

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA FOR THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS



... ..
... ..
... ..

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS

Officers

President LOUIS H. BURKE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of California
Vice President JAMES A. FINCH, JR., Justice, Supreme Court of Missouri
Secretary-Treasurer ALICE O'DONNELL, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C.
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer DON F. BELL, National Center for State Courts, Denver, Colorado
Chairman, Advisory Council C. A. CARSON III, Esq., Phoenix, Arizona

Board of Directors

LINDSAY G. ARTHUR, Judge, District Court, Juvenile Division, Minneapolis, Minnesota
LOUIS H. BURKE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of California
JAMES A. FINCH, JR., Justice, Supreme Court of Missouri
M. MICHAEL GORDON, Judge, Municipal Court of Houston, Texas
HOWELL T. HEFLIN, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Alabama
D. DONALD JAMIESON, President Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
E. LEO MILONAS, Judge, Criminal Court of the City of New York
EDWARD E. PRINGLE, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Colorado
JOHN T. REARDON, Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial Circuit of Illinois
PAUL C. REARDON, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts
WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Hawaii
CURTIS V. TILLMAN, Judge, Superior Courts of the Stone Mountain
Judicial Circuit, Decatur, Georgia

* * *

EDWARD B. McCONNELL, Director
ARNE L. SCHOELLER, Associate Director

ANALYSIS OF THE IDAHO COURTS INFORMATION SYSTEM

A Publication of
National Center for State Courts
1660 Lincoln Street - Suite 200
Denver, Colorado 80203

Systems and Technology Division
J. Michael Greenwood, Chief

Project Team:

Ernest H. Short - Consultant
James A. Gainey - Center Staff
William Popp - Center Staff
Beatrice Hoffman - Consultant

Publication No. R0012

June 1974

This study was funded by the Criminal Courts Technical Assistance project of the American University College of Law under its contract with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice, and by the National Center for State Courts. The National Center for State Courts bears sole responsibility for the contents of this report. This publication is a revision of a study completed in January 1974.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ANALYSIS OF EXISTING SITUATION	2
A. COURT STRUCTURE AND JURISDICTION	2
B. NEED FOR A COURT RECORDS AND INFORMATION SYSTEM.	3
C. THE CASELOAD ANALYSIS AND SUPPORT SYSTEM	4
D. PROBLEMS WITH THE PRESENT COURTS INFORMATION SYSTEM	5
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.	7
A. IMMEDIATELY.	8
B. AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.	10
C. FUTURE	12
IV. SUMMARY.	14
APPENDIX A.	16
B.	35
C.	42

TABLE OF FIGURES

PAGE

1. C.L.A.S.S. REPORTS AT PRESENT 6
2. SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR AN EDIT REPORT 11

I. INTRODUCTION

The Idaho Supreme Court has recently made concerted efforts to improve the administration of the Idaho courts by reorganizing the administrative structure. The Supreme Court recognized the importance of adequate and accurate information and statistical data to the administrative function and it emphasized the necessity "to review the effectiveness of the present manually-gathered, batch-processed judicial information system to determine whether it is adequate to assist the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office in discharging their management responsibilities...."¹ To obtain such a review, Chief Justice Charles R. Donaldson requested technical assistance through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Contract Number J-LEAA 043-72 to American University. The stated purpose of the technical assistance was "to perform an in-depth study and evaluation of the present judicial management information system² and to make recommendations for revision and future directions."

The National Center for State Courts was requested to provide the Idaho Supreme Court with this assistance. A technical assistance team was selected to include expertise in courts information systems, computer hardware, and statistical analysis and reporting. These team members made two site visits. Extensive interviews with courts people and data processors in the Auditor's Office were made to determine the courts' data needs and perceived problems with the present system. The present

¹

Chief Justice Charles R. Donaldson in a letter to Robert C. Anderson, June 25, 1973.

²

Ibid.

system was analyzed in the context of the courts' total information needs.

II. ANALYSIS OF EXISTING SITUATION

A. COURT STRUCTURE AND JURISDICTION

The State Supreme Court is composed of the Chief Justice and four Associate Justices elected for six (6) year terms. The Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in claims against the state (adversary opinions) writs of mandamus, certiorari, prohibition, and habeas corpus, with appellate jurisdiction from final judgment in District Court, orders of public utilities and the industrial commission.

In 1971, the Idaho judicial system moved from a multi-level court system to a two level system in which the functions of Probate, Justice and Police Courts were transferred to the District Court. Replacing these courts is a Magistrate Division within the District Court, staffed by magistrates under the administration of the District Judge.

The magistrate jurisdiction extends to both civil and criminal matters with civil jurisdiction limited to cases involving claims not in excess of \$2,500. Criminal jurisdiction of the magistrates is limited to misdemeanor and quasi criminal actions, the maximum punishment for which is a \$1,000 fine and/or confinement for less than one (1) year. Preliminary hearings to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant the case being bound over to District Court, bail-recognition hearings, and probable cause hearings for issuance of warrants for arrest and search and seizures are also within the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Division.

The District Judges have original jurisdiction in all cases and proceedings, and have appellate jurisdiction in cases appealed from the

Magistrate Division and from other agencies and boards in the state. The counties are represented by 24 District Judges, 60 Magistrates, six Administrator-Magistrates and one full time Administrator.

Since 1967, the Administrative Office of the Courts has been delegated responsibilities by the Supreme Court. These include:

- 1) Administration and supervision of the unified and integrated statewide court system.
- 2) Supervision of education programs for the judiciary.
- 3) Supervision of the Idaho State Law Library and Supreme Court Clerk's Office located in the Supreme Court Building.
- 4) Control and management of the Idaho Supreme Court Building.
- 5) Management and control of the fiscal operations of the Idaho Judicial System.
- 6) Development of a court management information system.

