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I. INTRODUCTION

American University, in partnership with the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the Pretrial Services Resource Center and the Justice Management Institute, has established a national-scope technical assistance project, funded by the Department of Justice (Bureau of Justice Assistance), to serve criminal courts and related judicial system agencies.

In order to establish service delivery priorities for the CCTAP project, the partner organizations undertook an initial national survey of technical assistance needs among various categories of practitioners. The American University Justice Programs Office surveyed state-level Prosecutor Coordinator Offices and Administrative Offices of the Courts. The Justice Management Institute interviewed Trial Court Administrators by telephone, and the Pretrial Services Resource Center (PSRC) polled both the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and the American Jail Association (AJA). Selected Public Defender Offices, trial court judges, and pretrial services agencies also were surveyed, and the results of these efforts will be incorporated into this analysis at a later date, along with additional local prosecutor and trial court administrator responses.

Methodology
This initial needs assessment survey concentrated on the directors, officers and key committee chairs of the national membership associations of the practitioner groups surveyed. This was done on the theory that individuals who are among the elected and appointed leaders of their national professional associations would be among the better informed members of their professions about developments in the field, and would tend to be widely distributed geographically. The survey elicited responses from 56 individuals in four broad practitioner categories: state court administration, trial court administration, prosecution, and local corrections. These individuals represented 37 states and every region of the country, and provided in excess of 700 responses identifying technical assistance and training needs. In order to facilitate analysis of these responses, they were grouped into sixteen subject area classifications. The following is a list of these classifications, with a sampling of the responses included in each:

ADR/ Special Courts
- Drug Courts
- Family and Juvenile Programs
- Alternative Dispute Resolution

Budget/ Fiscal
- Lack of access to federal money
- Insufficient resources
- Trial Court funding
Case Management
♦ Increasing caseload
♦ Need for additional Judges to handle the caseload
♦ Caseflow Management

Consolidation/ Restructuring
♦ Consolidation of clerk of court offices
♦ Reorganization
♦ Redistricting

Customer Service
♦ Improved customer service
♦ Training for more efficient customer service

Diversity/ Gender
♦ Sexual Harassment Training
♦ Court Interpreters for the Deaf
♦ Gender/ Ethnic toleration training

Fine Collection
♦ Collecting child support fees
♦ Collecting Court ordered fines

General Court Management
♦ Risk Management
♦ Change Management
♦ Simplifying the court process

Interagency Communication
♦ Communication methods
♦ Develop working relationship with the executive and legislative branches
♦ Better communication with the trial courts

Legislative Issues
♦ Megan’s law and its ramifications
♦ Sex Offender Registration
(for the APPA and the AJA only)

Publications
♦ Training manuals
♦ Materials for the public

Public Perception
♦ Educating the public about the court system
♦ Public service mentality
♦ Public trust and confidence
Sentencing
- Juvenile sentencing guidelines
- Sentencing concerns
- Three strike and death penalty cases

Staff/ Human Resources
- Tension among staff
- Staff turnover
- Helping all employees understand the significance of their work

Technology
- Technology training
- Automated docket system training
- Website development

Training
- Training for new prosecutors
- More extensive training for prison personnel
  (for the APPA and the AJA only)

The analysis is presented in four sections, each consisting of text followed by a series of graphs and charts, as follows:

II. State Administrative Offices of the Courts
This section looks only at the Administrative Offices of the Courts’ responses in the category “your office”.

III. Prosecution Function
This section examines the prosecutors’ responses to the Needs Assessment.

IV. Local Corrections
In this part of the analysis, the American Jail Association (AJA) and the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) are compared for the sections “local agency” and “correctional/probation offices throughout the region, state, and nationwide” from the Needs Assessment.

V. Local Courts
The final section presents the responses of three main groups-- the Administrative Offices of the Courts, the APPA, and the National Association for Court Management (NACM)-- concerning the technical assistance needs of local courts.

Appendix A contains a copy of the Needs Assessment instrument that, with minor modifications, was sent to each of the practitioner groups; Appendices B through E present a listing of all of the responses by the several practitioner groups surveyed; and Appendix F is a chart displaying the states represented by the various categories of respondents to the survey.
II. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES OF THE COURTS: YOUR OFFICE

Fifty State Court Administrators were sent the CCTAP Needs Assessment Questionnaire and a total of twenty-six states returned the assessment. Questions one, two, three, and five were grouped into one question to facilitate the analysis. The responses to questions six and seven also were analyzed in the aggregate. 

Question #1
What have been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Question #2
What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified in your office and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Question #3
What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Question #5
What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office or the local courts in your state during the next year?

For this area, there were a total of 240 responses. The overwhelming majority of answers were in the area of technology with a 27% response rate. For example, Idaho expressed a need for technological solutions to providing increasing levels of services. Montana stated that there is a "continued effort to automate the courts to a level that allows electronic transfer of needed information to other branches of the Montana government." New Hampshire desires training in the use of an automated docket system.

Case management and general court management tied at second place for the number of responses. New Jersey stated that, "providing local courts with training opportunities to clarify and institutionalize improved methods of efficient case processing and record keeping" was a concern in the area of case management. An example of general court management comes from Hawaii, with

---

1 Question number four in the needs assessment was omitted in the analysis due to the nature of the question. Question three asked about significant interagency needs offices have had to address over the past several years; question number four followed up by asking if any of these issues have been resolved. Most responses to the latter were in the form of "none", "all", or "some."

2 A copy of the Needs Assessment Questionnaire is presented in Appendix A. With minor modifications, this form was used to survey state AOC directors, state Prosecution Coordinators, and representatives of the American Jail Association and the American Probation and Parole Association.
the issue of “simplifying the court process and standardizing forms.”

Other areas that rated high in responses to this question include: budget/fiscal concerns, interagency communication, and ADR/ Special Courts. In the latter area, for example, California noted operational issues with drug courts, juvenile and family courts, and domestic violence courts.

**Question #6**

Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

**Question #7**

Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the major problems or issues related to the functioning of State AOCs - or the judicial system as a whole that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

For this question, a pie chart was created to graphically display the various categories of technical assistance needs; therefore, responses are presented in terms of percentages. As with the other questions, technology elicited the most responses at 23%. General court management, public perception, interagency communication, and case management tied at 10%. Texas stated that “we have a new Judicial Committee on information technology that has to set policy for the use of technology and has to set standards for technology.” Mississippi would like help on information technology applications in use by other state’s court systems. New Jersey commented on the issue of their technological difficulties stating that the main concern was to “strengthen the exchange of information and collaborative efforts which involve resource sharing and the linking of computerized data collection systems among government organizations and other community service agencies.”

Utah would like assistance in preparing and managing its budget, while Hawaii would like help in collecting court ordered fines and fees. In the public perception category, Louisiana spoke for many, stating, “The need to restore the public’s faith in the court seems to be a top priority of most Administrative Offices of the Courts.” Tennessee was in agreement with many states on the issue of increased caseload levels and consequently greater expenditures required to operate the courts.
Significant Management, Training - Related, and Interagency Issues of the Administrative Offices of the Courts

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Customer Service
- Diversity/ Gender
- Fine Collection
- General Court Management
- Interagency Communication
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology

Based on 240 Responses
Issues Amenable to Assistance From the CCTAP Project: Administrative Offices of the Courts

- Technology (23%)
- ADR/ Special Courts (8%)
- Budget/ Fiscal (12%)
- Case Management (10%)
- Fine Collection (2%)
- General Court Management (10%)
- Sentencing (5%)
- Staff/ Human Resources (8%)
- Public Perception (10%)
- Publications (2%)
- Interagency Communication (10%)
III. PROSECUTION FUNCTION

A total of fifty needs assessments were sent to the prosecutor contact in each state, with nine prosecutors responding as of the time of this writing. Graphic representation of subject areas of expressed technical assistance needs are presented in pie chart format; therefore, the responses are calculated in terms of percentages. One category was added for the analysis of the prosecutors needs assessment, which was “training.” Prosecutors requested training mainly for new personnel. Again, questions one, two, three, and five were combined in the analysis, as were questions six and seven.

Question #1
What have been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your agency has had to address over the past several years?

Question #2
What have been the most significant training-related needs identified in your agency over the past several years?

Question #3
What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your agency has had to address over the past several years?

Question #5
What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your agency during the next year?

For this question, technology constituted 25% and training 22% of the responses. Other significant areas include budget/ fiscal, case management, and general court management categories. Hawaii expressed concern with technology: “Updating the computer system within the office and getting connected to a larger server. The previous server limited the type and amount of software that we were able to work with.” Hawaii expressed training concerns by stating that the “training of new personnel as a result of recent loss of experienced attorneys was a problem.” Michigan also expressed this idea when explaining that “primarily the training issues can have a big impact on our cases and how they are processed.”

Georgia reported these issues:” In the area of technology, there are three pressing needs: upgrading of hardware and software in individual offices, selection and installation of a true case management system, and there is a real need to train personnel in the use of case management software. Hawaii expressed training concerns by stating that the “training of new personnel as a result of recent loss of experienced attorneys was a problem.” Michigan also expressed this idea when explaining that “primarily the training issues can have a big impact on our cases and how they are processed.” Missouri expressed this budget/ fiscal issue: “We are a two-person agency that services over 450 prosecutors, assistants and support staff. Our annual budget is approximately $160,000, so resources and manpower are limited.”

Question #6
Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?
Question #7
Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the significant problems or issues related to the functioning of your type of agency - or the judicial system as a whole - that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

For this question, technology and training were both tied at 29% each. Michigan would like to have “networking between the primary aspects of the criminal justice system - the local courts, prosecutors, and public defenders”, for interagency communication. Connecticut requests help in victim rights training, supervisory training, and most types of program evaluation. Missouri requests assistance in writing resource publications for local offices. Arizona explained the budget/ fiscal crisis by stating: “The entire criminal justice system in Arizona is struggling with insufficient resources to handle our increase in crime. In the last four years, all of the police agencies have received additional funding from local or federal initiatives while the balance of the criminal justice system - prosecutors, defense, courts and probation - has not. In jurisdictions such as Maricopa County - where population, crime and police officers are increasing - a critical situation has been created.”

Georgia would like help in the technology area by “developing or identifying methods that will enable a judicial circuit to track documents through the system from arrest to final disposition with a minimum of input and maximum sharing of common data elements.”
Significant Management, Training - Related, and Interagency
Issues for Prosecutors

Consolidation/Restructuring
Interagency Communication
Training
Staff/ Human Resources
Technology
General Court Management
Diversity/ Gender
Case Management
Budgt/ Fiscal

Based on 60 Responses
Issues Amenable to Assistance From the CCTAP Project: Prosecutors

- Budget/Fiscal: 18%
- Interagency Communication: 12%
- Technology: 29%
- Training: 29%
- General Court Management: 6%
- Publications: 6%
IV. LOCAL CORRECTIONS

In this section, the American Jail Association (AJA) and the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) surveys, conducted by the Pretrial Services Resource Center (PSRC), were analyzed in the categories “local agency” and “correctional/probation offices throughout the region, state, and nationwide.” The PSRC disseminated 24 surveys to the American Jail Association, and six surveys were returned. PSRC also sent 43 members of the American Probation and Parole Association surveys, and 11 were returned. For this analysis, two additional categories of responses were added—“jail overcrowding” and “legislative issues.” There are two analyses for each question, except number seven, in this section. The questions are broken down into the responses for “local agency” and “probation/correctional office throughout the state and nation.” Again, questions one, two, three, and five were grouped together, and questions six and seven were combined and analyzed together.

