

Tab 1

Montana Supreme Court Access to Justice Commission
December 3, 2021
Zoom Video Conference
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Justice Beth Baker, Ed Bartlett, Aimee Grmoljez, Hon. Leslie Halligan, Katy Lovell, Mark Mattioli, Kyle Nelson, Alison Paul, and Olivia Riutta.

Commissioners Absent: Georgette Boggio, Rick Cook, Hon. Stacie Four Star, Sen. Terry Gauthier, Dean Paul Kirgis, Hon. John Kutzman, Daniel McLean, and Rep. Katherine Sullivan.

Others Present: Emma Schmelzer, Niki Zupanic, Kathryn Hohmann, Harley Brown, Alex Kramer, Kim Dudik, McKayla Henson, Patty Fain, Ann Goldes-Sheahan, Sarah McClain, and Krista Partridge.

Call to Order & Introductions

Justice Baker called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. Justice Baker introduced Emma Schmelzer, the new ARPA Coordinator. She noted that Emma brings a wealth of national and international experience on mediation and we were fortunate to find someone of her caliber to join the team. Emma added that she is excited to return to Montana to help implement the Simplified Family Law Resolution Project. The approval of minutes from the last meeting was postponed until a quorum was present.

ARPA Simplified Family Law Resolution Project

Alison Paul said that MLSA is still waiting for the final contract from the Court Administrator's Office. MLSA will be working with the court to provide mediators for family law litigants who are under 300% of the federal poverty guidelines. Emma Schmelzer said that she has discussed the E-RAMP pilot with Patty Fain and hopes to build on the success of that project to tackle backlogged court calendars, empowering people to be able to move forward with their lives. She confirmed that Cascade County will be participating in the project, and said that she will be working with MLSA on procedures and protocols. Emma added that the Informal Domestic Relations trials are less intimidating and frustrating for self-represented litigants. Justice Baker said that the focus of the project will be on getting concrete data to measure outcomes and that we hope to have a full year of experience and data to present at the next legislative session.

MLSA Update

Alison Paul reported that the Montana Eviction Intervention Project with the Department of Commerce has expanded beyond providing attorneys for tenants facing eviction and will include MLSA administering rental assistance funds to eligible tenants in court-connected eviction cases. MLSA is hiring additional eviction navigators and intake and compliance specialists to support the project. The expanded program will also include a mediation component. MLSA has also received a grant from the Legal Services Corporation to revamp the MontanaLawHelp website by adding guided navigation and other improvements to make the website easier to use. Finally, Alison noted that MLSA is partnering with the Court Administrator's Office and the University of Montana on a pilot project to provide social worker services in dependency and neglect cases as a

first intervention to keep children from being removed from the home. Justice Baker thanked Alison and noted the critical importance of the eviction prevention project in averting homelessness. Justice Baker also congratulated Alison and MLSA on the national recognition for the Rural Incubator Program for Lawyers as highlighted in the current issue of the Montana Lawyer.

Court Help Program Update

Alex Kramer reported that four of the six self-help law centers (SHLC) are open and that the new AmeriCorps member in Bozeman will be starting soon. The Great Falls SHLC is still recruiting for an AmeriCorps member, and the center will be re-locating to the library. Justice Baker asked how people are being served in areas where the SHLC is closed. Alex said that the Helena SHLC and State Law Library staff are available by phone and have been sending out forms and assisting clients.

Justice for Montanans AmeriCorps Update

Harley Brown reported that the Justice for Montanans AmeriCorps program (JFM) has 26 member slots for the 2021-22 service term, with most members serving at the SHLCs and at MLSA. Additional members serve at the Office of Consumer Protection, Montana Fair Housing, YWCA Missoula, Legal Services Developer, and the Office of Child and Family Ombudsman. She explained that members help add capacity to serve Montanans in need of legal services and said that in the last service term, members reached over 50,000 Montanans through their outreach efforts. The difficulty in recruiting members this year is largely due to housing costs. Harley noted that one of the members from the last term needed over 60% of her stipend just to pay rent. Alison encouraged everyone to think of older individuals who might be interested in serving. Justice Baker pointed out that many JFM alumni return as staff members or volunteers because their AmeriCorps experience inspires a lifelong commitment to help. Emma Schmelzer suggested that recruiting host families for members might be a good option.