B. NEED FOR A COURT RECORDS AND INFORMATION SYSTEM

The functions which an Idaho court information system must attempt to serve include:

1) Statutory requirements. These are dictated by the legislature which requires the Administrative Office to collect, process and disseminate information concerning the number of filings, terminations and pending cases. In addition, the Administrative Office must report to the Supreme Court any need to expedite the handling of judicial business pending in the courts.

2) Operation requirements. These are the decisions that the Administrative Office must make to determine which business methods and systems employed in the offices of the judges and clerks can be more

effectively handled by computer processing.

3) Administrative requirements. These are the decisions that must be made concerning the performance and workload of the court. These decisions include availability and assignment of personnel, budgeting, and planning.

4) Interface requirements. These are the long and short term decisions of the court to supply information to external agencies or systems, e.g., whether defendant dispositional information should be provided to certain law enforcement agencies.

C. THE CASELOAD ANALYSIS SUPPORT SYSTEM

With the advent of the court modernization law the Administrative Assistant of the Court set about the task of developing court management reports to help improve court operations at all levels. This effort culminated in 1973, with the development of a statewide data reporting system using the computer capability of the State Auditor.

This statewide system, Caseload Analysis Support System (C.L.A.S.S.), is a first cut at automating the functions of the Idaho courts. It is intended to provide statistical data for management purposes at the trial court, district administrator and state office levels and also to provide limited case tracking capabilities. However, it is not intended to provide defendant tracking capabilities. The present system, after a full ten months of operation statewide, is providing the basic information that it is primarily designed to gather; that is, filing, dispositional and pending information.

Selected activity information on individual cases, from filing to disposition, is coded on an input form as the clerk learns of the activity.

Forms are mailed twice weekly to the State Administrative Office, where the data is keypunched and entered into the Auditor's computer. An edit program screens the data input for errors; accepted data becomes part of the permanent record on the file. Corrections are handled almost exclusively by a secretary and the keypunch operator.

Nine output reports are printed monthly from the system; most of them are statistical in nature (see Figure 1, p.6, C.L.A.S.S. Reports at Present). Several of these reports are available to the trial courts and judges.

The C.L.A.S.S. system is basically good. It is designed to provide a caseload inventory by type of case, disposition by type of case and number of cases pending. Elements of the design such as its single input form, daily entry, frequent updating and edit program are to be commended. In addition, the software is designed and written so that moderate changes could be incorporated easily and conversion to other similar hardware would not be difficult.

D. PROBLEMS WITH THE PRESENT COURTS INFORMATION SYSTEM

C.L.A.S.S. has developed problems. These result more from the evolutionary process of automating the system than from the software design itself. There is a high error rate, ranging from five percent to 43 percent per county, as indicated by a sample of input forms. This is not unusual in light of the facts that there was a very short training period and that the system has been in operation less than one year. It takes training and time for clerks, unfamiliar with automated procedures of recording, to learn the codes and become accustomed to the system.

Because of the high number of filings and relatively lower number

C.L.A.S.S. REPORTS AT PRESENT

Report number	Title	Description
190	Master Record Listing	A listing of all Class-3 cases; sent to district administrators and clerks monthly
200	Caseload and Activity Summary	An input-output summary by type of case, by judge, district, state; sent to judges and district administrator
220	Caseload and Activity Summary	Same as 200, but broken down by magistrate and district court as well; gives district and state totals; state office use only
230	Summary of New and Disposition Activity	By judge, county. State office use only
240	Input-Output Summary	New and disposed cases with % of change between them; also year to date. By magistrate court, district court, totals for county, district, state; state office use only
265	Case Aging Summary by County	Goes to district administrator and clerks along with #190
300	Summary of Non-Disp. Activities	By judge, county; state office use only
360	Motor Vehicle Violation counts	State office use only
350	Distribution of Fines and Fees	State office use only

FIGURE I

of terminations, there is a question as to the credibility of the data being captured. The Administrative Office of the Courts is most reluctant to publish figures from C.L.A.S.S. in an annual report until it is certain that they are substantially correct.

The output reports generated by C.L.A.S.S. are too extensive in their breakdown of data. These reports are readable for those familiar with the information system, but are difficult for people in the courts with limited knowledge of the system or computer logic.

C.L.A.S.S. addresses solely the statistical requirements of the Administrative Office. For the Administrative Office to develop a comprehensive record and information system, a more extensive design is necessary. This design must have the following capabilities:

- 1) Monitor a case through the judicial process.
- 2) Monitor a felony defendant through the judicial process.
- 3) Interface with the other criminal justice information systems.
- 4) Provide for effective accounting and financial administration of the courts.
- 5) Provide other related activities that should be included in the design as indicated by court system people once the initial system is designed.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations made by the technical assistance team are based on its analysis of Idaho's existing courts data system and the courts' information needs. The requirement to produce an annual report and the time necessary for system development and implementation require the following recommendations to be time dependent; recommendations

are classed as immediate, to obtain 1973 annual statistics; as soon as possible; and future--after 1974. The technical assistance team recommends:

A. IMMEDIATELY

1. For production of the 1973 annual report, audit all Class 3 open cases³:

- Print a listing of all Class 3 open cases as soon as possible.
- Send the list to all courts, explaining that a one-time year-end audit is being made. Instruct them to check each case listed and, if the case has been terminated in 1973, to so inform the State Office by sending coding forms with correct termination information.
- Send a memo to all district court administrators, explaining the audit list and instructions that have been mailed, and hold them responsible for seeing that the year-end audit is accomplished as quickly and accurately as possible.
- As correction sheets are mailed in, see that they are keypunched and updated as soon as possible. For this audit only, have errors corrected by phone rather than sending back the sheets to be corrected.
- Apprise the Administrative Director of the general validity of the 1973 figures.

If possible, manually recompile data from Report 200-1973 to replicate the sample format present as Figure A-1, p. 27. (See Appendix A, Suggested Changes for C.L.A.S.S.)