Question #1
What have been the most significant management and operational issues or needs that your local agency, the local courts and probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide have had to address over the past several years?

Question #2
What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified by or for your office, and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Question #3
What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs that your agency, and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Question #5
What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office and the local courts in your state during the next year?

In the “local agency” area, there are several noteworthy observations. The overwhelming number of responses for the AJA is in the category of jail overcrowding. Florida spoke for many states when it responded that jail crowding affects the entire criminal justice system. Technology was the second most popular response for the AJA. The APPA’s most frequent response was in the area of budget/fiscal concerns. Connecticut responded that there was a “lack of funding for community corrections’ criminal justice as a continuum of services.” Staff/human resources was the second largest concern for the APPA in the local agency. Common responses in this category includes a high turnover rate for the staff and a lack of staff to carry out the department’s mission.

In the section “correctional/probation offices throughout the state and nation”, the responses yielded similar results as the section “local agency.” The AJA again had the most responses for the category jail overcrowding, and the majority of responses for the APPA were in the budget/fiscal region. Common responses in the technology field included technology upgrades and maintaining office automation and technology. Several states cited concern with the newly enacted Megan’s law.
in the legislative issues category.

**Question #6**
Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

**Question #7**
What other major problems or issues that have not been asked related to the functioning of pretrial agencies, or the judicial system as a whole - that you feel have not yet been asked, which you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

In the section “local agency,” the APPA would like assistance with training. Illinois stated that there was a need to “train judges to assess the impact of their decisions on victims and jails, and train people to mediate more.” Florida felt that there was a need for additional training for officers who supervise offenders released from prison to probation. The AJA respondents felt that issues such as jail overcrowding, publications, and staff/human resources issues were amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project.

In the area of correctional/probation offices throughout the state and nation, the APPA again felt training was an issue that the CCTAP project could address. Illinois summarized this sentiment as follows: “A series of workshops to delineate and discuss operational changes to comply with SB363, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act, i.e. record keeping, fingerprinting, teen court, juvenile justice council, etc. Training currently is a ‘mishmash’ of disorganized lists of topics of limited relevance with even less availability. A training institute could be developed for relevant curricula for new officers.”
Significant Management, Training-Related, and Interagency Issues
For the APPA and the AJA: Local Agency

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Diversity/ Gender
- Interagency Communication
- Jail Overcrowding
- Legislative Issues
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology
- Training

Bar chart showing the percentage of significant issues for APPA and AJA.

- APPA
- AJA
Significant Management, Training - Related, and Interagency Issues for the APPA and the AJA: Correctional/Probation Offices Throughout the State and Nation

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Diversity/ Gender
- Interagency Communication
- Jail Overcrowding
- Legislative Issues
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology
- Training

APP:

AJA:

0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 40% 45%
Issues Amenable to Assistance From the CCTAP Project: APPA and AJA

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Diversity/ Gender
- Interagency Communication
- Jail Overcrowding
- Legislative Issues
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology
- Training

- APPA
- AJA
V. LOCAL COURTS

The final section is slightly more complex than the preceding sections, due to the fact that three different agencies are being compared across questions. The Administrative Offices of the Courts (AOC) responses are being looked at with those of the American Association of Probation and Parole (APPA) and the National Association for Court Management (NACM). All the agencies were analyzed for the responses marked “local courts” in their needs assessment survey. As with the preceding sections of this analysis, responses to questions one, two, three, and five were combined, as were responses to questions six and seven.

Question #1
What has been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Question #2
What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified for your office and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Question #3
What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Question #5
What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office or the local courts in your state during the next year?

The most frequent response concerning local court needs among NACM respondents was technology, at 35%, followed by staff/human resources (17%), and a three-way tie among budget/fiscal, case management, and diversity/gender (all at about 12%). The most common APPA response was sentencing (33%), followed by case management (24%) and interagency communication (13%). The most prevalent local court needs identified by AOC respondents were general court management (25%), technology (13%), and, at approximately 10% each, ADR/special courts, case management, and budget/fiscal issues.

Question #6
Would any of the problems noted in question #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

Question #7
Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the major problems or issues related to the functioning of State AOCs - or the judicial system as a whole- that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP service do you feel would be most helpful?

All groups felt that technology was the issue most amenable to assistance from the CCTAP.
project. Mississippi would like assistance on the pros and cons of different criminal tracking software in use by other states. The NACM respondent from Oklahoma stated that “they have a tremendous backlog in information technology and that they would benefit from an independent presentation on what systems are out there.” The APPA respondent from Florida would like assistance with calculating jail demographics. Among the AOC respondents, New Jersey would like to strengthen the exchange of information and collaborative efforts which involve resource sharing and the linking of computerized data collection systems among government organizations and other community service agencies.

Other major subject areas with which NACM respondents felt that the CCTAP project could help were staff/human resources, diversity/gender concerns, case management, and ADR/special courts. APPA respondents felt that, after technology, the CCTAP project could be most helpful to local courts in the subject areas of interagency communication, sentencing, case management, and public perception. Finally AOC respondents felt that, following technology, the need areas facing local courts that were most amenable to CCTAP assistance were public perception, and four others given equal levels of response: interagency communication, case management, budget/fiscal, and ADR/special courts.
Local Court Needs
Significant Management, Training-Related, and Interagency Issues of the NACM, APPA, and the AOC

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Customer Service
- Diversity/ Gender
- Fine Collection
- General Court Management
- Interagency Communication
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology

[Bar chart showing percentages for different needs across NACM, APPA, and AOC]
Local Court Needs
Issues Amenable to Assistance From the CCTAP Project:
The NACM, APPA, and the AOC

- ADR/ Special Courts
- Budget/ Fiscal
- Case Management
- Consolidation/ Restructuring
- Customer Service
- Diversity/ Gender
- Fine Collection
- General Court Management
- Interagency Communication
- Publications
- Public Perception
- Sentencing
- Staff/ Human Resources
- Technology
APPENDIX B
CCTAP NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY:
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES OF THE COURTS

Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Abbreviation</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASC=</td>
<td>ADR/ Special Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/F=</td>
<td>Budget/ Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM=</td>
<td>Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/R=</td>
<td>Consolidation/ Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS=</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/G=</td>
<td>Diversity/Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC=</td>
<td>Fine Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM=</td>
<td>General Court Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Abbreviation</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC=</td>
<td>Interagency Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB=</td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP=</td>
<td>Public Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN=</td>
<td>Sentencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/HR=</td>
<td>Staff/ Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC=</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA=</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What has been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

**Your Office:**

**Mississippi**
- Design of new statistical/ financial data system TEC

**Oregon**
- Caseload, technology, insufficient resources, communication with other agencies, Internet, sentencing CM, TEC, B/F, ICC, TEC, SEN

**Vermont**
- Communication methods, meeting resource needs, technological advances, providing training and education to staff, keeping abreast of technological advances, family court, developing efficient ways to process large volumes of cases, MIS, increasing case volume

**ICC, TEC, GCM, ASC, TEC**

**Arizona**
- Finding sufficient resources, long range strategic plan, dealing with attacks on the independence of the judiciary, coping with new juvenile legislation, enforcing court orders and collections, establishing performance standards, educating the public about the judiciary, implementing a statewide automated system B/F, GCM, FC, S/HR, PP, TEC

**Washington**
- Restructuring the organization of our information systems TEC

**Idaho**
- Increasing caseload filed, without corresponding increase in judgeships CM
- Increasing need for technological solutions to providing increased services TEC
- Increasing need to identify best practices and design educational programs (case management, sentencing, probation, technology) CM, SEN, TEC
Louisiana
- Difficulty in setting reasonable timetables for the completion of court improvement projects GCM

Virginia
- Implementation of technological changes TEC

California
- Implementation of three strikes team GCM
- Drug courts ASC
- Domestic violence courts ASC
- Family and juvenile programs ASC
- Technology information standards TEC
- Access to technology TEC
- Trial court funding B/F
- Access to justice D/G
- Court interpreters D/G
- Jury reform GCM

South Carolina
- Computerization of the judicial department TEC
- Increasing case loads for family and circuit courts CM

Utah
- Reorganizing the budget process B/F
- Developing a planning process which includes policy makers and managers ICC
- Creating a public service mentality PP
- Delivery of automated systems statewide TEC
- Methods for allocation of resources B/F

Montana
- Increasing federal requirements on reporting case and judgement information. CM
- Continued effort to automate the courts to a level that allows electronic transfer of needed information to other branches of Montana government. TEC

North Dakota
- Consolidation of the clerk of court offices, study is underway C/R

Connecticut
- Achieving local conformity to rules and procedures that are established on a statewide basis ICC

Alabama
- Lack of an adequate budget to fully provide for personnel, technology needs, facilities, education and other extras. B/F

Michigan
- Budget Cutbacks B/F
- Implementation of Family Division of Circuit Court in a structure that does not readily support such a shift. (Rather than merge the Circuit and Probate Courts, which both had family case jurisdiction, the Legislative shifted the family jurisdiction of the Probate
• Court to the Circuit Court, leaving all of the Probate Judges in Probate Court with only 20-25% of its previous caseload.) ASC
• Rapidly increasing requirements for family matters as a result of family division implementation and federal welfare reform with no corresponding increase in resources. ASC
• Need for overhaul of internal and state judicial information systems. TEC
• Need for greater training capacity, using alternative means of training delivery. GCM

Hawaii #1
• Identifying caseload and workload trends, including age of case to identified action CM
• Establishing a system which allows for extracting needed statistics; case type, case numbers, identifying repeat offenders within a computerized system TEC
• Capturing fiscal/accounting data; amounts of fine and restitution ordered, paid, outstanding balances, electronically computing and recording penalties, interest, etc. B/F

Hawaii #2
• Economic situation: How to deal with decreases in budget and staffing at a time when workload is increasing and there are increasing demands for service from the public B/F
• Technology: computerized court case management system, establishment of a data base, statistics TEC

North Carolina
• AOC improving our customer service (to our court officials) through a major reorganization of our 250 employee agency C/R

Tennessee
• Increasing case load for state courts CM
• Increasing number of capitol cases and the expenditures required on these cases CM, B/F
• The need for additional Judges and the allocation of Judges across the state CM

New Jersey
• State judiciary unification C/R

New Hampshire
• Technical Training TEC
• Determination of needs for: clerical staff, administrative staff, and judges S/HR
• Tension among levels of trial court and the Administrative Office of the Courts S/HR
• How to take the record in the trial courts (audio, stenographers, or real-time) CM

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
• Increasing needs for information on how the courts are processing cases and analysis of the outcomes.
• Increasing expectations of agency personnel for advancement, job enrichment, and compensation when both the tasks and flattened organizational structure are not conducive to supporting these issues within their positions.

