

**Critical Issues:
Planning Priorities for the
Wisconsin Court System**

2020 - 2022



Submitted to the Wisconsin Supreme Court
by the
Planning and Policy Advisory Committee
December 2019

**Critical Issues:
Planning Priorities for the Wisconsin Court System
2020 – 2022**

PPAC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2019	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PPAC PLANNING BACKGROUND	4
REPORT METHODOLOGY	5
CRITICAL ISSUES AND PLANNING PRIORITIES	
I. Use of Technology	7
II. Court Security.....	8
III. Research and Data Analysis	9
OTHER ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE	10
APPENDIX A: 2019 Judicial Conference Feedback	14

**PLANNING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
2019**

Circuit Court Judges

Hon. Scott Horne (Chair)
La Crosse County

Hon. John Yackel
Sawyer County

Hon. Robert Repischak
Racine County

Hon. Paul Van Grunsven
Milwaukee County

Circuit Court Commissioner
Commissioner Katherine Stewart
Barron/Washburn Counties

Appellate Court Judge

Hon. Brian Blanchard
Court of Appeals, District IV

Clerk of Circuit Court
Carlo Esqueda
Dane County

District Court Administrator
Theresa Owens
Fifth Judicial Administrative District

Public Member
Steven T. Cook
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Ex officio Members

Chief Justice Patience D. Roggensack
Wisconsin Supreme Court
Planning and Policy Advisory Committee, Chair

Hon. Michael Aprahamian
Waukesha County
Planning and Policy Advisory Committee, Vice-Chair

Hon. Randy R. Koschnick
Director of State Courts

Staff

Ann Olson
Policy Analyst
Office of Court Operations

Mission of the Wisconsin Court System:

The mission of the Wisconsin Court System is to protect individuals' rights, privileges and liberties, to maintain the rule of law, and to provide a forum for the resolution of disputes that is fair, accessible, independent, and effective.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Planning and Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC) of the Wisconsin Supreme Court develops the biennial *Critical Issues Report* to identify key matters affecting the court system and set priorities. The Supreme Court and Director of State Courts use this information to develop budget recommendations, priorities, and other initiatives.

For the 2020-2022 biennium, PPAC recommends that the Supreme Court and Director of State Courts prioritize three critical issues:

- Use of technology;
- Court security; and
- Research and data analysis.

This report includes recommendations from the PPAC Planning Subcommittee to address each critical issue. The action steps are divided into categories to indicate whether they are training objectives, short-term objectives, or long-term objectives.

Finally, this report summarizes activities and initiatives already in progress that address priorities identified both in this report as well as in prior reports. PPAC is responsible for monitoring the progress of each critical issue.

PPAC PLANNING BACKGROUND

The Planning and Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC) was created to advise the Supreme Court and the Director of State Courts, in the Director's capacity as the judicial system's planner and policy advisor (Supreme Court Rule 70.14). PPAC developed the court system's first strategic plan in 1994, entitled *Framework for Action*.

In order to strengthen the committee's overall planning function, PPAC established the Planning Subcommittee. The Planning Subcommittee has issued the *Critical Issues* report every other year since 2002. PPAC and the Director of State Courts have responded to the report's recommendations in a variety of ways, including creating subject matter subcommittees, directing the work of staff in the Office of Court Operations, and developing biennial budget proposals for the Supreme Court's consideration.

REPORT METHODOLOGY

The planning process for the 2020-2022 biennium began by reviewing articles and reports by the National Center for State Courts, the State Bar of Wisconsin, and others about trends affecting state courts. In July 2019, an online survey was conducted to collect information from internal and external stakeholders, including all state judges and justices, circuit court commissioners, clerks of circuit court, registers in probate, juvenile court clerks, district court administrators, director of state courts staff, PPAC members, legislators, elected county officials, district attorneys, public defenders, corporation counsel, State Bar of Wisconsin members, and staff at the Wisconsin Department of Corrections and Department of Justice.

