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Executive Summary

The National Court Reporters Association (NCRA) requested that The National Judicial College (NJC) “act as a facilitator with NCRA’s Stenographic Opportunities in the Courts Task Force (“Task Force”) to establish consensus for methodology and content of study and to publicize its results to the court reporting community and beyond at the discretion of the Task Force, the NCRA Board of Directors and NCRA personnel.” NJC was asked to develop a plan for the study. NJC contracted with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) and the Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies (GSCJS) at the University of Nevada, Reno to help NJC and the NCRA to complete these tasks.

Prior to creating the survey, the initial activity was to gather information that would assist in crafting the survey questions. During the mid-year meetings of the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) held in December 2010 and the Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ) held in January 2011, President William Dressel had informal discussions with Chief Justices and State Court Administrators about the future of stenographic reporters in the justice system.

A series of web surveys were then created to target various legal populations in order to determine the current attitudes toward the future of court reporting in the United States. The two populations surveyed for this report were judges of general jurisdiction listed within the database of NJC and stenographic court reporters who are members of NCRA.

Data collection for the judge survey and stenographic court reporter survey began April 28, 2011 and closed June 1, 2011. This report provides the results of the judges’ and court reporters’ surveys (see Appendix C-D for copies of the web survey instruments for each of the two populations). Appendix A and B contain all figures and tables, respectively, including those that are not discussed within the body of the report. Appendix E presents all email invitation letters and reminders.

There were 4,558 judges in the original population, 1,602 were randomly sampled, 576 accessed the survey, and 537 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 34%. There were 3,721 court reporters in the original population, 1,204 were randomly sampled, 543 accessed the survey, and 515 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 43%.
Respondents were allowed to endorse multiple options on some questions (i.e., select all that apply) and were allowed to skip any questions they did not want to answer; therefore the sample size, or “n,” varies from question to question, and for some questions, the sample size will be greater than the total number of respondents who completed the survey. For other questions, the sample size will be less than the number of respondents who completed the survey because of the survey skip pattern or because not every respondent chose to answer the question.

**Web Survey Methodology (Court Reporters and Judges)**

**Goal of Surveys**
Determine stenographic court reporting needs and the future role of stenography in the courts, including:
- current methods used to make the official court record
- technology trends of the courts
- future use of stenographic court reporters

**Survey Objectives**
Conduct a survey of judges in trial courts of general jurisdiction and of court reporters addressing:
- needs assessment of the current state of court stenography in their courts
- ways of enhancing court reporter roles in courtroom
- benefits and costs to both

**Procedures**
- Qualtrics Survey Software
- Four stakeholder groups
- Email letter on NJC letterhead
- Weekly follow-up reminders
- Surveys open April 28, 2011-June 1, 2011 (Judges and Court Reporters)
Sample

- Random sample of 537 judges in general jurisdiction courts; 34% response rate
- Representative sample of 515 stenographic court reporters; 43% response rate
- Judge survey 72% male; Court Reporters 89% female
- 83% of judges were between the ages of 50-69
- 78% of court reporters were between the ages of 40-59

General Content Areas Addressed in Surveys

- Court Reporters’ Role and Duties
  - Importance of Specific Services/Characteristics
  - Value/Future Likelihood of Use
  - Reasons for Non-Use
- Current Reporting Systems in Place
  - Advantages
  - Disadvantages
- Integration of Court Reporters into these Future Systems
- Projecting the Value of Specific Court Reporter Services
- Steps for Enhancing Future Role of Court Reporters

Key Findings from Web Survey Data

Method for Making Official Record (Top 3)

- Stenographic reporters – most common
- Audio (Court Reporters use more than Judges)
- Video (Judges use more than Court Reporters)
Judges’ Reasons for Not Using Stenographic Court Reporters
- Budgetary
- Preference for Audio
- Shortage of Available Court Reporters
- Transcripts are Seldom Required
- Legislation or Higher Authority

Judges’ Main Changes Envisioned for Court in Next 10-15 Years
(Most-Common Open-Ended Themes)
- Budget
- Technology eliminating need for Court Reporter
  (positive and negative comments)
  - Realtime
  - E-filing/Paperless
  - Case Management
- Procedural (e.g., statutory, increasing caseload, decreasing criminal jury trials)
- Political

Judges’ Reasons for Not Integrating Transcripts into ECMS (Most Common Themes)
- Budget
- Technology
- Not Needed
- No Plans
- Fine with What They Have
- Privacy Concerns

Support or Opposition to Audio, Video, and Realtime
(Judges and Court Reporters)
- Court reporters more likely to strongly oppose both audio and video recordings compared to judges
- Judges more likely to strongly support both audio and video recordings compared to court reporters
- Of the judges who indicated they currently did not use audio or video, most of them supported realtime, but court reporters were significantly more likely to strongly support realtime than judges.
Judges’ Reasons for Preferring Video and Audio to Stenographic Court Reporters
(Highest Agreement with Statements; Top 3)
- Enhances accuracy and completeness of record
- Allows immediate access to what was said
- Leads to more efficient transcript production

Judges: Most Important Services and Characteristics of Stenographic Court Reporters (Top 5)
- Accuracy of transcripts
- Timeliness of transcripts
- Professional demeanor and appearance
- Transcribing from steno
- Instantaneous readback

Agree or Disagree with Statements Regarding Realtime and Daily Transcript
- Judges are more inclined than court reporters to agree with the statement that “Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity.”
- Judges are also more than twice as likely than court reporters to agree that “Audio is adequate.”
- Court reporters were more likely than judges to disagree with the following statements:

  “There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter.”
  “Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate.”
  “The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.”

Factors that Will Significantly Impact Court Next 10-15 Years (Judges and Court Reporters)
- Budgets
- Integration of Technology
Steps Stenographic Court Reporters Can Take to Enhance their Role in the Courtroom of the Future

- Provide realtime
- Provide e-transcripts or integrate with the e-case management system
- Provide daily copy

Challenges in Transition to Future Environment

- Budget constraints
- Technology
- Resistance to change
- Political challenges

Some Suggested Solutions to Challenges in Transition to Future Environment

- Money and new ways to generate funding (e.g., federal funds, better collaborative relationship with legislators, raise taxes)
- Better technology; keep up with advancing technology; retrofitting courtrooms to handle new technology; use technology responsibly
- Some sort of hybrid record - part electronic and part paper; appropriate rule adjustment
- Education and training for everyone on new technology (e.g., training judges, clerks, court administrators, court reporters; educating the public and legislators on its need so there is more acceptance for their use and therefore, funding)
- Stenographic court reporters need to embrace change and finds ways to be more responsive, accurate, and provide more services (e.g., integrate index of all words spoken in transcript so easier for attorneys to find important passages easier in appellate cases)
- Maintaining a population of qualified court reporters
Recommendations

- Provide and promote realtime services. Court reporters need to market real time to judges (and educate them about it), court administrators, and motivate court reporters to step up to real time.
- Although realtime is seen as a very valuable skill by the Chief Justices and State Court Administrators, they also indicated that flexibility and being a team player and part of a pool were the most important things court reporters could do to enhance their roles in the courtroom.
- Provide e-transcripts and integrate with e-case management systems.
- Provide daily copy.
- Court reporters need to feel comfortable running recording equipment where used and to be willing to serve in a pool to transcribe the results captured on equipment. In cases where equipment isn’t currently being used, they need to educate decision makers (e.g., court administrators and judges) about the value of court reporter versus audio and video recording equipment.
- Court reporters need to expand the role of what they are willing to do. They need to take responsibility for other in-court functions that will provide greater value to the court system.
- Court reporters’ professional demeanor and appearance, as well as the relationship they have with their judge will help with their future role in the courtroom.
- Court reporters need to market themselves at judges’ or court administrators’ annual meetings (e.g., AJA, NAWJ, CCJ/COSCA, NACM).
- Discover new ways for court reporters to help judges generate funding (or reduce costs) and ways for court reporters to generate funding (e.g., federal funds and grants for the court reporting organization and courts; funding for new equipment; funding for training and education for members; increase collaboration and communication with legislators).
- Better technology; keep up with advancing technology; retrofitting courtrooms to handle new technology; use technology responsibly.
- Some sort of hybrid record - part electronic and part paper.
- Education and training for everyone on new technology and need (e.g., court reporters, judges, attorneys, clerks, court administrators, public, and legislators).
- Stenographic court reporters need to embrace change and find ways to be more responsive, accurate, and provide more services.
OVERVIEW REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF STENOGRAPHIC REPORTERS:
INTERVIEWS WITH CHIEF JUSTICES AND STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS
to the
National Court Reporters Association Task Force
by
Hon. William F. Dressel (Ret.), President
The National Judicial College

INTRODUCTION
The initial phase of this project, prior to creating the survey, was to gather information that would assist in crafting the survey questions. During the mid-year meetings of the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) held in December 2010 and the Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ) held in January 2011, I asked chief justices and administrators whether they would have an "informal discussion" with me about the future of stenographic reporters in the justice system.

Methodology
Most of the discussions were with an individual, but a few times it was in a group of three or four. I advised the Justice or Administrator that The National Judicial College was going to conduct a survey of judges, trial court administrators, stenographic reporters, and lawyers to explore the future role of court reporters in the justice system. I further advised that I would not quote them individually, but would be doing a report summarizing significant issues identified by them. Sometimes the justice/administrator began (without a question) describing the current system, issues they are facing, and what they foresee occurring in the future. Other times, I started out by asking them to describe their current situation; if they are currently using stenographic reporters are they planning to transition to or include another form of transcribing procedures in the next two or five years; and what they thought could be the role of stenographic reporters in the future, etc.
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Results

Methods for Making the Court Record
As we already knew, courts of limited jurisdiction/specialized courts use some form of electronic recording to capture proceedings. A few states indicated that a stenographic reporter could be made available to this court for a significant criminal matter. Thus, the court system already has extensive experience with electronic recording. It was generally agreed that how a record of proceedings was going to be made in the future in general jurisdiction courts was a rapidly evolving area. The following methods to transcribe proceedings identified were:

- Stenographic reporter (most common),
- Real time reporter,
- Audio,
- Video,
- Steno mask,
- Digital (generally described as the future), and
- Pools of various types of reporters/electronic equipment.

Decision to Hire Court Reporter or Install Electronic Equipment
In discussions on who has the decision making authority whether to hire a stenographic reporter or employ another method of transcribing proceedings, the following were identified:

- Presiding Judge,
- Individual Judge,
- Chief Justice/State Court Administrator per directive, policy, etc., and
- Local Funding Entity.

Four Main Considerations for Change Voiced
It was fairly unanimous among these two professions that there are four main considerations impacting how proceedings will be transcribed in the future:

- Budget reductions (funding and resources) are requiring courts to review all operational areas to reduce costs,
- Improvement in technology to record and transcribe proceedings (both currently for audio and future digital)
- Changing role of the judge – spending less time in court including fewer trials, and
- In the future courts will have electronic records including integrating transcripts of proceedings into the electronic record.
Common Themes and Issues Identified and Proposed Solutions

- Electronic recording will reduce cost to transcribe a proceeding,
- With judges trying fewer cases, there will be a reduced demand for stenographic reporters,
- It takes less time/cost to obtain a digitally recorded transcript,
- There exists difficulty in hiring stenographic reporters in rural areas,
- A cost effective practice or model will be to have a pool of stenographic reporters and electronic equipment servicing a judicial district/circuit or large court,
- If the stenographic reporter assumes additional duties within the court system, the versatility of a reporter based upon skills, knowledge, and ability to perform a variety of tasks could make them a valuable staff member,
- Status of state/court budgets makes all staff positions including stenographic reporters, a target in budget reduction initiatives,
- Due to reduction in trials, there will be fewer appeals and a corresponding drop in trial transcripts,
- The close relationship between a judge and stenographic reporter often will protect the stenographic reporter’s position (until the judge retires or stenographic reporter leaves, which presents an opportunity to introduce electronic recording).

It was generally agreed that it is only a matter of time before there will be new approaches used in transcribing proceedings. Likewise, there was a lot of discussion about the advantages of a pool approach. A pool is envisioned to include stenographic reporters, real-time reporters, and electronic equipment. While the valuable role played by stenographic reporters in transcribing the proceedings was recognized, it was expressed that stenographic reporters need to change including being willing to take on additional duties and be a flexible court system team player.

An area where there wasn't total agreement was the future including: how would the court record be made and what a court record/transcript might look like. The disagreement arose not in whether there would be change, but uncertainty as to the nature of what technology will be available to create an electronic record, including transcripts. There was agreement that there is a movement towards an electronic record, but also a wait-and-see approach until the new technology has been tested and a reliable product/equipment/process is identified. Thus, the future impact of technology on the courts and stenographic reporters is believed to be significant.
Introduction

The National Court Reporters Association (NCRA) requested that the National Judicial College (NJC) “act as a facilitator with NCRA’s Stenographic Opportunities in the Courts Task Force (‘Task Force’) to establish consensus for methodology and content of study and to publicize its results to the court reporting community and beyond at the discretion of the Task Force, the NCRA Board of Directors and NCRA personnel.” NJC was asked to develop a plan for the study. NJC contracted with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) and the Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies (GSCJS) at the University of Nevada, Reno to help NJC and the NCRA to complete these tasks.

NJC contracted with the CRDA and the GSCJS to conduct a series of surveys from various legal populations in order to determine the current attitudes toward the future of court reporting in the United States. There were two populations surveyed: judges of general jurisdiction listed within the database of NJC, and stenographic court reporters who are members of NCRA.

The CRDA emailed the brief web survey introduction letter with a web survey link to the population of NJC judge members and NCRA court reporter members. Data collection for the judge survey and court reporter survey began April 28, 2011 and closed June 1, 2011. This report provides the results of those surveys (see Appendix C-D for copies of the web survey instruments for each of the two populations).

Purpose, Goals, and Objectives

The overall goal of NJC was to investigate the future role of stenography in the courts and the types of methods used to make the official court record in the various courts today. The CRDA, in collaboration with NJC outlined a plan to conduct web surveys with the following stakeholders: 1) Court Reporters, and 2) Judges in trial courts of General Jurisdiction. In addition, the following goal and objectives were outlined prior to the beginning of the project:

GOAL: Determine stenography needs and the future role of stenography in the courts, including: the current state of stenography, trends of the courts and their future use of stenography and/or digital reporting, and future technology trends.

OBJECTIVE 1: Conduct a web survey of judges in trial courts of general jurisdiction that will gather data addressing the following: satisfaction of the current stenography and/or digital court reporting systems currently in place, as well as a needs assessment of the current state of court stenography in the courts.
OBJECTIVE 2: Conduct a web survey of court reporters that will gather data addressing the following: needs of court reporters, challenges they face in their profession, and their perceptions of the costs and benefits of the current court stenography process as well as their perceptions regarding the future trends for court reporting systems. These survey questions will address both the benefits and costs to court reporters of using either the current stenography and/or digital reporting process.

OBJECTIVE 3: Analyze data from all survey results.
Methodology

Sample Demographics
A targeted sample of 400 judges and 100 court reporters were expected to complete the surveys. NJC provided the email lists for the population of judges, and NCRA provided the email names for the sample of stenographic court reporters.

Routinely, surveys gather demographic data such as age, gender, etc., in order to examine potential response moderators. These demographics are discussed in greater detail on p. 6 of the judges’ section of the report, and on p. 18 of the court reporter section. Most of the judges (72%) were male, and 83% were between the ages of 50 and 69. In contrast, most court reporters were female (89%), and 78% were between the ages of 40 and 59.

There were 4,558 judges in the original population, 1,602 were randomly sampled, 576 accessed the survey, and 537 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 34%. There were 3,721 court reporters in the original population, 1,204 were randomly sampled, 543 accessed the survey, and 515 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 43%. It is unknown how many email addresses were invalid or returned undeliverable; therefore, these estimated response rates are likely underestimated.

