix Civil
Case Data

FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular

CASES: 1,703

VARIABLES: 36

RECORD LENGTH: 80

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 3: Connecticut Superior
Court Data

FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular

CASES: 217

VARIABLES: 39

RECORD LENGTH: 80

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 4: Connecticut Superior
Court Referee Data

FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular

CASES: 31

VARIABLES: 38

RECORD LENGTH: 80

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 5: Connecticut Superior
Court Attorney Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 16
VARIABLES: 36
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 6: Multnomah County
Circuit Court Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 252
VARIABLES: 17
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 7: King County
Panelist Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 27
VARIABLES: 68
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 8: King County
Attorney Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 44
VARIABLES: 50
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 9: Pima County
Pro Tem Program
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 306
VARIABLES: 38
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART 10: Pima County
Jury Trial Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASES: 160
VARIABLES: 38
RECORD LENGTH: 80
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

RELATED PUBLICATION:

Aikam, Alexander B., Mary Elsner Oram, and Frederick G. Miller.
FRIENDS OF THE COURTS: LAWYERS AS SUPPLEMENTAL JUDICIAL RESOURCES.
Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 1987.

8174

c:\catalog\oram.abs

ABSTRACT

Title: The Use of Adjuncts to Supplement Judicial Resources
Investigators: Alexander Aikman, Mary Elsner Oram and Frederick Miller
Producer: National Center for State Courts
Date of award: 1983
NIJ number: 83-IJ-CX-0021

Purpose of the Study

Six judicial adjunct programs, designed to use lawyers as supplemental judicial resources were evaluated by National Center for State Courts (NCSC) over a 30 months period. This study evaluated the impacts of the program in six sites: Pima County (Tucson, Arizona), Multnomah County (Portland, Oregon), Hennepin county (Minneapolis, Minnesota), King County (Seattle, Washington), Phoenix and State of Connecticut.

Methodology

Sources of information:

Data sources varied by site. In each site some data were collected from court case records. In some of the sites there were mailed questionnaires returned by judges, adjunct attorneys and litigating attorneys.

Sample:

Various sampling procedures and time frames were employed in the six jurisdictions.

In the **Pima County Superior Court** (Tucson, Arizona), all of the civil court-trial cases disposed of by judicial adjuncts or regular judges between January 1984 and March 1985 were selected. There is also a sample from the civil jury-trial list (civil cases requesting a jury trial). The first 50 cases disposed of each quarter from January 1984 through June 1985 were selected.

In the **Multnomah County Circuit Court** (Portland, Oregon), ten percent of the cases (252 cases) with motions for summary judgements heard by judicial adjuncts and regular judges between January 1983 and December 1985 were selected as the sample.

In the **Fourth Judicial District Court** in Hennepin County (Minneapolis, Minnesota), the sample consisted of all of the 1181 civil cases referred to arbitration hearings conducted by adjunct attorneys from September 1985 to June 1986.

In the **Superior Court of King County** (Seattle, Washington), the sample included 27 panelists (including regular judges and adjunct attorneys) and 44 litigating attorneys who responded to a mailed questionnaire.

In the Arizona Court of Appeals in Phoenix, the sample was the 1703 civil appeals (with and without oral arguments), that were disposed of by adjunct attorneys and judges between 1983 and 1985.

In the Superior Court of Connecticut a sample was selected from all of the civil cases referred to the trial reference program in three superior courts (New Haven, Bridgeport and Waterbury) from January 1984 through June 1985. There is also a sample of regular judges, trial adjunct attorneys, litigating attorneys, and their clients who responded to mailed questionnaires.

Dates of data collection:

1983 - 1986

Summary of Contents

Special characteristics of the study:

This multi-site study is one of the major attempts to evaluate the impacts of judicial adjuncts program on court system at the county level and the state level. The data set is valuable in that it provides information on case processing variables and collect opinions from different kinds of program participants.

Description of variables:

The court data include information on type of case, date of trial, type of judge, type of disposition, date of disposition, etc. For the questionnaire data, information includes experience with the program, satisfaction, and ideas for changes.

Unit of observation:

There are three different units of observation in this study: (1) civil trial case (2) trial judge, including regular judge and adjunct attorney and (3) litigating attorney.

Geographic Coverage:

Pima County (Tucson, Arizona), Multnomah County (Portland, Oregon), King County (Seattle, Washington), Hennepin County (Minneapolis, Minnesota), Phoenix, and state of Connecticut

File Structure

Data files: 19 files including 9 SPSSX control card files and 10 raw data files

Unit: civil trial case, trial judge and litigating attorney

Variables: 17 - 68 per file

Cases: 16 - 1703 per file

There are 9 control card files and 10 raw data files for each district court. The control card files are written in SPSSX commands and located before each of its defined data file. Each of the 10 data files has one record per case.