The survey asked respondents to rate the importance of nine topics:

- Use of technology
- Substance abuse/treatment courts
- Mental health
- Court security
- Pretrial services
- Self-represented litigants
- Racial disparities
- Research and data
- Victims' rights

Respondents were asked to rate each topic on a scale of 0-5, with 0 indicating that an issue was not at all important and 5 indicating that an issue was very important. For each question, respondents were also invited to rate subtopics within each area from 1-5. Beyond the 9 overall topics included in the survey, respondents were invited to provide additional topics they thought the court system should consider. Four hundred and eleven (411) completed survey responses were received. The overall response rate was slightly lower than for the 2017 survey, but similar to the 2015 response. The decline in response rate for the 2019 survey may be due to the revised, more detailed survey question format, and the perception that the survey would take longer to complete. The average completion time for the 2019 survey was between 5 and 7 minutes, which is similar to past years. In addition, state agency staff took the survey at lower levels than in the past. This may be, in part, due to changes in state administrative department leadership following the 2018 election and lack of familiarity with the survey among new staff and managers.

Survey results were tabulated separately for the 289 court respondents (judges, court commissioners, clerks, district court administrators, clerks of circuit court, and other court staff) and for the 152 non-court respondents (private attorneys, district attorneys, public defenders, elected officials, and others). Despite some differences in the ranking of issues, there was considerable overlap between both court and non-court responses.

The Planning Subcommittee reviewed the survey results and identified three critical issues for the 2020-2022 biennium. At the November 2019 Judicial Conference, Planning Subcommittee chair Judge Scott Horne presented the three selected critical issue areas. Conference attendees provided further guidance in the planning process (see Appendix A).

In drafting recommendations to address the three critical issues, the Planning Subcommittee focused on three types of actions or objectives. Short-term objectives address actions that are already taking place in the system or those that need to begin to ensure completion in the next 1-5 years. Long-term objectives are those that PPAC and the Supreme Court aspire to achieve in 5-10 years. Finally, PPAC recognizes the role that training plays in continually improving the quality of service the court system provides. Training objectives highlight how training, provided through the Office of Judicial Education, the Judicial College, and other conferences and trainings hosted throughout the year, such as the Court Safety and Security Conference, can be used to address the critical issues.

CRITICAL ISSUES AND PLANNING PRIORITIES

Critical Issue 1: Use of Technology

Issue

Following a 2015 rule petition presented by the Committee of Chief Judges, electronic filing (eFiling) is anticipated to be fully implemented at the circuit court level by the end of 2019.

The transition to eFiling has been accompanied by several technology implementation efforts, including the enhancement of the case management system to better integrate eFiling documents.

Technology is also being used to better capture the court record, through the installation of digital audio recording (DAR) equipment. This type of recording system provides courts with the flexibility to utilize digital court reporters to address the ongoing shortage of stenographic court reporters. Some counties are exploring online dispute resolution (ODR) systems to provide an alternative environment for mediation and conflict resolution.

An additional focus for technology during the 2020-2022 period will be the exploration of video remote interpreting (VRI), which uses high-quality video and audio to connect courtrooms with interpreters in remote locations. Improved availability of interpreter services is beneficial to counties and supports the procedural justice rights of parties.

In the coming biennium, emphasis also will be given to minimizing cybersecurity threats by ensuring that judges and court staff are trained on the proper and safe use of court system technology. In addition, the court system will support standardization and interoperability of technology across counties and explore avenues to increase the availability of video-based testimony, where feasible.

Action Steps

Training Objective:

PPAC will promote and support training for judges, court commissioners, attorneys, and court staff on available technologies, including advanced training on eFiling and use of digital audio recording equipment and software.

Short-Term Objectives:

PPAC, through the Consolidated Court Automation Programs (CCAP), will support statewide installation of improved technology for digital audio recording (DAR) equipment in all circuit courts. Each courthouse will have at least one DAR unit installed by the end of 2020, and each courtroom will have a DAR unit by the end of 2023.