- The sample separates the category of new cases, as listed in Report 200, into two sub-classes: new (as defined by codes 10, 11, 12, and 15 in case activity column 1) and reopened (all other codes in case activity column 1).
- It also combines all disposition sub-classes (in Report 200: disp. w/o trial, jury trial, court trial and not ident.) into one category of closed cases.

3. Idaho Court Administrative Office defines a Class 3 Open Case to be a case which has aged beyond a predetermined critical time period. The critical time varies based on the type of case, i.e. felony, misdemeanor, civil, etc.

Of course, Report 200-1973 would not include adjustment cases, necessary in monthly reports.

It is suggested that, for the 1973 Annual Report, the sample formats be used, as manually compiled from Report 200-1973, for the state and district compilations. Report 200-1973, as is, can be reproduced for inclusion in the 1973 Annual Report. A footnote should be included explaining the difference in definition of new cases in the state summary as contrasted to the court or county summaries. After the audit is made, Report 265 can be run with high confidence that the number of cases in class 3 are correct.

2. Establish the following positions within the Information Systems Section of the Administrative Office and obtain the necessary people:

- ADP Coordinator - This person would be responsible for setting up and supervising work to be performed by the Information Systems Section. This person would perform a data coordinating role between courts and with other agencies and be responsible for training activities associated with data collection and processing. He should improve the instruction manual for coding and implement the instructions by on-site visits; make a concerted attempt to cut down the large error rate by a) sending the errors back for correction as is presently being done by the secretary and b) visiting the courts concerned, with the errors in hand, to discuss the coding problems the coder has and to try to eliminate possible confusion concerning the directions; and discuss, on a continuing basis, with clerks and district administrators their output report needs. This person would also be responsible for coordinating the implementation of any new systems.

Systems Analyst/Programmer- This person would be responsible for the design and development of new systems and for systems maintenance. Initial emphasis should be on producing easily readable and meaningful reports for use by court personnel, the Administrative Director and the Chief Justice. The courts' own analyst/programmer

is necessary to get simplified reports produced as soon as possible since the Auditor's ADP staff cannot respond in time.

- Secretary/Key Punch Operator - This person would be responsible for general secretarial duties for the Information Systems Section and for key punching when needed.
- Key Punch Operator - This person would be responsible for the bulk of the key punching for the Information Systems Section.

The Court should be informed that this level of person-power will be required for normal system operation and maintenance. Extensive additional resources will be required for new system design and development.

B. AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

3. Create and implement a case reporting feedback mechanism to inform those filling out the case reporting forms of the quantity and nature of their mistakes. A suggested format for an edit report is presented as Figure 2, p.11. This report would perform two functions: (1) display information relating to the evolution of the system; (2) compare statewide performance of those making inputs to the system. This report should be supplemented with an error list. The ADP Coordinator should use this report to indicate where instructional assistance is needed and provide this help on-site.

4. Make necessary changes to C.L.A.S.S. as described in Appendix A, Suggested Changes for C.L.A.S.S., to obtain more reliable input and more useful output. The importance of Appendix A must be emphasized. This appendix details needed coding and

INFORMATION FOR MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1973
 JURISDICTION JUDGE J. J. SMITH
 RUN ON NOVEMBER 11, 1973

C.L.A.S.S.

NOTES

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES

IN C.L.A.S.S.

THE FORMAT OF THE CASE SUMMARY

REPORT HAS BEEN CHANGED SO THAT THE ACTUAL

TIME PERIOD, RATHER THAN THE C.L.A.S.S. CODE,

IS DISPLAYED.

A NEW REPORT, CALLED WEIGHTED

ANALYSIS, IS INCLUDED. WE WOULD

APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS.

PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

FOR YOUR JURISDICTION STATEWIDE

INPUT FORMS

REQ.	SUBMITTED	PER-CENT	PER-CENT
22	10	45.0	92.0

EDIT

TOTAL ENTRIES	ERRORS	PER-CENT	PER-CENT
322	18	5.0	16.2

322 18 5.0 16.2

FIGURE 2

SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR AN EDIT REPORT

output format changes. The example output reports presented in Appendix A identify the minimum outputs which could be recommended for a number of court systems.

5. Design and conduct regular training programs for the systems' user-community; these programs should be on a formal basis supplemented by informal help. These sessions should be an integral part of the ADP Coordinator's responsibilities.

6. Rewrite the C.L.A.S.S. user's manual to reflect changes made to the C.L.A.S.S. system; additional graphic displays and examples of inputs should be included.

7. Bring existing documentation under the control of the Administrative Office of the Courts. Training manuals, system write-ups, and program listings should reside in the Supreme Court Building and be maintained by the Information Systems Section of the Administrative Office.

C. FUTURE

The technical assistance team further recommends:

8. Design and develop a separate case and offender tracking system with capability to interface with other criminal justice information systems. The first step should be to develop an offender-based system (felonies only) in Ada County. A discussion of an approach to a case tracking system is included in Appendix B.

9. The case and offender tracking system and, at a later date, the C.L.A.S.S. system should be executed on a computer dedicated solely to processing the information needs of the Idaho courts. Given the explicit needs of the Idaho courts, there are two viable alternatives: (1) the acquisition of a dedicated small computer, usually termed mini-computer. (2) the purchase of computer time from an existing facility. With the acquisition of an on-site computer, the Court would be in full control of its information processing. This computer would reside in the Supreme Court building and would process the information requirements of the Courts exclusively. Access to the computer, frequency of report generation, definition of new requirements and other related activities would all be controlled by the Administrative Office.

Costs for a dedicated computer--in this instance a mini-computer is sufficient--are roughly comparable⁴ to leasing time on a large computer, but of a different kind. A dedicated computer has a high initial cost and low maintenance costs; leasing has a low initial cost and high maintenance costs.

	Initial Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs
Dedicated mini-computer with software	\$130,000- 180,000	\$7,000 - 8,000
Rental with software	\$20,000- 50,000	\$30,000 - 48,000

⁴The term "roughly comparable" is used because many of the variables affecting costs must be refined.