Rhode Island (not included in survey)
• Restoring credibility of the AOC with the legislature - due to criminal charges against the former administrator and chief justice
Local Courts:

Mississippi
- Electronic filing and storage of court records TEC

Oregon
- Insufficient resources, community outreach (B/F, PP)

Arizona
- Ability to address increasing caseloads, sufficient funding, space mgmt. Needs, security, better cooperation among court community, education and training CM, B/F, GCM, ICC

Maryland
- Technology TEC
- Accessibility for all under the American with Disabilities Act D/G
- Case Management CM
- Drug Court should be established and family courts ASC
- Lack of funding B/F

Idaho
- Increasing caseloads filed without corresponding increase in clerical staff or maintenance and operations budget CM, B/F
- Desperate need for technology TEC
- Turnover S/HR
- Space constraints GCM

Louisiana
- Finding means of sustaining the enthusiasm of trial judges for court reform GCM

Virginia
- Keeping pace with technology TEC
- Shortage of personnel B/F
- Changes in the law GCM
- Docketing practices CM

California
- Three strikes law GCM
- Court interpreters D/G
- Jury reform GCM

South Carolina
- Computerization - automation TEC
- Staffing levels S/HR

Utah
- Infusion of new resources to be implemented in conjunction with new juvenile sentencing guidelines SEN
- Construction of new ADR programs ASC
- Implementation of new automated system TEC
- Introduction of speciality courts, i.e., drug courts, domestic violence courts ASC

North Dakota
- Reduction in the number of trial judges S/HR

Michigan
- Implementation of family division of circuit court ASC
• Pressure to increase fee/fine collection FC
• Requirements for greater accountability S/HR
• Inter-governmental relations regarding control of court functions, budget and staff. B/F
• Public trust and confidence PP
• Greater need for alternative means of dispute settlement to increase litigant satisfaction ASC
• Training of chief judges and court staff GCM
• Pro se litigation GCM
• Personal Protection Orders GCM

Hawaii #2
• Collecting court ordered fines/fees FC
• Simplifying the court process; standardize forms GCM

Hawaii #3
• Growing case loads CM
• Shrinking budgets B/F
• Outdated computer systems TEC

North Carolina
• Trial courts-implementation of alternative to court programs, pilot programs, together with increasing caseload and limited resources ASC, CM

New Jersey
• State judiciary unification C/R

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
• Expectations from interest groups and the public that courts can change their operations to specifically address their concern of the day. Criminal procedure, statutes, and process limit what the courts can accomplish - which then makes the court appear unresponsive to their societal imperatives.

Rhode Island (not included in survey results)
• Installation of a new criminal/juvenile information system linking all courts and justice agencies
• Assessment of problems and overhaul of the state traffic court
• Address the handling of child protective cases in state's family court

2. What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified for your office and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Your Office:
Mississippi
• Training in the use of new computer systems TEC

Oregon
• Technology TEC
Vermont
- Technology, Customer service, team building, sexual harassment, caseflow management, ADA, coping with change, stress management, docket specific training, gender and ethnic bias, leadership, community and media relations, managing conflict

Arizona
- Technical training, upper level training for managers TEC, S/HR

Washington
- Difficulty recruiting experiences programmers and data base managers for statewide judicial computer system TEC

Idaho
- Same as answer #1

Louisiana
- The need for continuing education for state level administrators GCM

Virginia
- Technology TEC
- Diversity Training D/G

Tennessee
- Caseflow management CM

New Jersey
- Technical issues focused on the development and implementation of standardized policies and procedures TEC
- Providing local courts with training opportunities to clarify and institutionalize improved methods of efficient case processing and record keeping CM

New Hampshire
- Familiarizing administrative office of the courts staff with trial court operations and needs GCM

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Continuing education for the support staff at the central operation and field offices. This is particularly difficult in the use and application of technology. The ability to procure the software is far easier than determining it’s use in the system, which in turn is easier than having adequate support staff to train personnel. Increased duties for existing staff coupled with the burden of implementing new technology as potential solutions can easily exceed our capability to successfully implement them as real solutions.

Rhode Island (not included in survey results)
- Training in the use of new computer network software

Local Courts:
Mississippi
- Use of technology and its applications for the court system TEC

Arizona
- High turnover in court staff, ethics training, customer service training CS, S/HR
Idaho
- Turnover S/HR
- Insufficient staffing levels that leave little or no time to adequately train new hires S/HR

Louisiana
- The need for continuing education for trial court administrators GCM

Virginia
- Technology TEC
- New procedures occasions by changes in the law GCM
- Calendar Management practice CM
- Diversity training D/G

California
- Cross training in felony sentencing for municipal court judges, municipal court staff training on handling felonies GCM
- Death penalty cases SEN
- Sentencing, specifically felony sentencing and the three strikes law SEN
- Voir dire issues GCM
- Proposition 115 and preliminary hearings GCM
- Informing judges of changes in the law GCM

Utah
- Role clarification with respect to administrative responsibilities or court executives and judges ICC
- Case Management CM
- Fiscal Mgmt B/F
- New System for Court Reporting CM

North Dakota
- Sexual Harassment training D/G
- Gender fairness training D/G
- Technology training TEC

Michigan
- Training for chief judges on specific management issues, particularly negotiations, and personnel management GCM
- Family court training for judges and staff GCM
- Change management GCM
- Planning GCM
- Dealing with pro se litigants GCM

Hawaii #3
- Management of the courtroom and of the caseload CM, GCM
- Helping all employees understand the significance of their work in relation to the entire criminal justice process S/HR

North Carolina
- Lack of funds for training in specialized areas combined with an increased caseload which makes time away from court difficult for judge B/F
- Spanish language training D/G
New Jersey
• Providing adequate and equalized technical training opportunities to all levels of management and support staff TEC

New Hampshire
• Training in automated docketing system TEC

South Carolina
• Automation TEC

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
• Demands for new approaches to case management top the list. The courts would like to utilize mediation across the state to impact caseloads. Alternatives to adjudication are proven concepts for both criminal and civil applications yet we are unable to justify or fund these alternatives to the satisfaction of the legislature.
• Caseloads and attitudes on sensitive issues such as domestic violence, drug abuse, and juvenile crime require significant education resources. Our ability to bring the judges together once or twice a year for legislative updates and education cannot meet their need for discussion and analysis of approaches that have been proven valid elsewhere.
• Community treatment services in rural areas are stretched beyond capacity, if any exists, to support the courts and alternative approaches.

Rhode Island (not reported in survey results)
• Employee orientation
• Public Service training

3. What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Your Office:
Mississippi
• Sharing information and coordinating standards used between agencies ICC

Oregon
• Technology, Customer Service TEC, CS

Vermont
• Communication, Understanding each other’s roles, identifying barriers to good outcomes for our respective customers, caseflow management, sentencing and jail overcrowding, technology, child support ICC, S/HR, CS, CM, SEN, FC

Arizona
• Better working relations with executive and legislative branches, automation systems ICC, TEC

Washington
• Resolving network compatibility issues between statewide systems and locally developed networks TEC
Idaho
- Identification of prosecutor/public defender automation needs to integrate into court system. Improved case management practices used by courts, prosecuting attorneys, public defenders, private attorneys, etc. TEC, CM

Louisiana
- Lack of access to federal money designed to pay for the implementation of federal mandates B/F

Virginia
- Automated interfaces with other agencies of government TEC

California
- Three strikes SEN
- Drug Courts ASC
- Domestic Violence Courts ASC
- Family and juvenile programs ASC
- Technology information standards TEC
- Access to technology TEC
- Trial Court funding B/F
- Access to justice D/G
- Court Interpreters D/G
- Jury reform GCM

Utah
- Introduction of new juvenile sentencing guidelines SEN
- Operational relationship with executive division of youth corrections ICC
- Facility demands GCM

Montana
- Same as number two

North Dakota
- Child support disbursements moving to the executive branch B/F

Connecticut
- Adequate funding for, and additional responsibilities required of, the courts B/F

Alabama
- Sentencing reform and the possible consequences to prosecution, corrections, and probation SEN
- Lack of a clear tracking process for defendants throughout the system CM

Michigan
- The need to balance inter-agency cooperation with necessary independence ICC

Hawaii #1
- Electronic exchange/transfer of information TEC

New Hampshire
- Poor relations with the state legislature ICC
- Lack of adequate funding B/F
- Exchange of electronic information with the public and with executive branch agencies TEC
Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Sharing information with other branches of government. While our internal information gathering meets our needs, our information is coveted by other agencies of government. The time and cost of sharing what we have accumulated is adding additional stress to our ability to serve internal and external requests.

Rhode Island (not included in survey results)
- Again, the statewide criminal justice information systems
- Courthouse security and the availability of sheriffs
- Issues related to providing representation to indigent defendants in criminal cases

Local Courts:
Mississippi
- Development of integrated computer systems used by entities related to the court system TEC

Oregon
- Technology, Greater societal demands TEC, PP

Arizona
- Better relations between trial courts, better cooperation among systems, better relations with community, customer service ICC, CS, PP

Idaho
- Lack of understanding by the members of the judiciary, court administration, legislature, etc. in other counties that our problems and needs are different from those in the rest of the state GCM

Louisiana
- Lack of access to federal money designed to pay for the implementation of federal mandates B/F

Virginia
- Automated interfaces with other agencies of government TEC

California
-Death penalty cases SEN
- Training retire judges to handle three strikes cases SEN
-Sentencing, specifically felony sentencing and the three strikes law SEN
-Voir dire issues GCM
-Proposition 115 (Provides the right to a speedy trial) GCM
-Informing judges of changes in the law GCM
-Technology issues and needs TEC

South Carolina
- Automation TEC

Utah
- Strategic Planning GCM
-Fiscal/ Budget preparation and management B/F
- Team Building with management staff in the field S/HR
-Use and application of mgmt information ICC
Montana
- Automation technology training, data entry and beyond TEC

North Dakota
- Technology training TEC
- Risk management training GCM

Alabama
- Technology training has been a significant need for the system TEC
- We have tried to maintain legal update training for judges, the use of ADR, and issues surrounding possible sentence restructuring ASC

Michigan
- Training for legislative analysis GCM
- Project Management GCM
- Strategic planning and thinking GCM

Connecticut
- Diversity-specifically understanding the diverse cultures D/G

Hawaii #1
- Implementation of the decriminalized traffic system GCM
- Conversion of the criminal calendaring system off a Wang program TEC
- Customer service CS

Hawaii #2
- Training for staff in caseflow management issues and in areas related to better use of technology. Training in the use of computer equipment, data bases and software. CM, TEC
- Training in security related issues, and in the area of providing information to the public; when to provide or not provide, about giving legal advice. CS

North Carolina
- AOC need for coordination of all out of state training GCM

California
- Three strikes, Drug Courts, Domestic violence courts, family and juvenile programs, technology information standards, access to technology, trial court funding, access to justice, court interpreters, jury reform, transmittal of sentencing electronically to the Department of Justice and of drug/alcohol convictions to the Department of motor vehicles ASC, TEC, B/F, D/G

North Dakota
- Changes in child support procedures GCM
- Follow-up and supervision of misdemeanor sentences GCM

Michigan
- Struggles for direct control over personnel and budgeting B/F
- Conflict over control of record and clerk functions with an elected executive branch clerk ICC

Hawaii #3
- Communication ICC
North Carolina
- Relationship between the AOC (as the agent who represents the judicial branch of gov’t) and our general assembly—need for more comprehensive, detailed, and justified budget request in our efforts to acquire catch-up funding for automation and court personnel.