All users of CCAP technology will be required to complete mandatory cybersecurity training on an annual basis.

PPAC, through the Court Interpreter Program, will pursue opportunities for use of video remote interpreting, including development of a VRI pilot program in a small number of counties.

Long-Term Objectives:

PPAC will support initiatives that embrace emerging technologies in a manner that strengthens the Wisconsin Court System and improves the administration of justice.

By 2025, Wisconsin state courts at all levels will utilize electronic filing systems.

Critical Issue 2: Courthouse Security

Issue

The 2012 adoption of Supreme Court Rule Chapter 68 laid the groundwork for establishing county-level security protocols that provide a safe environment for judges, parties, members of the public, and staff to participate in court proceedings. The PPAC Court Security Subcommittee played a substantial role in the creation of SCR Ch. 68, which provides a framework for counties and courts to use when examining their policies and practices, exploring construction or renovation projects, and instituting new security measures.

Action steps in this critical issue area are intended to support local committees in the development of training plans and the assessment of threats and incidents. In addition, efforts will include training and technical assistance for local committees to develop security self-assessments and strategic plans. In addition, events such as the Court Safety and Security Conference can foster effective collaboration with law enforcement officers to ensure that judges and court staff are prepared to react in an emergency situation.

The PPAC Court Security Subcommittee has undertaken a review of the current rule and is preparing to submit a rule petition to enact revisions. These changes are intended to ensure that all counties will be equipped with a unified set of basic guidelines to ensure a safe and secure court environment.

Action Steps

Training Objectives

PPAC, in partnership with District Court Administrators, PPAC Court Security Subcommittee members, and Office of Court Operations staff, will support training opportunities regarding judicial security measures, threat and incident reporting, and effective security and facility committee management.

Short-Term Objectives

PPAC, through the Office of Court Operations and District Court Administrators, will continue to provide guidance to judges and county committees regarding submission of security threats and incident reports. These reports enable the Office of Court Operations to analyze trends and provide updates to the Supreme Court.

Each county will, by 2022, demonstrate that it has established a local security committee, developed a process for reporting security incidents, and conducted a security self-assessment. Following a security audit or self-assessment, local committees will be encouraged to develop a strategic plan for addressing unmet security needs.

PPAC, through its Court Security Subcommittee, will submit a rule petition to update portions of SCR Ch. 68 to more effectively serve judges, court officials and the community.

Long-Term Objective

By 2025, every court in Wisconsin will be in compliance with the guidelines established in SCR Ch. 68.

Critical Issue 3: Research and Data Analysis

Issue

The Wisconsin Court System created a Research and Justice Statistics unit in 2018 to help improve the availability, analysis, and application of court data.

To ensure that this work provides value to the court system as a whole, a Research and Justice Statistics Advisory Committee has been convened. This internal oversight body, which includes representation from across the court system, including the Chief Justice, the Director of State Courts, circuit court judges, clerks of circuit court, district court administrators, and staff from the Office of Court Operations, will provide feedback and guidance regarding potential research projects and methods.

It is anticipated that the Research and Justice Statistics unit will help the court system assess the effectiveness of evidenced-based decision making tools being used by judges across the state, and thereby encourage use of research-supported techniques.

Action Steps

Training Objective:

PPAC will support the efforts to train clerks of circuit court and court staff to improve the consistency and accuracy of court data entered into CCAP.

Short-Term Objective:

By 2022, PPAC will, through the Research and Justice Statistics Advisory Committee, develop guidelines and priorities for effective court data research and reporting.

Long-Term Objectives:

PPAC will support the Research and Justice Statistics Advisory Committee in determining how best to work in partnership with state agencies to identify topics of mutual interest and to prioritize long-term objectives.