Outreach and Communications Committee

Katy Lovell said that the committee has been meeting monthly and is working on targeted messaging designed for different audiences. She shared a “Smart Chart” process that the group has been working on and explained that the first chart will be designed for the Governor’s office as the intended audience. Katy explained that the committee will share the chart with the members once it’s finalized. Justice Baker thanked the committee for starting on this work. Niki Zupanic added that the committee will be seeking input on the chart from other committees and members of the commission.

Katy then needed to leave the meeting, but voted to approve the September meeting minutes before leaving.

Self-Represented Litigants Committee

Ann Goldes-Sheahan reported that she hasn’t been active on the committee recently due to the rollout of the new State Bar tech platform and asked Sarah McClain to give an update on the committee’s activities. Sarah said that State Law Librarian Christine Mandiloff has agreed to co-chair the committee and that the committee plans to hold a strategic planning session in early January. Sarah said that the priority for the committee is to develop resources that aren’t already

covered by MontanaLawHelp or the Legal Services Developer. The most recent project was a brochure for informal probate and supplementary family law FAQs. She said the committee is open to new members and welcomes suggestions on topics where resources are needed. Justice Baker said that the outreach to libraries is very beneficial and is thankful for the involvement of Christine and the State Law Library. Ann Goldes-Sheahan added that the new State Bar Licensed Lawyer website will go live soon and should make it much easier for the public to find lawyers and link to resources. She said she will reach out to Alex Kramer to provide training on the Licensed Lawyer site to SHLC staff.

Approval of September Meeting Minutes

A quorum was reached when Aimee Grmoljez joined the meeting. Justice Baker asked if there were any additions or corrections to the September meeting minutes. There were no additions or corrections. Judge Halligan moved to approve the minutes as submitted and Alison Paul seconded the motion. The minutes were approved without objection.

Policy and Resources Committee

Justice Baker reported that the committee will be working with the Outreach and Communications Committee and the ARPA program to prepare for the 2023 legislative session. She added that the committee will also be discussing the idea of a tax credit for lawyers who locate in rural areas and will look at models in Maine and Arizona for ideas.

ABA Racial Justice Working Group Update

Kim Dudik reported that the group met in October and agreed on the need to take a different and systematic approach to get tribal organizations and native populations involved in the group. She said that Alison Paul is working on finding and hiring a facilitator for the next meeting. She said that Justice Baker worked with the Judges Association to include implicit bias training in the next meeting. Justice Baker clarified that Justice Gustafson has discussed the subject with the National Center for State Courts and is working to include racial justice education at the Judges Association meeting. Justice Baker said we are learning from the ABA and other national efforts and there are great resources available to educate jurors and court personnel on implicit bias.

2021 Pro Bono Report

Patty Fain presented the 2021 Pro Bono report and covered some highlights from the report. She said that in 2020, 1,150 attorneys reported 100,000 hours of service, worth approximately \$14,000,000. Reporting for pro bono hours is voluntary and Montana has a great tradition of leading the nation in pro bono reporting, even ahead of states with mandatory reporting. Unfortunately, reporting is down 40% from three years ago, likely a result of the pandemic. She said that innovative approaches for reporting and ways to provide service have grown out of the pandemic and it's possible that this will foster a long-term increase in service. Patty reported that that service had started to decline even before the pandemic, and she is concerned that the aging attorney population and less volunteerism shown by newer attorneys will increase that trend. She asked the group to share perspectives and ideas on how generate more interest in pro bono service in the face of increasing need. Justice Baker thanked Patty and agreed that we need to find ways to reinvigorate a spirit of service in members of the bar and come up with different approaches to more effectively engage out-of-state attorneys being admitted by motion. She said that we need to build on the innovations that came out of the pandemic. Aimee Grmoljez suggested using Survey

Monkey to send out a survey to attorneys so that they can provide input anonymously. Patty said that she feels a need to dig a little deeper than what can be gained through an online survey, and that she's looking at ways to do focus groups that could also be anonymous. Justice Baker said that engaging law students and instilling the culture of service at an early stage in their careers will be key for the future. Ann Goldes-Sheahan said that some of the younger trustees on the State Bar Strategic Planning Committee were very interested in pro bono service and might be willing to lead the effort to engage their peers.