B/F, GCM

New Jersey
- Enhance the delivery of services to our clients and the public at large PP, CS
- Creating opportunities for forums, conferences, and meetings which provide meaningful exchanges of interagency communications ICC
- Developing and implementing state of the art information processes TEC
- Establish and make available certain training elements related to performance evaluation criteria GCM

North Carolina:
- Improving relationship between court officials and the AOC: re information services, equipment and supplies, etc., through committees, regional workshops, etc. ICC

New Jersey
- Continuing to improve quality of service while providing adequate technical training opportunities as our court systems rapidly move into a more fully computerized case processing, case tracking and data collection environment. TEC

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Court Security issues are increasing in both urban and rural areas. Many of our court facilities built prior to 1995 did not incorporate standards for secure facilities. Courthouses have traditionally been places to conduct public business. This very often brings individuals in close proximity to one another in highly stressful circumstances. Construction issues can only resolve some access problems. The personnel involved must understand the need and limitation of what can be accomplished.
- Non English-speaking clients and individuals with hearing impairment stretch resources in rural areas. New laws concerning the use of certified practitioners further complicates the issue.

5. What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office or the local courts in your state during the next year?

Your Office:
Mississippi
- Reorganization of AOC functions C/R

Oregon
- Drug courts, Family courts, Technology, Internet ASC, ASC, TEC, TEC

Vermont
- Caseflow management issues, prose litigants, better inter and interagency communication, employee education, security, alternatives to the court process, technological advances CM, CM, ICC, S/HR, ASC, TEC

B12
Arizona
- Increased accountability and need to adhere to performance standards, ongoing funding needs, B/F, S/HR

Washington
- Accommodate statewide computer applications TEC
- Greater state level funding B/F
- Develop family courts to include all civil and family cases and juvenile offenders ASC

Louisiana
- The need to restore the public’s trust in our courts PP

Virginia
- Legislative studies GCM

California
- SCA 4 (provides for the voluntary unification of superior and municipal courts, review of need for preliminary hearings and two tier criminal system in light of changes brought about by passage of SCA 4 C/R
- Strategic planning, budget development, community outreach, court security, access to technology, alternative sentencing, court interpreters, jury policies/mgmt, jury instructions in plain English, analysis of fiscal impact of proposed/new laws, coordination of technology among courts statewide and with state and local criminal justice agencies B/F, ICC, TEC, ASC, D/G

South Carolina
- Increased filings- limited number of judges CM
- Increasing complexity of cases CM

Utah
- Relocation to new facility GCM
- Changes in senior mgmt. Staff GCM
- Changes in budget administration B/F
- Creating a focus on customer service and public trust and confidence CS, PP
- Debate over the prospect of a family court structure ASC

North Dakota
- Programs for consolidation of clerk of court offices C/R

Connecticut
- Continually adding responsibilities without adequate funding B/F

Alabama
- Sentencing reform, centralization of child support collection services, budget needs, technology enhancements, legal education for judges, officials, and employees SEN, B/F, TEC
Michigan
- The need to have a constitutional amendment for a merger of trial courts, or some other approach to merging the administrative operations of the trial courts. C/R
- Standards for judicial information systems TEC
- Public trust and confidence in the courts PP
- Trial Court Performance standards GCM
- Development of new mediation alternatives ASC

Hawaii #1
- Lack of resources B/F

Hawaii #2
- Same as stated in response to question #1

North Carolina
- Need for increased funds from our legislature to catch up in automation/technology improvements and additional court personnel TEC, B/F
- Need for continued improvement of the public perception of the courts PP

Tennessee
- Increasing caseload for state courts CM
- Increasing number of capital cases and the expenditures required on these cases CM, B/F
- The need for additional Judges and the allocation of Judges across the state B/F

New Jersey
- Inter and intra departmental transitions as a result of management restructuring C/R

New Hampshire
- Electronic exchange of information with the public TEC
- Electronic filing TEC
- Enhancing public opinion of the courts PP
- Enhancing credibility with the legislature ICC
- Enhancing constituent service GCM
- Revision of judicial branch job descriptions and salary matrix B/F, GCM
- Defining the mission of the Administrative Offices of the Courts with trial courts ICC
- Public outreach PP

Idaho
- See answer to #4

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Our concern must be focused on our human resource development. Without the ability to offer significant compensation for full participation in assessment, problem solving, and doing more with less, our staff must find value in these issues on a different level. Supporting our personnel in the process of identifying our most pressing needs, targeting shared concerns, and supporting their efforts must be our top priority - while at least maintaining the existing level of service.

Rhode Island (not included in survey results)
- Installation of criminal case management software
- Follow up on improvements to the traffic court
- The ever present need to provide timely and fair access to justice
Local Courts:

Mississippi
- Information of technological applications TEC

Oregon
- Meeting public demand CS

Arizona
- Increased accountability, heavy workload, increased expectation by the public PP, CM, S/HR

Louisiana
- The managerial and financial problems associated with meeting federal data reporting mandates B/F

Virginia
- Court Improvement Program GCM
- Calendar Management CM

California
- Continued need to address three strike cases and continuing coordination efforts, strategic planning, budget development, community outreach, court security, access to technology, alternative sentencing, record preparation in death cases, court interpreters, jury instructions B/F, ICC, TEC, ASC, D/G

Utah
- Concentrated attention on case mgmt CM
- Family court proposal ASC
- Evaluation of juvenile sentencing guidelines SEN
- Continuation or speciality courts after federal funding expires ASC

North Dakota
- Redistricting C/R
- Consolidation of clerk of court issues GCM
- Supervision of misdemeanor sentences SEN

Michigan
- Training of chief judges and administrators in personnel and budget management, change management, and planning. GCM
- Constitutional amendment to merge trial courts C/R
- Public trust and confidence PP
- Family Court issues ASC
- Increasing number of pro se litigants GCM

North Carolina
- Working through budget process with the AOC toward a good budget request and good coordination with the AOC in presenting the budget B/F

New Jersey
- Full transition into an automated statewide case processing and data collection system TEC
- Providing adequate training to staff and producing local procedural manuals which correspond directly with manuals being developed by the AOC. PUB
Idaho
- See answer to #4

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Assess their most immediate needs, engage them in a discussion on those problems we believe can be addressed with existing resources and expertise. The others must be realistically prioritized for our next round of legislative processes, or explore alternative funding mechanisms for these issues.

6. Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5 be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful.

Your Office
Texas
- We have a new Judicial Committee on Information Technology that has to set policy for the use of technology and has to set standards for technology. TEC

Mississippi
- Information on technology applications in use by other state's court system TEC

Virginia
- Calendar management GCM

California
- Access to technology and alternative sentencing TEC, SEN

Hawaii #2
- Assistance in the areas of technology and in the collection of court ordered fines and fees. TEC, FC

North Carolina
- Assistance with several pilot - criminal docket management programs and others, networking, and publications CM, PUB

New Jersey
- Technical assistance to address human resource management issues and staff training. Assistance in furthering the development of standardized process manuals specifically in the area of Pre-Trial investigation, Pre Sentence Investigation reports and the bail process. S/HR, PUB

Alabama
- Advanced training in technology and sentence reform TEC, SEN

Idaho
- Need to design more training programs on effective case management and sentencing practices. Need to provide technical assistance to local courts. Need to identify blueprints for self-assessment of effective case management practices CM, SEN

Utah
- Budget preparation and management. Planning. B/F, GCM
Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- These problems have been faced by most private and public sector organizations. Research material and approaches must abound. Use your group to screen and offer the best and most current literature. Present written material for a core group of management to review and provide a contact person within your group for questions. Offer assistance with specific time lines that must be met by the accepting group. Once our focus is better developed, an on site presentation would seem more beneficial to further develop the concepts and strategies necessary to carry them out.

Local Courts
Texas
- Focus on integrated justice information system TEC

Mississippi
- Pros and cons of different criminal tracking software in use by other states TEC

Virginia
- Calendar management GCM

California
- Access to technology and alternative sentencing TEC, SEN

Hawaii #3
- Assistance with technology itself or with identifying the needs of each player so that technology can be developed to best address the identified needs. TEC

New Jersey
- Assistance in orienting management and staff to statewide procedural standards while incorporating localized adjustments to conform to courthouse environments and resource availability. GCM

Utah
- Case Management/ Delay reduction CM

Michigan
- Targeted technical assistance to assist SCAO in helping trial courts with strategies for changes in administrative structures to meet the challenges for accountability and to support family division and/merged courts. Assistance in community outreach. Fees, fine collection programs assistance. ASC, PP, FC

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- Allow us to survey the courts in the areas requiring most attention. Once we identify potential areas of interest you can provide the research information specific to those areas. Then you can facilitate the process by connecting us to the appropriate grants or funding sources to accomplish the goal.
7. Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the major problems or issues related to the functioning of State AOC’s - or the judicial system as a whole- that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

Mississippi
- Sharing of information ICC

Oregon
- Technology, Human Resources TEC, HR

Louisiana
- The need to restore the public’s faith in the courts seems to be a top priority of most AOC’s in the country PP

Alabama
- Training, Technical Advice TEC

Michigan
- Public trust and confidence PP
- Development of models for early mediation or alternative service delivery prior to cases reaching the adjudicative stage, prior to submission to judge or involvement of judges ASC
- Development of models for interdependence with executive and legislative branches to improve coordination while maintaining the essential independence of the judicial decision-making process. ICC

North Carolina
- Increased complexity of cases, increased length of time to try case- both of which lead to backlogs and delays in the administration of justice CM
- The effects of automation on the administration of justice TEC

Tennessee
- Increased number of capital cases and expenditures required TEC, B/F

New Jersey
- Strengthening the exchange of information and collaborative efforts which involve resource sharing and the linking of computerized data collection systems among government organizations and other community service agencies TEC

Alabama
- Many jurisdictions are unable to successfully obtain federal funds due to unfamiliarity with the federal requirements. CCTAP could be most helpful in working with states in building communication lines with federal funding agencies ICC

North Dakota
- Supervision of misdemeanor sentences SEN

Utah
- Movement towards community court lacks definition GCM
- Drug Courts, which have been successful under federal funding, may be at jeopardy because of competing demands for limited state dollars ASC, B/F
- Assessment of performance standard initiative S/HR
California
- Adequate provision of trial and appellate counsel S/HR

Washington
- How to develop and maintain a structure or judicial system which allows policy decisions affecting the judiciary to be made by a leadership group ICC
- Methods for assessing the impact of criminal legislation law GCM

Arizona
- Increase public's understanding of the courts, adequate resources B/F, PP

Kentucky (not included in survey results)
- The parochial nature of some local courts. Since some court personnel view their jobs as front line troops in the war for social order it becomes difficult for them to accept outside input. The concept that their specific problems are homegrown and beyond resolution through foreign methods pervades some systems. Standard approaches to problem solving - seeing beyond the perceived problem - may be the most difficult yet a productive step your group can accomplish with statewide or local systems.
- Judges, like all court personnel, should be approached from a human resource perspective. Regardless of their method of election or appointment their strength and weaknesses should be addressed.