By 2025, the Research and Justice Statistics unit will create a functioning court data warehouse.

OTHER ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE

In addition to the three topics outlined above, the following section highlights ongoing activities associated with areas included in previous critical issues reports, but not selected as critical issues for the 2020-2022 cycle. These include treatment courts, evidence-based decision making, pretrial services, and racial disparities. Each of these areas plays a significant role in the overall functioning of the court system and contributes to the effective administration of justice.

Treatment Courts

Substance abuse, mental health, and the availability of treatment resources once again ranked among the most important issues in the most recent critical issues survey, both for court and non-court respondents. Although substance abuse and mental health have been included as critical issues in past reports, the proliferation of treatment courts, also referred to as problem-solving courts, across the state demonstrates a high level of strategic engagement by the court system to effectively address the needs of offenders with substance abuse and mental health challenges.

Currently, 62 counties and five tribal communities operate treatment courts, including adult drug treatment courts, tribal healing to wellness courts, mental health courts, veterans' courts, OWI courts, and family drug treatment courts. Many of these programs are supported through Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) grants, created by 2005 Wisconsin Act 25 in order to augment efforts underway in some counties to provide treatment and diversion for non-violent adult offenders for whom substance abuse is a contributing factor in their criminal activity.

Because mental health and substance abuse issues continue to plague residents, often as co-occurring disorders, and because these cases continue to drive a large percentage of court dockets, it is incumbent upon the court system to approach problem-solving courts in a coordinated manner, and to provide judges with the training and tools they need to successfully operate these programs.

The court system provides direct assistance to specialty courts through a statewide problem-solving court coordinator, who works with judges and treatment court staff to augment state and district training programs and to ensure adherence to statewide treatment court standards. In addition, several training sessions have been offered for problem-solving court programs in various stages of planning and implementation. Peer review programs are also being developed, and the problem-solving court coordinator is spearheading a statewide strategic planning effort to provide a coordinated path forward for the state's specialty courts. Various aspects of treatment court recordkeeping and confidentiality are also being explored in order to improve consistency across county programs and ensure that participants' information remains confidential. This review will take place within a workgroup consisting of PPAC Effective Justice Strategies (EJS)

Subcommittee members, county treatment court coordinators, clerks of circuit court, judges, and Office of Court Operations staff.

Evidence-Based Decision Making

Wisconsin has long been a national leader in the support and application of Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM) principles. The primary focus areas of EBDM include building collaboration, implementing change, and reducing recidivism across the criminal justice continuum, beginning at arrest and continuing through discharge following a sentence.

Members of the state-level EBDM team, which includes EJS members, continue to provide a framework for statewide implementation of pre-trial and diversion programs, including developing program standards, training county-level teams on implementation, supporting bail reform, and providing evidence-based recommendations for criminal justice system stakeholders at all levels of the criminal justice system.

EBDM efforts in Wisconsin have also benefitted from technical assistance provided by the National Institute of Corrections. Through NIC support, the state EBDM team convened a two-day sustainability and planning meeting to foster continued EBDM expansion and serve as a framework for justice system operations and decision-making in Wisconsin. One product of this gathering was development of a statewide plan for expansion of EBDM efforts, focusing on (1) Education, (2) Governance, (3) Expansion/Scale-Up, and (4) Data/Research. This statewide plan is expected to guide future activities and to help additional counties implement EBDM by proactively engaging community stakeholders and developing targeted local action plans. Work in this area will also continue to focus on encouraging the use of risk assessments, supporting bail reform, and providing criminal justice system stakeholders with additional evidence-based resources and approaches.

Pretrial Services

A direct outgrowth of the statewide EBDM effort has been the emergence of several pretrial services pilot programs. The Pretrial Pilot Project currently includes 8 counties, all of which are in different stages of implementation (Milwaukee, Eau Claire, Chippewa, Waukesha, Marathon, Rock, Outagamie, and La Crosse). The goal of this pilot project is to identify successful interventions, address challenges, evaluate the effectiveness of pretrial services, and create tools and processes that can be replicated in other counties. As the pilot project moves forward, a statewide operational guide is being developed, and the Wisconsin Department of Justice is exploring how best to collect and analyze data from the pilot counties to assess outcomes.