A more detailed analysis of the factors relating to such a decision are contained in Appendix C, "Comparison of System Alternatives," and "Estimated Hardware Costs."

10. Expand the case and offender tracking system statewide and include misdemeanor and civil case history.

11. Develop a separate financial accounting system.

12. Explore and develop where desirable other application areas (e.g., jury selection and management systems).

IV. SUMMARY

The present courts information system consists of a statistical reporting system called C.L.A.S.S., a good first-cut statistical system. However, there are two pressing problem areas: the high input error rate and the difficulty in reading output reports. The system should be modified to correct these deficiencies. An immediate audit of certain classes of pending cases should be made to provide more accurate information for the 1973 Annual Report.

C.L.A.S.S. presently provides limited case tracking information and no offender tracking capability. Also C.L.A.S.S. does not have capability to interface with other criminal justice information systems. Efforts should be initiated to develop first a case and offender tracking system and later other information systems as needed.

C.L.A.S.S. is presently being run on the State Auditor's computer. The newly developed case and offender tracking system and C.L.A.S.S. should be run on a courts' mini-computer located at the Supreme Court Building.

Additional information processing staff should be obtained for the Administrative Office of the Courts. These additional resources are required to provide the necessary training and programming support.

The Idaho courts will require substantial funding increases for implementation of the recommendations to design and develop a case and offender tracking system, to increase the information processing staff, and to purchase a mini-computer.

APPENDIX A
SUGGESTED CHANGES FOR C.L.A.S.S.

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTED CHANGES FOR C.L.A.S.S.

This statewide system has been designed to obtain a great deal of statistical data. After 10 months of operation, the Administrative Office is receiving feedback from the clerks and judges which necessitates some modifications to C.L.A.S.S.

They include:

1. "Type of Case," when combined with the docket number, forms the identification number. It also permits statistical analysis and is essential for checking of keypunch errors at the Administrative Office. Each "Type of Case" code, when combined with the docket number, is counted as a case. A consistent input error has been reported whereby a case has been opened under one code but in further activity or disposition has been given a different code. This ultimately leaves the System with extra open cases that should be terminated.

The difficulty in using the type of case code as part of the identifier for purposes of counting was pointed up recently when codes 22, 27 and 29 were added. These codes are not exclusive and a DWI case, for example, may be interpreted as code 21 or 22. This has caused confusion among coders and created many errors. It is possible that, in correcting "Type of Case" errors, an overcount of new cases has occurred. It has been estimated by those in the system that this overcount may amount to as much as 20 to 30% of the total new cases.

Changing this feature of the system would be a major task and therefore is not recommended at this time. It is important to keep this problem in mind, however, for any future time when the system is

overhauled or a new system designed. A simple class of code as part of the identifier would be preferable. An example would be: codes for civil, criminal, traffic and other proceedings only. Under these broad categories, another set of classifications could be designed for type of case: domestic relations, support, DWI, etc. The type of case category, however, should not be part of the identifier in order to allow it to be expanded or condensed as needed.

It is suggested that no changes be made in the codes for type of case at the present time, with the exception that codes 22, 27 and 29 be eliminated, and a return made to the simpler version. Elimination of the codes will cause temporary confusion and some errors, but it should improve the validity of the data. Overlapping categories means that presently the counts of felonies, drug abuse, DWI, etc. are not correct.

To get an accurate count on particular charges, such as DWI and drugs, the column titled most serious charge should be used. To ensure that clerks will include the most serious charge on the input sheet, an edit should be programmed to throw out as an error all docket numbers bearing a felony or misdemeanor code if the type of charge is not included. The most serious offense charged will permit analysis of caseload trends, assignment of judges. This field should be a minimum of nine characters. Local ordinance codes should not be recorded, only state equivalent.

2. There is a serious overcounting in criminal and traffic cases, due to the fact that every count on a single charge, and every defendant on a single charge is counted as a single case.

It is suggested that the multiple defendants be continued but the multiple counts be eliminated. The system is not presently geared

to permit total information on each count and defendant to be collected, anyway. It would be preferable to have each case, regardless of the number of counts, closed when all counts have been dealt with.

This change carries with it the risk of appearing to have fewer criminal and traffic cases in 1974 than in 1973. The decision as to whether a single complaint or each count on a complaint is to be counted as a single case should be made as soon as possible. The longer the decision is delayed, the harder it will be to change...if it is found that the change is desired.

3. There is confusion as to the meaning of new cases. All cases entered into the system are being counted under this category regardless of what code they bear (from activity column 1). This poses problems for comparison purposes in years to come. New filings should be compared with new filings and reopened cases with reopened cases or else there will be distortion in the interpretation of the growth or decline in cases handled by the court.

It is recommended that most of the codes in column 1 be eliminated, leaving only codes 11, 12 and 15 to be counted as new cases and code 19 for all reopenings. This means that all transferred cases would be coded under 12, and would prevent confusion as to the difference between reciprocal and support cases, as is happening now. Code 10 probably should be eliminated as this code is causing confusion. The same instructions could prevail; that is, not to enter misdemeanor or traffic warrants until activity begins, but the case could be entered under 11 at that time. If 10 is not eliminated, it should be counted under new cases.

If it is felt desirable not to eliminate any of the codes in column 1, at the very least new categories should be designed for

the output reports. New cases would include 10, 11, 12 and 15; reopened cases would group all the others under it.

Note that transferred cases have been counted as new cases. This is optional, but most courts consider transferred cases as new to their court.

4. There are too many errors for a system of this size, even granting that the clerks are new at coding. The error rate is as high as 48% in a few courts. This is taking the time of two people, the equivalent of about 1 F.T.E., for correction of the errors. If these people were cutting the error rate, their time would be well spent, but that doesn't appear to be the case.

To get the error rate down, it is suggested that a number of action codes be eliminated so that validity can be maintained in the open and closed case counts. If activity codes are eliminated or curtailed, then emphasis can be placed on having the codes correct in the opening and disposition areas.