Procedure

Data Collection Procedures
The CRDA emailed the brief web survey introduction letter with a web survey link to the population of judges on NJC’s database and NCRA court reporter members (see Appendix E).

Data collection for the judge survey and court reporter survey began April 28, 2011 and closed June 1, 2011. The web surveys were administered via an online web survey software, Qualtrics, housed at CRDA. CRDA sent weekly follow-up email reminders to the judges and court reporters after the first launch date.

Thematic Content Analysis of Open-ended Items
Qualitative data from open-ended questions were thematically coded; no specific frequencies were recorded, and no inter-rater reliability ratings were calculated. The most frequently mentioned similar responses from respondents in each category (e.g., judges, and court reporters) were collapsed into broader conceptual categories if deemed thematically and theoretically appropriate by coders.
Data Cleaning, and Analysis
All uniquely identifying information were kept separately from the responses, for purposes of confidentiality. A complete and fully annotated data file was maintained for the duration of the study. All closed ended items (multiple choice, yes no) were cleaned, and all results tabulated via frequency counts and percentages and are presented in bar graph, pie graph, or tabular form. All open-ended items are be presented in broad thematic categories based on most frequent and similar responses.

Judge and Court Reporter Web Surveys
The sample for the judge web survey included the 537 responding judges who are listed in NJC’s database. NJC provided a list of participants and their email addresses (n = 4,558). All duplicates were removed and a final sampling frame of 1,602 potential participants were randomly selected. An email invitation letter written on NJC letterhead and signed by President William Dressel of the NJC was emailed to a random sample of judges (see Appendix E). The invitation email included a web link to take the judge survey (see Appendix C), explained the purpose of the survey and included a request for their cooperation with the project. Reminder email invitations were sent to non-respondents weekly, until the close of the survey on June 1, 2011.

The sample for the court reporter web survey included court reporters who are currently members of the National Court Reporters Association (NCRA) and are listed on NCRA’s mailing list. The NCRA provided a list of participants and their email addresses (n = 3,721). All duplicates were removed and a final sampling frame of 1204 potential participants were randomly selected. An email invitation letter written on NJC letterhead and signed by President William Dressel of NJC was emailed to this random sample of court reporters (see Appendix E). The invitation email included a web link to take the court reporter survey (see Appendix D), explained the purpose of the survey, and included a request for their cooperation with the project. Reminder email invitations were sent to non-respondents weekly, followed by a final reminder until the close of the survey on June 1, 2011.

The online surveys were developed using Qualtrics.com, with questions and methodology derived from a joint collaboration of NCRA Task Force members, NJC, GSCJS, and CRDA. NCRA staff and management determined which court reporters should be included in the initial population of court reporters, and provided this population of email addresses to CRDA/GSCJS. NJC provided a list of judges serving in courts of general jurisdiction. From these two populations of email addresses, a sampling frame was created for judges and court
reporters. First, all email addresses were stratified by state, and each state was represented in the final sampling frame based on the percentage of total NCRA members in that particular state. A program was written in PASW (Formerly SPSS [Statistical Package for the Social Sciences]) to randomly pull a set percentage of judges and court reporters from each state, based on the calculated percent of court reporters that should represent each state. Although each state included court reporters who were randomly selected to represent his or her state, each state may not have been equally represented in the final sample of completed surveys. See Tables Judges Q6 and Court Reporters Q6 in Appendix B (Number and Percentage of Completed Judge and Court Reporter Surveys by State).
Survey Results

JUDGES

Section 1: Demographics

Gender
Demographic analyses were conducted on the respondents (n=537) who participated in the survey. Almost two-thirds of the respondents who chose to provide their gender (n=535) that they were male (72%; see Figure Judges Q7).

Age
 Judges ranged in age from 30 through 70+. The vast majority of judges (83%) were between the ages of 50 and 69 (see Table Judges Q5).

Courts Overseen
The vast majority of judges who responded to this survey reported that they work in either State Courts (59%) or General Jurisdiction Courts (37%; see Figure Judges Q2a) who reported overseeing types of courts other than those choices available, two judges reported overseeing criminal court, two judges reported overseeing juvenile courts, one judge oversees drug court, veterans court, and mental health court. And one judge reported being retired.

Table Judges Q5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge age (in years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Judges Q2.

Judges: What is Your Gender? (n=535)

Figure Judges Q7.

Judges: In What Type of Court(s) Do you Currently Work? (n=623)

Types of Courts:
- State
- General jurisdiction
- Limited jurisdiction
- State appellate
- Federal

*Select all that apply* (multiple selections made by judges)
Jurisdiction Size
Only 66 (12%) of the judges surveyed work in jurisdictions of less than 50,000 people. Thirty-one percent of judges work in jurisdictions with between 50,000 and 250,000 citizens, 20% work in jurisdictions with between 250,000 and 500,000 citizens, and 36% of judges report that they work in jurisdictions with 500,000 or more citizens (see Figure Judges Q3).

Judges: Size of Jurisdiction (n=533)
*Largest jurisdiction for judges overseeing multiple courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Citizens in Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 50,000</td>
<td>12% (n=66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 – 250,000</td>
<td>31% (n=166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,001 – 500,000</td>
<td>20% (n=108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 – 999,999</td>
<td>17% (n=89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td>19% (n=99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Judges Q3.

Positions Currently Staffed
Judges were asked to indicate what positions are currently staffed in their courtroom. Judges were allowed to select all positions that applied to their court, resulting in a total of 2,163 positions chosen from the available options. Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of judges who chose the item, rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular position staffed. The most commonly chosen staffed positions were: clerk (including courtroom, law, and other types of clerks; chosen 19% of the time), stenographic court reporters (18%), judicial assistant or secretary (18%), bailiff or jury monitor (not serving a security function, 16%), court administrator (15%), electronic recording operator or monitor (9%), and voice writer / stenomask (3%). The remaining position options were chosen less than 1% of the time, respectively. A summary table is presented on the following page (see Table Judges Q4).
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Section 2: Court Record

Methods Used to Make Official Record

Judges indicated that stenographic court reporters are used in the majority of courtrooms (n=414; 48%) The second most often used method for making a court record is audio recording (35%), followed by voice writer/stenomask (7%), and video recording (7%; see Table Q8a). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of judges who chose the item, rather they are representative of all mentions for that particular item.

Table Judges Q8a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used to make official court record</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporting</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice writing, stenomasking</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for Not Using Stenographic Court Reporters

Judges who indicated that they did not use stenographic court reporters in their courtrooms (n=263) indicated that the most common reason for not using them was budgetary considerations (30%). This finding is consistent with the qualitative interviews with the Chief Justices and State Court Administrators. Some mentioned that cost was an issue and court reporters’ costs needed to be reduced. An additional 21% indicated issues directly involving stenographic court reporters stating that there is a shortage of available reporters (13%), or that there is some concern with either timeliness or accuracy (4% each). Technological reasons for not using stenographic court reporters account for 26% of the responses (preference for audio 18%, video 5%, or voice writing/stenomasking see Figure Judges Q9a).

Judges: Reason(s) Using Methods other than Stenographic Court Reporting (n=263)

- Budgetary considerations: 30%
- Preference for audio: 18%
- Shortage of available stenographic reporters: 13%
- Transcripts are seldom required: 8%
- Legislation or higher authority: 8%
- Other: 6%
- Preference for video: 5%
- Timeliness problems: 4%
- Accuracy problems: 4%
- Preference for voice writing, stenomasking: 3%

Figure Judges Q9a.

Judges’ use of Stenographic Court Reporters

Judges use stenographic court reporters in a number of venues. Stenographic court reporters are used to make the record in criminal, civil, family, and juvenile courts. Judges “always” used stenographic court reporters in criminal court 72% of the time, followed by “always” using them in civil court (45%), family court (37%), and juvenile court (36%). Figure Judges Q8b presents a summary of all judicial responses.
Assignment of Stenographic Court Reporters

Judges report that the majority of the time when court reporters are used in their courts, they are assigned to a specific judge (50%), Court reporters who are assigned through a pool are less common (19%), and judges reported that assignment of court reporters to a mixture of a pool system and assignment to a judge occurred approximately 22% of the time (see Figure Judges Q8c).
Support for Implementation of Court Reporting Systems

If judges did not indicate that they currently use either audio or video recording, they were asked to indicate their support for the implementation of audio, video, and realtime court reporting systems. Of the judges who responded to these questions, many expressed support for the implementation of realtime court reporting (97%), and less for both audio and video recording methods (35% and 41% respectively; see Figure Judges Q9b).

Agreement with Statements Regarding Audio or Video Recordings of Proceedings

Judges who indicated that they preferred audio or video recording systems over the use of stenographic court reporters were asked to indicate their level of agreement to a number of statements regarding why they prefer audio and/or video systems. Agreement ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Figure Judges Q9e below presents the mean (average) scores for each question, high means indicating higher judicial agreement.
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Judges: Agreement with Statements Regarding Audio or Video Recordings of Proceedings

Table Judges Q10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who transcribes the official record (in or out of court)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter(s)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, Monitor</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter / Stenomask</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk(s)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, Secretary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Judges were asked to indicate who transcribes the record in their courts. Overwhelmingly, judges state that they use stenographic court reporters to transcribe the record (62%). Other methods/individuals used include electronic recording operator or monitor (12%), voicewriter/stenomask (8%), and the courtroom clerk (3%). Some judges also indicated that outside contractors were hired to do the transcription (see Table Judges Q10). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of judges who chose the item, rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item.
Preservation of Court Records

When asked who preserves or archives the official record either in or out of court, judges indicated that the majority of the time, stenographic court reporters are the individuals who perform this task (35%). Other individuals who preserve court records include IT staff (28%), courtroom clerk (13%), and the electronic recording operator, monitor (9%; see Table Judges Q11). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of judges who chose the item, rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who preserves the official record (in or out of court)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter(s)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk(s)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, Monitor</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter / Stenomask</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, Secretary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>816</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Stenographic Court Reporter Services

Judges who use stenographic court reporters in their courtrooms were asked to indicate the importance of specific services and characteristics of the stenographic court reporters. Importance ranged from 1 (not at all important) to 4 (very important). The mean (average) for each service or characteristic was calculated, with higher means indicating greater importance, as indicated by the judges.

Judges: Importance of Services or Characteristics

Judges stated that the three most important services of a stenographic court reporter are accuracy of transcripts (mean = 3.80), timeliness of transcripts (mean = 3.67), and transcribing from steno (mean = 3.09). Professional demeanor and appearance of the court reporter (mean = 3.59) was listed as the most important characteristic. The three least important to judges were: clarification of technology terms, accents or distractions (mean = 2.29), bailiff duties related to jury monitoring (mean = 2.24), and swearing in of witnesses (mean = 2.02). The scores for all of the services and/or characteristics are presented in Figure Judges Q12.
Figure Judges Q12.

Judges: Importance of the Services or Characteristics of Stenographic Court Reporters

- Accuracy of transcripts (n=489) - 3.80
- Timeliness of transcripts (n=491) - 3.67
- Professional demeanor and appearance (n=482) - 3.59
- Transcription from steno (n=493) - 3.09
- Instantaneous read back (n=485) - 3.08
- Realtime reporting (n=485) - 2.97
- Technological assistance (n=480) - 2.90
- Instant record retrieval: prior, current proceedings (n=487) - 2.88
- Assistance to the hard of hearing (n=490) - 2.63
- Electronic transcript management (n=484) - 2.59
- Clerical or administrative support (n=503) - 2.55
- Transcription from audio/video (n=501) - 2.51
- Daily copy transcripts (n=486) - 2.30
- Clarification: tech. terms, accents, or distractions (n=502) - 2.29
- Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring (n=504) - 2.24
- Swearing in of witnesses (n=501) - 2.02

Average (Mean) Score for Each Statement
Judges Who Felt that Either Realtime or Daily Copy Were Not at All or Not Very Important

If judges indicated that realtime or daily copy were not at all important, or were not very important, they were asked their level of agreement to a number of statements. Of those judges who indicated that either of these services were not important, 72% indicated that they agreed that realtime is a luxury, not a necessity. However, more than three-fourths (77%) disagreed that there is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter; half of the judges disagreed with the statements that cost is all that matters (56%) and that audio recording was adequate (56%; see Table Judges Q13).

Table Judges Q13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realtime or daily copy not at all / not very important</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford either service</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good, but it is adequate</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much difference between audio recording and court reporter</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services, not appealed</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Future of Your Court

Section 4 of the survey was designed to determine what judges think might be impactful in the future of the court and the types of court reporting and court management systems that may be utilized.

Factors with Most Impact in the Future

When asked to indicate which factors they thought would have the most significant impact in the next 10 to 15 years, 57% of them rated budgetary considerations highest. This was followed by the integration of technology (28%). Focus on accuracy of official court record, alternative dispute resolution, jurisdiction size, and internet/remote adjunction each received 5% or less (see Figure Judges Q14).
Judges: Who is Currently Managing Electronic Case Management System? (n=698)*

Judge Q15a.

Judges: Steps to Enhance Stenographic Court Reporters' Role in the Future Courtroom (n=1,162)*

Judge Q16.
Use of Electronic Case Management Systems
Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they use an Electronic Case Management System (ECMS; see Figure Judges Q15 in Appendix A). Of the judges who indicated use of ECMS, the majority indicated that the clerk of court’s office managed that system. Only 2% reported that stenographic court reporters were involved in the management of their ECMS (see figure Judges Q15a on the following page). Although ECMS is used quite often, transcripts are integrated into the system only 12% of the time. However, 49% of the judges foresee the transcript being integrated into the ECMS in the next 10 to 15 years (see also Figures Judges Q15b and Judges Q15c in Appendix A).

The Role of Stenographic Court Reporters in the Future
When asked what stenographic court reporters can do in the future to enhance their roles in the court system, of those respondents who answered this question, the top three responses were: provide realtime (28%), provide e-transcripts and integrate with e-case management (19%), and provide daily copy (13%). Providing assistance to hard of hearing and taking on additional responsibilities currently held by other personnel accounted for another 19%, while 10% indicated that there are no additional roles that court reporters can fill (see Figure Judges Q16 on the following page). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of judges who chose the item, rather they are representative of the number of times that particular item was mentioned.
Influence in Record Making Methods
Forty-seven percent of judges indicate that they are the individual responsible for determining the method used to make the official record in their court. In those cases where judges are not responsible for this task, court administrators (19%), legislators (13%), and others are responsible for choosing the method (see Figure Judges Q17). Some of the “others” mentioned include the State Supreme Court, Judicial Council, and Chief Judge.

Judges: Who has Most Influence in Deciding Method of Making Official Record? (n=531)

COURT REPORTERS

Section 1: Demographics

Gender
Of the individuals who respond question, 89% indicated that female (457), 9% male (48), and individuals chose not to respond (Figure Court Reporters Q7).
Age
Court reporters who responded to this survey were between the ages of 18 and 70+. The majority of the men and women fall between the ages of 40 and 59 (83%). Ten percent report being between 18 and 39, 7% report being older than 59 (see Table Court Reporters Q5).

Types of Courts Worked In
Ninety percent report working in State, Federal, or General Jurisdiction courts. The rest indicate that they work in either limited (2%) or other (8%; see Figure Court Reporters Q2). Other responses include county and district court.

Jurisdiction Size
Court reporters reveal that they work in jurisdictions of varied sizes. Twenty-four percent stated that they work in a jurisdiction of 1,000,000 or more citizens, while 21% work in jurisdictions of 50,001 to 250,000 (see Figure Court Reporters Q3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Court Reporters Q5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court reporter age (in years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Court Reporters Q2.