File	Filename	Description	Recfm	Blksize	Lrecl	#Records	#Cases
1	Minn.prg	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	84	
2	Minn.dat	civil case data	FB	7200	80	1181	1181

12 13	Phoenix.prg	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	94	
13	Phoenix.dat	civil case data	FB	7200	80	1703	1703
14 15	Conn.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	114	
15 16	Conn.dat	civil case data	FB	800	80	217	217
16 17	Conref.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	102	
17 18	Conref.dat	trial judge data	FB	800	80	31	31
18 19	Conaty.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	96	
19 20	Conatt.dat	attorney data	FB	800	80	16	16
20 21	Port.prg	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	33	
21 22	Port.dat	civil case data	FB	800	80	252	252
22 23	Seapan.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	87	
23 24	Seapan.dat	panelist data	FB	800	80	27	27
24 25	Seaatt.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	83	
25 26	Seaatt.dat	attorney data	FB	800	80	44	44
26 27	Tucson.jcl	SPSSX cards	FB	800	80	229	
27 28	Tucson.dat	court trial data	FB	800	80	306	306
28 29	Tucjur.dat	jury trial data	FB	800	80	160	160

Reports and Publications

Aikman, Alexander B., Mary Elsner Oram and Frederick G. Miller (1987). *Friends of the Court: Lawyers as Supplemental Judicial Resources*, National Center for State Courts. Williamsburg, Virginia.

8979

Code Book for Minneapolis Arbitration Program Data

Program name = 'minn.prg'
Data file = 'minn.dat'
Program is written in SPSSPC+

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.
There are 1,181 cases in the data file.

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1-4		caseno	Case ID Number	
5-6		mof	Month of case filing date	
7-8		df	Day of case filing date	
9-10		yrf	Year of case filing date	
11		trtype	Type of trial requested 1 = court 2 = jury	
12-13		casetype	Case type 1 = personal injury 2 = property damage 3 = contract 4 = mechanic's lien 5 = miscellaneous 6 = writ/injunction 7 = wrongful death 8 = malpractice 9 = default judgment 10 = combination PI and contract 11 = condemnation	88
14-19		doldem	Dollar amount asked (\$ ---, ---)	
20-22	F2.1	trdays	Estimated number of days needed for trial	88.8
23-24		mnoi	Month of notice of issue date	
25-26		dnoi	Day of notice of issue date	
27-28		yrnoi	Year of notice of issue date	
29-30		monr	Month of nonreadiness date	
31-32		dnr	Day of nonreadiness date	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
33-34		yrnr	Year of nonreadiness date	
35		timely	Was notice of nonreadiness filed in a timely manner? 1 = Yes 2 = No	8
36-37		marb	Month of date assigned to arbitration	
38-39		darb	Day of date assigned to arbitration	
40-41		yrarb	Year of date assigned to arbitration	
42-43	A	arbitor	Code for attorney arbitrator	
44-45		marbh	Month of arbitration hearing date	
46-47		darbh	Day of arbitration hearing date	
48-49		yrarbh	Year of arbitration hearing date	
50-51		maward	Month of arbitration award date	
52-53		daward	Day of arbitration award date	
54-55		yaward	Year of arbitration award date	
56-61		award	Dollar amount of arbitration award or settlement (\$ ---, ---)	
62		trialrq	Was a trial requested after arbitration? Completed only for cases that completed arbitration. 1 = Yes 2 = No	
63-64		moreq	Month of date trial requested	
65-66		dreq	Day of date trial requested	
67-68		yrreq	Year of date trial requested	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
69		whoreq	Which party requested trial after arbitration complete? 1 = plaintiff 2 = defendant	
70-71		dispo	Type of disposition 1 = arbitration 2 = settled prior to or during arbitration hearing 3 = dismissed with prejudice 4 = closed per court order 5 = returned to block judge 6 = stricken (bankruptcy) 7 = appealed for trial 8 = returned to court	
72-73		modisp	Month of disposition date	
74-75		ddisp	Day of disposition date	
76-77		yrdisp	Year of disposition date	

(Disposition date provided for only those cases that received a final disposition--dispo=4.)

78		whoawd	The arbitrator found in favor of: 1 = plaintiff 2 = defendant	
79-80		nocont	Number of continuances granted (Not known for most cases.)	

Code Book for Arizona Court of Appeals Division One

Department E Program

Program name = 'phoenix.prg'
Data file = 'phoenix.dat'

Program is written in SPSSPC+

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 1,703 cases in the data file.