It is suggested that all codes in column 2 be eliminated. If it is felt that some codes be retained, only the following are recommended to be kept: codes 22, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

It is suggested that eight codes be eliminated from column 3; codes 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48 and 50.

It is suggested that codes 61, 62 and 63 be eliminated from column 4, and code 75 be eliminated from column 5.

It is further suggested that all codes be eliminated in column 7 except code 99. Code 99 can be used for all of the codes presently located as 91-97.

The disposition codes 46, 49, 51, 59, 64, 69, 71, 74, 81, 82, 83 and 84 have been retained and most of the activity codes have been struck.

5. The fines and fees input information should be eliminated. Not only will it simplify the work for the coders but it should be a good bargaining point to get them to input correct case data, since so much on the form has been eliminated.

If the data were valid, it might be useful to retain it. However, it not only appears to be invalid, but it is difficult to devise a way to audit it to even determine when it is valid. It is suggested that, if such economic data is essential, it be obtained from more authoritative sources: the state treasurer or the county auditor, etc.

Unless it is essential politically, the less data available concerning fines and fees the better. The legislature and the public should be disabused of the idea that the judicial system can pay for itself out of fines and fees. If justice is to be obtained, the citizenry must subsidize the court system.

6. The transfer information could be easily eliminated, so far as using the data is concerned. It doesn't appear to be too difficult a job for the clerks, so a decision might be made to retain it. However, for all that data input, there is no payoff for either the state office or the district administrator. It might better be left off.

7. Output reports should include mean and median time from filing to disposition for cases disposed of, and mean and median time from filing for all cases pending.

8. a. Combine programs SPC 0180 and SPC 0190, eliminating one program.

b. Combine programs SPC 0350 and SPC 0360, thus eliminating another program.

Alterations would have to be made to the JCL deck to reflect the

suggested changes. This could save time and money and still reflect a complete package.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN REPORTS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE:

#190 (Figure A-1) The change in #190 states right on the sheet what the clerk or district administrator is expected to do with the report. Only a minimum of information is listed, so that the clerk is not confused by detail that she cannot understand. This can continue to be sent to the courts monthly, as long as an education effort is made to explain why the cases over 120 days (or whatever time period has been chosen) should be checked.

#220 (Figure A-2) This report is an accounting in-and-out summary and replaces reports #200 and #220. The state summary pages are shown, with district and state totals, but the top format can be used to show type of case within judge, county, district categories. The important change is to take the pending count at the end of the month and start the same count at the beginning of the next month. This is essential to account for all cases. Also, reopened cases are counted as a separate category. Total Caseload is added as a separate category, defined as cases open beginning of month plus new and reopened cases. Adjustment cases are not added into it.

#221 (Figure A-3) This report is a new one. It is similar to report #221 except that it is a cumulative report. Only the first page is shown, as it can be made exactly like #220, with cumulative figures.

Note that adjustment cases in report #220 are any that do not bear the date of the processing month. Adjustment cases, in report #221, on the other hand, show all cases that were added or terminated in the previous year.

#190

MASTER RECORD LISTING

DATE

THESE CASES ARE LISTED ON THE C. L. A. S. S. SYSTEM AS BEING 120 DAYS OR OLDER, FROM FILING DATE. PLEASE CHECK THEM AND IF THEY HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF, SEND THE PROPER DISPOSITION CODE AND DATE ON THE REGULAR INPUT FORMS.

DISTRICT	COUNTY	CITY	TYPE OF CASE	DOCKET NUMBER	FILING DATE	CHARGE
1	05		11	4693	01/12/72	999 25

REPORT 220 - CASEFLOW MONTHLY SUMMARY REPORT, MONTH OF JANUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS MONTH	REOPENED CASES THIS MONTH	CASES CLOSED THIS MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN END OF MONTH	-----	TOTAL CASELOAD** THIS MONTH
CIVIL	1	50	10	20	5	25	5	55	-----	75
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
CRIMINAL NON-TRAFFIC	STATE									
	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
7										
	STATE									

-24-

*adjustment cases are corrections of previous errors
 **caseload equals cases open beginning of month plus new and reopened cases

FIGURE A-2

REPORT 220 - CASEFLOW MONTHLY SUMMARY REPORT, MONTH OF JANUARY - MAGISTRATES DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS MONTH	REOPENED CASES THIS MONTH	CASES CLOSED THIS MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN END OF MONTH	-----	TOTAL CASELOAD** THIS MONTH
TRAFFIC	1								-----	
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
OTHER PROCEEDINGS	STATE									
	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
7										
	STATE									

-25-

FIGURE A-2 (con't.)

REPORT 220 - CASEFLOW MONTHLY SUMMARY REPORT, MONTH OF JANUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASES	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS MONTH	REOPENED CASES THIS MONTH	CASES CLOSED THIS MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN END OF MONTH	-----	TOTAL CASELOAD** THIS MONTH
TOTAL CASES	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
	STATE									

-26-

FIGURE A-2 (con't.)

REPORT 220 - CASEFLOW MONTHLY SUMMARY REPORT, MONTH OF FEBRUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS MONTH	REOPENED CASES THIS MONTH	CASES CLOSED THIS MONTH	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN END OF MONTH	-----	TOTAL CASELOAD** THIS MONTH
CIVIL	1	55	10	25	5	25	10	60		85
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
	STATE									
CRIMINAL NON-TRAFFIC	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
	STATE									

-27-

*adjustment cases are corrections of previous errors
 **caseload equals cases open beginning of month plus new and reopened cases

FIGURE A-2 (con't.)