Public Comment and Next Meeting Dates

Justice Baker asked for public comment. There was no public comment. The 2022 meeting dates are listed on the agenda and Justice Baker asked members to put them on their calendars. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Tab 2

The Supreme Court of Montana
Office of the Court Administrator

Beth McLaughlin
Court Administrator



301 South Park
P.O. Box 203005
Helena, Montana 59620-3002
Telephone (406) 841-2950
FAX (406) 841-2955

January 11, 2022

TO: Ryan Osmundson
Governor's Budget Director

Rep. Bill Mercer
Section D Interim Committee

FROM: Beth McLaughlin
Supreme Court Administrator

RE: HB632 Quarterly Update

As required by HB632, Section 21, the Judicial Branch must report quarterly on program implementation, expenditure of funds, and measurable outcomes. The Branch was allocated \$944,721 in HB632 to streamline and expediate the processing of family law matters, which were delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The funding will support early mediation and simplified case processing for self-represented and low-income litigants.

The Branch hired a highly experienced staff person to oversee the program. The new program director has extensive mediation experience and has worked as a victim advocate. The expenditures during the first quarter reflect her salary and set-up costs. The Branch will work with the Montana Legal Services Association as the service provider for the mediation program. During this quarter, the procurement bureau was completing the contract with MLSA, which means no expenses were invoiced and paid.

The program has two components:

Informal Domestic Relations Trials:

The Branch will implement simplified domestic relations trials, which allow litigants to agree to an informal process that does not adhere to the formal court process. The following has been done:

- The Supreme Court approved the IDRT rules.

- The Branch selected the 1st Judicial District (Lewis and Clark and Broadwater counties), the 4th Judicial District (Missoula and Mineral counties), and the 12th Judicial District (Hill, Chouteau, and Liberty counties) as the pilot districts.
- The Branch completed forms and informational materials for litigants who are interested in the process. Most litigants who will seek this out are representing themselves so it's critical to have easy-to-understand informational materials. (Parties with attorneys may also opt to use IDRT – it is not limited to only self-represented litigants.)
- The Branch completed the performance measurement framework, which is attached. Performance measurement reporting will start in July 2022.
- The Branch anticipates IDRT to begin by the end of January 2022.

Domestic Relations Mediation Program:

The Branch, through a contract with the Montana Legal Services Association, will provide family law mediators in certain cases where litigants meet financial requirements, are self-represented, and need a parenting plan as part of the domestic relations case. Through MLSA, litigants will also receive legal advice before mediation. Again, litigants are self-represented and providing legal advice should shorten the mediation process as clients will understand the legal framework before entering mediation. The following has been done:

- The Branch selected the 8th Judicial District (Cascade County), the 13th Judicial District (Yellowstone County), the 18th Judicial District (Gallatin County), and the 19th Judicial District (Lincoln County) as the pilot sites. Each district has many self-represented litigants and has a case backlog from Covid-19 impacts on the court.
- The Branch has designed the mediation process and worked informally with MLSA on developing selection criteria for mediators.
- The Branch is designing a process to identify older cases in the pilot districts that could be appropriate for mediation with the aim of closing those cases first.
- The procurement bureau finalized the contract in early January, which means the remaining program development (selecting and training mediators, selecting cases, and developing performance measurements) can now move forward quickly in the new year.
- The Branch anticipates mediation will begin by March 2022.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Cc: Justice Beth Baker
Emma Schmelzer, Project Manager
Cathy Duncan, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Montana Legal Services Association

Understanding Informal Domestic Relations Trials

Beginning in January 2022, some Montana courts will offer a new option for resolving domestic relations cases. This new option is called “informal domestic relations trials,” or IDRTs.

The following courts and judges will be allowing IDRTs:

- The First Judicial District Court (Broadwater and Lewis & Clark Counties)
- The Fourth Judicial District Court (Missoula and Mineral Counties)
- The Twelfth Judicial District Court (Chouteau, Hill, and Liberty Counties)

If you file a domestic relations case in one of these courts, you now have two options for resolving that proceeding. Domestic relations cases include divorces (or “dissolutions”), custody and visitation (or “parenting plans”), child support, division of property, protection orders, as well as changes to previous domestic relations orders (or “modifications”).

The two types of trials you can choose between are informal and traditional. You will need to choose the type of trial that you think is best for your case. You may want to talk to a lawyer before deciding which type of trial is best for you.

To move forward with an informal trial, you, the other party (your spouse or the other parent), and the judge will all need to agree that an informal trial is the best option. If you can’t all agree, you will have a traditional trial.

What is an Informal Trial?

In an informal trial, you and the other party speak directly to the judge. The judge will ask questions to make sure you cover everything the judge needs to know to decide your case. When you are done speaking, the judge will ask the other person or that person’s lawyer if there are other questions that they think the judge should ask. If it seems helpful, the judge will ask the questions suggested. The other person or lawyer does not question you directly. They also do not get to interrupt you or object to evidence you want to give the judge. Similarly, you do not get to ask the other party questions directly, interrupt, or object to evidence. Most of the time, you and the other person will be the only witnesses.