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1-5		caseno	Case ID Number	
6	A	spec	Designates special cases B = Procedure B cases S = "Special" cases blank = neither	
9-10		yrfi	Year of filing date	
11-12		mofi	Month of filing date	
13-14		dafi	Day of filing date	
16-17		yratisu	Year of date at issue	
18-19		moatisu	Month of date at issue	
20-21		daatis	Day of date at issue	
22		oral	Was case argued orally? 1 = Yes 2 = No	0, blank
23-24		yrorag	Year of oral argument date	
25-26		moorag	Month of oral argument date	
27-28		daorag	Day of oral argument date	
29		depte	Was case assigned to Department E? 1 = Yes 2 = No	blank
30-31		yrun	Year of date under advisement	
32-33		moun	Month of date under advisement	
34-35		dayun	Day of date under advisement	
37-38		yrdec	Year of decision date	
39-40		modec	Month of decision date	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
41-42		dadec	Day of decision date	
44		dectype	Type of decision 1 = opinion 2 = memo decision 3 = order 4 = stipulation and order 5 = order and memo decision 6 = transfer to supreme court 7 = motion and order of dismissal 8 = supplemental memo decision 9 = order/decision by Procedure B 0 = order decision	
46-47		vote	Vote of judges/pro tems in deciding case 10 = decision by one judge 20 = author + one concurring; no dissent 21 = author + one concurring; one in dissent 30 = author + two concurring; no dissent 31 = author + two concurring; one in dissent 35 = author + 1 1/2 concurring; 1/2 in dissent 77 = decision by court (per curiam)	blank
49-50		disposit	Disposition type 1 = affirmed 2 = appeal affirmed; cross appeal dismissed 3 = affirmed; attorney's fees granted	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(disposit con't.)		4 = affirmed as amended or as modified	
			5 = appeal affirmed; cross appeal modified or modified in part	
			6 = affirmed in part and dismissed in part	
			7 = appeal affirmed; cross appeal modified and dismissed	
			8 = affirmed in part and vacated in part	
			9 = award attorney fees	
			10 = reversed	
			11 = affirmed in part and reversed in part	
			12 = reversed and remanded or remanded for a new trial	
			13 = reversed and remanded with directions	
			14 = affirmed in part, reversed in part and remanded	
			20 = remanded	
			21 = remanded with instructions	
			22 = affirmed and remanded with instructions	
			23 = affirmed as modified; remanded	
			24 = affirmed in part and remanded in part	
			25 = judgment vacated; remanded	
			26 = affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded with instructions	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(disposit con't.)	28 = affirmed in part, and reversed and remanded in part	
			29 = reversed as to appeal and cross appeal	
			30 = dismissed or appeal dismissed	
			31 = dismissed with prejudice	
			32 = dismissed for lack of jurisdiction	
			33 = dismissed as moot	
			40 = relief granted	
			41 = relief deemed moot	
			42 = set aside; issue injunction	
			45 = deny stay of lower court	
			50 = transfer	
			55 = decline jurisdiction	
			56 = order vacated	
			60 = consolidated	
52-53		yrrec	Year of reconsideration date	
54-55		morec	Month of reconsideration date	
56-57		darec	Day of reconsideration date	
58	A	recact	Action on request for reconsideration	
			D = denied	
			G = granted	
			E = request dismissed	
60-61		yrrev	Year of review date	
62-63		morev	Month of review date	
64-65		darev	Day of review date	
66	A	revuact	Action on request for review by Supreme Court	
			D = denied	
			G = granted	
			E = request dismissed	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
68-69		yrman	Year of mandate date	
70-71		moman	Month of mandate date	
72-73		daman	Day of mandate date	
75-76		yrter	Year of termination date	
77-78		moter	Month of termination date	
79-80		dater	Day of termination date	

Code Book for Connecticut Superior Court

Trial Referee Program--Caseload Data

Program name = 'conn.jcl'
Data file = 'conn.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 217 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1	court	A	Court location B = Bridgeport N = New Haven W = Waterbury	
2-4	caseno		Case ID Number	
5-7	yrref		Year of reference date	
8-9	moref		Month of reference date	
10-11	dayref		Day of reference date	
13-14	mohear		Month of date of scheduled refereed trial	
15-16	dayhear		Day of date of scheduled refereed trial	
17	xyrhear		Year minus 80 of date of scheduled refereed trial (6 = 86, 2 = 82, etc.)	
18	typepro		Type of referee 1 = practicing attorney 2 = semi-retired attorney	
20	dispwout		How was the case disposed? 1 = disposed without short calendar hearing 2 = short calendar hearing held	
22	distype		Type of disposition 1 = pretrial default 2 = settled pretrial	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(distype con't.)		3 = dismissed pretrial 4 = withdrawn pretrial 5 = stipulated judgement pretrial 6 = trial/judgment 7 = post trial stipulated judgment 8 = settled, dismissed, withdrawn post trial	
24-25	modisp		Month of disposition date	
26-27	daydisp		Day of disposition date	
28	xyrdisp		Year minus 80 of disposition date	
29-30	moshort		Month of short calendar hearing date	
31-32	dayshort		Day of short calendar hearing date	
33	xyrshort		Year minus 80 of short calendar hearing date	
34	except		Were exceptions to the report filed? 1 = No 2 = Yes	
36	object		Were objections to the report filed? 1 = No 2 = Yes	
38	sresult		Result of short calendar hearing 1 = judgment entered in accordance with filing 2 = finding rejected 3 = other	
40-41	hrttime		With mintime, the length of time the judge spent for the short calendar hearing. 99 = not applicable	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
42-43	mintime		(See hvertime) 99 = not applicable	
45	wwotrial		Was a refereed trial conducted? 1 = no, case was disposed without 2 = yes, an attorney refereed trial took place	
47-48	mohcom		Month of date refereed trial commenced	
49-50	dayhcom		Day of date refereed trial commenced	
51	xyrhcom		Year minus 80 date refereed trial commenced	
52-53	mohconc		Month of date refereed trial concluded	
54-55	dayhconc		Day of date refereed trial concluded	
56	xyrconc		Year minus 80 of date refereed trial concluded	
57-59	trdays	F3.1	Length of trial in days	
60-62	timerev	F3.1	Number of hours attorney referee spent reviewing the record	
63-65	timedec	F3.1	Number of hours attorney referee spent deciding the issues	
66-68	timeprep	F3.1	Number of hours attorney referee spent preparing the written finding	
70-71	mosign		Month of date data form signed by attorney referee	
72-73	daysign		Day of date data form signed by attorney referee	
74	xyrsign		Year minus 80 of date data form signed by attorney referee	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
75-76	modone		Month of date data form submitted to AOC	
77-78	daydone		Day of date data form submitted to AOC	
79-80	yrdone		Year of date data form submitted to AOC	