REPORT 221 - CASEFLOW CUMULATIVE REPORT, MONTH OF JANUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF YEAR	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS YEAR TO DATE	REOPENED CASES YEAR TO DATE	CASES CLOSED YEAR TO DATE	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN ----- END OF THIS MONTH	TOTAL YEAR TO DATE
CIVIL	1	50	10	20	5	25	5	55	75
	2								
	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	STATE								
CRIMINAL NON-TRAFFIC	1								
	2								
	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	STATE								

-28-

FIGURE A-3

REPORT 221 - CASEFLOW CUMULATIVE REPORT, MONTH OF FEBRUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	CASES OPEN BEGINNING OF YEAR	ADJUSTMENT* CASES ADDED	NEW CASES THIS YEAR TO DATE	REOPENED CASES YEAR TO DATE	CASES CLOSED YEAR TO DATE	ADJUSTMENT* CASES CLOSED	CASES OPEN ----- END OF THIS MONTH	CASELOAD** YEAR TO DATE
CIVIL	1	50	15	50	10	55	10	60	120
	2								
	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	STATE								
CRIMINAL NON-TRAFFIC	1								
	2								
	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	STATE								

#265

-29-

*adjustment cases are corrections of previous errors
 **caseload equals cases open beginning of year plus new and reopened cases

FIGURE A-3 (con't.)

#222 (Figure A-4) This report cannot be produced until a year's data has been processed. A computer report can be designed, or if necessary, the report can be manually produced by using the present year's report #221 and the past year's report #220. This report makes no attempt to balance across as report #221 does; it is basically a comparison report of important categories.

#265 (Figure A-5) This report should be changed so that the clerk or district administrator can read it easily. Therefore, instead of categories Class - 1, 2 and 3, the exact number of days should be in the title. The times should be consistent regardless of the type of case, unless a separate criminal or civil report is required. This report should be sent monthly along with report #190.

There are many other reports that could be recommended, but there is a danger of overkill in producing a lot of reports that no one looks at. The C.L.A.S.S. system is very close to doing that at the present time.

There is no problem in designing reports. The problem is in keeping them at a useful minimum. For that reason, only four computer reports and one manual report have been suggested at the present time.

If the Administrative Director can succeed in getting the district administrators to use these reports for management purposes, he will find that there will be no dearth of suggestions by them as to what other reports they might want. Copies of the suggested output reports for the future are contained at Figure A-6.

REPORT 222 - CASEFLOW CUMULATIVE COMPARISON REPORT, MONTH OF JANUARY - MAGISTRATE DIVISION

TYPE OF CASE	DISTRICT	NEW CASES THIS MONTH TO DATE		REOPENED CASES MONTH TO DATE		CASES CLOSED MONTH TO DATE		CASES OPEN ---- MONTH TO DATE		TOTAL CASELOAD MONTH TO DATE	
		Last This % Year	Year Change	Last This % Year	Year Change	Last This % Year	Year Change	Last This % Year	Year Change	Last This % Year	Year Change
CIVIL	1										
	2										
	3										
	4										
	5										
	6										
	7										
	STATE										
CRIMINAL NON-TRAFFIC	1										
	2										
	3										
	4										
	5										
	6										
	7										
	STATE										

FIGURE A-4

AGING OF PENDING CASES FROM FILING DATE

DISTRICT	-----TIME FROM FILING-----					TOTAL
	0-60	61-90	91-120	121-180	181-UP	
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
State						

FIGURE A-5

SUGGESTED REPORTS FOR THE FUTURE

Annual Statistical Reports

1. An in-and-out summary for the year, similar to report #220.
2. Criminal terminations by type of disposition.
3. Civil terminations by type of disposition.
4. Time analysis of year's terminations by general categories of disposition - criminal:
 - a) days from filing to arraignment
 - b) days from arraignment to disposition
 - c) days from filing to disposition
5. Time analysis of year's terminations by general categories of disposition-civil:
 - a) days from filing to trial-set date
 - b) days from trial-set date to disposition
 - c) days from filing to disposition
6. No. of filings and dispositions, by general type, per judge and magistrate, for the year.
No. of pending cases at the end of year, per judge and magistrate.
7. Time analysis of all year's filings:
 - a) number and percent closed in 60-120 days
 - b) number and percent closed in 121-180 days
 - c) number and percent closed 181-365 days
 - d) number still open

Statistical Reports - Semi-Annual

1. Time analysis of pending cases with arraignment dates: no. of days from arraignment date, in traffic, felony and misdemeanor cases.

FIGURE A-6

2. Time analysis of pending cases where trial date has been set:
no. of days from trial-set date - in civil and criminal cases

Accounting Reports

FIGURE A-6 (con't.)

APPENDIX B

AN APPROACH TO A CASE TRACKING SYSTEM

APPENDIX B

AN APPROACH TO A CASE TRACKING SYSTEM

The task of designing a system for case tracking data capture and flow is complex and difficult at best. In designing such a system, a major consideration should be that those who need or regularly make use of data should receive it routinely; those who do not consistently use the data should not receive it as a routine matter. The other factor is to eliminate or reduce redundant data capturing activities. Once an item has been collected by an agency (generally the first agency in point of processing a case), the data should flow through to subsequent agencies and not be regenerated in later stages.

A. Arrest Stage Data

The typical criminal case is commenced by an arrest. This then becomes the point of origin of the case history data system. The tasks at this stage are an analysis of the function of the arresting officer in the criminal justice process and the design of a data capture sequence which will minimize data required for subsequent steps in the process.

To determine the data needed at the point of arrest, one must analyze the situation in terms of alternative possible occurrences between the arrest and the next stage. If nothing intervenes before the next stage, thus minimizing the data capture function of the arresting officer, only the gross objective characteristics of the subject need be recorded. Those items are:

- 1) Suspect's Name
- 2) Residence Address

- 3) Date of birth
- 4) Sex
- 5) Race
- 6) Color hair, eyes
- 7) Weight
- 8) Height
- 9) Vehicle involved - plate no./state operator's license no.

The arresting officer should also include data linking suspect to a particular offense; this information comprises

- 10) Name of complainant(s)/witness/victim
- 11) Address of same
- 12) Description of criminal act

Booking Stage Data

Assuming the suspect is brought in, the next step in processing is to further verify the identity of the individual, formally charge him, determine his criminal record.