Rhode Island (not included in survey results)
- Better public service
- Better public understanding of the role of the court
APPENDIX C

CCTAP NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY: PROSECUTORS

1. What have been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your agency has had to address over the past several years?

Hawaii
- Updating the computer system within the office and getting connected to a bigger server. The previous server limited the type and amount of software that we were able to work with. **TEC**
- Having to come up with the most efficient case tracking system that can provide reports on statistics and other information at a moment's request. **CM**
- Having to fill all the vacancies and operate in full capacity; addressing the felony backlog. **GCM**

Arizona
- the Maricopa County Attorney's Office has been struggling with increasing caseloads without a corresponding increase in resources. From 1992 to 1996 the Office saw a 30% increase in felony and delinquency filings while receiving a 14.5% increase in prosecutors over the same time period. This increase in the caseloads of individual attorneys has been compounded by the increasing complexity of prosecution; in addition, the Office has not received adequate funding to pay staff commensurate with the market. **CM, B/F**

Nebraska
- development of an accurate workload measurement for the equitable distribution of work within the office and for a determination of maximum office workload. **CM**

Georgia
- staffing, technology and specialized training. Most prosecutors offices are shorthanded on support staff and that is probably true for prosecutors offices throughout the country. **TRA, S/HR, TEC**
- in the area of technology, there are three pressing needs: upgrading of hardware and software in individual offices, selection and installation of a true case mgmt. system, and there is a real need to train personnel in the use of the case mgmt. Software. **TEC**

Connecticut
- increased workload without proportional increase in resources, lack of resources to properly deal with legislative mandates such as victim's rights, full faith and credit; slow development of mgmt. Info. Sys.; lack of training opportunities. **CM, B/F, TEC**
Missouri
- We are a 2 person agency that services over 450 prosecutors, assistants and support staff. Our annual budget is approx. $160,000 so resources and manpower are limited. It is also difficult for us to get technological improvements to the counties due to the lack of financial resources B/F, TEC

Michigan
- Due to our growth, increased caseload and governmental reorganization our biggest issues or needs are: a)interfacing with the local courts and our office data processing system b)upgrading our system to accomplish a and improve data processing, management training for prosecutors and staff CM, C/R, TEC, TEC

2. What have been the most significant training-related needs identified in your agency over the past several years?

Hawaii
- Trial advocacy, victim/witness counseling, and violent offenses GCM

Arizona
- the office has experienced turnover which has increased our need for training in all areas. We have instituted formal attorney training, computer training for all staff and specialized training to handle specific prosecution issues. Additional local training is needed in advanced prosecutorial issues, such as DNA, sexual predators, etc. S/HR, TRA, GCM, TEC

Nebraska
- new attorney training and training for all staff in new technologies TEC, TRA

Georgia
- the most significant training related needs are specialized courses at the state level on drug prosecution, death penalty cases, domestic violence, juvenile crimes and providing victim-witness services TRA

Connecticut
- Money-national level programs are out of reach with air, lodging, and tuition; instate basic course for new prosecutors, it has been difficult to develop programs for more than one day since criminal courts run every day; generating interest, Ct. Does not require CLV’s, result is a lack of incentives to attend B/F, TRA

South Dakota
- training of newly elected states attorneys every four years TRA

Missouri
- more hands on how to training such as trial schools; we also have difficulty getting persons to training and getting them to take it seriously; we would like to publish manuals for PA’s but we have to rely on volunteers TRA

Michigan
- computer training, management training (personnel issues) TEC, TRA, S/HR
3. What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your agency has had to address over the past several years?

**Hawaii**
- The handling of cases conflicted by the different offices of prosecuting attorneys within the State; Complying with the procedural requirements of the different agencies, i.e., the courts and the police department ICC

**Arizona**
- The majority of criminal justice agencies in Maricopa County work very well collectively to address common policy and program issues. However, the entire system is struggling with increased cases and insufficient resources, causing serious backlogs in trial availability CM, B/F
- In addition, the County is also working feverishly to address Year 2000 computer issues. The County’s integrated case tracking system, designed in the 1970’s, is not Year 2000 compliant. This has presented challenges for the criminal justice agencies to design and implement a system meeting each agencies needs. TEC

**Nebraska**
- Court scheduling, gaining the recognition that what one agency does may affect the entire system down stream is a difficult but important concept. We have had recent situations where judges or prosecutors have been added to the system without planning for the effect on our agency or the rest of the system GCM

**Connecticut**
- Development of information systems that interact, need for cross training TEC, TRA

**Hawaii**
- Inter-agency need: effective and efficient sharing of criminal justice information (between law enforcement agencies, between counties, and between county and state law enforcement agencies) ICC
  - Intra-agency: replacing the case tracking/management information system with a system which provides equipment and applications for all staff to have adequate resources to work effectively and efficiently TEC

**Missouri**
- Other agencies such as ours have far more resources and it is difficult for us to catch up; we also need more of a voice within the state B/F, ICC

**Michigan**
- Systems compatibility, jurisdictional issues between police and social service agencies, joint training issues (domestic violence, sexual assault, major crimes) TEC, ICC, TRA
5. What major issues do you foresee affecting your agency during the next year?

**Hawaii**
- Possible cutbacks in funding in the different programs funded by the State. This will result in the reduction of salaried personnel, training, equipment, and supplies B/F
- Training of new personnel as a result of recent loss of experienced attorneys TRA

**Nebraska**
- Planning for the impact of policy changes, new legislative initiatives or demographic changes, using new technologies to make our work more efficient, refining workload measurements TEC, CM, GCM

**Georgia**
- Selection, installation and training of personnel in a case mgmt. system TRA

**Connecticut**
- Implementing constitutional amendment on victim’s rights, labor matters- ADA, EEO, worker’s comp, FMLA, property interest in jobs D/G

**Hawaii**
- Our agency will be implementing a new WINDOWS-based case tracking system which will need to be tailored specifically to our department’s needs while having the capability of electronically providing linkages to other local law enforcement agencies. Training all staff to use the new system will be ambitious and encouraging other law enforcement agencies to make the investment to link in will also require a great deal of negotiating TEC

**Missouri**
- Lack of financial and human resources B/F, S/HR

**Michigan**
- Primarily the training issues- can have a big impact on our cases and how they are processed TRA

6. Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

**Michigan**
- Networking between the primary aspects of the criminal justice system - the local courts, prosecutors, and public defenders ICC

**Georgia**
- Unless project members were familiar with the case management software selected, training services could not be provided. All the problems identified could be resolved by additional funding. TEC, B/F

**Nebraska**
- Technical assistance in the form of research on the system impact from legislation, policy changes, etc. Development of new user friendly case management systems. GCM, TEC

**Connecticut**
- Victim rights training, supervisory training, most types of program evaluation TRA, TRA C4
Hawaii

- A short term on-site consultation to review, evaluate, and make recommendations related to the proposed case tracking/management information system would be helpful. Such a report could give impetus to supporting funding proposals, soliciting and achieving inter-agency cooperation, and be an independent confirmation that the proposed system will achieve our agency's objective. TEC

Hawaii #2

- Training of personnel on the prosecution of cases TRA

Missouri

- Help with publications to offices PUB

7. Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the significant problems or issues related to the functioning of your type of agency- or the judicial system as a whole - that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

Hawaii

- Nothing significant at the present

Arizona

- we are not fully informed of what CCTAP can provide to answer this question. However, the entire criminal justice system in Arizona is struggling with insufficient resources to handle our increase in crime. In the last 4 years, all of the police agencies have received additional funding from local or federal initiatives while the balance of the criminal justice system- prosecutors, defense, courts and probation- has not. In jurisdictions such as Maricopa County - where population, crime and police officers are increasing- a critical situation has been created B/F

Nebraska

- developing a formula for determining the impact from new legislation, rules, schedules, policies, etc. on all of the components of the justice system; assistance in determining a workload formula to protect the quality of services; using technology to improve the efficiency of the agency including the development of case management information systems; leadership development TEC, TRA

Georgia

- developing or identifying methods that will enable a judicial circuit to track documents through the system from arrest to final disposition with a minimum of input and maximum sharing of common data elements TEC

Connecticut

- making federal mandates such as Megan's law, full faith and credit and victim's rights work TRA
Hawaii

- finding ways to share resources between the four countries and state law enforcement agencies, i.e., joint training across jurisdictions for same type agencies and multi-purposes agencies overcoming the tremendous costs associated with geographical obstacles to networking ICC, B/F
APPENDIX D
CCTAP NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY: AJA DIRECTORS

1. What have been the most significant management and operational issues or needs that your local corrections agencies nationwide in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Your local agency:

1. Jail crowding and alternatives to incarceration.
2. Overcrowding; privatization issues; less money for programs
3. Management of who comes to jail; communications with other agencies; crowding
4. Jail crowding; inadequate reception/intake area
5. Overcrowding; inadequate facilities and resources
6. Population increases; need to build; few treatment program; lack of public safety; mission and vision; high rates of recidivism

Local criminal justice system:

1. Jail crowding affects the entire criminal justice system
2. Inadequate juvenile justice facilities; interconnected, integrated computer system; AFIS
3. Finite jail space and need to consider who really, in terms of public safety, needs to be in jail
4. Space problems; case processing glitches; computer systems that are not integrated result in duplication of data entry
5. Components failing to operate as a system; system overload; few treatment referral programs

Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Jail crowding issues; effective alternatives to incarceration
2. Information technology
3. Legislation that generates more police and arrests that does not permeate to rest of system
4. Same problems as above
5. Overcrowding; construction funds; urban areas fare better than rural in terms of construction
6. High rates of recidivism; inadequate programs; failure to coordinate with local system concerning the return of offenders; high populations; need to build
2. What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified for your office and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Your local agency:

1. Effective and reliable training to ensure compliance with state (Florida) Model Jail Standards as well as accreditation standards.
2. New technology — PCS
3. Correctional ethics; management training; use of force vs. deliberate indifference; warrant management information system; direct supervision inmate management; labor relations and sexual harassment
4. Changes in the laws; computer changes and keeping staff up-to-date with changes and technology; acquiring permission and set up for video arraignments and expansion of other court functions
5. 
6. Line budget that specifically identifies training of all correctional personnel annually

Local corrections agencies:

1. Same as above
2. Writing reports; physical fitness for duty
3. Use of force; rules of supervision; standards and accreditation; basic jail security; victim notification (Meagan law);
4. Similar as local agency
5. Lack of resources for training in rural counties; inadequate space for training; many jails do not have full-time jailers
6. Training staff and other personnel on the new philosophy of expanded public safety paradigm shifts

Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Same as above
2. Liability issues; jail standards and inspections; writing policies and procedures; funding for programs
3. Operations 101 (from 1930 -1998); privatization issues; sentencing decisions and impact on jail; classification (juvenile; female offenders); selection and hiring of competent staff; budget and resources
4. State is working with jail managers and other criminal justice members on data exchange, improvement of criminal history files, automated fingerprinting, etc.
5. Adequate resources (including time off for staff) for up-to-date training
6. Annual in service training programs do not exist in most corrections systems throughout the state; training to the collaborative, forming partnerships and sharing resources with agencies that share the corrections mission is either not done or slow in coming
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3. What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs that your office and the local courts in your state you have had to address over the past several years?