Code Book for Connecticut Superior Court

Trial Referee Program -- Referee's Questionnaire

Program name = 'conref.jcl'
Data file = 'conref.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 31 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1	A	court	b = Bridgeport n = New Haven w = Waterbury	
2-3		caseno	Case ID Number	
4		worth	Was the trial referee program worthwhile? 1 = very worthwhile 2 = worthwhile 3 = neutral 4 = doubtful 5 = definitely not worthwhile	
5		chgproc	Should changes be made to program procedures? 1 = yes, add more judicial exposure 9 = yes, make other unspecified change 0 = no	
6		chgsche	Should changes be made to program schedule? 1 = yes, wasted too much of my time 2 = yes, require pre-trial hearing 3 = yes, schedule trials further ahead of time	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(chgsche con't.)	4 = yes, schedule more cases per referee 5 = yes, schedule like the court's calendar 6 = yes, make more accomodation to the referee's schedule 9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
7		chgselec	Should changes be made to how cases are selected for the program? 1 = yes, base assignment on referee's experience 2 = yes, select only short cases 9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
8		othchg	Should other changes be made? 1 = yes, don't grant any continuances 2 = yes, send pleadings to referees before the start of the refereed trial 3 = yes, add more judicial input 4 = yes, allow referee to hold the papers until finding is complete 5 = yes, explain the complete trial referee procedure to the litigants	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(othchg con't.)	6 = yes, let litigants remove their case from the program 9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
9		approp	Was the tone and procedure of the refereed trial appropriate? 1 = yes 2 = no 3 = yes and no 8 = don't know	
10		whyappro	Why or why not to above item? 1 = referees should have more judicial trappings 2 = referees should have more authority	blank
11		opina	The trial referee program works well. 1 = disagree strongly 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = agree strongly 8 = no opinion	blank
12		opinb	The trial referee program works best with simple cases (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
13		opinc	The trial referee program produces "second-class justice." (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank

Connecticut Superior Court
 Trial Referee Program -- Referee's Questionnaire

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
14		opind	The trial referees are well qualified. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
15		opine	The trial referees are well prepared. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
16		opinf	I would prefer to have a case of mine heard by a judge. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
17		tort	1 = tort cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
18		contract	1 = contract cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
19		domrel	1 = domestic relations cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
20		rpr	1 = real property rights cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
21		isoffact	1 = cases involving issues of facts only are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
22		voluntrd	1 = The trial referee program should be limited to cases that volunteer 0 = not checked	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
23		simple	1 = simple cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
24		allty	1 = trial referees can hear any case requesting a court trial 0 = not checked	
25		refagain	Would you be willing to serve as a trial referee again? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	
26		whyagain	Why or why not to referee again? 1 = cannot because I am a one-person office 2 = yes, because it helps move cases quickly 3 = yes, because I learned things	blank
27		benefit	What benefit did you gain personally from serving as a trial referee? 1 = more insight into litigation 2 = learned that cases must be decided fairly 3 = listed an altruistic motive 4 = felt that I helped reduce court delay 5 = gained a judicial point of view 6 = satisfaction from serving the court 7 = helped poor cases 0 = gained no benefit	9

Connecticut Superior Court
 Trial Referee Program -- Referee's Questionnaire

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
28		delinst	Did you gain insight into the problem of court delay? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	
29		prepared	Did you feel adequately prepared for the refereed trial? (Same code as for approp, above.)	
30		litsprep	Were the litigating counsel adequately prepared for the refereed trial? (Same code as for approp, above.)	blank
31		litspres	Were the litigating counsel efficient? (Same code as for approp, above.)	blank
32		litseff	Did the litigating counsel make a good effort to settle the case? (Same code as for approp, above.)	blank
33		premrou	Should the trial referee program be routine for all civil cases? (Same code as for approp, above.)	
34		select	Should the trial referee program be routine for selected civil cases? (Same code as for approp, above.)	blank
35		seltort	1 = make TR program routine for tort cases 0 = not checked	
36		selcontr	1 = make TR program routine for contract cases 0 = not checked	
37		seldomre	1 = make TR program routine for domestic relations cases 0 = not checked	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
38		selrpr	1 = make TR program routine for real property rights cases 0 = not checked	
39		selisof	1 = make TR program routine for all cases with only issues of fact litigated 0 = not checked	
40		selvolun	1 = make TR program routine for cases that volunteer 0 = not checked	
41		selsimpl	1 = make TR program routine for simple cases 0 = not checked	
42		selall	1 = make TR program routine for all civil cases 0 = not checked	
43		selemerg	1 = use the trial referee program in emergency situations only 0 = not checked	
44		signed	1 = respondent signed the questionnaire 0 = questionnaire not signed	