The data items used in this case may be:

- 1) Date of birth
- 2) Place of birth
- 3) Marital status
- 4) Name of spouse
- 5) Address of spouse
- 6) Children
- 7) Occupation
- 8) Employer's name
- 9) FBI number

- 10) ICID number
- 11) Parent's name

Arraignment State Data

Before treating the question of disposition of cases before arraignment, a brief treatment of the arraignment function is needed, since the bulk of cases advance to this step. At this point the analysis becomes more complex than the previous procedure because the functions to be served become more numerous. To make the distinction among subprocesses more clear, the arraignment stage is broken into several subprocesses.

A. Calendaring. This involves processing of the defendant presented for arraignment, taking action against those not present, estimating time required for processing, and making a record of the actions taken. The clerk must prepare a listing of the persons to be arraigned. The list, taken from arresting agency reports, must enable the court and agency to correlate records and to lay the foundation for the courts tracking of defendants in process. Data may include the following:

- 1) Defendant's name
- 2) Defendant's address
- 3) Defendant's age
- 4) Arresting agency
- 5) Date arrested
- 6) Charge lodged at booking
- 7) Agency defendant ID number
- 8) Prisoner status (held/out on bail)

Those cases which will require further processing beyond the arraignment stage would involve additional data recordings to permit

assessment of the status of each, to facilitate productive reappearances, etc. Among the data related to reappearance scheduling are:

- 1) Name and telephone of defense counsel
- 2) Detention status
- 3) Date of next appearance
- 4) Judge before whom next appearance is scheduled

From the data gathered for the arraignment calendar, the clerk's office can prepare the calendars for subsequent appearances.

B. Appearance Preparation

The clerk is the primary agent for the above calendaring functions and additional recording functions. The responsibility of the office is the maintenance of case reporting which would possibly include the following data:

- 1) Defendant's name
- 2) Defendant's address
- 3) Court case identification number
- 4) Arresting agency
- 5) Date of arrest
- 6) Charges
- 7) Defense counsel
- 8) Date of arraignment
- 9) Date of defendant release from custody
- 10) Date and result of each appearance
- 11) Case age

The clerk should maintain readily accessible records indicating:

- 1) Type of each case pending
- 2) Charges

- 3) Status of case
- 4) Latest detention status
- 5) Judge assigned
- 6) Dates, number and outcome of appearances
- 7) Defense counsel
- 8) Prosecuting attorney

The clerk should be in a position to report monthly all dispositions, by name of case, indicating each

- 1) Date of arrest
- 2) Date arraigned
- 3) Date of disposition
- 4) Nature of disposition: plea, trial, convicted/acquitted, dismissed, charge(s) found guilty, etc.
- 5) Sentence imposed for each defendant convicted

The clerk should be prepared to report the number of cases pending at the beginning of each month and to rank pending cases by age and by age/status within all cases.

A simple means of maintaining these records is to subdivide the list into functional status listings as follows:

- Awaiting arraignment
- Motion calendar
- Pre-trial calendar
- Trial calendar
- Awaiting sentence

This information should be available to assist the Court Administrators in managing the courts and evaluating its operation.

C. The Prosecution Stage

The prosecuting attorney is primarily responsible for the maintenance of evidentiary data. The vehicle for this is the prosecuting attorney's case file which is comprised of identifying material, notes and statements of witnesses, lists of exhibits, copies of documents, etc. Since the file is basically confidential in nature, its maintenance is beyond the scope of this study.

The prosecuting attorney, however, obviously figures large in the calendaring process since his office appears in every case. While the initiative for moving a case lies with the court, the processing must be one of cooperative interaction among the judge, prosecuting attorney and defense counsel. No one party can dictate the order of cases at any processing stage. Also, the prosecutor must be included because he depends on reasonably precise data to answer substantive questions which, if left unanswered, would frustrate the entire process.

Many other reports could be formulated, but the compilation of an exhaustive list would serve no present purpose. The point of this discussion is that the court must provide for a detailed system analysis before conclusions are set in concrete.

COMPARISON OF SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES

<u>CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>MINI-COMPUTER</u>	<u>RENTAL OF COMPUTER TIME</u>
<u>COST</u>	<u>HARDWARE</u>	<u>ON-LINE COSTS</u>
The cost figures are for a system capable of processing the existing C.L.A.S.S. system in Ada County.	CPU (40k bytes) Disc (10m bytes) Tape (2 drives) Card Reader CRT (2) Terminal Printer High Speed Printer Purchase Cost \$94,000	The rental cost for the use of the State Auditor's computer is not available. Vendors are hesitant to give quotes without volumes. The estimate of costs is based on previous use of terminals and the conversations with commercial vendors. \$2,000 - \$3,000 per month
	<u>BATCH COSTS</u>	<u>BATCH COSTS</u>
	Not applicable	The costs to generate reports and ancillary activities \$500.00 - \$1,000.00 per month
	<u>SOFTWARE</u>	<u>SOFTWARE</u>
	System Definition Programming Documentation \$30,000 - \$80,000	System Definition \$10,000 - \$30,000 Programming Documentation \$10,000 - \$20,000
	<u>SYSTEM MAINTENANCE</u>	<u>SYSTEM MAINTENANCE</u>
	An Analyst/Programmer will be needed.	The Court must either employ their own Analyst/Programmer or retain an Analyst/Programmer who is familiar with the system.

APPENDIX C

COMPARISON OF SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES AND HARDWARE COSTS

CHARACTERISTIC

MINI-COMPUTER

RENTAL OF
COMPUTER TIME

ADVANTAGES

DEDICATED SYSTEM

The judiciary have absolute control over the usage of system. Control of system definition, implementation, interfacing with other Criminal Justice Systems will reside in the Administrative Office.

When the system is operational, the frequency of all activities (e.g. report generation) will be controlled by the Administrative Office.