Court Reporters: In What Type of Court(s) Do you Currently Work? (n=588)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Select all that apply*

Figure Court Reporters Q3.

Court Reporters: Size of Jurisdiction (n=505)

*Largest jurisdiction for multiple courts*
Positions Currently Staffed

Court reporters were asked to indicate what positions are currently staffed in their courtrooms. Respondents were allowed to select all positions that applied to their courts, resulting in a total of 2,252 positions chosen from the available options. Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of court reporters who chose the item, rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item. The most commonly chosen staffed positions were: stenographic court reporter (chosen 22% of the time), clerk (19%), court administrator (17%), bailiff or jury monitor (not serving a security function, 16%), and judicial assistant or secretary (16%). The remaining position options were chosen less than 10% of the time, respectively. A summary table is presented below (see Table Court Reporters Q4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Currently Staffed or Employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff, jury monitor (non-security)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, secretary</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, monitor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter, stenomask</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Court Record

Making the Record

When court reporters were asked to indicate what method is used to make the official record, stenographic court reporting was mentioned 62% of the time. Audio recording was mentioned next most frequently (28%), and video recording, voice writing/stenomask, or another method were also mentioned, but less frequently (see Table Court Reporters Q8a). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of court reporters who chose the item, rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used to make official court record</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporting</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice writing, stenomasking</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Venues in Which Stenographic Court Reporters Work
The venues in which stenographic court reporters make the records are varied. As indicated by Figure Court Reporters Q8b, and consistent with the judges’ responses, stenographic court reporters are used in criminal court, civil court, family court, and juvenile court. Stenographic court reporters are also used most frequently in criminal courts, followed by civil courts.

Assignment of Court Reporters
As we saw with the judges, court reporters indicate that the majority of the time, they are assigned to specific judge (47%), or are assigned via a pool (12%). The remaining 30% state that they are assigned through a combination of assignment to judge and pool, and 10% are assigned other ways (see Figure Court Reporters Q8c). Other responses include courtroom rotations, judge rotations, and coverage of specific demographic areas regardless of judge or courtroom.

Court Reporters: Stenographic Court Reporters by Court Type

Assignment of Court Reporters

Court Reporters: Stenographic Court Reporters Typically Assigned (n=510)
Support or Opposition for Alternative Recording Systems

Stenographic court reporters who indicated that their courts currently do not use either video or audio recording systems also were asked to indicate the extent to which they either supported or opposed alternatives to stenographic court reporting. These particular respondents showed the greatest support for the implementation of realtime (76% strongly support), and the strongest opposition to both video recording and audio recording (75% and 76% strongly opposed, respectively).

Figure Court Reporters Q9b.

Court Reporters: Support or Opposition for Implementing Systems

Section 3: Stenographic Court Reporter Services

Influence on the Making of the Official Record

Stenographic court reporters were asked who had the most influence on deciding which method was used in their courts for making the official record. Table Court Reporters Q10 contains the responses to this query. According to court reporters, judges have the largest influence in choosing the method used to make the official record (57%), and court administrators also have influence in some courts (14%). The remaining influence comes from legislators, court reporters, local government officials (including the governor), clerk of court’s office, and other (see Table Court Reporter Q10). Responses in the other category indicate that at times litigants choose, but the
majority of responses in this category state that it is a combination of many individuals, generally a combination of attorneys, judges, court reporters, and/or legislators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Court Reporter Q10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most influential on the making of the official record …</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of courts office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government official(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services Provided by Stenographic Court Reporters**

Stenographic court reporters were asked to indicate how often they provide certain services to their courts. The top three services provided most often are: instantaneous read back, instant record retrieval, and transcription from steno. Figure Court Reporter Q11 (next page) summarizes whether a service was offered (always, often, or rarely; blue region) or not (never; grey region).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Court Reporter Q11.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services that stenographic court reporters might provide</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of services provided …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval: prior, current proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification: tech. terms, accents, or distractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realtime and/or Daily Copy
Rarely or Never Provided

Stenographic court reporters who indicated in question 11 that realtime services and/or daily copy transcripts were rarely or never provided by them to the court were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements related to these two services (see Table Court Reporters Q12 on the following page). Court reporters overwhelmingly disagreed with the statements that might explain why these services were not used. The two statements that received the most agreement were “Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford either service” (33%), and “Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity” (31%), but they disagreed with these same statements more often (67% and 69%, respectively).
Section 4: Future of Your Court

Factors with the Most Significant Impact on Future Courts

Stenographic court reporters were asked to indicate which factors might have the largest impact on courts in the next 10 to 15 years. Eighty-five percent of the respondents stated that budgetary considerations and the integration of technology will have the largest impact (see Figure Court Reporter Q13). See open-ended responses section for more detailed explanations regarding respondents’ reasons for mentioning these two themes.

Table Court Reporter Q12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements regarding realtime and / or daily copy ...</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford either service</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good, but it is adequate</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much difference between audio recording and court reporter</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services, not appealed</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Court Reporters Q13.

Court Reporters: Factors with Most Significant Impact on Court in Next 10 to 15 Years (n=493)
Electronic Case Management System

When asked if their courts use an Electronic Case Management System (ECMS), 58% indicated that one was in use (see Figure Court Reporters Q14 in Appendix A). Of the individuals whose courts use ECMS, only 6% indicate that stenographic court reporters currently manage those systems. In the majority of courts (64%), courtroom clerks, court administrators, IT staff, and judicial assistants or secretaries manage these systems (see Figure Court Reporters Q14a below). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of court reporters who chose the item; rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item.

Court Reporters: Who is Currently Managing Electronic Case Management System? (n=617)*

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses.](chart.png)

**Figure Court Reporters Q14a.**

Transcript Integrated into ECMS

The stenographic court reporters whose courts use ECMS were asked whether the transcripts were integrated into those systems (see Figure Court Reporters Q14b in Appendix A). Forty percent indicated that they were. Of the 60% who indicated that the transcripts were not integrated into the ECMS, 74% indicated that they foresee the integration occurring in the future (see also Figure Court Reporters Q14c in Appendix A). The reasons given for not believing that the transcripts will be incorporated into the ECMS included budget concerns for the court, the fairness of having transcripts available without having to pay a court reporter to provide them for a fee, privacy issues, especially as they pertain to sealed records, and the fact that many court reporters are restricted in their use of the courts’ ECMS and therefore could not provide the integration.
Stenographic Court Reporters as Managers of the ECMS and Steps to Enhance the Role of Stenographic Court Reporters in the Future

When asked if they believe that stenographic court reporters would play a role in the management of ECMS in the future, 71% indicated that they believe it will happen (see Figure Court Reporters Q15 in Appendix A). Stenographic court reporters were asked to indicate what roles they believe they might be able to fill in order to enhance their place in courtrooms. Providing realtime services was the most important of those listed (23%). Also considered important were providing e-transcripts and integrating with e-case management (19%), providing assistance to hard of hearing (17%), and providing daily copy (16%). One percent stated that there are no additional roles that court reporters can fill (see Figure Court Reporters Q16). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of the percentage of court reporters who chose the item; rather they are representative of the mentions for that particular item.

Figure Court Reporters Q16.

Court Reporters: Steps to Enhance Stenographic Court Reporters' Role in the Future Courtroom (n=1,962)*

- Provide realtime: 23%
- Provide e-transcripts, integrate with e-case management: 19%
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing: 17%
- Provide daily copy: 16%
- Become record managers with case mgmt. expertise: 13%
- Take on add. responsibilities held by other personnel: 9%
- Other: 2%
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill: 1%

Multiple endorsement (select all)*
Comparative Results

Methods Used to Make the Court Record
Comparing the judges’ responses to the court reporters’ responses, we find that there are some differences in the frequency (expressed as percentages) of the methods used to make the court record. For both populations, it is clear that stenographic court reporting is the most common method used (mentioned 48% of the time by judges and mentioned 62% by court reporters). This finding is consistent with the qualitative interviews conducted by President Dressel with Chief Justices and State Court Administrators in general jurisdiction courts. We also see that audio and video recording is used quite often; court reporters mentioned that audio recording is the system used most often in the courts in which they work (28%), whereas judges mentioned its use only 7% of the time. Judges report that video recording is used 35% of the time, whereas court reporters indicate that its use in their courtrooms in which they work only 5% of the time. Voicewriting/stenomask as methods for making the record are quite uncommon according to both the judges and the court reporters who responded (see Figure Comparative 1). Note that the percentages reported are not representative of respondents who chose the item, rather they are representative of all mentions for that particular item by those respondents who answered the question.

Methods Used to Make the Court Record*

*Select all that apply (multiple selections made)

Figure Comparative 1.
Use of Stenographic Court Reporters

For those courts that use stenographic court reporters, judges indicated that in criminal court, they are used 100% of the time. In civil cases, judges indicated that stenographic court reporters were used 96% of the time. Court reporters indicated similar usage (97% criminal and 96% civil; see Figure Comparative 2).

Support or Opposition for Implementation of Systems

Judges and court reporters who currently do not use audio or video recording were asked about their support for the implementation of audio, video, or realtime systems. Audio recording systems garner more support from both these judges (41%) and these court reporters (7%) than do video recording systems, but opposition from court reporters is significantly greater than judges’ opposition for audio recording systems. These same judges who did not indicate that they initially used audio or video recording are also significantly more likely to support the use of video recording systems (35%) than court reporters (4%). In fact, these court reporters who currently do not use audio or video were more likely to statistically significantly strongly oppose both audio and video recordings compared to judges, who were more likely to strongly support both.
The Future of Court Reporting:
2011 National Survey – Judges & Court Reporters

The system that seems to have the most support from both judges and court reporters is realtime reporting. Ninety-seven percent of these same judges (see Figure Comparative 3; 97% of n=226, who indicate that they currently do not use audio and video) and 98% of these same court reporters (98% of n=271) indicate that they would support the implementation of realtime reporting systems within their courtrooms. Although these judges and court reporters supported realtime reporting, court reporters were statistically significantly more likely to “strongly support” realtime when compared to judges (see also Table Comparative 3).

Figure Comparative 3.

Support or Opposition for Implementation of Systems

![Bar chart showing support or opposition for implementation of systems]

Table Comparative 3:
Degree of opposition or support ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems (1=strongly support to 4=strongly oppose)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Influence in Making of Official Record

Both judges and stenographic court reporters agree that judges have the most influence in choosing the method of making the official record (47% and 57% respectively). President Dressel’s interviews with Chief Justices and State Court Administrators revealed that judges were most often responsible for the decision to hire a court reporter or install electronic equipment in their courts. This decision-making role appears to be shifting from the individual judge to others. The next most influential are court administrators (judges 19%, court reporters 14%), followed by legislators, other, and court reporters (see Figure Comparative 4).

![Figure Comparative 4](image-url)
Agree or Disagree with Statements Regarding Realtime and Daily Copy

When asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with statements regarding the use of realtime and daily transcripts, results were mixed. Judges agreed much more often with the statements than did the court reporters. When asked if the reason that realtime and/or daily transcripts were not at all or were not very important to them, 44% of judges agreed that it is because of budgetary or cost reasons, while only 33% of court reporters who “rarely” or “never” provided realtime or provided daily copy agreed with that statement. When asked if audio is adequate, 44% of judges agreed, while only 18% of these same court reporters agreed. The largest difference in statement agreement is seen when asked if realtime is a luxury. Seventy-two percent of judges agreed with that statement, while only 31% of court reporters agreed (see Figure Comparative 5).

**Figure Comparative 5.**

Agree or Disagree with Statements Regarding Realtime and Daily Copy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=375)</th>
<th>Judges (n=302)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=304)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=307)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=303)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=374)</th>
<th>Judges (n=305)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost all that Matters</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio is Adequate</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Much Difference</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime a Luxury</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Need Services</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical Differences between Judges and Court Reporters: Statements Regarding Realtime and Daily Copy

Judges and court reporters were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement to a number of statements regarding realtime and daily copy. The differences between the responses of judges and court reporters were tested to determine whether those differences were meaningful. Judges were only asked this series of questions if they had indicated in the previous question that they thought that realtime or daily copy were either not at all important, or not very important. Court reporters were asked about their attitudinal agreement with this series of statements regardless of their answer on the previous question (which asked about frequency of services provided rather than importance). Overall, judges and court reporters differed significantly on all five statements, with court reporters more likely to disagree with all statements (see Table Comparative 5 below). Compared to judges, court reporters were more likely to disagree with the following statements: “There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter,” “Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate,” “There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter,” “Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity,” and “The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.”

Table Comparative 5: Statements regarding realtime and daily copy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford to pay for realtime services or daily transcripts.</td>
<td>Court Reporters: 2.09</td>
<td>Judges: 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate.</td>
<td>Court Reporters: 1.62</td>
<td>Judges: 2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter.</td>
<td>Court Reporters: 1.27</td>
<td>Judges: 1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity.</td>
<td>Court Reporters: 2.03</td>
<td>Judges: 2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.</td>
<td>Court Reporters: 1.73</td>
<td>Judges: 2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors that Will Significantly Impact the Court in the Next 10-15 years

It seems that there is quite a bit of agreement between judges and court reporters when it comes to their perceptions of the factors that will impact courts in the future. The most influential for both judges (57%) and court reporters (62%) is perceived to be budget considerations. The second most impactful factor is perceived to be the integration of technology (judges 28%; court reporters 23%). Other factors perceived to have less impact are accuracy of official court record, alternative dispute resolution, and jurisdiction size (see Figure Comparative 6).

Figure Comparative 6.

Factors That Will Significantly Impact Court in Next 10-15 Years

- Budget considerations
- Integration of technology
- Focus on accuracy of official court record
- Alternative dispute resolution
- Jurisdiction size
- Other (please specify)
- Internet/Remote adjudication

Percent of Responses (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Judges (n=520)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=493)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget considerations</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of technology</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on accuracy of official court record</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction size</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Remote adjudication</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foresee Integrating Transcript into Electronic Case Management

Individuals whose courtrooms use Electronic Case Management Systems (ECMS) were asked whether they believed transcripts would eventually be integrated into this system. Judges were almost evenly split between whether they believed the transcripts would be integrated (49%) or whether they would not (51%). Court reporters were much more likely to believe that transcripts would become part of the ECMS in their courtrooms in the future compared to judges (74% vs. 49%, respectively; see Figure Comparative 7).

Figure Comparative 7.

Foresee Integrating Transcript into Electronic Case Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges (n=275)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=168)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Will integrate)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Will not integrate)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steps Stenographic Court Reporters Can Take to Enhance Their Role in the Courtroom of the Future

When it comes to enhancing the role of stenographic court reporters in the courtroom, judges and court reporters agreed on most of the items. The most important service that court reporters can provide, according to both judges and court reporters, is realtime (this was a “select all that apply” question, and therefore, there were multiple responses that could be endorsed; of those responses, judges mentioned “realtime” 28% of the time and court reporters mentioned “realtime” 23% of the time). The next is to provide e-transcripts or integrate with the e-case management system (mentioned 19% of the time for both), and third is daily copy (mentioned 16% by court reporters and 13% by judges; see Figure: Comparative 8). There were some “other” infrequent (2%) suggestions by judges, such as: improve judicial demeanor; presence and companionship; incorporate technology into the courts; and lobby for funding.

Although realtime is also seen as a very valuable service by the Chief Justices and State Court Administrators interviewed by President Dressel, they also indicated that flexibility and being a team player and part of a pool were the most important things court reporters could do to enhance their role in the courtroom.

![Figure Comparative 8.](image_url)

*Select all that apply (multiple selections made)*

- Provide realtime
- Provide e-transcripts, integrate with e-case management
- Provide daily copy
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill
- Take on add. responsibilities held by other personnel
- Become record managers with case mgmt. expertise
- Other

Percent of Responses (%)
Open-Ended Results

The following open-ended responses from judges and court reporters, in their respective sections, are direct quotes made by survey respondents. They have not been edited for substantive content. Information that could be used to identify the respondent has been removed — such as people referred to by name — to allow the respondents to remain anonymous.