Code Book for Connecticut Superior Court

Trial Referee Program -- Litigating Attorney's Questionnaire

Program name = 'conaty.jcl'
Data file = 'conatt.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 16 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1	A	court	b = bridgeport n = New Haven w = Waterbury	
2-3		caseno	Case ID Number	
4		worth	Was the trial referee program worthwhile? 1 = very worthwhile 2 = worthwhile 3 = neutral 4 = doubtful 5 = definitely not worthwhile	
5		chgproc	Should changes be made to program procedures? 1 = yes, add more judicial exposure 9 = yes, make other unspecified change 0 = no	
6		chgsche	Should changes be made to program schedule? 1 = yes, wasted too much of my time 2 = yes, require pre-trial hearing 3 = yes, schedule trials further ahead of time	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(chgsche con't.)	4 = yes, schedule more cases per referee 5 = yes, schedule like the court's calendar 6 = yes, make more accomodation to the referee's schedule 9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
7		chgselec	Should changes be made to how cases are selected for the program? 1 = yes, base assignment on referee's experience 2 = yes, select only short cases 9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
8		othchg	Should other changes be made? 1 = yes, don't grant any continuances 2 = yes, send pleadings to referees before the start of the refereed trial 3 = yes, add more judicial input 4 = yes, allow referee to hold the papers until finding is complete 5 = yes, explain the complete trial referee procedure to the litigants 6 = yes, let litigants remove their case from the program	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(othchg con't.)	9 = yes, make some other unspecified change 0 = no	
9		approp	Was the tone and procedure of the refereed trial appropriate? 1 = yes 2 = no 3 = yes and no 8 = don't know	
10		whyappro	Why or why not to above item? 1 = referees should have more judicial trappings 2 = referees should have more authority	blank
11		opina	The trial referee program works well. 1 = disagree strongly 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = agree strongly 8 = no opinion	blank
12		opinb	The trial referee program works best with simple cases (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
13		opinc	The trial referee program produces "second-class justice." (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
14		opind	The trial referees are well qualified. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
15		opine	The trial referees are well prepared. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
16		opinf	I would prefer to have a case of mine heard by a judge. (Same codes as for opina, above.)	blank
17-18		moass	Number of cases assigned to trial referee program	
19		resent	Did you resent having your cases assigned to the trial referee program? (Same code as for approp, above.)	
20		particip	What was the nature of your participation? 1 = attorney for plaintiffs 2 = attorney for defendants 3 = attorney for third parties 4 = attorney for plaintiffs and defendants 5 = attorney for plaintiffs and third parties 6 = attorney for defendants and third parties	
21		discomp	Was discovery complete before the refereed trial? (Same code as for approp, above.)	
22		settled	Was your case settled? (Same code as for approp, above.)	
23		when	If yes to settled, when was your cases settled? 1 = before being set for refereed trial	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(when con't.)	2 = 1-14 days after notice of being set. 3 = 15+ days after notice of refereed trial 4 = right before start of refereed trial blank = not applicable	
24		setlhear	Was the case settled during the refereed trial? (Same codes as for approp, above.) blank = not applicable	
25		setldecs	Was the case settled by the decision of the trial referee? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	blank
26		satisfy	Was your client satisfied with the outcome of the case? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	blank
27		excorobj	Did you file exceptions or objections to the trial referee's report? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	
28		whyexob	If yes to excorobj, why? 1 = findings were not based on the evidence blank = not applicable	
29		money	Would the money result have been the same if your case had been tried? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	blank
30-35		monydiff	If no to money above, what would have been the difference? ± \$--, --- = amount more or less estimated blank = don't know/ not applicable	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
36		timesave	Did the trial referee program save any time? (Same codes as for approp, above.)	
37-39	F3.1	daysave	If yes to timesave above, how many days in hundreths do you think were saved? ---.- = number of days saved blank = don't know/not applicable	
40		tort	1 = tort cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
41		contract	1 = contract cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
42		domrel	1 = domestic relations cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
43		rpr	1 = real property rights cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
44		isoffact	1 = cases involving issues of facts only are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
45		voluntrd	1 = The trial referee program should be limited to cases that volunteer 0 = not checked	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
46		simple	1 = simple cases are well suited to the trial referee program 0 = not checked	
47		alnty	1 = trial referees can hear any case requesting a court trial 0 = not checked	
48		none	1 = no types of cases should be routinely referred to trial referees 0 = not checked	
49		signed	1 = respondent signed the questionnaire 0 = questionnaire not signed	

Code Book for Multnomah County Circuit Court

Motions for Summary Judgment

Program name = 'port.prg'
Data file = 'port.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 252 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>
1- 2	protem		ID code for <u>pro tem</u> judge
3- 7	caseno		5-digit suffix of case number assigned by court.
8- 9	moass		Month of date assigned to SJ hearing
10-11	dayass		Day of date assigned to SJ hearing
12-13	yrass		Year of date assigned to SJ hearing
14-15	morpt		Month of date report received
16-17	dayrpt		Day of date report received
18-19	yrprt		Year of date report received
20-21	morec		Month of date attorney received case
22-23	dayrec		Day of date attorney received case
24-25	yrrec		Year of date attorney received case
26-27	mohear		Month of hearing date
28-29	dayhear		Day of hearing date
30-31	yrhear		Year of hearing date
32-34	revtime	F3.1	Time spent reviewing records (hours)
35-37	heartime		Length of SJ motion hearing (minutes)
38-39	result		How motion was resolved on day of hearing 1 = hearing reset 2 = no hearing because no praecipe 3 = no hearing because no appearance 4 = no hearing -- case already settled or dismissed 5 = hearing cancelled

Multnomah County Circuit Court
Motions for Summary Judgment

Column

Number Code Type Description

(result
con't.)