PRIVACY

All of the components relating to the system will reside in the Supreme Court Building. Access to this machine can be controlled by the Administrative Office. More importantly, the Administrative Office will be able to specify the logic for transfer of information to a larger Criminal Justice system.

LOW MAINTENANCE

Once the initial outlay for hardware been made, the cost of maintaining the hardware is very reasonable (for a \$100,000 worth of hardware, the monthly maintenance would be approximately \$600 per month).

SOFTWARE

The large scale computer manufacturers, best illustrated by IBM, offer their customers much more comprehensive software (programs and procedures). In addition to being more comprehensive the software tends to be more reliable.

CONTINUITY

IBM will surely be on the American business scene 10 years from today. Many of the mini-computer manufacturers will also be here; some, however, will cease production of mini-computers.

CHARACTERISTIC

MINI-COMPUTER

RENTAL OF
COMPUTER TIME

DISADVANTAGES

HIGH INITIAL COSTS

The purchase of a mini-computer system necessitates a significant capital investment. (Approximately \$100,000 is needed to purchase the equipment necessary to process the State of Idaho's information needs.)

DOWNTIME

Few of the mini-computer manufacturers have field engineering offices in Salt Lake City. As a result, service can be expected to lag behind IBM service. Four to eight hours will probably elapse before a serviceman arrives on site.

CONTROL OF SYSTEM

The Administrative Office might not have full control of the system. For example, if the State Auditor's computer is overloaded, the Court system might be forced off the computer. Privacy of the Court's records might be violated. None of the above may occur. Indeed, it is conceivable that no control will be sacrificed at all.

Yet, losing some or most of the control is a real possibility. There are precedents. LEAA publicly supports comprehensive criminal justice systems in which the Courts are an integral part. When any organization is subsumed by another, control is often assumed by the larger entity. A New Jersey judicial system was designed to be on-line most of the working day. In actuality, the system is on-line 1-2 hours a day if at all.

HIGH OPERATING COSTS

Monthly operating costs should be at least \$2,500.

ESTIMATED HARDWARE COSTS

<u>Device</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Additional Increment Cost</u>
Central Processing Unit (CPU) 40,000 bytes	\$18,000	Each additional 16,000 bytes is \$5,000
Disk Drive 10,000,000 bytes	\$22,000	Each additional 10,000,000 bytes is \$16,000
Tape Drive	\$11,000	
Card Reader	\$ 3,000	
Cathode Ray Terminal (CRT)	\$ 4,500	
Terminal Printer	\$ 4,000	
High Speed Printer (300 LPM)	\$16,000	

NOTE - These costs are representative of prevailing prices. Quoting average costs is often deceiving because the performance of the equipment differs significantly.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS

Council of State Court Representatives

Alabama Howell T. Heflin Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Maine Charles B. Rodway, Jr. Adm. Asst. to the Chief Justice	Oregon Loren D. Hicks State Court Administrator
Alaska Jay A. Rabinowitz Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Maryland William H. Adkins, II Dir., Adm. Office of the Courts	Pennsylvania A. Evans Kephart State Court Administrator
Arizona James Duke Cameron Vice Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Massachusetts Walter H. McLaughlin Chief Justice, Superior Court	Rhode Island Walter J. Kane Ct. Administrator, Supreme Court
Arkansas C. R. Huie, Exec. Secy. Judicial Dept., Supreme Court	Michigan Thomas M. Kavanagh Chief Justice, Supreme Court	South Carolina Joseph R. Moss Chief Justice, Supreme Court
California Donald R. Wright Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Minnesota Richard E. Klein State Court Administrator	South Dakota Fred R. Winans Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Colorado Harry O. Lawson Court Administrator, Jud. Dept.	Mississippi R. P. Sugg Associate Justice, Supreme Court	Tennessee T. Mack Blackburn Exec. Secy., Supreme Court
Connecticut John P. Cotter Associate Justice, Supreme Court	Missouri Fred L. Henley Judge, Supreme Court	Texas Thomas M. Reavley Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Delaware Daniel L. Herrmann Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Montana James T. Harrison Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Utah Allan E. Mecham Admstr. and Clerk, Supreme Court
Florida James B. Ueberhorst State Courts Administrator	Nebraska Paul W. White Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Vermont Lawrence J. Turgeon Ct. Administrator, Supreme Court
Georgia Benning M. Grice Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Nevada Howard W. Babcock Judge, District Court	Virginia Lawrence W. l'Anson Justice, Supreme Court
Hawaii Tom T. Okuda Adm. Ser. Dir., District Courts	New Hampshire John W. King Justice, Superior Court	Washington Orris L. Hamilton Justice, Supreme Court
Idaho Charles R. Donaldson Justice, Supreme Court	New Jersey Frederick W. Hall Justice, Supreme Court	West Virginia Charles H. Haden, II Justice, Supreme Ct. of Appeals
Illinois Joseph H. Goldenhersh Justice, Supreme Court	New Mexico John B. McManus, Jr. Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Wisconsin Horace W. Wilkie Justice, Supreme Court
Indiana Norman F. Arterburn Chief Justice, Supreme Court	New York Richard J. Bartlett State Adm. Judge	Wyoming Glenn Parker Chief Justice, Supreme Court
Iowa W. W. Reynoldson Justice, Supreme Court	North Carolina Bert M. Montague Dir., Adm. Office of the Courts	District of Columbia Gerard D. Reilly Chief Judge, Court of Appeals
Kansas David Prager Justice, Supreme Court	North Dakota Harvey B. Knudson Associate Justice, Supreme Court	Guam Joaquin C. Perez Chief Judge, Island Court
Kentucky James S. Chenault Judge, 25th Judicial District	Ohio C. William O'Neill Chief Justice, Supreme Court	Puerto Rico Jose Trias Monge Chief Justice, Supreme Court
Louisiana John A. Dixon, Jr. Associate Justice, Supreme Court	Oklahoma William A. Berry Justice, Supreme Court	Virgin Islands Cyril Michael Presiding Judge, Municipal Court

END