In order to provide additional structure and leadership to the pretrial services effort, the Director of State Courts Office recently added a statewide pretrial services program manager in the Office of Court Operations to serve as a dedicated resource for these programs. This position will help facilitate the development and expansion of effective pretrial programming in additional Wisconsin counties.

Racial Disparity

In a survey using live polling of judges at the 2019 Wisconsin Judicial Conference, more than three-fourths of judges indicated that they felt it is either *extremely important* (51%) or *important* (27%) for judges to understand implicit bias. In addition past Wisconsin Judicial Conference sessions focused on implicit bias, including a plenary session in 2015 and a breakout session in 2018, the PPAC Effective Justice Strategies subcommittee continues to encourage training and awareness on this concept among attorneys and judicial officers. Dane County has held several county-level training seminars, and Milwaukee County judges and court staff participate in an annual conference on the intersection of race and justice each year. In 2019, La Crosse County convened a series of community-wide forums that drew local elected officials, judges, law enforcement representatives and others.

Training to increase awareness of implicit bias may be explored as a component of the Judicial College so that all new judges can be provided with a framework for understanding how unconscious biases may impact judicial decision-making. In addition, Wisconsin Department of Justice treatment court participant data may be reviewed to examine whether or not race impacts treatment court or pretrial diversion program participation.

Conclusion

This report identifies critical issues for the court system to address during the coming biennium. The Planning and Policy Advisory Committee will monitor the actions taken to achieve the objectives and will update the Wisconsin Supreme Court and the Director of State Courts on progress.

Appendix A: 2019 Judicial Conference PPAC Session Feedback

Use of Technology																						
<p>1. Do you feel that the switch to an eFiling system has been beneficial for the court system, overall?</p> <p>A. Yes B. I'm not sure C. No</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>106</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>16</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>10</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>132</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	106	80	B	16	12	C	10	8	Total	132							
	Number	%																				
A	106	80																				
B	16	12																				
C	10	8																				
Total	132																					
<p>2. Do you feel that eFiling has increased your efficiency as a judge?</p> <p>A. Yes B. Somewhat C. I'm not sure D. Not Really E. Absolutely not</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>66</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>24</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>12</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>18</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>126</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	66	52	B	24	19	C	12	10	D	18	14	E	6	5	Total	126	
	Number	%																				
A	66	52																				
B	24	19																				
C	12	10																				
D	18	14																				
E	6	5																				
Total	126																					
<p>3. Do you feel that the Judicial Dashboard has increased your efficiency as a judge?</p> <p>A. Yes B. Somewhat C. I'm not sure D. Not Really E. Absolutely not</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>83</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>11</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>10</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>110</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	83	75	B	11	10	C	10	9	D	4	4	E	2	2	Total	110	
	Number	%																				
A	83	75																				
B	11	10																				
C	10	9																				
D	4	4																				
E	2	2																				
Total	110																					
<p>4. Does inadequate or outdated technology (audio, video, display, WIFI, etc.) impede the presentation of evidence in your courtroom?</p> <p>A. Yes B. Often C. Sometimes D. Hardly ever E. Never</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>50</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>14</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>45</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>12</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>7</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>128</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	50	39	B	14	11	C	45	35	D	12	9	E	7	5	Total	128	
	Number	%																				
A	50	39																				
B	14	11																				
C	45	35																				
D	12	9																				
E	7	5																				
Total	128																					
<p>5. Would you consider use of video remote interpreting (VRI) in your courtroom?</p> <p>A. Yes B. Probably C. I'm not sure D. No</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>90</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>19</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>9</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>12</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>130</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	90	69	B	19	15	C	9	7	D	12	9	Total	130				
	Number	%																				
A	90	69																				
B	19	15																				
C	9	7																				
D	12	9																				
Total	130																					