In an informal trial the Montana Rules of Evidence do not apply, so you can explain the issues more informally and provide any documents or other evidence to the judge without worrying whether it is allowed (or “admissible”). The judge will decide the importance of what each person says and the evidence provided.

Both parties and the judge have to agree to an informal trial. No one can force you to do an informal trial. If you do not choose to do an informal trial, you will have a traditional trial and hearing.

What is a Traditional Trial?

In a traditional trial, lawyers or people who represent themselves usually present information to the judge by calling witnesses and asking questions of them. Each side gets to ask questions directly of the other person and their other witnesses (this is called “cross-examining”). Generally, the judge asks few, if any, questions during a traditional trial.

In a traditional trial, the Montana Rules of Evidence (found [in title 26, chapter 10 of the Montana Code Annotated](#)) apply. These evidentiary rules can be complicated. They place limits on the things you and other witness can talk about and the kind of documents and other evidence that you can give to the judge to consider in deciding the case.

If you or the other person has a lawyer in a traditional trial, the lawyer may, if allowed by the court, make opening statements and closing arguments to the judge and will ask questions of you, the other person, and other witnesses. The lawyer may object if they believe the testimony or documents violate the Montana Rules of Evidence. If you represent yourself, you will be expected to follow the Rules of Evidence. You will be the one to make opening statements and closing arguments, question witnesses, and make objections.

If I Choose an Informal Trial, Can I Have Other Witnesses?

In general, an informal trial will only involve testimony from you and the other party. The judge can decide if other witnesses are necessary.

There is one exception. If you or the other party give the judge a written report from an expert, you, the other party, or the judge can ask that the expert testify under oath and answer questions by either party, their lawyers, or the judge.

Can I Choose an Informal Trial if I Have a Lawyer?

Yes. People with lawyers and people representing themselves can both use informal trials. If you have a lawyer, the lawyer will help you prepare and can sit next to you during the informal trial to offer advice.

In an informal trial, lawyers CAN NOT ask you or the other party questions and they CAN NOT object to evidence or testimony.

A lawyer in an informal trial CAN help you to:

- Prepare for the trial
- identify the issues in the case,
- identify other issues that the judge should ask the other party about,
- question expert witnesses, and
- make short arguments about the law at the end of the case.

Remember, informal trials are voluntary. An informal trial will be used only if both people involved in the case and the judge agree.

Why Would I Choose an Informal Trial?

- Fewer rules apply. Informal trials are usually easier for people who are representing themselves. The judge asks questions and guides the process. The judge will try to reduce conflict between the two sides and help them focus on the children or other issues.
- You can speak directly to the judge about your situation without interruption or objections from the other person or their lawyer.

- You may be uncomfortable with a setting where the other person is allowed to directly ask you questions. In an informal trial, the other person and their lawyer may not question you.
- You do not have to worry about formal rules of evidence that limit what you can say in the courtroom. You can:
 - speak freely about conversations between you and other people who are not present in the courtroom;
 - tell the judge about the important issues in your case without worrying if what you say is admissible; and
 - ask the judge to consider any documents or other evidence. It is up to the judge to decide if they are important.
- You do not need to worry about getting a lot of different witnesses to come to court to make your case. Instead, you can tell the judge yourself what is important or rely on letters or other documents. If the judge agrees that a particular witness is needed to explain something in person or to answer questions, that witness can be called.
- Informal trials may be shorter. If you have a lawyer, the lawyer may need less time to prepare and work on your case, which may cost you less. Also, you may not need to take as much time off from work.
- An informal trial might be right for you if your case is relatively simple, and you are comfortable explaining your circumstances and the facts to the judge.

Why Would I Choose a Traditional Trial?

- The Rules of Civil Procedure and formal procedures are in place to control the process. The Montana Rules of Evidence will apply. You or your lawyer may feel more comfortable with this structure.
- You may like the fact that the Rules of Evidence control what people can say and what documents the judge can consider.
- It is important for you or your lawyer to question the other person directly.
- You may bring any witnesses you think are important to the courtroom. You or your lawyer can question your own witnesses and cross examine the other person's witnesses.
- In a traditional trial, the judge will not usually consider written statements from family members, friends, or professionals such as teachers, counselors, appraisers, or police officers. People with something to say about the issues will need to testify during the trial.
- A traditional trial might be better for you if you are represented by a lawyer and your case is complicated. For example, you might prefer a traditional trial if you and the other person own a business or have lots of stocks and property to divide that is difficult to value.

