

WORKGROUP: FUNDING & EXCEPTIONS

AOC Caseflow Management Unit: Cathy Clarich, Manager; David Svoboda; Misty Moseley-Helber, Specialist.

Funding: The Caseflow Management Unit (CMU) is charged with developing a process for courts to apply for monies from the court security fund (pending the passing of legislation). There will also be a need to determine who to award monies to, should there be more requests than available funds. In beginning to think about the processes that need to be developed, the CMU staff would benefit from input regarding several topics:

In the second phase of implementation there are a number of Standards that involve equipment, facilities upgrades, and other security measures that would need funding to obtain and implement or to bring up to the minimum standard level. The CMU would like input from the Workgroup on:

a. How should Standards 12 through 22 be prioritized? In other words, which of those standards should courts be focusing on implementing first, and how do the remaining standards fall in priority behind the standards that should be the initial focus of implementation.

b. What kind of information should a court provide in seeking security fund monies. Specifically, thinking about courts that have no other funding source that will authorize funds or courts that cannot obtain full funding from other funding sources, what should courts be asked to provide as far as information and data to support a request for security fund monies.

c. Applications for JCEF and Fill the Gap monies include a requirement that courts meet performance measures to demonstrate success in use of the monies to implement the project the monies were requested for. When those funds are sought for court security improvements, particularly for improvements related to standards 6, 9, and 12 through 22, does the workgroup have ideas on what could be appropriate performance measures?

Exemption Process. The Standards, as adopted, contains the following:

The AOC has developed a process for courts to seek an exception to the standards at the request of the Presiding Judge based either on a request from the court's funding authority or on the Presiding Judge's own initiative, with exceptions encompassing both delay and timing of implementation or departure from standards. Requests for exceptions shall be made on a yearly basis on the form approved by the Administrative Office of the Courts and shall be submitted to the Administrative Director.

a. A form similar to that used for seeking an exception to the MAS is being developed. Does the Workgroup have thoughts on the information a court should have to provide to demonstrate that an exception is warranted.

b. Does the Workgroup have an thoughts on flow of the Application, particularly in how to generate and move the application forward when the exception is sought because local funding has been denied by the local funding authority.