Courthouse Security																							
<p>6. How many courthouses in Wisconsin have active security screening at the building entrance?</p> <p>A. 19%</p> <p>B. 27%</p> <p>C. 38%*</p> <p>D. 43%</p> <p>E. 49%</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>14</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>12</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>74</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>12</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>12</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>124</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Number	%	A	14	11	B	12	10	C	74	60	D	12	10	E	12	10	Total	124	
	Number	%																					
A	14	11																					
B	12	10																					
C	74	60																					
D	12	10																					
E	12	10																					
Total	124																						
<p>7. Does your county have an active court security and facilities committee?</p> <p>A. Yes, and it meets regularly</p> <p>B. Yes, but it does not meet regularly</p> <p>C. We don't have a committee</p> <p>D. I don't know</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>85</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>16</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>10</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>115</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Number	%	A	85	74	B	16	14	C	4	3	D	10	9	Total	115				
	Number	%																					
A	85	74																					
B	16	14																					
C	4	3																					
D	10	9																					
Total	115																						
<p>8. How many counties reported security incidents to the Director of State Courts in 2018?</p> <p>A. 11-15</p> <p>B. 16-20</p> <p>C. 21-25</p> <p>D. 26-30</p> <p>E. More than 30</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>19</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>25</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>20</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>13</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>57</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>134</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Number	%	A	19	14	B	25	19	C	20	15	D	13	10	E	57	43	Total	134	
	Number	%																					
A	19	14																					
B	25	19																					
C	20	15																					
D	13	10																					
E	57	43																					
Total	134																						

*As of November 2019, 27 counties, or 38%, indicated that they have active security screening at their courthouse entry. An additional 4 counties do not have building-level perimeter screening, but have security screening at the entry point to the courtroom area of the building.

Other Areas of Importance																						
<p>9. Do you support the return of most 17-year-olds to juvenile court?</p> <p>A. Yes, this system worked well in the past and research supports such a change</p> <p>B. Yes, but only with additional resources for county services</p> <p>C. Not sure - I would need to see the details</p> <p>D. No, the present cutoff is appropriate</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>51</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>43</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>19</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>21</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>134</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	51	38	B	43	32	C	19	14	D	21	16	Total	134				
	Number	%																				
A	51	38																				
B	43	32																				
C	19	14																				
D	21	16																				
Total	134																					
<p>10. Would you like more training on how to incorporate trauma-informed practices into your courtroom?</p> <p>A. No, I have already done this</p> <p>B. No, I don't see how this would be useful to me</p> <p>C. Yes, I would like more training on how to apply it</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>39</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>15</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>72</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>126</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	39	31	B	15	12	C	72	57	Total	126							
	Number	%																				
A	39	31																				
B	15	12																				
C	72	57																				
Total	126																					
<p>11. Do you feel that you have somewhere to turn if you need help dealing with stress or trauma as a result of serving as a judge?</p> <p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. I don't know</p> <p>C. No</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>85</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>13</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>29</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>127</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	85	67	B	13	10	C	29	23	Total	127							
	Number	%																				
A	85	67																				
B	13	10																				
C	29	23																				
Total	127																					
<p>12. How important is understanding about implicit bias for a judge?</p> <p>A. Extremely important</p> <p>B. Important</p> <p>C. Somewhat important</p> <p>D. Not very important- I'm not sure how it applies to me</p> <p>E. Not at all important- I don't see this as a problem</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>73</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>38</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>21</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>8</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>143</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number	%	A	73	51	B	38	27	C	21	15	D	3	2	E	8	6	Total	143	
	Number	%																				
A	73	51																				
B	38	27																				
C	21	15																				
D	3	2																				
E	8	6																				
Total	143																					