How Does an Informal Trial Work?

- The person who started the case will speak first. The person will tell the judge about the case, what result the person wants, and why. The judge will ask the person questions in order to confirm relevant facts. Only the judge asks questions—not the lawyers and not the other person. The judge will ask the other person or their lawyer whether there are other topics the judge should ask about.
- This process is repeated for the other person.
- Each person may submit relevant documents and other evidence that they want the judge to

see. The judge will look at each item and decide whether it should be considered. If there are any experts, the expert's report will be given to the judge. Either person may ask to have the expert testify. The expert may be questioned by the judge, the people in the case, or their lawyers.

- The judge will give each person an opportunity to respond to statements made by the other person.
- Each person or their lawyer may make a short closing statement about the issues and how the judge should decide.
- After all the above steps are done, the judge decides the case and shares it with both people. Because informal trials are often shorter and less complicated, sometimes the judge can decide the matter before the parties leave the court room.

How Does a Traditional Trial Work?

- Both people and/or their lawyers make an opening statement if permitted by the judge. The person who filed the case or the motion at issue goes first.
- The person who filed the case or motion then calls their witnesses. Following the Rules of Evidence, that person or their lawyer questions the witnesses and presents the documents or other evidence that the person wants the judge to review. The other person or their lawyer then cross-examines the witnesses. Both people in the case usually testify.
- The other person then gets a turn to call witnesses. That person or their lawyer questions the witnesses and presents documents or other evidence for the judge to review. The person who filed the case or their lawyer then takes a turn questioning the witnesses.
- The question-and-answer process and the presentation of documents or other evidence can be interrupted by objections. Some evidence and testimony may not be allowed if the judge agrees with the objections.
- The parties and/or their attorneys may make a closing argument if permitted by the judge, summarizing the evidence (witness statements, documents, and other items), explaining how the evidence supports the result that person wants, and telling the judge what the person thinks the judge should consider in deciding the case.
- After all the above steps are done, the judge will make a decision. The judge may need additional time to make a ruling.

Choosing an Informal Domestic Relations Trial for Your Family Law Case

Note: You can agree to trying an Informal Domestic Relations Trial (IDRT) either by using this form or telling the judge you want to during a hearing.

This process may not be right for your case, and these instructions cannot take the place of advice from a lawyer. Talk to a lawyer if you have **any** questions.

What Terms Do I Need to Know?



Petitioner/Plaintiff- Depending on the type of case, the person who files an action in court is either called the petitioner or the plaintiff. If you were the first person to file something in court, this is you.

Respondent/Defendant- Depending on the type of case, the person who needs to respond to someone else's action in court is either called the respondent or defendant. If the other person filed first, this is you.

Dissolution- Dissolution is the legal word for divorce in Montana

Modification- If you want to change something about something the Court has already ordered (i.e. a dissolution, parenting plan, or order of protection), then you are asking for a modification.

Informal Domestic Relations Trial (IDRT)- This is a new process for handling family laws cases in Montana. You can learn more about the difference between this and a traditional trial at <https://courts.mt.gov/idrt/>.

Traditional Trial- The usual process for family law cases tends to involve a traditional trial. You can learn more about the difference between this and an IDRT at <https://courts.mt.gov/idrt/>.

Montana Rules of Evidence- The laws that govern how a traditional trial works for family cases in Montana is called the Montana Rules of Evidence. They can be found [in title 26, chapter 10 of the Montana Code Annotated.](#)

Who Can Use the Form?



You can use this form if you:

- Are seeking a dissolution, parenting plan, order of protection, or modification from a participating District Court. Right now IDRTs are available in the First District (Lewis & Clark or Broadwater County), Fourth District (Missoula or Mineral County), or Twelfth District (Chouteau, Hill, or Liberty County).

What Do I Do with this Form?



1 Fill out the Form

- Fill out all the blanks on the Informal Domestic Relations Trial Agreement.
- Sign and date your Informal Domestic Relations Trial Agreement.
- Fill out the judicial district, county, and caption. If you aren't sure which judicial district you are in, you can look at another document that has been filed in your case or ask the Clerk of District Court. The caption looks like this:

Montana _____ Judicial District Court <i>Number of the judicial district where you are filing</i> _____ County <i>Name of the county where you are filing</i>	
_____, Petitioner / Plaintiff, and _____, Respondent / Defendant.	Case No.: _____ <i>Filled out by Clerk of District Court Unless you have already filed your case and know the number</i> Informal Domestic Relations Trial Agreement

2 Make Copies

- Make one copy of the form after you have filled it out.