Your local agency:

1. Same as answer 1
2. Electronically communicating information
3. Warrant management; technology hardware and software; information sharing; decision-making as a systems approach
4. Changes in the law; handling inmates who previously would be sent to state prison
5.  
6.  

Local correctional agencies:

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. Definitions of maximum and super maximum security; crowding, rated vs. design capacity; inmate health costs; DNA; quality management
4. Same as above
5. Litigation issues; state-wide standards
6. Courts assuming responsibilities that are clearly those of corrections (e.g., where and when to place offenders in alternative housing); committing offenders to the jail who could be place under other forms of sanctions

Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. Examining Department of Corrections; why only 43 of 3353 jails dual accredited?; what has U.S. government done for small (less than 200 bed) jails; substance abuse programming in jails
4. Same as above
5.  
6. Same as above
4. Which, if any, of the above needs or issues have not been resolved to your satisfaction?

Your local agency:

1. Same as answer 1
2. None of these needs/issues have been resolved because of lack of communication, funding and number of people to be trained.
3. Issues will never be resolved unless better communication; technology costs may not be feasible; “King and I” syndrome of who is in charge
4. Situation is dynamic; new data being collected and there are no specific answers so far; unknown if State will continue funding and at what level
5. 
6. Funding treatment programs; developing collaboration with societal agencies

Local criminal justice system:

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. Focus sessions and frame face-to-face seminars have resulted in communications with judges; use of MAP “mutual agreement sentence pacts” i.e., day reporting; electronic monitoring, intensive probation
4. Same as above
5. 
6. Committing large numbers of offenders for long periods of time; components working together as a system

Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. Remember: “None of us is as smart as all of us” Walt Disney; Running a jail is not like managing Disneyland, or is it?
4. Same as above
5. 
6. Reductions in inmate population; in service training programs; funding for treatment programs
5. **What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office, or the local courts in your state during the next year?**

**Your local agency:**

1. Same as answer 1
2. Technology; crowding; sicker inmates (HIV, TB, aging)
3. New sentencing guidelines (drug free school zones); DNA-testing; juveniles and impact of "super predator" laws; terrorism (domestic enforcement laws); "we now worry more about intruders than injury"
4. The expanding inmate population as communities and populations grow; difficulty in finding and hiring acceptable employees to meet expanding demands of corrections
5. 
6. Adequate operation budget funding; criminal justice system's and society's lock them up and throw away the key philosophy

**Local criminal justice system:**

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. Domestic violence; inmate industries; substance-abuse programming; mentally ill offenders; juveniles and co-ed programming
4. Same as above
5. Litigation and liability issues as relate to above stated issues
6. Maintaining the lock them up attitudes; non-system decision making that impact various components

**Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:**

1. Same as answer 1
2. Same as above
3. 
4. Same as above
5. 
6. Over population issues; adequate funding and support for programs
6. Would any of the issues or problems noted in questions #5, be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

Your local agency:

1. Provide technical assistance for projecting future jail bed requirements
2. “I don’t know the answer to this”
3. Train judges to assess the impact of their decisions on victims and the jails; “train people to mediate more”; qualification of program effectiveness (substance abuse, domestic violence; education vs. recidivism; industry)
4. Assistance to find qualified applicants to fill staff positions
5. 
6. Publish researched and written reports that support the collaborative systems

Local corrections agencies:

1. 
2. 
3. Dangerousness: how do we measure who is violent; retributive or community justice
4. Same as above.
5. Educational projects defined to encourage state legislatures develop jail standards
6. Same as above

Correctional agencies throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. 
2. 
3. Impact of incarceration vs probation (community correction) costs
4. Same as above; problems are common
5. 
6. Same as above
7. What other major problems or issues that have not been asked related to the functioning of pretrial agencies, or the judicial system as a whole - that you feel have not yet been asked, which you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

1. Consultants — technical assistance; “information on what other jurisdictions have been successful doing and how they did it”

2. Assistance with establishing a comprehensive monitoring system for pretrial releases to ensure adequate supervision and subsequent appearance at court; assistance with reducing arrest to trial time frames and reducing the inordinate number of court “set overs”

3. None
8. Are there two or three colleagues in other jurisdictions/agencies whom you recommend that we contact for comments on the questions covered in this survey? Please list their names, titles and telephone numbers.

1. Erio Alvarez, Criminal Justice Specialist
   County Center, 26th Floor
   601 East Kennedy Boulevard
   Tampa, FL 33602

   Mike Bridenback, Court Administrator 13th Judicial Circuit
   Court House, Room 304
   419 Pierce Street
   Tampa, FL 33602

2. Tom Berlinger
   Director of Operations
   Florida Sheriffs’ Association
   (850) 877-2165

   Chief Judge Belvin Berry
   9th Judicial Circuit
   (407) 836-2008

3. Jay Ashe
   Superintendent, Hamden Massachusetts Sheriff Office
   Ludlow, MA
   (413) 547-8000

   Frank Hecht
   Captain, Pima County, AZ
   Tucson, AZ
   (520) 740-5801

4. Lt. Ruth Jenkin
   Deschutes County
   63333 West Highway 20
   Bend, OR 97701
   (541) 388-6667; fax (541) 330-9162

   Ted Nelson, Commander
   Marion County
   4000 Aumsville Hwy., SE
   Salem, OR 97301
   (503) 581-1183; fax (503) 588-6818
Lt. Dave Roughton  
Jackson County  
10 S. Oakdale  
Medford, OR 97501  
(541) 776-7127; fax (541) 776-7060

Ray Coleman  
Regional Justice Center  
620 West James Street  
Kent, WA 98302  
(206) 296-1269; fax (206) 205-2104

5. James Vermeerch  
Executive Director  
Missouri Sheriffs’ Association  
229 Madison Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65101  
(573) 635-5929

Dr. Rick Sluder  
Professor/Criminal Justice  
Central Missouri State University  
Warrensburg, MO 64093  
(816) 543-4950

6. Lamont Flanagan,  
Commissioner for the Baltimore City Pretrial Services and Detention Facility  
(410) 209-4005

Devon Brown  
Director of the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation for Montgomery County, Maryland  
(301) 217-7555
APPA DIRECTORS SURVEY

1. What have been the most significant management and operational issues or needs that your local agency, the local courts and probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide have had to address over the past several years?

Your local agency:

1. The expansion of the department to include more specialized services (i.e., sex offender unit; drug treatment court; pretrial services; court liaison unit; investigations unit, etc.)

2. Lack of space for appropriate operations, including community; lack of staff to carry out department’s mission; shift of staff from one unit to another due to seniority causes caseload disruption

3. Development and construction of 50-bed intensive treatment intervention residential facility for adult felony offenders to serve 5 counties

4. Reorganization from regional probation and parole to one division of probation and parole/community corrections. Establishing staffing and budget patterns for reorganization. Purchasing vehicles, safety equipment, and technology for field offices. Planning and developing strategies for implementation of community sentencing and truth in sentencing. Communication with legislators.

5. Legislative mandates and additional job duties and responsibilities without appropriate funding. Turnover rate lack of expediency in hiring has created an operation issue

6. Keeping up with the technology — 800 MHZ radios, PCS, updating electronic monitoring, new computer software, etc.

7. Staff turnover; lack of resources

8. Lack of funding and staffing for specialized caseloads, e.g., sex offenders; drug probationers; and high risk violent offenders.

Local courts:

1. Concern that department will be asked to assume parole functions; additional costs of assuming sex offender supervision; new drug unit formed to response to drug related offenses; use of large-scale specialization has improved ability to supervise offenders

2. Lack of space for appropriate operation

3. Development and expansion of community services as sentencing options to meet mandates of sentencing changes implemented 7/1/96

4. New legislation mandating community sentencing, truth in sentencing and increase in pre-sentence investigations. Local court are now involved in planning councils to implement community sentencing. Truth in sentencing guidelines have been a major issue for the courts
6. The changes in probation laws and how the laws effect the conditions of supervision has a significant impact on the management and operational issues. The Courts and the Department have encountered difficulties in complying with all the provisions of the Public Safety Information Act, for example. The taking of pictures of 748 offenders created an operational issue for courts and department. A number of offenders did not fully understand the law and were mandated to take photos and these photos were sent out on the Internet and labeling the offender as a sex offender/predator without a full understanding of the law.

7. County CJIS system still not “live.” Complying with new legislation, i.e., Public Safety Information Act, sex offender and sexual predator notification; photographs; Internet photos; presentence investigations seem more demanding along with sentencing guidelines.

8. Large dockets. Some judges blame sentencing guidelines for lack of options; offender returns (VOPs).

9. Lack of community based treatment and incarceration sanctions for specialized offender groups; Sentencing guidelines used for population controls as opposed to offender classification and treatment.

Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Technology; alternative sanctions; lack of funding for community corrections’ criminal justice as a continuum of services; privatization

2. Needs/problems of county (Cook) differs from those of rest of state; greater staffing needs and safety issues concerning staff

3. Training, safety, personnel selection; the steady increase in caseloads without adequate staff to supervise as required

4. The development of network relationships with local mental health and/or alcohol treatment agencies in order to facilitate effective treatment of offenders under community control sanctions; effective cross-training of criminal justice, court, law enforcement, and treatment agencies to ensure cooperative understanding of how these sanctions can be effectively administered to offenders.

5. Strategic planning for impact of community sentencing and truth in sentencing. Developing supervision and classification standards that allow for intermediate sanctions and progressive disciplinary measures. Caseload/staff ratios are always a concern. Many still address law enforcement/social work role of PPOs. Balanced supervision allowing avenue to impose supervisory sanctions that fit offender behavior.

6. Finding ways to effectively balance the blending of automation and people skills in order to productively help local agencies deal with legislative changes.