JUDGES

Q15d: Why do you foresee the transcript not being integrated into this electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?

For those who indicated that they did not foresee the transcript being integrated into the electronic case management system, the most commonly cited responses from judges is funding; followed by a claim that it is not necessary. Other responses included: no plans for integration yet; things are staying the way they are; multiple departments are responsible for the transcribing; privacy concerns; system not designed for this; and court rules or regulations. Some examples of these comments include:

Funding:

Budgetary constraints.

Cost and necessity. Most cases are not appealed.

Not needed:

The transcript is not usually needed and is never transcribed except in the event of appeal or when purchased by a party after the proceedings is concluded. In both events the party pays the Court Reporter directly for the transcription. I have no idea how or why it would ever be made a part of our ECMS.

Not necessary in vast majority of cases.

No plans:

We can't even get an operable electronic case management system to work. Integrating the transcript is not even on the horizon.

I am unsure whether transcript will or will not be integrated into the appellate case management system, but the trial court will not due to lack of relevance.
Staying with what they have:

My court reporter is statutorily and ethically responsible for the transcript that she makes. Mixing those duties with the clerk of court case management duties would usurp the court reporter duties. Statutorily my court reporter must keep her rough notes for ten years. Obviously most of those notes are not transcribed, but having the clerk in charge of the notes could be problematic.

Transcript is available from certified court reporter that can produce any transcript electronically and instantly send it as required. Only very rare instances where transcript is needed in case file, e.g. transcript of a judge’s order. Transcript of most other proceedings would be unnecessary.

Privacy concerns:

The electronic system is unreliable and inaccurate and beyond the control of the court. It is susceptible to fabrication and outside influences.

A separate and distinct function. Integration would give too easy access to information otherwise not available to others/public/curiosity seekers.

Q16: What steps can stenographic court reporters take to enhance their role in your courtroom in the future? (Other)

Improve judicial demeanor.

Presence and companionship.

Incorporate technology into the courts.

Lobby for funding.

Q18: Please describe the changes you envision taking place in courts over the next 10-15 years from a technology, procedural, or even political standpoint.

When asked to describe the changes the judges envision taking place in their courts over the next 10-15 years from either a technology, procedural, or political standpoint, answers were diverse. With respect to technology, which was the most cited theme generally, there were mixed feelings. Some judges indicated that they’d like to see an increase in technology,
coupled with the elimination of court reporters. Other judges indicated the exact opposite, stating that increases in technology are likely to decrease the use of court reporters, which they felt would be a mistake. Other responses specified under what circumstances or in which courts they specifically use court reporters and when they do not. Finally, some judges mentioned changes with respect to e-filings, realtime, and case management.

**Technology:**

**Increasing technology; elimination of court reporters**

Shift to electronic files in all case types i.e. no hard copy case files; already have some case types in that form. Probably less use of court reporters and more electronic recording with voice recognition transcription (e.g. Dragon Naturally Speaking)

Greater reliance on electronic/FTR recording and decreasing use of live court reporters.

I predict we will eliminate court reporters and move entirely to the use of digital electronic recording systems.

Voice recognition software will become improved to the point that an audio recording can also generate a transcript, with the assistance of a trained operator.

The use of electronic recording coupled with voice recognition software will produce highly accurate transcripts integrated with the case management system.

Much more use of technology; electronic filing; management of electronic discovery; meeting the challenges of assuring proper presentation of cases even with increased pro se litigants; continued struggle for proper and regular funding; proper involvement of attorneys in the adversarial process.

Due to a shortage of stenographers in my state I expect our courts to focus on developments in technology to fill the traditional role of stenographers

I believe that within the next 10-15 years our Court system will become paperless with the official record becoming electronically stored as part of that paperless system. Our system has already eliminated court reporters except in capital cases.

I envision more electronic recording without a court reporter, per se; more administrative courts; more mandatory mediation and arbitration; greater push for judicial appointments as opposed to elected judges; more pro se litigants; greater need for translator.

The state and county budgets will definitely impact the courts. Our court system at this point is underfunded. Unknown is whether individuals will continue to be trained as court
reporters. I can foresee court proceedings becoming electronically recorded as technology advances.

Technology is going to almost eliminate the need for court reporters, provide for a more accurate record and permit those providing ancillary services (e.g. interpreters) to appear at remote locations via video conferencing.

**Technology is eliminating court reporters; disagreement with this procedural move.**

Due to budget constraints, it's frustrating that we can't do all tasks that the court reporters are capable of. Also it appears as if there is a definite move to eliminate court reporters and move to the recording devices. This would be a definite mistake.

I am very worried that the Idaho Supreme Court will do away with court reporters, as a cost saving measure, and rely only on the electronic record. This would be a complete disaster for the state and its citizens. I foresee court reporters slowly being phased out in my state.

Paperless filings. I do not see, nor would I like to see any effort to eliminate or reduce Court Reporters. My court reporter provides real time which is very valuable. She proofreads all my decisions. She is a confidant and a teammate. From the appellate court standpoint, I would imagine they would suffer even more if court reporters were eliminated or cut back. I review digital records transcribed by court clerks, and they are at times horrible, mostly because of infirmities in the recording system.

I am afraid, in this era of draconian budget cuts that live court reporters are going to be replaced by electronic recording devices. Missouri is in the beginning stages of establishing an electronic filing system, which, I think, is going to be similar to the system in Bankruptcy courts. We will be paperless, eventually. I also fear that the General Assembly will try to use budget cuts to curtail what it perceives as "judicial activism," whatever that is.

Electronic filing perhaps replacing court reporters with electronic equipment (will be big mistake).

**Court reporters used for specific tasks and hearings.**

Court reporters used primarily for trial and/or evidentiary hearings. Electronic recordings for routine calendaring type hearings.

Electronic records of court proceedings.
Realtime:

A unified judiciary (clerks of court and courts) and oversight by the court administrator’s office. Remote IT access and adequate sound systems, Realtime and generation of transcripts more quickly. Electronic filing.

Realtime recording is a tremendous asset to judges. I anticipate that the use of real time will expand in a big way over the next five years.

E-filing/Paperless:

Electronic case filing will begin within the next 18 months and court will begin conversion to paperless files.

E-filing in our court.

Electronic case filings, video depositions and trials for preservation of the record.

Going paperless.

Elimination of paper; voice recognition software; remote conferencing/hearings.

Case Management:

More sophisticated case mgt; more technology in courtroom itself.

A uniform case management system in which all courts in the state are connected.

Procedural:

PROCEDURAL: Statutory and Rules changes to accommodate new technology; more summary proceedings.

Increase in pro se litigants and decrease in budget.

I am very concerned by the marginalization and minimization of the judicial branch of government from a budget perspective of adequate funding for the courts. We cannot guarantee due process or open government with the severe cutbacks imposed upon the judiciary.

I expect to see the continuation of the trend of increased pro se cases. This trend, coupled with the ever-increasing caseload and budget considerations which make the legislature disinclined to create new judgeships, suggests that the system may collapse under its own weight.
More mediation, reduction in civil litigation, introduction of case management, budget.

The number of cases coming before the court will continue to increase. The number of judges/court reporters/staff is not likely to keep up with these increasing numbers. Existing court personnel will be forced to handle more and more cases, increasing the likelihood of mistakes.

Fewer criminal jury trials. Software that will accurately turn oral testimony into written word almost immediately (realtime). Faster turnaround time in preparation of transcripts in order to move cases.

Political:

Unfortunately, given the political climate I see a movement away from merit selection, or retention of a much watered down merit system. For the most part, courts will remain a viable third branch of government despite legislative efforts in the states in particular to negatively impact that. I also see technology playing an ever increasing role in the courts with full out e-filing, likely going away from court reporters and using video transcription in real time, etc.

A loss of good will. Public, politicians, and government functionaries disinclined to respect the court's role in our democracy, accompanied by attendant reprioritization of public resources away from the judiciary. Politicization of the judicial branch.

Increasing political pressure to substitute video court reporting for the court stenographer.

Q19a: Please describe the top two challenges you foresee in this new environment you described in the previous question, or during the transition to this new environment, and the potential solutions you may have to offer to overcome those challenges.

With respect to the top two challenges judges foresee in the future, the two top themes that generally reoccur relate to technology and increasing budget constraints. Judges also mentioned resistance to change as a challenge, and political challenges. Within these broader themes, judges provided specific examples, some of which are listed below:
Technology:

The technology that we have is unreliable, prohibitively expensive to maintain and changes so quickly that by the time that the court, staff and attorneys have become competent in using it, it has become obsolete.

The need for personnel trained and available to operating the digital systems.

Older (less technologically knowledgeable) judges.

Familiarizing sessions' clerks with the use of the sophisticated equipment that is now in many of our court rooms. There is an institutional rigidity that must be overcome as there is with any systemic change.

A new case management system and electronic filings.

Keeping up with advancing technology.

Integration of electronic systems/ technologies that are constantly changing.

The efficient use of technology to cut down the expense of holding court.

Shortage of court reporters resulting in conversion to audio recording with real time transcription.

Adaptability.

Expense and time for further training and update to equipment.

Finding the financial resources for the upfront cost of technology for converting from paper based court records to electronic records and case management. The eventual cost savings of electronic case management will inure to the benefit of the local county clerks, not the judicial system. Consequently, the political will in the administrative end of the judicial branch is not there at present to seek the money from the legislature. Especially in these challenging fiscal times.

Update electronics to keep pace with technology.

Digital recording transcription software.

The political resistance to advancing technology by those who will be displaced (e.g. court reporters, court clerks).

Going paperless, funding the transition.

Judicial education on adopting needed changes in an old institution. Acceptance of self represented litigants and ensuring the cases are heard and decided on the merits. Technological advances can improve the way we do business but judges must embrace those changes if they are to really make a difference.
Adequacy of trial record if using electronic recorder/FTR.

Transitioning to a greater emphasis on electronic documents and electronic system.

Staying on top of technology.

Preparation and verification of the technical record for purposes of appeal; handling of exhibits at trial (introduction, maintenance as part of the record, etc.) and making sure they are a part of the appellate record. Impact of evolving technology.

Acceptance by court reporters of electronic recordation.

Paying for and implementing the system.

Finding funds to add new technology.

Creating adequate electronic records of the proceedings in court.

The "cultural" shift to an electronic system. Users will be unwilling to change the way in which they keep and refer to records and execute signatures.

More technology in the court and less need for actual court reporters.

Transition from certified stenographic court reporters to some alternative reliable record making, preservation and retrieval system.

They are a great substitute for Court Reporter generated transcripts.

Judges distrust the use of audio visual recording devices as "official Transcripts". Most lay people apparently think.

Fiscal challenges are paramount at this time and drive all technology decisions, for both state and local funding.

Creating and/or purchasing a system that adequately performs all of the functions needed.

Technology is very important and must be utilized, but we should not forget the human contribution to the system. I have seen several times when an electronic recording system failed and we were without any recording or a recording that could not be understood. A human knows when he or she did not hear or understand what was said and can ask the speaker to repeat.

Integration of technology.

Stenographic court reporters becoming obsolete and released from employment. The skills needed and level of training will be reduced significantly. We have already experienced this with electronic recording equipment. Our legislature, last session, approved electronic recording of testimony as a method of taking testimony. Employees can be trained and certified on the system in a handful of days. As a result
of this change, the reporters are simply monitoring the system and performing the services of a typist.

Accuracy of verbatim record.
Prevent mediations from becoming just something else the parties have to do.
Preserving accurate records of proceedings held across all case types.

**Budget:**

Budget challenges.
Budget concerns.
As with all changes, the finances to implement those changes will present a challenge.
Budgetary constraints based upon the economy.
Our State is in deep financial trouble. The courts do not have a good relationship with the legislature. We are allocated less that 2% of the State's general operating budget for the entire judicial system, including all salaries, (judges and clerks), retirement, operating costs, etc. There is no more money to dole out, and if there was, the legislature would not give it to us.

Budget constraints and increasing caseloads.
Funding and cuts to personnel.
Their jobs.
Budget is a challenge and has regrettably lead to a lot of court reporters losing their jobs or being fearful of losing.
Budgeting.
Money.
With the current budget restraints and the reliance on technology to an ever greater extent, will our core values and principals be compromised?
Budget difficulties.
Keeping the courts and branch courts open.
Personnel being cut.
Budgetary challenges to the court system.
We need one reporter per judge. Due to budget constraints, that ratio is not available to us right now.
Not enough money to do the job.
Figuring out how to live within our means.
Budget.
Balancing fiscal concerns with the need for fast and accurate reporting, upon which a price cannot be placed, in my opinion.

Resistance to Change:
Overcoming resistance to change in court clerks who have done things the same way for YEARS.
Resistance to change is deeply imbedded in the court system.
To provide consistency and uniformity across districts, the state needs to examine a unified judiciary. This will require legislators to look beyond their local constituents and letting control of local power in order to facilitate better court services.
Uniform system from court to court in terms of management.
Changing hearts and minds.
Adapting to the ever-increasing demands of the job in terms of caseload and non-represented litigants.
Getting a statewide case management system for both criminal and civil cases.
Getting it all to work together.
Can the courts and the statewide administrative offices work in harmony?
I think the judicial system has to be sensitive to not having the courtroom become too sterile appearing, given the onset of technology and the increasing use of forms.

Politics:
Convincing the voting public that merit selection of judges really does give a better judiciary than election of judges. At the same time, maintaining judicial independence in the face of threats to the independence of the judiciary over a few unpopular decisions.
1) The ongoing intrusion of conduct commissions in the adjudication process; 2) the distancing of the public from its input in the selection of those persons privileged to render final determinations in disputes.
Nationwide there is a sustained attack upon the judiciary by both the legislature and executive branch of government. We are portrayed as aloof, inflexible, and pedantic. The three justices of the Iowa Supreme Court who were hounded out of office because of their ruling on gay marriages is positive proof that electors want compliant judges’ not independent ones. This is how the National Socialists took over in 1935.

Our state’s central administrative office of the courts is an overly bureaucratic organization staffed by people with no working knowledge of actual courtroom operations.

The Idaho Supreme Court sets transcript deadlines on appeals too quickly. I don’t think they take into consideration the other job duties court reporters have outside of preparing appellate transcripts. It creates a great deal of stress and drama within my court.

Reaffirmation of the independence of the judiciary.

Dealing with incompetent legislators.

Our primary challenge is to find ways to provide and deliver necessary and accessible justice for litigants, and do it with substantially fewer resources, but without diminishing the quality of that justice.

**Q19b: Proposed Solutions to Challenges Mentioned**

**Funding:**

Better economy or allocation of limited resources so that the judicial branch is not short-changed in favor of departments such as education, fish, and wildlife.

Justifying the high initial expense with the long range cost savings and higher level of services provided. Our court has traditionally allowed court reporters to keep all transcript fees generated. Historically, the investment was minimal. We paid a basic salary and minimal equipment costs. Retaining a percentage of the transcript fees to defray maintenance, upgrade, and initial costs could be a selling point for some jurisdictions.

In the likely absence of sufficient resources, our courts need to thoroughly exam current practices, procedures and rules to reduce or eliminate waste, duplication and other inefficiencies. We then need to develop creative systems and practices that enable us to accomplish more with less, and in a manner that does not marginalize or violate the legitimate needs of those who deserve quality justice from us.

The judiciary is not another agency and its budget should not be reduced based on politics. Performance measurements will establish the judiciary’s credibility with the public and
separate the judiciary from other branches of government and their agencies. We need to establish performance measures so that data can be collected and provide support for our directives and request for funding to make improvements.