- 6 = no hearing because pro tem recused
him- or herself
- 7 = motion granted
- 8 = motion granted in part
- 9 = motion denied
- 10 = hearing continued
- 11 = motion taken under advisement
- 12 = parties offered stipulated judgment
for approval
- 13 = unknown
- 14 = other
- 15 = no hearing -- motion withdrawn

Code Book for King County WA Superior Court EDP

Panelist's Questionnaire

Program name = 'seapan.jcl'
Data file = 'seapan.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 27 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1-4	id	Case ID Number	
6	type	Respondant was: 1 = attorney panelist 2 = judge	
8	worthwh	Was the settlement conference program worthwhile? 1 = definitely worthwhile 2 = worthwhile 3 = neutral 4 = not worthwhile 5 = definitely not worthwhile	
10	particip	Did all panel members participate? 1 = yes 2 = no 3 = uncertain 7 = don't know	9
12	whonopar	If no on item above, who didn't participate? 1 = judge 2 = lawyer panelist 9 = not applicable/no response	
14	opiniona	The program works well. 1 = disagree strongly 2 = disagree 3 = neutral	blank

King County WA Superior Court EDP
 Panelist Questionnaire

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(opiniona con't.)	4 = agree 5 = agree strongly 7 = don't know	
15	opinionb	Program works well for newer cases. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
16	opinionc	Program works well for cases ready for trial. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
17	opiniond	Discovery should be complete before conference. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
18	opinione	Panel attorneys added to judge's efforts. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
19	opinionf	Panel attorneys seemed well qualified. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
20	opiniong	Panel attorneys seemed well prepared. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
21	opinionh	Settlement conferences are more effective with a single judge. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
22	opinioni	Settlement conferences are more effective with a single attorney. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
23	opinionj	Limit the program to volunteer cases. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
24	opinionk	Materials submitted by the parties were useful. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
26	consens	Did the panel reach a consensus? 1 = yes, in all cases	9

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(consens con't.)	2 = yes, in some cases 3 = no	
27	noconsen	If no consensus, how was recommendation presented? 1 = as if there were a consensus 2 = each panelist expressed his/her own view 3 = as a range of values 4 = judge told separate views and recommendation 5 = methods 1, 2, and 3 above used 6 = methods 1 and 2, above, used 7 = methods 2 and 3, above, used 8 = methods 1 and 3, above, used 9 = no response/not applicable	9
28	pdpanel	Were you on a panel with representatives from the plaintiffs' and defense bars? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	9
29	pdhelp	If yes to item above, did this panel design help the settlement process? 1 = yes 2 = no 3 = uncertain 7 = don't know 8 = not applicable/not on such a panel	9
30	qual1	Trial experience: 1 = necessary for attorney panelist 0 = not checked	blank
31	qual2	Five years at the bar: (Same codes as for qual1, above.)	blank
32	qual3	Ten years at the bar: (Same codes as for qual1, above.)	blank

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
33	qual4	Recognition and standing in legal community. (Same codes as for qual1, above.)	blank
34	qual5	Substantive experience. (Same codes as for qual1, above.)	blank
35	qual6	Other qualifications: 1 = mentioned another quality necessary for attorney panelists 0 = no other qualities mentioned	blank
36	pipd	Personal injury/property damage cases are well suited to EDP. 1 = agree 0 = not checked	
37	contract	Contract cases are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
38	domrel	Domestic relations cases are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
39	monyonly	Cases asking money damages only are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
40	simple	Simple cases are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
41	complex	Complex cases are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
42	all	All cases are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
43	unreal	Cases where clients are unrealistic are well suited to EDP. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
44	other	Other types of cases well suited to EDP: 1 = mentioned another type of case 0 = none others mentioned	
45	noopin	1 = did not express an opinion as to what cases were well suited to EDP 0 = expressed opinions marked above	
46	counsell	Litigants' counsel were adequately prepared. (Same codes as for particip, above.)	9
47	counsel2	Litigants' counsel discussed settlement realistically. (Same codes as for particip, above.)	9
48	counsel3	Litigants' counsel made <u>bona fide</u> efforts to settle the cases. (Same codes as for particip, above.)	9
49	youprep	Did you feel adequately prepared for the conference? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	
50	routine	Should the program be made routine for all types of cases? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	9
51	pipd2	Program should be permanent and routine for personal injury/property damage cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
52	contract2	Program should be permanent and routine for contract cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
53	domrel2	Program should be permanent and routine for domestic relations cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
54	monyon12	Program should be permanent and routine for cases asking only money damages. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
55	simple2	Program should be permanent and routine for simple cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
56	complex2	Program should be permanent and routine for complex cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
57	all2	Program should be permanent and routine for all cases. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
58	unreal2	Program should be permanent and routine for all cases where clients are unrealistic. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
59	other2	Program should be permanent and routine for some other type of case. (Same codes as for other, above.)	
60	noopin2	1 = did not check any type of case for which the program should be permanent and routine. 0 = program should be permanent and routine for the types of cases checked above.	
61	again	If program is repeated, would you be willing to serve again? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	
62	repeat	Should the program be repeated? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
63	xperyear	Repeated how many times per year? 1 = once a year 2 = twice a year 3 = once or twice a year 4 = two or four times a year 5 = three times a year 6 = four times a year 7 = it depends 8 = don't know	9
64	change1	Change should be made in conference procedures. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
65	change2	Change should be made to scheduling and caseflow. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
66	change3	Change should be made to case selection. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
67	change4	Change should be made to panel selection. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
68	satis	Benefits of serving: 1 = satisfaction of helping court 0 = not checked	
69	newidea	1 = got new ideas to help my practice 0 = not checked	
70	savetime	1 = saved court time 0 = not checked	
71	helplita	1 = helped litigating attorney dispose cases 0 = not checked	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
72	interest	1 = interesting experience 0 = not checked	
73	didntgn	1 = didn't gain any benefit 0 = not checked	
74	likedwi	1 = liked serving with other panel members 0 = not checked	
75	othben	1 = mentioned another benefit 0 = not checked	
76	insight	Do you have greater insight into the court processes and causes of delay than before serving? (Same codes as for particip, above.)	
77	signed	1 = signed name to questionnaire 0 = did not sign name to questionnaire	