3 File Form at the Courthouse

- Go to the Clerk of District Court's office in your county courthouse. Give the Clerk of District Court the original Informal Domestic Relations Trial Agreement.
- Give your copy to the Clerk of District Court and ask them to stamp it as "Filed". Keep the copy in a safe place.

Where Can I Get Help?



- **The Court Help Program** is a free service provided by the Montana Supreme Court to assist people with civil, non-criminal legal problems. You can visit their website at <https://courts.mt.gov/selfhelp/> to find your nearest Self-Help Law Center.
- **Montana Legal Services Association (MLSA)** gives free legal help to low and moderate-income people. To find out if you qualify for MLSA, call the MLSA HelpLine at 1-800-666-6899.
- **The State Bar Lawyer Referral and Information Service (LRIS)** refers people to Montana lawyers who might be able to help. The referral is free. Call LRIS at 1-406-449-6577.
- **The State Law Library** can help you find and use legal resources such as books, forms, and websites. You can visit the Law Library website at www.lawlibrary.mt.gov. Or you can contact a Reference Librarian at 1-800-710-9827 or by email at mtlawlibrary@mt.gov.

Name

Mailing Address

City State Zip Code

Phone Number

E-mail Address (optional)

Petitioner/Plaintiff Respondent/Defendant

MONTANA _____ JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, _____ COUNTY

<p>_____, Petitioner / Plaintiff, and _____, Respondent / Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No: _____ Informal Domestic Relations Trial Agreement</p>
--	---

My name is _____. I agree to the following:

- I want an informal domestic relations trial. I make this choice voluntarily and understand that both people involved in the case and the judge must agree to it.
- I understand that because the Montana Evidence Rules do not strictly apply, both sides can present any relevant evidence we think is important. The judge will decide how much weight to give the evidence provided.
- I understand I will not have the right to question the other side and the other side will not question me. Instead, the judge will ask both of us questions about the issues in the case. Each side may suggest topics or questions for the judge to ask about.

- I understand that most of the time, the two people in the case are the only witnesses. Sometimes a party needs an expert witness (someone with special training and education) to give an opinion, which is allowed in informal trials. The parties may ask experts questions. Other witnesses may testify only if the judge agrees they are needed.
- I understand that lawyers may not ask the parties questions but may question expert witnesses. Lawyers may also make opening statements if allowed by the judge, identify the issues, and make short arguments about the law at the end of the case.

I have read this document, and I understand and agree to an informal domestic relations trial.

Signature

Date

Essential IDRT Performance Measures

December 2021

Case Data Specific Measures – Quantitative:

1. Number of Cases for which the data are being analyzed in the time period (e.g., during the project) – are litigants using the new process

Breakdown by:

- district

2. Time to Disposition - the average time from filing to disposition – how quickly cases are reaching resolution

Breakdown by:

- district

3. Time to Disposition/Case Closure For Regular Track Cases - the average time from filing to disposition – are IDRT cases resolving faster than regular track cases

Breakdown by:

- district

Collection Method:

1. All IDRT Case Numbers will be reported to the ARPA coordinator.
2. Using the Full Court case management system, the ARPA coordinator will track days to disposition/case closure for IDRT cases.
3. Using the District Court Dashboard, the IDRT time to disposition/case closure will be compared to regular track time to disposition/case closure.

Timeline:

1. Case Specific Measure will be reported every six months starting in July 2022.

Case Data Specific Measures – Qualitative:

1. Litigant satisfaction during the data analysis (e.g., during the project) – are litigants satisfied with the IDRT process

Breakdown by:

- district

2. Judicial Satisfaction – during the data analysis (e.g., during the project) - are judges satisfied by the IDRT process

Breakdown by:

- district

Collection Method:

1. The ARPA Coordinator and MLSA will develop a short survey gauging satisfaction with the IDRT for litigants.
2. Litigants will be handed the hardcopy survey in court and asked to complete it before leaving the courtroom.
3. Survey will be forward to the ARPA coordinator and input using Survey Monkey
4. Participating judges will be surveyed using Survey Monkey

Timeline:

1. Litigant survey measures will be reported every six months starting in July 2022.
2. Judges will be surveyed every six months starting in July 2022.