More adequate funding for court clerk staff.

Obtain new funding sources (doubtful).

Either shifting of funds from other areas in our judicial budget or obtaining additional funding from the legislature or outside grant resources.

Sadly, the solution in most respects comes down to $$$$$$. Improvements in technology, such as case management programs and e-filing, are helpful but are inadequate to address the bigger issues.

**Politics:**

Marketing our brand. Publicize the positive. Train (formally and informally) our judges/staff to believe the inherent “goodness” of our work. Train our judges’ staff to behave to earn respect. Reinvigorate civics lessons into our elementary, secondary and post-secondary schools. Encourage judges to get out into the community - at the same time remove the political incentives to do so.

Convince the elected officials within the judicial branch (i.e. the Supreme Court Justices) to take control of the bureaucracy to start planning for the transition. Educate elected officials in the executive and legislative branch on the eventual savings to be had using technology. And convincing them it’s a good idea even if the savings mostly accrue to a different level of government.

Legislature providing statewide revenue or allowing individual circuits to increase court costs for rainy day situations.

The legislature and the public must be made aware of our needs and convinced of our value. Trying to foster a better relationship with the legislators of the state to find monetary solutions. Closer relationship to governmental budget makers - local funding for courts.

**Education:**

More efficient operation and education of the public and law makers of how the court functions and its importance in our democracy.
We must continue to educate judges on the issues of the day and the benefit of change in certain areas. The institution itself must be willing to take on a new face that reflects the reality of the judiciary today. At the same time we must not lose the traditions that make our system what it is.

Training clerks and court administrators to properly handle, process the electronic filings. Training judges to access the electronic filings and navigate the system so the judge can access case information.

Judges are going to have to find ways to constantly get involved in technological training. This is going to be harder as judges are older.

**Technology:**
The stenographic court reporter can take a more stronger and assertive role in marshalling evidence and records, gathering and storing evidence and testimony and allowing access for appellate purposes or for the public. The court reporter would need the use of the tools of technology and the expertise to create a new paradigm in the courtroom.

Technology should be used to enhance the working relationship that the court has with the reporters. It is so convenient to have an individual in the courtroom as opposed to a recording device. Technological advancements are important, but the duties that individual court reporters have with their assigned judges cannot be replaced by electronic devices.

Education of all involved in the courtroom to the benefits of new technology in capturing the proceedings and making an accessible record thereof. There will, of course, be some reluctance on those whose livelihoods are dependent on the current, rather expensive and labor intensive, means of recording and preparing transcripts of proceedings and possible union-management issues as well.

Stenographic court reporters need to embrace change and finds ways to be more responsive, accurate, and provide more services. For example, deposition transcripts routinely include an index of all words spoken. Attorneys can review the index to find important sections of testimony. This could be added to make trial transcripts easier to use for appellate purposes.
Other:
Careful analysis and planning.

Court reporters because of their long term relationship with a judge have the capacity to be the "chief of staff" of a trial judge office. They also can be pivotal in improving judicial demeanor if the judge is open to feedback and they are given proper training.

No real solution; simply when choosing a platform for record storage there must some significant belief that it will be viable for 10 to 15 years and will be easily translated to the next technology.

Procedural:
Ensure that judges have enough quality time to make good decisions - there will always be a tension in an era of reduced resources between being efficient and being fair and just.

Using pools of court reporters/monitors, bailiffs, security. Educating judges on how to handle increasing pro se litigants while at the same time, preserving a proper record. Increasing the use of "pro se" clinics at various courts.

This will require an irreplaceable human element; just as we need judges, we will always need reporters because mere transcription doesn't replace the need to make the clear record in court in the first place, and we all know how poorly we judges and lawyers do that without court reporters.

A critical component is collaboration and a willingness to change our approach to criminal justice, so that we can lead the way towards a more evidence based approach to the cases that come before us. That would include criminal cases and family matters.

COURT REPORTERS

Q14d: Why do you foresee the transcript not being integrated into this electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?

For those court reporters who indicated that they did not foresee the transcript being integrated into the electronic case management system, budget concerns were a common response. Other responses included that there was not a need for ECMS, privacy concerns, and procedural aspects
of transcript integration — such as access restrictions and the growing use of digital technology. Some examples of these comments include:

**Budget:**

Budget constraints in upgrading and/or replacing case management system to accommodate such transcripts. Unwillingness or inability of clerk's office to manage retrieval and/or archiving.

Our court doesn't have the necessary funds to upgrade to another audio system. Presently, our system is merely recording the audio and doesn't do it very well. Several people talk over each other and rustle papers at crucial parts of hearings to make it difficult to decipher on the final transcript.

**Not Needed:**

I believe that a stenographic court reporter will always be the most cost-effective, accurate, and efficient means of managing the court record because making and preserving the court record is entirely more complex. I don't foresee an electronic management system being capable of doing what a court reporter does day in and day out. Court reporters bring to the courtroom a human component and also utilizing the latest technology.

No need

**Privacy:**

Transcripts should only come from court reporters and all copies should be paid for so making them part of the case system is just not right.

Concern for others getting a copy of transcript without paying for it.

**Procedural:**

Current access restrictions by court reporters to the court management system and court internet. If restrictions are lifted, each court reporter would require training with
regard to the court management system. I don't see either of these things happening any time soon.

Because real-time is not mandatory. I believe that more and more stenographic reporters will be phased out and replaced by digital reporters and they do not have the capability to produce a real-time record so it will not be possible to integrate the real-time record into the electronic case management system.

A verbatim stenographic court reporter is cost effective, professionally responsible, provides the most accurate form of recording, retrieving and archiving the proceedings. Court reporter software systems encourage a Computer Aided Data Input system and would be welcomed in our professional community to work in concert with pre-trial and post-trial motion practice. Verbatim stenographic court reporters have the ability to integrate the preliminary discovery and disclosure for ease of utilization at trial.

**Other:**

It has never been talked about to this point.

Our state has just selected a new vendor for a brand new state-wide unified system and I just don't know enough about it yet. It will be a year or two before its implemented.

**Q17: Please describe the changes you envision taking place in courts over the next 10-15 years from a technology, procedural, or even political standpoint.**

Court reporters indicated that they envisioned technological changes taking place in the courts over the next 10-15 years. Specifically, some felt that technological changes would lead to the replacement of court reporters, whereas others felt that technological changes could enhance the role of the court reporter and efficiency of the court. The variety of tasks, roles, and services that court reporters could fulfill was also mentioned by court reporters, highlighting the potential for future increased use of real-time in the court. Court reporters also mentioned budget and procedural concerns related to anticipated changes that may take place in the courts over the next 10-15 years. Some examples of these comments include:
Technology:

Increasing Technology; elimination of court reporters

I see more replacement of court reporters with electronic recording.

I expect if court reporting technology does not improve to a significant level, court reporters, as we know it today, will not have jobs. Everything is going digital and electronic.

Video technology seems to be taking over the courtrooms across Michigan. Sad, but true.

I live in a rural area, so the changes I see may not apply to all. In Iowa we are in the infant stages of electronic case management. This will impact the court system in Iowa, to what degree it is still too early to tell. Depending on budget, I foresee going to regional court systems, with the integration of technology, video and sound.

I can envision the legislature of this state implementing audio recording in all courts without giving consideration to the accuracy of the record.

Transcripts filed electronically with no need for paper.

The courtroom becoming more of a technology-friendly judicial arena.

Technology is eliminating court reporters; disagreement with this procedural move

Real-time court reporters are the future of court reporting. Machines malfunction, people forget to turn them on, or there is no one monitoring the machines. Court reporters have the ability to stop witnesses if they speak too softly, there are noises that block out the answers, or a number of other distractions involved in a trial. Technology is always helping the court reporter's ability to provide the official record accurately and instantly to the Court and other participants in a trial.

I think the move toward electronic recording is inevitable, due to the perception that it saves money and is somehow more efficient, combined with the fact that many judges will be retiring in coming years and we will be losing the ones who really understand why our record is vital and what we do. In general I've found older, more experienced attorneys have a greater respect for the record, and make a better one. I don't think younger attorneys always understand that, and with younger attorneys in turn becoming judges, I'm afraid they won't fight to keep their court reporters.
It’s a sad thing when people feel that a Digital Recorder can replace a stenographic reporter. I foresee that stenographic reporters will be taking on the role of digital monitors, as well as doing stenography in Felony cases. Picking a jury is virtually impossible to be done by a digital recorder because many times an attorney does not specify who they are talking to and which venireman is actually speaking. A digital recording is not an adequate or accurate way to record proceedings in a courtroom or deposition setting.

Technology will keep increasing in the courts. I believe that is what the future holds. I strongly believe that court reporters should remain in the courtroom. The integrity of the record and the protection of rights of defendants and others can only be done by a human being. Technology is not infallible but a court reporter is.

Reporters will embrace technology and all judges will want real-time. Court administrators will still not understand what we do and will want to replace reporters with machines. They will hire transcribers who will not care about words as reporters do and they will not try to decipher accents, legal terms, case cites and mumbling.

I believe that real-time reporters provide a real service to their judges and to the attorneys. I foresee judges requiring real-time all the time. I do foresee some integration of newer technology; however, I do believe that the benefits to a court reporters' accuracy, their abilities to help other staff, their real-time capabilities, their abilities to slow a witness down or speak louder or more accurately, their fast turn-around time, their understanding of court proceedings and a how a record should be maintained, as well as their responsibility as the keeper of the exhibits far outweighs any budgetary benefit to an electronic recording system. A court reporter can offer assistance to attorneys in the way of daily copy or overnight turnaround that an electronic system simply cannot do ... In other areas, of the courtroom, especially in remote areas like Wyoming, I see videoconferencing used more and more.

The courts would utilize their employees and technology to provide a prompt, cost-effective, and accurate service to the public. Stenographic reporters are a major part of the future in courts because we cannot compromise the integrity of the record. I believe that stenographic reporters provide an excellence in quality in making the record that the judiciary, the bar, and the public demand.

I work in rural Oklahoma. There has been an official opening in my courthouse for a majority of the last decade. There just aren't enough reporters passing the state certification. Given this shortage and budget shortfalls, I expect to be replaced by an inferior reporting method within 5 years.
Court Reporters used for specific tasks and hearings:

I think courts will be trying to keep up with the ongoing technological advances that are being made in computer software. E-filing, case management and a stenographic real-time court reporter can greatly increase our efficiency – which we will need to handle our growing dockets. Perhaps we'll be so efficient that we can do more with less time, less money. The future is exciting.

I believe that ALL court reporters that are not doing real-time now should be doing real-time in every courtroom in which they report. Transcripts will be delivered electronically rather than a hard copy provided.

I find myself pretty pessimistic, and feel that electronic recording will become more prevalent. In our court, I feel that there is no appreciation of an accurate record or the reporter going the extra mile, and that ER will be embraced because of budgetary constraints.

From my knowledge and experience of being a court reporter for 20 years and counting, I truly believe that Real-time technology will be what preserves the court reporting profession in the years to come. There are so many advantages to having a "real-time" reporter versus any other technology or any type of recorder/recording equipment. Due to the increasing number of hearing-impaired persons in our country and all the advantages to having a real-time reporter and what they have to offer the judicial system, I believe in the next 10-15 years real-time will be a requirement for employment and not an option. Also, in the next 10-15 years I hope that the judicial system, parties/litigants involved, court administrators would realize the importance and value of an accurate, verbatim record. I hope we can get to a point in the future where the importance and focus is not on cutting costs by eliminating stenographic court reporters, but focusing on the integrity and accuracy of the record.

Budget:

From my perspective, the driving force behind all change in our courts is budget. Those in charge of the budget really don't care all that much about the accuracy of the record - "good enough" is good enough for them. Our duties as stenographic reporters have changed drastically in the last 3 years, almost all budget driven. More court coverage has been assigned to digital recording so the steno reporters have time to get transcripts done, because there is no $$ to pay overtime for transcript work. We do not receive $$ for transcripts, only salary. Consequentially, we cover mostly trials. The citizens in Florida deserve the best record possible, and that is made by a live steno reporter, not someone monitoring 3 courts at once. I envision more court proceedings over video - eliminating the need to transport prisoners, a $$ and security concern.
For budgetary reasons, it may come to pass that court reporters will be phased out. Unless the powers that be truly want to protect the accuracy of the court record by utilizing court reporters, they may just switch to electronic recording and hire people to type the record from audio recording. It's hard to say. I've been reporting for over 20 years and I have seen many, many changes in my field.

I am concerned that budgetary constraints will influence the administrative office to look at the bottom line figures and drop court reporters. Sometimes those who make the budgeting decisions are nowhere near the facility they are making the decision about, and that greatly concerns me.

With budget cuts, it's easy to view court reporters as "glorified secretaries". However, we still provide the most accurate transcripts and real-time capabilities. My judge loves to sit back and listen to a trial. When she's done, she prints a copy of my real-time transcript and doesn't have to worry about taking complete notes.

**Procedural:**

Hopefully with the continued success of real-time writing, along with the ability to write for the hearing impaired, the court system will continue to realize that the stenographic record is still the best way to make a record. Also, with the large multicultural society in my court system, I believe it would cause a large problem with accents when using only a digital recording. You can never go back and ask a witness what they said. Our court system does use digital recording in rooms where there is not a high volume of transcripts. But there have been times where the operator has forgotten to turn on the machine or never wrote down pertinent information for someone to transcribe at a later date.

I think the court system will deteriorate without the necessity of having live court reporters working for judges. In the state of Iowa, reporters are also the judge's secretary, and we do all the typing. I have always felt reporters are the most integral person in the court system along with the judge and we our profession [sic] has kept up with technology with changes, all at our own expense by and large. Too much money has been spent on court administrator types and that's the problem we have had here in Iowa and not enough spent on the basic people we need to run it, such as reporters, clerks, reporters, bailiffs, more judge appointments to handle the caseload. Unfortunately, reporters make our job look too easy sometimes. We have lost reporters over the past couple years due to a now-ousted supreme court justice who wanted to get rid of us and it will take time to get that entire back [sic], if we ever do, due to budget problems like all states now. Justice is not being served to the people if we
don't try to make politicians realize this and make sure budgets for court systems take some priority. I am already seeing the problems in the state of Iowa due to employees being laid off and working with short staff; we are making more mistakes, more tired and frustrated; morale low; and this is not good for the public -- the decisions made can affect someone's life for the rest of their life, and we need to be on the top of our game in all respects, everyone.

One centralized system in the state instead of every county managing their own records. More mediation instead of using judges and court reporters unfortunately.

Q18a: Please describe the top two challenges you foresee in this new environment you described in the previous question, or during the transition to this new environment, and the potential solutions you may have to offer to overcome those challenges. Challenge 1:

With respect to the top two challenges court reporters foresee in the future, the two most common concerns mentioned were related to technology and the budget. Court reporters also mentioned educational, political, and procedural challenges, some of which are listed below:

**Technology:**

**Increasing Technology/positive**

- Embracing technology
- Staffing with reporters who are willing and able to write realtime and produce quick, accurate transcripts. Having your staff stay current with technology.
- Changing the perception of court reporters and bringing to light advances in technology.
- Court reporters becoming more integral in the overall courtroom technology incorporating the Clerk positions, the court administrator or judicial assistants’ positions.

**Increasing Technology/negative**

- The record will not be as accurate when digital recording is the only record.
- The misconception that "audio recording" is the solution to a budget crisis. In reality, the audio system is a major step backwards. Right now you have highly trained, highly efficient court reporters who can, if rotated often enough, provide almost daily copies
on anything, know the extreme importance of preserving the record, asking people to speak up, stopping interruptions. To switch the system to audio recording which can't do any of that and at which time a typist has to transcribe something which would take much longer and consequently cost MORE and is definitely outdated, archaic and inefficient.