Code Book for King County WA Superior Court EDP

Litigating Attorney's Questionnaire

Program name = 'seaatt.jcl'
Data file = 'seaatt.dat'
Program is written in SPSSX

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 44 cases in the data file.

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1-4	id		Case ID Number	
5	type		Respondant was: 1 = attorney for plaintiff or petitioner 2 = attorney for defendant or respondent 3 = attorney for third party defendant 4 = other 5 = attorney for defendant and third party 6 = attorney for plaintiff and third party	9
6	status		Status of the case at the time the questionnaire was completed: 1 = settled before conference 2 = settled during conference 3 = settled 1 to 14 days after conference 4 = settled more than 14 days after conference 5 = went to trial 6 = still pending 7 = summary judgment granted before conference	9

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
7	confhelp		If response to status (above) \leq 4, did the conference contribute to the settlement? 1 = yes 2 = no 3 = maybe 7, 8 = don't know 9 = not applicable	
8	reason		How did conference help? 1 = showed true value of the case 2 = discovery was completed earlier 3 = set value and % for each defendant 4 = settled as a direct result of the conference 5 = started discussion 6 = process didn't help and may have hurt 7 = panelists' opinions helped 9 = not applicable.	
9	volunt		Was case volunteered? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
10	react		If not a volunteer, what was your reaction to being assigned to EDP? 1 = positive-type of reaction given (ex., pleased, happy to participate, etc.) 2 = neutral-type reaction (ex., "I was not opposed to it.")	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(react con't.)		3 = negative-type reaction (ex., "I thought it would be a waste of time.") 4 = surprise 9 = not applicable	
11	discov		Was discovery completed prior to the settlement conference? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
12	satisfy		If status, above, \leq 4, was your client satisfied with the outcome? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
13	settled		If status, above \leq 4, would your case have been settled even without the conference? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
14	monysame		If yes on settled, above, for the same amount of money? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
15-20	money		If no on monysame, above, for how much more or less? + ---- = would have settled for this much more. - ---- = would have settled for this much less. 999999 = would have settled for a different amount of money but do not know what the difference would have been.	
21	whynoset		If the case has not been settled, why not? 1 = fault of plaintiff	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(whynoset con't.)		2 = fault of defendant 3 = case too complex 4 = discovery not complete 5 = difference of opinions 6 = \$ amount recommendation from panel "off" 7 = there was no incentive to settle 8 = negotiations are ongoing; the case will probably be settled 9 = not applicable	
22	narrow		Did the conference lead to narrowing or simplification of the issues? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
23-25	days	F3.1	Number of trial days saved by the conference blank = none --.- = days in hundreths saved	
26	inspres		Was an insurance adjuster present at the conference? 1 = yes 2 = no 8 = none involved in the case	
27	inshelp		If yes on inspres, above, did the presence of an insurance adjuster help? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	
28	particip		Did all panel members participate? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	9
29	whonopar		If no on item above, who didn't participate? 1 = judge	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
	(whonopar con't.)		2 = panelist 3 = plaintiff panelist 4 = defense panelist 9 = not applicable	
30	pdhelp		If there was representation of plaintiff and defense bar was on panel, did this panel design help the settlement process? (Same codes as for confhelp, above.)	9
31	pdhow		If yes on pd help, above, how did this panel design help? 1 = both agreed on liability 2 = added weight and perspective 3 = balanced views 4 = gave a range of analysis 5 = appeared to be fair and unbiased 6 = hurt the situation 7 = added credibility 8 = don't know 9 = not applicable	
32-33	nocases	F2.0	How many of your cases were in the EDP program? (fill in number of cases)	
34	worthwh		Was the settlement conference program worthwhile? 1 = definitely worthwhile 2 = worthwhile 3 = neutral 4 = not worthwhile 5 = definitely not worthwhile	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
35	opiniona		The program works well. 1 = disagree strongly 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = agree strongly 7 = don't know	blank
36	opinionb		Program works well for newer cases. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
37	opinionc		Program works well for cases ready for trial. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
38	opiniond		Discovery should be complete before conference. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
39	opinione		Panel attorneys added to judge's efforts. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
40	opinionf		Panel attorneys seemed well qualified. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
41	opiniong		Panel attorneys seemed well prepared. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
42	opinionh		Settlement conferences are more effective with a single judge. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank
43	opinioni		Settlement conferences are more effective with a single attorney. (Same codes as for opiniona, above.)	blank