7. Specialization; financial and human resources; technology; alternative sentencing options; statutory changes; public reactions’ dual diagnosed offenders; down sizing; competitive salaries; privatization; inter-agency coordination; political agenda; ADA implementation; performance based budgeting; collective bargaining/fair labor law/FMLA
8. Safety issues, including purchasing of 800 MHZ radios for probation officers safety while conducting field work; supplying offices with technology to increase performance and work efficiency, such as PCS and laptops

2. What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified by or for your office, and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Your local agency:

1. Recently provided training to the entire department when computer terminals were installed throughout the county. Specialized training in substance abuse, domestic violence, sex offenders, drug testing and weapons/self-defense

2. Orientation training for new officers; safety training/self-defense; on-going staff development; specific caseload training: sex offender, drug, domestic violence; data inquiry training

3. Agency just being formed; expected full implementation by January/February 1999

4. Computer technology training has been the greatest need for several years. This office basically establishes and coordinates the training needs for the division statewide

5. Dealing with a younger offender population; specialization of caseloads requiring staff to receive specific training based on specific type of supervision provided to offender, i.e., drug offender, community control, electronic monitoring, sex offender

6. Almost independent for training purposes; train the trainers programs have been used to train staff. Need for more staff to become instructor certified. Local tech does not offer many placements for 40-hour mandatory slots and department needs to “get creative”

9. An easy way to accomplish all the mandatory training requirements

10. Lack of comprehensive in-service training for probation officers in treatment, counseling, data automation and security issues; lack of funding for trainers as well as staff workload relief positions

Local courts:

1.

2.

3. Juvenile intake training for judges relative to detention admissions

4. Implementation of new sentencing legislation, which calls for presumption of community control sanctions rather than prison for specific classes of offenders

5. Most recently training on truth in sentencing guidelines; drug court procedures and operations; duties and services provided by probation and parole; imposing realistic rules and conditions for probation offenders
6. Keeping up with statutory changes, sentencing guidelines
7.
8. Very little training conducted, especially criminal bench; Sarasota County does some good quality computer training
9. Judges request training on diversionary programs
10. Lack of funds for training judges and criminal judiciary staff on sentencing alternatives, classification, and court automation efficiency

**Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:**

1. Officer safety; law enforcement training; automated system utilization; new ways of looking at clients (e.g., motivational interviews)
2.
3. Safety; domestic violence; comprehensive, timely, on-going basic training and orientation for new officers.
4. The development of a mentality that supports the development and expansion of community control sanctions, recognizing the effective implementation of a continuum of sanctions that can be imposed within the community.
5. Computer technology training; community policing practices and activities; treatment resources and practices; gangs; special needs offenders (e.g., sex offenders, elderly, mentally ill); how to network with other agencies and disciplines; how to impose and utilize intermediate sanctions and progressive discipline; cultural changes of supervision
6. Helping local agencies cope with the above needs in light of budgetary constraints
7. Sex offenders, computers; sentencing guidelines; court ordered payments; liability; firearms; health issues; workers compensation; ADA; gangs; obtaining quality training
8. More opportunity for 40-hour training; need to develop more probation-specific training
9.
10.
3. What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs that your agency, and the local courts and in your state you have had to address over the past several years?

**Your local agency:**

1. Working relationship has been established with the local police (domestic violence and gang units), State’s Attorney’s Office (sex offender unit), Juvenile Probation Department and a university research and outreach team.
   - Regarding the gang unit, staff do not have the training that the Chicago police do, creating safety issues.
   - The Sex Offender Unit relies on the State’s Attorney’s Office and the State Police for information about notification and criminal background information. However, this information is often incomplete or difficult to obtain.
   - In short, staff require similar training to that of other agencies and better communications with them as well. Also, “out expectations of the other agencies are unclear regarding our relationships and need to more clearly defined.”
2. Records exchange and disclosure, the ability to share information with other agencies and still respect confidentiality; cost of services to a population that many times has neither insurance nor resources for treatment.
3. Agency information. “Pre-service training will be paramount.”
4. Networking with other agencies in areas of substance abuse, employment education, and enforcement; awareness of various services provided by other agencies
5. Keeping an open line of communication with various agencies, i.e., court, State Attorney, Public Defender’s Office, local law enforcement, public
6. Keeping up with technology; line officers need computers and laptops for case notes; record retention, and efficiency
7. Lack of funding for appropriate number of personnel to work service positions and partnership positions with the courts and other agencies; jail overcrowding and reduced availability of incarceration as an option
8. Implementation of sex offender laws and requirements for mandatory reporting; inadequate funding for supervision and control; treatment alternatives to prose o for substance abusers inadequately funded

**Local courts:**

1.
2.
3. Gaining greater knowledge as to services provided to probationers (make court more effective).
4. Convincing the courts (located in relative rural environment) that the recent legislative change in sentencing guidelines is founded not only on overcrowded prisons but on the recognition that nonviolent, non-personal injury and drug related offenders are inappropriately placed in prison. Additionally, convincing them that research has identified that there are treatment approaches in corrections that can be effectively applied with success in the community.

5. Keeping abreast of legislative mandates and new laws regarding probation issues; constantly establishing new partnerships in order to keep lines of communication open and to provide assistance to a number of agencies and public

7. Computer system that allows communication among criminal justice agencies; too much duplication and hard copies; lack of communication with police, clerk, state attorney, etc

9. Too many violations of supervision; lack of availability of sanctions

10. Massive growth of caseload dockets; expectation of courts to use more community based alternatives and to monitor victim restitution sanctions

**Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:**

1. Use of alternatives to incarceration; urine taking policy; technology: sharing databases; privacy of information; business processes

2.

3. Records exchange and disclosure.

4. Same as the issue identified for the local courts above. Wanting to take control/stepping in thus interrupting or short circuiting the corrections treatment process.

5. Cooperation with other agencies; role clarification; same as local agency needs

6. Legislative mandates and additional duties and responsibilities without appropriate funding

7. Coordination and recognition by law enforcement; relationship with courts; coordination with job services; inter local partnerships; contract services provides; sharing of automated data; drug courts; department of juvenile justice and D.C. coordination

8. P&P officers need better technology; need to reduce paperwork; “too many levels telling the officers how to do their jobs”
4. Which, if any, of the above needs or issues have not been resolved to your satisfaction?

Your local agency:

1. Many programs are new or under development, therefore, the process of evaluation is still on-going. The issues with regard to Gang Unit and Sex Offender Unit are yet unresolved.
2. Records exchange and disclosure; Safety needs are in the process of being addressed by a committee comprised of managers, line officers, and support staff; some court orders have been adapted to facilitate sharing of information
3. These issues are on going and will continue until legislation is finalized
4. Sufficient funding by legislators
5. Lack of resources
6. Community corrections has not been adequately funded to implement surveillance monitoring of sex offenders; treatment of drug offenders; monitor victim impact concerns

Local courts:

1. Gaining greater knowledge as to services provided to probationers; juvenile intake training
2. "'Buy in' by all the judges — overall skepticism — but willingness to try. One or the other of the judges may have a tendency to get involved in programming treatment
3. Funding
4. Lack of funding to accomplish specialized courts and prosecution of habitual offenders, violent juveniles or substance abuse cases

Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Technology issues; appropriate referrals to programs
2. Records exchange and disclosure
3. Same as issues identified for local courts; wanting to take control/stepping in thus interrupting or short-circuiting the corrections treatment process
5.
6. Sufficient staffing
7.
8.
9.
10.
5. What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office, the local courts in your state during the next year?

Your local agency:

1. 
2. There has been an increase in the number of offenders sentenced to consecutive sentences of prison and probation. As a result, the offender population will likely increase as will the number of violent offenders. In this instance, the office believes it will move from performing a probation function to a parole function.
3. Implementation of local community corrections philosophy; continued increase in probation clients; continuing concern for safety and for confidentiality
4. Developing a credible working relationship with all criminal justice actors in each of the five counties served and building a relationship with community mental health, alcohol, and other drug treatment agencies to ensure strong transition and aftercare services for offenders once they leave county facility.
5. Community sentencing; truth in sentencing; supervision standards; workload issues; technology upgrades
6. Dealing with the increasing needs of public safety; finding cost effective programs, community policing, and partnerships; Finding cost effective programs congruent with the needs of each specified population; maintaining office automation and technology
7. 
8. 
9. Increasing caseloads
10. Diversion of additional resource to comply with monitoring of sex offenders. Anticipates decrease in drug offender treatment program, physiological services and education programs

Local courts:

1. 
2. 
3. Court space needs
4. Adapting to the continued expansion and development of community control sanctions and maintaining a supportive influence in the development of same.
5. 1 and 2 of above
6. Growth of courts and specialization, e.g., domestic violence division, habitual offender division, drug court; Legislative updates and mandates
7. 
8. 
9. Overcrowded jails; caseloads; dockets
10. No relief for reducing caseloads, especially to address drug offender court permitting presentence investigation prior to determining sentence
Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. Meagan’s law; technology and use of information; privatization of supervision services; privacy laws
2. 
3. Implementation of new juvenile justice legislation; safety; training; records disclosure and exchange
4. Same as for local courts mentioned above
5. Same as response 1 to question 5
6. Same as local agency
7. 
8. 
9. 
10.
6. Would any of the issues or problems noted in questions #5 be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

Your local agency:

1. 
2. Because not a parole agency, this agency could benefit from the experience of other probation/parole departments regarding their supervision and monitoring of offenders. This may require additional training for officers who supervise offenders released from prison to probation.
3. Community corrections implementation may be amenable as well as other issues noted.
4. Cross-training; creative ways of spreading information on “what works in corrections”
5. Yes, community sentencing division in particular.

Local courts:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. Cross-training; creative ways of spreading information on “what works in corrections”
5. Both divisions intend to do training with court, DA and local communities on these issues; extensive training is intended next year on these issues and implementation of new legislation.

Probation/parole offices throughout your state, region, and nationwide:

1. All items noted in question 5
3. A series of workshops to delineate and discuss operational changes to comply with SB363, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act, i.e., record keeping, fingerprinting, teen court, juvenile justice council, etc.

Training currently is a "mishmash" of disorganized list of topics of "limited relevance" with even less availability. "A training institute could (should) be developed for relevant curricula for new officers (extended residential basic training and on-going certification; required and optional courses. Monographs on the specific area of safety, protocols for home visits, arrest, office safety, etc.

"It is an excellent time with SB363 to develop record exchange protocols among police, schools, and probation. The disclosure authorization by SHOCAP should be extended to include all minors under any type of court supervision

4. Cross-training; creative ways of spreading information on "what works in corrections"

5. Same as above

6.

7. Media/public relations; privatization (basic studies on effectiveness); resources on how to obtain funding/grants; studies on how salaries affect retention/recruitment of staff; liability; sentencing alternatives; automation use and technology
7. What other major problems or issues that have not been asked related to the functioning of pretrial agencies, or the judicial system as a whole - that you feel have not yet been asked, which you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

1. Increase OR pretrial supervision; electronic monitoring
2. Use of electronic monitoring to monitor home confinement curfew cases
3. Education of the public: who, how, what are the most effective ways to make this happen; i.e., informing about effective corrections and who/what prison should be used for
4. Unsure at this time
5. Education of the public: who, how, what are the most effective ways to make this happen; i.e., informing about effective corrections and who/what prison should be used for
6. Unsure at this time
7. CCTAP could assist our new Sarasota County Pretrial Services Department in its operations; the program could assist the county jail with demographics and provide more sentencing alternative
8. On-site consultation concerning issues for court practitioners. This would raise the level and commitment to adequately fund pre-sentence classification treatment evaluation for offenders; An attempt to demonstrate proper case resolution and sentencing actually decreases both crime and cost to the public
8. Are there two or three colleagues in other jurisdictions/agencies whom you recommend that we contact for comments on the questions covered in this survey? Please list their names, titles and telephone numbers.