Preventing the replacement of court reporters with audio recording equipment.

Getting lawyers and judges comfortable with the technology that has been available to them to more efficiently access documents and transcripts and learning how to use these tools in making decisions and managing a court.

Technology/accepting change

Nobody likes change. The court system may have to change the roles and duties of employees, not just as it relates to court reporting. I think the technology is available now to have the court record for every hearing published online. The counties and states could make a profit on the pages instead of the court reporter. However, the skills of the court reporter would have to be compensated with higher salaries instead of transcript copies.

Just the change of our document-handling system from written to automated. A lot of people are scared of change and technology.

The thinking of a judge can be difficult to change as to the traditional role of a reporter, i.e., they take down the record and then prepare the transcript. In the new environment the reporter acts as an assistant to the judge during the work day via communication from the realtime and messaging throughout the day, the judge looks to the reporter for input on technological needs, communication between counsel/court staff/litigants, et cetera, and the reporter and the judge work together along with the court administrator on budget and various issues even going so far as to meeting with local governmental authorities.

Budget:

The budget is the biggest challenge. Courts are expected to do more with less.

Budget crisis. The commissioner’s court trying to cut expenses and/or cut salaries and/or cut personnel. Updating to the new environment will cost money. Thanks to the budget crisis, the courts' improvements/updates will be stalled/delayed because of the commissioners not wanting to go to that expense.
Challenge one will be staffing. Who wants to enter a profession in which people will always say you are going to be replaced and it's not because of unprofessionalism, it is because of the budget?

Solving budgetary problems.

**Education:**

Getting the training necessary to perform the expected duties in the future while working a fulltime job in court.

Court reporting training.

Getting young people to attend court reporting school and the large dropout rate for those who do attempt court reporting.

**Politics:**

Political factions that reduce essential professional services to a budgetary line item. Court reporters are the guardians of the record, put simply. We have borne the cost of bringing this profession into the 21st century. We continue to evolve and progress with the times through technological advances every year and apply them to the venues we serve.

Trying to convince court administrators and politicians and judges to realize how important court reporters are to the court system.

Governing officials looking beyond the bottom line as being the most important factor for their consideration.

**Procedural:**

The number one challenge will be keeping private information private and to be on top of viruses and worms that can infect the system, shutting everything down. Courts will need to be vigilant that social security numbers, victims of violence, minor children's names and contact information is not available; especially in cases involving juveniles.

Judges have to realize that part of their role in the courtroom is to convey the seriousness of appearing within the court system. In my state, the Supreme Court has to realize that the record has to be made impartially, not by one side or the other or even the Judge and that the cheapest is not always the best; and what's being sold as the
cheapest is not always the most cost efficient.

Non-court stenographer personnel (at all levels) making decisions directly affecting court stenographers, from protocol and procedure, to hardware and software, to production and dissemination, to technology without fully understanding how and why our systems work the way they do.

**Q18c: Challenge 2.**

**Budget:**

The economy seems to be stabilizing, but the trickle down effects are far from over. A reporter is usually a higher paid employee and as we’ve seen those positions are one of the first to be cut when budgets are being revamped and reporters are replaced with electronic technology.

Additionally, cost is a factor as the equipment and software to effectively run realtime is expensive at the outset. Speaking from experience, I have invested approximately $12,000.00 in equipment and software to become realtime ready.

The court system as a whole needs to become more economically efficient. Because the position of court reporter is the least political job in the court system, reporters need to find ways to persuade administration of their value.

Budgetary considerations will remain a top priority for Courts. The public demands that we do more with less, yet are upset when a criminal goes free because of "technical, legal issues."

**Education:**

Educating the judiciary, the legislature, the public, the attorneys as to the invaluable and active role the court reporters can play in this advancement of technology process for the future of the courts.

Better educated court reporters. Many are taking on-line courses to become court reporters. Require undergraduate degree.

Educating the public and court workforce, including new attorneys and new judges, on the advantages a live court reporter providing realtime can offer versus electronic recording. New reporters must be equipped with not only the knowledge and ability to write realtime,
but able to acquire the necessary equipment to produce realtime upon entering the work force.

**Procedural:**

The security and protection of the transcript. A pdf should not be tampered with, which is one thing that digital signature is supposed to prevent. If counsel chooses to manipulate the transcript using professional versions of software designed for this purpose, then pdf should not be supplied to counsel at all anymore.

Quit putting appeals on stay.

Be ready to do team work.

Getting all reporters to write realtime.

For those employees that hang in there and retrain themselves, they should be rewarded.

Court Reporters becoming more adept to a "paperless" system.

Reporters maintaining their high standards. Requirements for certification and continuing education are a challenge for every state employing court reporter. We need to maintain our high standards by keeping up with evolving language and technological changes.

I think some court reporters are afraid of change. Court reporters are going to have to be willing to work harder and harder in order to show how important we are in the system. Continuing to become better and better, work towards realtime and getting transcripts out asap is a lot of work. Not to mention, finding all the time to do it and juggle just everyday life. I think sometimes court reporters don't realize we need to step up to every challenge in order to make our profession even more invaluable in the future. And in doing this, take on more responsibilities, educate ourselves about the new technologies available and be willing to do this with a smile on our faces. In making ourselves indispensable (which I think we are anyway), we have to prove to everyone that we are up for the challenge, yes we can go all electronic, yes we can assist the court in whatever needs to be done making us well rounded. Not to allow ourselves to be complacent and apathetic.

**Technology:**

Coordinating the use of new technology: The current case management system doesn't organize material very well. Adopting new technology requires changes to that system as well as to the habits of attorneys, judges, deputies, court reporters, etc.

Creating software to integrate court reporters with clerks that would be helpful, reduce
stress and workload, and encourage cooperation. There has historically been competition between these two fields, and I think their integration would make the court system one lean machine.

Having court reporters becoming real time certified. Everyone began their career at a different time with varying amount of experience within the judicial system and varying skill levels. This is not something that can just happen overnight.

Electronic equipment failure.

Challenge two will be getting digital recording transcribers to do a good job, especially when facing the growing number of people speaking with accents, too rapidly, and deciphering all the technical experts.

**Other:**

To address the ongoing budget concerns in the courts while still maintaining the integrity of the record and safeguarding the employment of current court personnel.

I don't see any other challenges

Not sure.

**Q18b: Proposed Solutions to Challenges Mentioned.**

**Education:**

Continuing education and keeping up with current issues, certifications, furthering our abilities. The good thing for our profession is an untrained clerk pushing a button is no replacement for a highly trained professional who knows the extreme importance of preserving the record, providing accurate fast transcripts and maintaining courtroom order. If courts require incentives for certification, that may help. Right now in our court, all you need is to have graduated from court reporting school. And when you take the initiative to become certified, they don't pay for it, nor do you get any sort of pay increase for your efforts.

More education with regard to available software/hardware solutions for common practices and a more streamlined approach to retrieving information. More vendors offering free training to familiarize judges with software. Judges seeking training to become more efficient with the tools already provided for them.

The reporter has to be knowledgeable on the latest, greatest, and fastest technology of making
a record and willing to embrace it, sometimes at their own cost, in other words, out of their own pocket. But the most important thing is the reporter has to make themselves an invaluable part of the court staff and even the courthouse if possible. You have to work smarter and even harder than ever before, be willing to do more during the day to assist while remaining upbeat and professional. Your position has to be the one they look at and say, "we can't get rid of The Reporter, look how hard they work, what a value we get from their salary, and they have a positive outlook versus The Bailiff who reads a book or complains all the time."

Require court stenographers to be educated and knowledgeable with regard to their software and hardware and do not place this responsibility in the hands of an IT department without stenographer input/authority.

Take time to attend more seminars to learn what software and hardware will do to make my job easier and more appreciated.

The reporter has to educate the judge on their capabilities and continually work to build up the trust of the judge and the administrator. The judge in turn has to learn to accept new paradigms in the way of working together with the reporter and not excluding them from the sacrosanct relationship with his secretary/court clerk. Both parties need to share information they gather and concerns they each have in the day-to-day operation of that courtroom.

Education and training.
Take courses, buy software and hardware.
Recruit students; make provisions for entry-level reporters at testing level.

**Technology:**
The court reporters in Iowa are ready for this challenge. I would say 80 percent are absolutely on board to become technical official record leaders and would gladly offer any input or help that the court reporting profession in this state can think of to make that happen. We do not want to just silently by while solutions are found -- we WANT to actively be part of this solution. We envision becoming "court room managers", are willing to absorb the expense of extra training (most of us) and also a good number have purchased their own equipment to make this happen. We welcome this challenge!!!

A stenographic reporters realtime transcription of plea hearings, probation violations hearings, trials, restraining order hearings is instantaneously available. Prosecutors and defense
attorneys can both determine immediately if all legal issues have been addressed properly, lowering the number of dismissals on technical issues. I believe a software application can be implemented that would allow the courtroom clerks to take and input the sentences directly into the case management system, thus making their jobs easier; no more waiting for the file from the judge or bailiff and then trying to read the handwriting on the entry. Restraining orders could be available for service to all parties within minutes, doing a cut and paste from the reporter's transcript to a word program that generates the order. Police departments could access these orders online and serve them on the parties.

Having a court reporter in the room ensures a record is constantly being made. Sometimes things get unplugged, papers cover microphones. If I can see it, I can stop the proceedings to correct the problem, ensuring a record is being made. As great as technology is, it's not ready to replace a human who has "been there, done that" and knows that's not going to work. My husband used his Dragon Dictate app on his iPhone to tell me he loves me and that Friday we will have fun when we go on vacation. What translated gave me confidence about why I am still needed in the courtroom: "I love you on Friday. We will have fun when we go on vacation." That is very similar to stories of voice recognition saying, "The sprinkler system has ruled" instead of "The Supreme Court has ruled". There's always the story of someone forgetting to turn the equipment on, as well. Yes, I am still needed in the courtroom. Maybe someday I won't be, but for now, the record is in my hands. After 18 years, I have been there, done that. The record is safe.

I personally believe technology will someday replace the court reporter. The only solution I believe is to embrace technology and become a part of digital record making.

**Budget:**

Evaluate in detail the state budget for all departments and attempt to curb waste so that the money may be put to better use.

I think the budget issues will come into play. I think a cost-comparison study conducted by the court administrator of our courts should be presented to the commissioners so they can see the cost savings by implementing more job duties to the court reporters therefore reducing the employment costs of tipstaffs and potentially court clerks.

Get rid of some of the obvious local government wasteful spending which continues to happen even though it's financially lean times

Provide the legislators with cost studies on what it costs to have retrials when recordings fail. Provide the legislators with studies showing how much it costs in delays when using
alternative methods to make the record. Provide the legislators with cost analyses of how much it would cost to replace the alternative methods with the live reporter, as has happened in some states.

**Procedural:**

I think court reporters provide an important role that electronics cannot provide. I can see what is happening all over the room before a camera can zoom there or audio can maybe pick it up. The biggest advantage of having a live court reporter is the human element, having "been there, done that" and knowing a record cannot possibly be made without parenthetical such as (Defense attorney indicates his response in the negative.)

To reinvent ourselves, offer valuable services to all people involved, judges, lawyers, other court staff and the general public. We are also our judges' administrative assistants, so, for example, to offer research assistance; lawyers, offer realtime transcripts; court staff, help with scheduling cases and rounding people up for hearings; and the public, as far as assistance in hearing-impaired, offering realtime translation.

Truly, there is nothing better than a court reporter in the courtroom to monitor their own equipment and testimony in court. A person, who is creating the record simultaneous to the testimony being given, can stop the witness when necessary, slow a speaker down, ask them to speak up or to repeat verbiage they may not have understood. There is no better solution than to actually having someone in the courtroom controlling the production of the record at the time the record is being built. A system monitor, even if a person, cannot tell how the record will turn out in using an electronic system.

Tell the public, most of whom have no idea what goes on in the courts of their country, EXACTLY what is going on and that we do serve the public, that we are not overpaid and lazy and that we do pay for our health care, retirement, and disability benefits. We need to point out what is going to happen to the judicial system and our citizens if the courts are not staffed properly. I don't think the nation's citizens will accept the fact that their case cannot be heard for years or the criminals are released because they could not be brought before the court in a timely manner.
Appendix A:

Figures
Figure Judges Q2.

Judges: In What Type of Court(s) Do you Currently Work? (n=623)

Types of Courts:
- State
- General jurisdiction
- Limited jurisdiction
- State appellate
- Federal

*Select all that apply* (multiple selections made by judges)

Figure Judges Q2a.

Judges: What is the Highest Level of Court that You Oversee? (n=537)

Types of Courts:
- General jurisdiction
- State
- Limited jurisdiction
- State appellate
- Other
- Federal
Figure Judges Q3.

**Judges: Size of Jurisdiction (n=533)**

*Largest jurisdiction for judges overseeing multiple courts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Citizens in Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50,000</td>
<td>12% (n=66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - 250,000</td>
<td>31% (n=166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,001 - 500,000</td>
<td>20% (n=108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 - 999,999</td>
<td>17% (n=89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td>19% (n=99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Judges Q7.

**Judges: What is Your Gender? (n=535)**

- Male: 72%
- Female: 26%
- Prefer not to respond: 1%
Figure Judges Q8b.

Judges Use of Stenographic Court Reporters: By Court Type

![Graph showing the use of stenographic court reporters by court type.]

Figure Judges Q8b_1.

Judges: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Criminal Court (n=398)

![Graph showing the use of stenographic court reporters in criminal court.]
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Figure Judges Q8b_2.

Judges: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Civil Court (n=387)

Figure Judges Q8b_3.

Judges: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Family Court (n=339)
**Figure Judges Q8b.**

**Judges: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Juvenile Court (n=307)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure Judges Q8c.**

**Judges: How are Stenographic Court Reporters Typically Assigned? (n=408)**

- Court reporter assigned to judge(s): 50%
- Combination of the two: 22%
- Pool, court reporters assigned as needed: 9%
- Other: 19%
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Figure Judges Q9a.

Judges: Reason(s) Using Methods other than Stenographic Court Reporting (n=263)

- Budgetary considerations: 30%
- Preference for audio: 18%
- Shortage of available stenographic reporters: 13%
- Transcripts are seldom required: 8%
- Legislation or higher authority: 8%
- Other: 6%
- Preference for video: 5%
- Timeliness problems: 4%
- Accuracy problems: 4%
- Preference for voice writing, stenomasking: 3%

Figure Judges Q9b.

Judges: Support or Opposition for Implementing Systems

- Video Recording (n=217):
  - Strongly Support: 9%
  - Support: 33%
  - Oppose: 33%
  - Strongly Oppose: 2%

- Audio Recording (n=215):
  - Strongly Support: 8%
  - Support: 33%
  - Oppose: 28%
  - Strongly Oppose: 30%

- Realtime Court Reporting (n=226):
  - Strongly Support: 1%
  - Support: 35%
  - Oppose: 62%
  - Strongly Oppose: 2%
Figure Judges Q9b_1.

Judges: Video Recording System (n=217)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support or Opposition</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Judges Q9b_2.

Judges: Audio Recording System (n=215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support or Opposition</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Judges Q9b_3.

Judges: Realtime Court Reporting System (n=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support or Opposition</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Judges Q9e.

Judges: Agreement with Statements Regarding Audio or Video Recordings of Proceedings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average (Mean) Score for Each Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance accuracy &amp; completeness of court record</td>
<td>3.20 (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow immediate access to what was said</td>
<td>3.20 (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to more efficient transcript production</td>
<td>3.07 (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify court administration</td>
<td>3.04 (n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to more reliable record keeping</td>
<td>3.02 (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to more effective courtroom management</td>
<td>2.92 (n=52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve judges’ decision-making</td>
<td>2.74 (n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make written transcript unnecessary</td>
<td>2.24 (n=54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Judges Q12.