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
44	opinionj		Limit the program to volunteer cases. (Same codes as for opinionona, above.)	blank
45	opinionl		Preparing materials for the conference was helpful to the settlement process. (Same codes as for opinionona, above.)	blank
46	opinionm		The materials prepared by the other side for the conference were useful in the settlement process. (Same codes as for opinionona, above.)	9
47	pipd		What types of cases are best suited for settlement conferences? 1 = personal injury/property damage cases 0 = not checked	
48	contract		1 = contract cases 0 = not checked	
49	domrel		1 = domestic relations cases 0 = not checked	
50	monyonly		1 = cases asking money damages only 0 = not checked	
51	simple		1 = simple cases 0 = not checked	
52	complex		1 = complex cases 0 = not checked	
53	allcases		1 = all cases 0 = not checked	
54	unreal		1 = cases where clients are unrealistic 0 = not checked	

<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
55	other		1 = mentioned another type of case 0 = none others mentioned	
56	noopin		1 = did not express an opinion as to what cases were well suited to EDP 0 = expressed opinions marked above	
57	change1		Change should be made in conference procedures. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
58	change2		Change should be made to scheduling and caseflow. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
59	change3		Change should be made to case selection. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
60	change4		Change should be made to panel selection. (Same codes as for pipd, above.)	
61	signed		1 = signed name to questionnaire 0 = did not sign name to questionnaire	

Code Book for Tucson Pro tem Program

Program name = 'tucson.jcl'
Data files = 'tucjur.data', 'tucson.dat'

'tucson.dat' contains data for court trials.
'tucjur.dat' contains data for jury trials.

Program is written in SPSSX.

All data for a case are contained in one 80-column record.

There are 306 cases in 'tucson.dat'
There are 160 cases in 'tucjur.dat'

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
1-6		caseno	Case ID Number	
7-8		mofile	Month of case filing date	00, 99
9-10		dayfile	Day of case filing date	00, 99
11-12		yrfile	Year of case filing date	00, 99
13		demand	Original trial demand 1 = court 2 = jury	
14-15		casetype	Case type 1 = mv tort 2 = tort non-mv 3 = contract 4 = foreclosure 5 = quiet title 6 = declaratory judgment 7 = fraud 8 = non-classified 9 = unknown 10 = eminent domain 11 = consumer fraud	00, 99
16		appeal	Was this case an appeal? 0 = No 1 = Yes--from arbitration 2 = Yes--from JP court	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
17-18		moatis	Month of at issue date	00, 99
19-20		dayatis	Day of at issue date	00, 99
21-22		yratis	Year of at issue date	00, 99
23-24		moltrdt	Month of 1st trial date	00, 99
25-26		dayltrdt	Day 1st trial date	00, 99
27-28		yrltrdt	Year of 1st trial date	00, 99
29-30		mo2trdt	Month of 2nd trial date	00, 99
31-32		day2trdt	Day of 2nd trial date	00, 99
33-34		yr2trdt	Year of 2nd trial date	00, 99
35-36		moltrdt	Month of last trial date	00, 99
37-38		dayltrdt	Day of last trial date	00, 99
39-40		yrltrdt	Year of last trial date	00, 99
41-42		moass	Month of date assigned to <u>pro tem</u> program	00, 99
43-44		dayass	Day of date assigned to <u>pro tem</u> program	00, 99
45-46		yrass	Year of date assigned to <u>pro tem</u> program	00, 99
47-48		modisp	Month of disposition date	00, 99
49-50		daydisp	Day of disposition date	00, 99
51-52		yrdisp	Year of disposition date	00, 99
53		typejudg	Type of judge hearing trial 1 = regular judge 2 = <u>pro tem</u> judge	9
54		whendisp	When was the case disposed? 1 = prior to assignment 2 = between assignment and pretrial statement 3 = after pretrial statement	9
55		disptype	Type of disposition 1 = settled by parties 2 = change of venue	

<u>Columns</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Missing Value Codes</u>
		(disptype con't.)	3 = summary judgment 4 = dismissed by court 5 = jury verdict 6 = court trial and judgment	
56-57		motrst	Month of date of trial start	00, 99
58-59		daytrst	Day of date of trial start	00, 99
60-61		yrtrst	Year of date of trial start	00, 99
62-63		hrprtr	With minprtr, hours and minutes spent by judge/ <u>pro tem</u> before trial (hrprtr:minprtr)	
64-65		minprtr		
66-67		daystr	With hrstr, the number of days and hours spent in trial (daystr:hrstr)	
68-70	F3.1	hrstr		99.9
71-73		hrspotr	With minpotr, the number of hours and minutes spent by the judge/ <u>pro tem</u> after trial (hrspotr:minpotr)	999
74-75		minpotr		
76		notrset	Number of trials set for this case	