1. Mario Paparozzi, APPA president (609) 292-6475
   Mike Mullins, Chair, CT Board of Parole (860) 692-7400
   Mike Brown, Director Community Corrections (603) 271-5652

2. James E. Dare
   Director, Montgomery County APD
   41 North Perry Street
   Dayton, OH 45422-2001
   (937) 225-4714

3. Don Meyer, Director
   Macon County Probation and Court Services
   253 East Wood Street
   Decatur, IL 62523
   (217) 424-1444; fax (217) 425-4513

   Ronald Schaefer, Director
   St. Clair County Probation
   11 West Lincoln
   Belleville, IL 62220
   (618) 277-5690; fax (618) 277-1080

   Kerwin Harvitt, president, Ohio Chief Probation Officers’ Association, (419) 424-7085

5. Justin Jones, Deputy Director
   Division of Community Sentencing
   2200 Classen Boulevard
   Suite 1900
   Oklahoma City, OK 73106
   (405) 523-3075

6. Larry Lumpee, DJJ, 744-8902
   Mike Bridenback, Court Administrator, 272-5894
   Julianne Holt, Public Defender, 272-5980
   Harry Lee Coe, State Attorney, 272-5400
   Denise Alvarez, Chief Judge, 272-6840
Cal Henderson, Sheriff, 247-8000
8. Steven Foster, Sarasota County Criminal Justice Coordinator
   (941) 951-5700

George McQuistan, Manatee County Probation
(941) 749-3051

Walt Smith
Sarasota County Court Administrator
(941) 951-5700

9.

10.
CCTAP NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESPONDENTS

AJA

1. David Parrish  
   Detention Department Commander  
   Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office  
   P.O. Box 3371  
   Tampa, FL 33601  
   Tel: (813) 247-8310; fax: (813) 247-8897; email: dparrish@hcso.tampa.fl.us

2. Sally Graham  
   Manager  
   Administrative Services Department  
   Orange County Corrections  
   P.O. Box 4970  
   Orlando, FL 32802  
   Tel: (407) 836-3581; fax: (407) 836-0359

3. Peter Perroncello  
   Superintendent Jail Operations  
   200 West Street  
   Dedham, MA 02027  
   Tel: (617) 329-3705; Fax: (617) 326-1079

4. Tom Slyter  
   Facility Commander  
   Multnomah County Sheriff's Office  
   1906 SW Halsey Street  
   Troutdale, OR 97060  
   Tel: (503) 248-3266; Fax: (503) 248-5489; email: mcso5080@teleport.com  
   http://www.multnomah.lib.or.us/sheriff/

5. Sally A. Halford  
   Assistant Division Director  
   Missouri Department of Corrections/Division of P & P  
   1511 Christy  
   Jefferson City, MO 65101  
   Tel: (573) 526-6577; Fax: (573) 751-8501; email: shalford@mail.state.mo.us

6. Calvin A. Lightfoot, Warden  
   Allegheny County Jail  
   950 2nd Avenue  
   Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Tel: (412) 350-2100; Fax: (412) 350-2032

APPA

1. Terry Borjeson
   Deputy Director
   Office of Chief Bail Commissioner
   2275 Silas Deane Highway
   Rocky Hill, CT 06067
   Tel: (860) 529-1316; Fax: (860) 529-2438

2. Nancy Martin
   Chief Probation Officer
   Cook County Adult Probation Department
   69 West Washington, Suite 2000
   Chicago, IL 60602
   Tel: (312) 603-0258; Fax: (312) 603-9993

3. Darrell McGibany
   Director
   Madison County Probation and Court Services
   157 N. Main Street, Suite 312
   Edwardsville, IL 62025
   Tel: (618) 692-6255; Fax: (618) 656-4591

4. James F. Wichtman
   Executive Director
   Northwest Community Corrections Center
   203 N. Prospect Street
   Bowling Green OH 43402
   Tel: (419) 353-4066; Fax: (419) 353-7124; e-mail: nwcbcf@wcnet.org

5. Kathy Waters, Deputy Director
   Oklahoma Department of Corrections
   Division of Probation and Parole
   1219 Classen Drive
   Oklahoma City, OK 73103
   Tel: (405) 218-4201; Fax: (405) 218-4215; e-mail: daniel.reed@doc.state.ok.us
   http://www.doc.state.ok.us

6. Gail K. Reddick
   Senior Circuit Administrator
   Florida Department of Corrections
   3390 U.S. 19 North, Suite 340
7. Joseph E. Papy  
Regional Director  
Florida Department of Corrections  
4520 Oak Fair Boulevard  
Tampa, FL 33610  
Tel: (813) 744-8700; Fax: (813) 744-6356; e-mail: jepapy@mail.state.fl.us  
http://www.dc.state.fl.us

8. Same as above

9. Same as above

10. Same as above
APPENDIX E: NACM

Jose Guillen
Executive Officer
NAPA County Consolidated Courts
Napa County, California

The Napa County Courts has replied that it could use assistance in the following areas: 1. how to reorganize and reengineer its management operations so that it might better address change in the future; 2. information on what is available in the area of court technology; 3. training for staff on professionalism and also specific training on the purpose of the court; and, 4. training on budget preparation and strategic and financial planning. As with the other courts, Mr. Guillen stated that his jurisdiction could also use help in resource allocation.

Nadine Sanchez
Court Administrator
La Crusa, New Mexico

Ms. Sanchez stated that the technical assistance needs of her jurisdiction include follow-up for an ongoing grant for a team court. This would include data collection to evaluate how the project has worked. Additionally, she stated that they could use more expertise on how to implement a "one day, one jury" system and training on time and caseflow management for judges. Her jurisdiction includes both urban and rural areas. They would also like to be able to check for consistency between both these areas.

Diane Burrell
Assistant Trial Court Administrator
District Court
Fourth Judicial District, Idaho

The areas of interest for technical assistance in this jurisdiction are in managing growth, automation technology, caseflow management and training of staff. Ms. Burrell specifically requests that this be done by on-site consultation.
Anne Thompson
Court Administrator
Municipal Criminal Court
Tulsa, OK

The Municipal Criminal Court in Tulsa, Oklahoma just completed the first phase of its Strategic Plan. A review of the plan indicates that the court has focused on automation technology, resource and staff allocation, health and security, and space as the primary issues needing attention. Ms. Thompson reiterated this during her telephone interview, stating that the court needs to focus on information technology and resource allocation. According to Ms. Thompson, while training of management staff is well taken care of by the city, there needs to be more training for in-service employees. This might include the preparation of training manuals. They also just completed a systems audit by IBM. She feels that they have a tremendous backlog in information technology and that they would benefit from an independent presentation of what systems are out there. She stated that she feels they have a "bilge" mentality and have not had sufficient resources to even study what they need. It is a high volume traffic and misdemeanor court which also includes the juvenile curfew docket.

Diana Jones
Court Administrator
Garden City, Kansas

According to Ms. Jones, the most pressing and immediate needs of this court are for an increase in the number of judges and space. Garden City, Kansas is in a growing community where approximately 26 different languages are spoken. Due to a severe shortage of courtrooms, court is sometimes held in space provided by the Salvation Army or at the fairgrounds. There are few staff members who are bilingual. Sometimes there may be as many as 5 interpreters in a courtroom for a trial. Ms. Jones felt their short-term automation needs have been well handled. The only training she thought might be helpful was on how to handle a diverse ethnic community. She also stated that as they have been so under siege on space issues, there hasn't been sufficient time to focus on other needs they might have.
## Appendix F: Responses by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>Prosecutor</th>
<th>APPA/AJA</th>
<th>NACM</th>
<th>Public Defender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs Assessment Survey: Technical Assistance and Training

**Introduction:** The Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project (CCTAP) is a joint undertaking of American University, the Justice Management Institute, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, and the Pretrial Services Resource Center. The project is designed to help state and local criminal courts and related agencies, both with respect to their agency-specific needs and the improvement needs of the criminal adjudication system as a whole. It has formal working relationships with the National District Attorney Association, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics (SEARCH), and many national professional memberships associations representing practitioners in the courts, corrections, law enforcement, and criminal justice planning and policy development fields. The project is administered by American University.

CCTAP services include: short-term on-site consultation by an individual or team of senior practitioners (including multiple site visits, if necessary), training programs for state and local judicial system personnel (in-state and regional); dissemination of resource materials from the collections and publications of the partner organizations; and assistance with jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction networking of judicial system personnel. All of these services are offered at no cost to the requesting court, agency or jurisdiction. In some cases, minor cost sharing may be entailed to carry out the goals of a particular on-site assignment.

Because the project does not have unlimited funds, we will be conducting periodic needs assessments by phone and mail with judicial system practitioners in order to establish priority need areas for the allocation of project resources and effort. Your cooperation in completing this survey form would be very much appreciated and valuable to the project in maintaining the relevancy of CCTAP to the needs of the field.

Finally, although the CCTAP project will focus on criminal case processing issues, we also are interested in any needs you might identify related to civil case processing as well, so that we may incorporate these into our project planning and the development of priorities for other Justice Department and SJI technical assistance activities with which the CCTAP project is coordinating.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Please mail or fax your completed survey to the CCTAP Project Office:

CCTAP Project  
American University  
Brandywine 660  
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20016-8159  
Fax: (202) 885-2885
CCTAP NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY: STATE AOC DIRECTORS

Name: ____________________________________________
Title: ____________________________________________
Agency: __________________________________________
Mailing Address: __________________________________
Telephone Number.: ____________________________ Fax: __________________________
E-Mail Address: __________________________________
Court/Agency Web Site: ____________________________

1. What have been the most significant internal management and operational issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Your office: ______________________________________

Local courts: _____________________________________
2. What have been the most significant training-related issues or needs identified for your office and for the local courts in your state over the past several years?

Your office:

Local courts:

3. What have been the most significant interagency issues or needs your office and the local courts in your state have had to address over the past several years?

Your office:
4. Which, if any, of the above needs or issues have not been resolved to your satisfaction?

Your office:

Local courts:

5. What major issues or needs do you foresee affecting your office or the local courts in your state during the next year?

Your office:
Local courts:

6. Would any of the issues or problems noted in question #5 be amenable to assistance from the CCTAP project? If so, what type of CCTAP service would be most helpful?

Your office:

Local courts:
7. Outside of your own jurisdiction, what are the major problems or issues related to the functioning of State AOCs — or the judicial system as a whole — that you feel that the CCTAP project should address? What type of CCTAP services do you feel would be most helpful?

8. Are there two or three colleagues in other jurisdictions whom you recommend that we contact for comments on the questions covered in this survey? Please list their names, titles and telephone numbers.