Judges: Importance of the Services or Characteristics of Stenographic Court Reporters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average (Mean) Score for Each Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of transcripts</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of transcripts</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional demeanor and appearance</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval: prior, current proceedings</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification: tech. terms, accents, or distractions</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=489) (n=491) (n=482) (n=493) (n=485) (n=480) (n=487) (n=490) (n=484) (n=503) (n=501) (n=486) (n=502) (n=504) (n=501)
Figure Judges Q14.

**Judges: Factors with Most Significant Impact on Court in Next 10 to 15 Years (n=520)**

- **Budget considerations**: 57%
- **Integration of technology**: 28%
- **Focus on accuracy of official court record**: 5%
- **Alternative dispute resolution**: 3%
- **Jurisdiction size**: 3%
- **Other (please specify)**: 2%
- **Internet / Remote adjudication**: 2%

![Chart showing percent of responses for factors with most significant impact](chart)

**Percent of Responses (%)**

Figure Judges Q15.

**Judges: Court Uses an Electronic Case Management System (n=512)**

- **Yes**: 65%
- **No**: 25%
- **Don’t know; not sure**: 10%

![Pie chart showing responses to question about electronic case management system](chart)
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Figure Judges Q15a.

Judges: Who is Currently Managing Electronic Case Management System? (n=698)*

Judges: Transcript Integrated into Electronic Case Management (n=313)

Figure Judges Q15b.
Figure Judges Q15c.

Judges: Foresee Transcript Being Integrated into Electronic Case Management (n=275)

- Yes: 49%
- No: 51%

Figure Judges Q16.

Judges: Steps to Enhance Stenographic Court Reporters' Role in the Future Courtroom (n=1,162)*

- Provide realtime: 28%
- Provide e-transcripts, integrate with e-case management: 39%
- Provide daily copy: 13%
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing: 10%
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill: 10%
- Take on add. responsibilities held by other personnel: 9%
- Become record managers with case mgmt. expertise: 9%
- Other: 2%

*Multiple endorsement (select all)
Figure Judges Q17.

Judges: Who has Most Influence in Deciding Method of Making Official Record? (n=531)

- Judges: 47%
- Court administrators: 19%
- Legislators: 13%
- Other: 7%
- Court reporters: 7%
- Clerk of Court's office: 3%
- Attorneys: 2%
- Local government official(s): 2%
- Governor: 0%
- Courtroom clerk: 0%
Figure Court Reporters Q2.

Court Reporters: In What Type of Court(s) Do you Currently Work? (n=588)*

Types of Courts:
- State
- Federal
- General jurisdiction
- Other
- Limited jurisdiction

*Select all that apply*
(multiple selections by court reporters)

Figure Court Reporters Q2a.

Court Reporters: Highest Level of Court in Which you Work (n=543)

- State
- Federal
- Other
- General jurisdiction
- State appellate
- Limited jurisdiction
The Future of Court Reporting:
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Figure Court Reporters Q7.

Figure Court Reporters Q3.

Court Reporters: What is Your Gender? (n=511)

*Largest jurisdiction for multiple courts

Number of Citizens in Jurisdiction

Court Reporters: Size of Jurisdiction (n=505)
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Figure Court Reporters Q8b.

Court Reporters: Stenographic Court Reporters by Court Type

![Bar chart showing the frequency of use for stenographic court reporters in different court types](chart)

*Frequency of Use*
- **Always**
- **Most of the time**
- **Rarely**
- **Never**
- **Not Applicable**

Figure Court Reporters Q8b_1.

Court Reporters: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Criminal Court (n=488)

![Bar chart showing the frequency of use for stenographic court reporters in criminal court](chart)
Court Reporters: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Civil Court (n=485)

Frequency of Use

Percent of Responses (%)

Always: 55%
Most of the time: 27%
Rarely: 12%
Never: 2%
Not Applicable: 4%

Court Reporters: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Family Court (n=431)

Frequency of Use

Percent of Responses (%)

Always: 36%
Most of the time: 18%
Rarely: 17%
Never: 8%
Not Applicable: 21%
Figure Court Reporters Q8b_4.

Court Reporters: Use of Stenographic Court Reporters in Juvenile Court (n=429)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Percent of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Court Reporters Q8c.

Court Reporters: Stenographic Court Reporters Typically Assigned (n=510)

- Pool, court reporters assigned as needed: 47%
- Court reporter assigned to judge(s): 30%
- Combination of the two: 12%
- Other: 10%
Figure Court Reporters Q9a.

Court Reporters: Reason(s) Using Methods other than Stenographic Court Reporting (n=4)

- Other: 50%
- Preference for audio: 25%
- Budgetary considerations: 25%

Figure Court Reporters Q9b.

for Implementing Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording (n=260)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording (n=259)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting (n=271)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Court Reporters Q9b_1.

Court Reporters: Video Recording System (n=260)

Figure Court Reporters Q9b_2.

Court Reporters: Audio Recording System (n=259)
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Figure Court Reporters Q9b_3.

![Bar chart showing the degree of support or opposition to realtime court reporting among Court Reporters. 76% strongly support, 23% support, 1% oppose, and 1% strongly oppose.]

Figure Court Reporters Q11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Reporters: Services Provided</th>
<th>Provided (%)</th>
<th>Not Provided (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval: prior, current proceedings</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification: tech. terms, accents, or distractions</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=502) for all categories except where noted.
Figure Court Reporters Q13.

Court Reporters: Factors with Most Significant Impact on Court in Next 10 to 15 Years (n=493)

- Budget considerations: 62%
- Integration of technology: 23%
- Focus on accuracy of official court record: 6%
- Other: 4%
- Jurisdiction size: 3%
- Alternative dispute resolution: 1%
- Internet / Remote adjudication: <1%

Percent of Responses (%)

Figure Court Reporters Q14.

Court Reporters: Court Uses Electronic Case Management System (n=498)

- Yes: 58%
- No: 16%
- Don't know; not sure: 26%
Court Reporters: Who is Currently Managing Electronic Case Management System? (n=617)*

- Courtroom clerk(s): 23%
- Court administrator: 14%
- IT staff: 14%
- Judicial assistant, Secretary: 13%
- Stenographic court reporter(s): 6%
- Other: 3%
- Electronic recording operator, Monitor: 1%
- Voicewriter / Stenomask: 0%

Figure Court Reporters Q14a.

Multiple endorsement (select all)*

Court Reporters: Transcript Integrated into Electronic Case Management (n=285)

- Yes: 40%
- No: 60%

Figure Court Reporters Q14b.
Figure Court Reporters Q14c.

Court Reporters: Foresee Transcript Being Integrated into Electronic Case Management (n=168)

- Yes: 74%
- No: 26%

Figure Court Reporters Q15.

Court Reporters: Foresee Stenographic Court Reporter Role in Electronic Case Management (n=278)

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%
Figure Court Reporters Q16.

Court Reporters: Steps to Enhance Stenographic Court Reporters' Role in the Future Courtroom (n=1,962)*

- Provide realtime: 23%
- Provide e-transcripts, integrate with e-case management: 19%
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing: 17%
- Provide daily copy: 16%
- Become record managers with case mgmt. expertise: 13%
- Take on add. responsibilities held by other personnel: 9%
- Other: 2%
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill: 1%

Multiple endorsement (select all)*
Figure Comparative 1.

Methods Used to Make the Court Record*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Judges (n=855)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=817)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporting</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice writing, stenomasking</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Select all that apply (multiple selections made)

Figure Comparative 2.

Use of Stenographic Court Reporters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Reporters (n=488)</th>
<th>Judges (n=439)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Reporters (n=485)</th>
<th>Judges (n=387)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Reporters (n=431)</th>
<th>Judges (n=539)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Reporters (n=429)</th>
<th>Judges (n=307)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes (Used in court) | No (Not used in court)
Figure Comparative 3.

Support or Opposition for Implementation of Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=260)</th>
<th>Judges (n=217)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=259)</th>
<th>Judges (n=215)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=271)</th>
<th>Judges (n=226)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Support (strongly, support)
- Oppose (strongly, oppose)
Figure Comparative 4.

Most Influence in Making of Official Record

- Judges: 47% (n=531) vs. 57% (n=505)
- Court administrators: 19% vs. 11%
- Legislators: 13% vs. 11%
- Other: 9% vs. 6%
- Court reporters: 7% vs. 6%
- Clerk of Court’s office: 3% vs. 1%
- Local government official(s): 2% vs. 1%
- Governor: <1% vs. 1%
- Attorneys: <1%
- Courtroom clerk: <1%
Agree or Disagree with Statements Regarding Realtime and Daily Copy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=375)</th>
<th>Judges (n=302)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=304)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=307)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=377)</th>
<th>Judges (n=303)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=374)</th>
<th>Judges (n=305)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost all that Matters</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio is Adequate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Much Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime a Luxury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Need Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Agree (strongly, agree)**
- **Disagree (strongly, disagree)**
Figure Comparative 6.

Factors That Will Significantly Impact Court in Next 10-15 Years

- **Budget considerations**
  - Judges: 57%
  - Court Reporters: 62%
- **Integration of technology**
  - Judges: 23%
  - Court Reporters: 28%
- **Focus on accuracy of official court record**
  - Judges: 5%
  - Court Reporters: 6%
- **Alternative dispute resolution**
  - Judges: 3%
  - Court Reporters: 1%
- **Jurisdiction size**
  - Judges: 3%
  - Court Reporters: 3%
- **Other (please specify):**
  - Judges: 2%
  - Court Reporters: 4%
- **Internet/Remote adjudication**
  - Judges: <1%
  - Court Reporters: <1%

Percent of Responses (%)
Figure Comparative 7.

Foresee Integrating Transcript into Electronic Case Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges (n=275)</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=168)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Will integrate)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Will not integrate)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Comparative 8.

Steps Stenographic Court Reporters Can Take to Enhance Their Role in the Courtroom of the Future*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Court Reporters (n=1,962)</th>
<th>Judges (n=1,162)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide realtime</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide e-transcripts, integrate with e-case management</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide daily copy</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide assistance to hard of hearing</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take on add. responsibilities held by other personnel</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become record managers with case mgmt. expertise</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select all that apply (multiple selections made)*
Appendix B:
Tables
### Table Judges Q4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Currently Staffed or Employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (includes courtroom, law, others)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, secretary</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff, jury monitor (non-security)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, monitor</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice writer, stenomask</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy or Sheriff Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff attorney</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court reporter (generic)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Attendant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Marshal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Judges Q5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge age (in years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 69</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Judges Q6: Number and Percentage of Completed Judge Surveys by State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Judges Q6: Number and Percentage of Completed Judge Surveys by State, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=534</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Future of Court Reporting: 2011 National Survey – Judges & Court Reporters

### Table Court Reporters Q4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Currently Staffed or Employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff, jury monitor (non-security)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, secretary</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, monitor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter, stenomask</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Court Reporters Q5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court reporter age (in years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Court Reporters Q8a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used to make official court record</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporting</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice wriring, stenomasking</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>817</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Judges Q10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who transcribes the official record (in or out of court)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter(s)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, Monitor</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter / Stenomask</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk(s)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, Secretary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>678</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table Judges Q11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in Court Reporting</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographic court reporter(s)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk(s)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic recording operator, Monitor</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrator</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicewriter / Stenomask</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial assistant, Secretary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>816</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table Judges Q13.

### Realtime or daily copy not at all / not very important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements regarding realtime and / or daily copy …</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford either service</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good, but it is adequate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much difference between audio recording and court reporter</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services, not appealed</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Court Reporters Q6. Number and Percentage of Completed Court Reporter Surveys by State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Court Reporters Q6 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=512 100%
Table Court Reporter Q10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most influential on the making of the official record ...</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court administrators</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court reporters</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of Court’s office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government official(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Court Reporter Q11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services that stenographic court reporters might provide</th>
<th>Frequency of services provided ...</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval: prior, current proceedings</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification: tech. terms, accents, or distractions</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Court Reporter Q12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realtime or daily copy rarely or never provided...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford either service</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good, but it is adequate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much difference between audio recording and court reporter</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services, not appealed</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Comparative 3:
*Degree of opposition or support ...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems (1=strongly support to 4=strongly oppose)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Comparative 5:
*Statements regarding realtime and daily copy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford to pay for realtime services or daily transcripts.</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter.</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity.</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
Judge Survey
INTRODUCTION:

The National Judicial College and the University of Nevada Reno’s Center for Research Design and Analysis are conducting this study to explore future opportunities for stenographic court reporters in a judicial setting. In this study, we seek to understand the many important factors that come into play when making decisions about the official court record, such as budgetary considerations, personnel needs, and technology capabilities. The survey results will not only help to clarify how the official court record is made currently, but also will provide information about any future potential changes and improvements in the court system. This survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time. Your answers will remain completely confidential and will be reported in aggregate form only. No individual answers will be identified. You may choose to skip any question you do not want to answer. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.
Q1 SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS:
The following questions relate to your current role in the court and your court system.

What position do you currently hold in the court system?

Court administrator
Judge
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q2 In what type of court(s) do you currently work? (select all that apply)
Federal court
State court
State appellate court
General jurisdiction
Limited jurisdiction
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q2a Of the following courts, which court is the highest level of court that you oversee?

Federal court
State court
State appellate court
General jurisdiction
Limited jurisdiction
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q3 How large is the jurisdiction in which your court is located in terms of number of citizens?
If you oversee a number of courts, please select the jurisdiction with the largest population.

0 – 50,000
50,001 – 250,000
250,001 – 500,000
500,001 - 999,999
1,000,000+
Not sure
Q4 Which of the following positions are currently staffed or employed within your court(s)?
(select all that apply)

By stenographic court reporters, we refer to individuals who use machine shorthand to make a verbatim record.

By voice writer/stenomask, we refer to individuals who use their voice and what is commonly referred to as a "stenomask" to record their voice to make the record.

Courtroom clerk
Judicial assistant / Secretary
Stenographic court reporter
Voice writer / Stenomask
Court administrator
Electronic recording operator / Monitor
Bailiff / Jury monitor (jury monitoring duties, not courtroom security)
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q5 What is your age in years?

18 - 29
30 - 39
40 - 49
50 - 59
60 - 69
70+
Q6 In which state or U.S. Territory do you **primarily** work?

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Q7 What is your gender?

Male
Female
Prefer not to respond

SECTION 2: COURT RECORD
The following questions relate to the making, preservation, and archiving of the court record.

Q8a. Which method(s) does your court(s) use to make the official record either in or out of the court? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive. (select all that apply)

By stenographic court reporting, we refer to using machine shorthand to make a verbatim record.

By voice writing/stenomasking, we refer to the method by which individuals use their voice and what is commonly referred to as a "stenomask" to record their voice to make the record.

Stenographic court reporting
Voice writing / Stenomasking
Audio recording
Video recording
Display If Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Selected

Q8b How often do you use stenographic court reporters to make the record in each of the following venues? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive the record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display If Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Selected

Q8c In your court system, how are stenographic court reporters typically assigned?

Pool, court reporters assigned as coverage is needed
Court reporter assigned to judge(s)
Combination of the two
Other (please specify): ____________________________
Q9a What is (are) the reason(s) that your court uses methods other than stenographic court reporting? (select all that apply)

- Shortage of available stenographic court reporters
- Preference for voice writing/stenomasking
- Budgetary considerations
- Preference for audio
- Preference for video
- Transcripts are seldom required
- Accuracy problems
- Timeliness problems
- Legislation or higher authority
- Other (please specify): ____________________

Q9b Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose the implementation of the following systems by checking the appropriate box to the right of the following systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video recording system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Display If (Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Not Selected And Q9a Preference for audio Is Selected) Or (Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Not Selected And Q9a Preference for video Is Selected)

Q9e Please indicate the extent with which you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box to the right of the following statements.

Audio or video recordings of court proceedings would...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>make the written transcript unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow immediate access to what was said.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve judges’ decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance the accuracy and completeness of the court record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplify court administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more effective courtroom management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more reliable record keeping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more efficient transcript production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 For the following questions, if you oversee more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court that you oversee.

Who transcribes the official record either in or out of court? By "transcribe," we mean to create a transcript from notes or recordings. (select all that apply)

- Courtroom clerk(s)
- Judicial assistant / Secretary
- Voice writer / Stenomask
- Electronic recording operator / Monitor
- Stenographic court reporter(s)
- Court administrator
- IT staff
- Clerk of Court’s office
- Other (please specify): ____________________

Q10h Where are the transcribers you hire for your court primarily located? By "transcribers," we mean those who create a transcript from recordings or stenographer notes.

- In state
- Out-of-state
- Outside U.S.

Q11 Who preserves or archives the official record either in or out of court? (select all that apply)

- Courtroom clerk
- Judicial assistant / Secretary
- Voice writer / Stenomask
- Electronic recording operator / Monitor
- Stenographic court reporter
- Court administrator
- IT staff
- Clerk of Court’s office
- Other (please specify): ____________________
Q12 SECTION 3: STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTER SERVICES
The next set of questions asks about various services that stenographic court reporters might provide for your court. For the following questions, if you oversee more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court that you oversee.

Please indicate the importance of the following types of services or characteristics of stenographic court reporters for your court:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval of prior and current proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of technical terms, accents, or environmental distractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional demeanor and appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Display If Q12 Realtime reporting - Not at all Important Is Selected Or Q12 Realtime reporting - Not Very Important Is Selected Or Q12 Daily copy transcripts - Not at all Important Is Selected Or Q12 Daily copy transcripts - Not Very Important Is Selected

Q13 You indicated that either realtime services or daily copy transcripts are not at all important or not very important to you. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford to pay for realtime services or daily copy transcripts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14 SECTION 4: FUTURE OF YOUR COURT

The following questions ask about the future of your court and the types of court reporting and court management systems your court will utilize. For the following questions, if you oversee more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court that you oversee.

Which of the following factors will have the most significant impact on your court in the next 10 to 15 years?

- Integration of technology
- Focus on accuracy of official court record
- Alternative dispute resolution
- Jurisdiction size
- Internet / Remote adjudication
- Budget considerations
- Other (please specify): ____________________
Q15 Does your court use an electronic case management system?

Yes
No
Don’t know; not sure

Display If Q15 Yes Is Selected

Courtroom clerk(s)
Judicial assistant / Secretary
Voice writer / Stenomask
Electronic recording operator / Monitor
Stenographic court reporter(s)
Court administrator
IT staff
Clerk of Court’s office
Other (please specify): ____________________

Display If Q15 Yes Is Selected

Q15b Is the transcript currently integrated into this electronic case management system?

Yes
No

Display If Q15 Yes Is Selected And Q15b No Is Selected

Q15c Do you foresee the transcript being integrated into this electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?

Yes
No

Display If Q15 Yes Is Selected And Q15b No Is Selected And Q15c No Is Selected

Q15d Why do you foresee the transcript not being integrated into this electronic case manage-
ment system in the next 10-15 years?

Q16 For the following questions, if you oversee more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court that you oversee.

What steps can stenographic court reporters take to enhance their role in your courtroom in the future? (select all that apply)
- Provide realtime
- Provide daily copy
- Provide electronic transcripts that integrate with electronic case management systems
- Become managers of the record with case management expertise
- Take on additional responsibilities now held by other court personnel
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill within the courtroom
- Other (please specify): ____________________

Q17 Who has the most influence in deciding what method is utilized in making the official record in your court? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive.

- Judges
- Attorneys
- Court administrators
- Courtroom clerk
- Clerk of Court's office
- Court reporters
- Legislators
- Local government official(s)
- Governor
- Other (please specify): ____________________

Q18 Please describe the changes you envision taking place in courts over the next 10 to 15 years from a technology, procedural, or even political standpoint.
Q19a Please describe the **top two** challenges you foresee in this new environment you described in the previous question, or during the transition to this new environment, and the potential solutions you may have to offer to overcome those challenges. Challenge two is on the next page.

**Challenge 1:**

Q19b **Solution to Challenge 1:**

Q19c **Challenge 2:**

Q19d **Solution to Challenge 2:**

You have reached the end of the survey, if you have finished the survey to your satisfaction, select the “Submit” button.

**IMPORTANT!** Clicking on "Submit" will save your responses and “close out” your survey. You will not be able to go back to the survey to enter or modify any responses. If you do not want to close out your survey simply close your browser at this time without selecting the button.

If you wish to modify any of your responses, select the back button to return to the survey at this time.

Thank you for your participation. Your responses have been recorded.
Appendix D:
Court Reporters Survey
INTRODUCTION:

The National Judicial College and the University of Nevada Reno’s Center for Research Design and Analysis are conducting this study to explore future opportunities for stenographic court reporters in a judicial setting. In this study, we seek to understand the many important factors that come into play when making decisions about the official court record, such as budgetary considerations, personnel needs, and technology capabilities. The survey results will not only help to clarify how the official court record is made currently, but also will provide information about any future potential changes and improvements in the court system. This survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time. Your answers will remain completely confidential and will be reported in group form only. No individual answers will be identified. You may choose to skip any question you do not want to answer. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Q1 SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS:
What position do you currently hold in the court system? (select all that apply)

Stenographic court reporter
Manager of court reporters
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q2 In what type of court(s) do you currently work? (select all that apply)

Federal court
State court
State appellate court
General jurisdiction
Limited jurisdiction
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q2a Of the following courts, which court is the highest level in which you work?

Federal court
State court
State appellate court
General jurisdiction
Limited jurisdiction
Other (Please specify): ____________________
Q3 How large is the jurisdiction in which your court is located in terms of number of citizens? If you work in a number of courts, please select the jurisdiction with the largest population.

0 - 50,000
50,001 - 250,000
250,001 - 500,000
500,001 - 999,999
1,000,000+
Not sure

Q4 Which of the following positions are currently staffed within your court(s)? (select all that apply)

By stenographic court reporters, we refer to individuals who use machine shorthand to make a verbatim record.

By voice writer/stenomask, we refer to individuals who use their voice and what is commonly referred to as a "stenomask" to record their voice to make the record.

Courtroom clerk
Judicial assistant / Secretary
Stenographic court reporter
Voice writer / Stenomask
Court administrator
Electronic recording operator / Monitor
Bailiff / Jury monitor (jury monitoring duties, not courtroom security)
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q5 What is your age in years?

18 - 29
30 - 39
40 - 49
50 - 59
60 - 69
70+
Q6 In which state or U.S. Territory do you primarily work?

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virgin Islands
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming
Other
Prefer not to respond

Q7 What is your gender?

Male
Female
Prefer not to respond

SECTION 2: COURT RECORD  The following questions relate to the making, preservation, and archiving of the court record.

Q8a. Which method(s) does your court(s) use to make the official record either in or out of the court? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive. (select all that apply)

By stenographic court reporting, we refer to using machine shorthand to make a verbatim record.

By voice writing/stenomasking, we refer to the method by which individuals use their voice and what is commonly referred to as a "stenomask" to record their voice to make the record.

Stenographic court reporting
Voice writing / Stenomasking
Audio recording
Video recording
None
Other (please specify): ____________________
Display If Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Selected

Q8b How often do you **make** the record in each of the following venues? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive the record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Court (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display If Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Selected

Q8c In your court system, how are stenographic court reporters **typically** assigned?
- Pool, court reporters assigned as coverage is needed
- Court reporter assigned to judge(s)
- Combination of the two
- Other (please specify): ______________________________________

Display If Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Not Selected

Q9a What do you think is (are) the reason(s) that your court uses methods **other than** stenographic court reporting? (select all that apply)

- Shortage of available stenographic court reporters
- Preference for voice writing/stenomasking
- Budgetary considerations
- Preference for audio
- Preference for video
- Transcripts are seldom required
- Accuracy problems
- Timeliness problems
- Legislation or higher authority
- Other (please specify): ____________________
Display If Q8a Audio recording Is Not Selected And Q8a Video recording Is Not Selected

Q9b Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose the implementation of the following systems by checking the appropriate box to the right of the following systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Recording System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Court Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display If (Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Not Selected And Q9a Preference for audio Is Selected) Or (Q8a Stenographic court reporting Is Not Selected And Q9a Preference for video Is Selected)

Q9e Please indicate the extent with which you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box to the right of the following statements.

Audio or video recordings of court proceedings...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>make the written transcript unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow immediate access to what was said.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve judges' decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance the accuracy and completeness of the court record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplify court administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more effective courtroom management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more reliable record keeping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead to more efficient transcript production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 SECTION 3: STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTER SERVICES

For the question below, if you work in more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court in which you work.

Who has the most influence in deciding what method is utilized in making the official record in your court? By “make,” we mean to capture, transcribe, preserve, or archive.

Judges
Attorneys
Court administrators
Courtroom clerk
Clerk of Court's office
Court reporters
Legislators
Local government official(s)
Governor
Other (please specify): ____________________

Q11 The next set of questions asks about various services that stenographic court reporters might provide to the court. For the following questions, regardless of whether you work in more than one court, please consider the needs of all of the courts in which you work. How often do you provide the following types of services to all of the courts in which you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realtime reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily copy transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcript management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to the hard of hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous read back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant record retrieval of prior and current proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from audio/video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription from steno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff duties related to jury monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing in of witnesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of technical terms, accents, or environmental distractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Display If Q11 Realtime reporting - Rarely Is Selected Or Q11 Realtime reporting - Never Is Selected Or Q11 Daily copy transcripts - Rarely Is Selected Or Q11 Daily copy transcripts - Never Is Selected

Q12 For the following question, regardless of whether you work in more than one court, please consider the needs of all of the courts in which you work.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements as they relate to the perceptions of the decision makers in all of the courts in which you work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost is all that matters; the court budget can’t afford to pay for realtime services or daily transcripts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording might not be as good as a court reporter, but it is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much difference between an audio recording and a court reporter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime is a luxury, not a necessity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of cases don’t need these services because the cases are not appealed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 SECTION 4: FUTURE OF YOUR COURT

The following questions ask about the future of your court and the types of court reporting and court management systems your court will utilize. For the following questions, if you work in more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court in which you work.

Which of the following factors will have the most significant impact on your court in the next 10 to 15 years?

Integration of technology
Focus on accuracy of official court record
Alternative dispute resolution
Jurisdiction size
Internet / Remote adjudication
Budget considerations
Other (please specify): ____________________
Q14 Does your court use an electronic case management system?

Yes  
No  
Don’t know; not sure

Display If Q14 Yes Is Selected

Courtroom clerk(s)  
Judicial assistant / Secretary  
Voice writer / Stenomask  
Electronic recording operator / Monitor  
Stenographic court reporter(s)  
Court administrator  
IT staff  
Clerk of Court’s office  
Other (please specify): ____________________

Display If Q14 Yes Is Selected

Q14b Is the transcript currently integrated into this electronic case management system?

Yes  
No

Display If Q14 Yes Is Selected And Q14b No Is Selected

Q14c Do you foresee the transcript being integrated into this electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?

Yes  
No

Display If Q14 Yes Is Selected And Q14b No Is Selected And Q14c No Is Selected

Q14d Why do you foresee the transcript not being integrated into this electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?
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Display If Q14 Yes Is Selected

Q15 Do you foresee the stenographic court reporter playing a role in the management of the electronic case management system in the next 10-15 years?

Yes
No

Q16 For the following questions, if you work in more than one court, please consider the needs within the highest level of court in which you work.

What steps can stenographic court reporters take to enhance their role in courtrooms in the future? (select all that apply)

- Provide realtime
- Provide daily copy
- Provide electronic transcripts that integrate with electronic case management systems
- Become managers of the record with case management expertise
- Take on additional responsibilities now held by other court personnel
- Provide assistance to hard of hearing
- There are no additional roles that court reporters can fill within the courtroom
- Other (please specify): ____________________

Q17 Please describe the changes you envision taking place in courts over the next 10 to 15 years from a technology, procedural, or even political standpoint.

Q18a Please describe the top two challenges you foresee in this new environment you described in the previous question, or during the transition to this new environment, and the potential solutions you may have to offer to overcome those challenges.

Challenge 1:

Q18b Solution to Challenge 1:
Q18c **Challenge 2:**

Q18d **Solution to Challenge 2:**

You have reached the end of the survey, if you have finished the survey to your satisfaction, select the “Submit” button.

**IMPORTANT!** Clicking on "Submit" will save your responses and “close out” your survey. You will not be able to go back to the survey to enter or modify any responses. If you do not want to close out your survey simply close your browser at this time without selecting the button.

If you wish to modify any of your responses, select the back button to return to the survey at this time.

Thank you for your participation. Your responses have been recorded.
Appendix E:
Invitations and Reminders
COVER LETTERS

Judge Cover letter

Dear Judge [first name] [last name],

The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno, is conducting a study about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey because of the position that you currently hold in the court system. Your opinions are extremely important to us, and your responses will represent others who hold a position similar to your own.

This survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment now to click on the link below. Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

The National Judicial College thanks you in advance for your cooperation.
You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.

[survey link]

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College
REMINDE

Court Reporters Reminders

Dear [first name] [last name],

This is just a reminder that The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno need your feedback.

We are conducting a study about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.

[link]

This web survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment now to click on the link above. Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College
Dear <<NAME>>,

A few weeks ago, The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno sent out an email invitation to complete a survey about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. Due to the random selection process, we are not able to select another participant to replace your opinions; therefore, we are sending out another friendly reminder before we compile all the results in just a few weeks.

NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

This web survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment of your time now to click on the link below.

You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.

<<PASTE LINK HERE>>

Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College
Judges Reminders

Dear Judge [first name] [last name],

This is just a reminder that The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno need your feedback.

We are conducting a study about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.
[link]

This web survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment now to click on the link above. Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College
Dear Judge <<NAME>>,

A few weeks ago, The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno sent out an email invitation to complete a survey about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. Due to the random selection process, we are not able to select another participant to replace your opinions; therefore, we are sending out another friendly reminder before we compile all the results in just a few weeks.

NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

This web survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment of your time now to click on the link below.

You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.

<<PASTE LINK HERE>>

Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College
Final Reminder

This is our final reminder. A few weeks ago, The National Judicial College (NJC), in conjunction with the Center for Research Design and Analysis (CRDA) at the University of Nevada, Reno sent out an email invitation to complete a survey about the use and evolving roles of stenographic court reporters within the judicial branch of government. Due to the random selection process, we are not able to select another participant to replace your opinions; therefore, we are sending out another friendly reminder before we compile all the results. We'd like to close the survey out by end of business day, Tuesday, May 31st and a response by that time would be greatly appreciated.

NJC and the CRDA are seeking input from judges, court managers, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and court reporters. Survey instruments have been prepared for each group of stakeholders in order to produce a statistically valid view of the changes taking place within the stenographic community.

This web survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time, and we’d appreciate it if you could take a moment of your time now to click on the link below. You may access the survey by clicking on the link below or by cutting and pasting the link into your internet browser.

PLACE LINK HERE

Your responses to the survey will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any technical problems with the survey, please call the Center for Research Design and Analysis at 1-800-929-9079, Monday-Friday, 9 am - 9 pm PDT; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm PDT. If you have any questions about this project, please contact Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org.

Best regards,
Hon. William Dressel
President, The National Judicial College