

# Agenda

## Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties

February 10, 2017  
12:00 to 2:00 p.m.

Administrative Office of the Courts  
Scott M. Matheson Courthouse  
450 South State Street  
Executive Dining Room

Welcome, approval of minutes, recognition of exiting member, and rescheduling April meeting	Tab 1	10 minutes	Judge Barry Lawrence, Chair
Strategic Plan		5 minutes	Judge Barry Lawrence
Recognition of Self-Help Center	Tab 2	5 minutes	Judge Barry Lawrence
Summary of <a href="#">New York's Court Navigator Report</a>	Tab 3	10 minutes	Mary Jane Ciccarello
Subcommittee updates	Tab 4	1 hour	All
Other Business		5 minutes	All

### [Committee Web Page](#)

**Proposed Bimonthly Meeting Schedule:** Matheson Courthouse, 12:00 to 2:00 p.m. unless otherwise stated.

April 14, 2017 (subject to change)

June 9, 2017

August 11, 2017

October 13, 2017

December 8, 2017

Tab 1

# **Minutes of the Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties**

December 9, 2016

Draft. Subject to approval

## **Members Present**

Judge Marsha C. Thomas (Chair), Christopher Martinez, Eric Mittelstadt (phone), Jessica Van Buren, Judge Barry Lawrence, Judge Douglas Thomas, Lisa Collins, Mary Jane Ciccarello, Shaunda McNeill (phone), C. Sue Crismon, Carl Hernandez, Judge Catherine Roberts

## **Members Excused**

Judge Elizabeth Knight, Carol Frank, Leti Bentley, Virginia Sudbury, Susan Griffith, Tyler Cameron, Jaclyn Howell

## **Staff**

Nancy Sylvester

### **(1) Welcome and introduction of new members.**

Judge Marsha Thomas welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Judge Catherine Roberts, who will replace Judge M. Thomas on the committee. She then introduced Judge Lawrence as new chair. Ms. Sylvester thanked Judge M. Thomas for her exemplary service to the committee.

### **(2) Approval of minutes.**

Mary Jane Ciccarello moved to approve the minutes with a correction by Judge M. Thomas. Judge Lawrence seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

### **(3) Forms Committee**

Nancy Sylvester and Judge Lawrence discussed the standing committee on forms rules. The committee discussed the nuances of the rules and mulled the sections on mandating forms and how that interacted with paralegal practitioners and the general public.

### **(4) Strategic Plan**

Judge M. Thomas went over the new language on the strategic plan regarding pro se e-filing. She then discussed the fact that the CORIS rewrite committee is coming up with a new My Case portal for self-represented litigants. It will show filings in their cases and how to proceed further on their case. There will be text reminders to litigants as well about court hearings. Concerns were raised about how many computers are going to be available for pro se litigants in the courthouse. Concerns were also discussed about how well pro se litigants would be able to use the new system.

Judge M. Thomas then went over what to do about the strategic plan: update it, create a new strategic plan, focus on individual ideas as needs/opportunities arise. The committee had a discussion on what

Draft: Subject to approval

Minutes of the Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties

December 9, 2016

Page 2

each of these would look like. Ms. Van Buren noted that the strategic plan is not required by the Judicial Council. Judge M. Thomas said the committee may not even need a strategic plan; the committee could just focus on individual priorities.

Judge Roberts asked whether the committee was focusing on getting lawyers to people or dealing with resources for those who don't have them. The committee noted that it was both. Judge Lawrence raised a question of whether there could be a bench card listing all of the resources and clinics that judges and practitioners could use. Ms. Ciccarello said it would be out of date within a week but the courts' website is always up to date. Judge D. Thomas said the clerks needed to get the education on it because they are on the front line. Ms. Collins said the clerks of court have been asking for training statewide and support increasing funding to get it. Ms. Ciccarello went over the curriculum they have been using to train a few clerks, which is a lot like what Jessica Van Buren uses to get her interns trained. She said clerks get study units and are tested on them. Once virtual study is completed, they shadow in the law library. It's a 12 hour course per clerk. They get education units, too, and have to verify with their supervisor that they can do it. Judge Lawrence and Ms. Collins said this should be mandated for clerks across the state.

Prof. Hernandez noted that there is nothing on the list that discusses improving access to justice, even though that is a big part of these efforts. He requested changing the committee name to something like Committee on Resources for Increasing Access to Justice. Ms. Crismon talked about the Access to Justice Commission that once existed. It now exists under the Bar as the Pro Bono Commission. She went through the history of why things exist as they do now. Prof. Hernandez said he was interested in exploring sending a message that the committee is doing more, not just dealing with self-represented parties.

Judge M. Thomas said Mary Jane and Jessica circulated an Access to Justice Document that describes what all of the groups around the state are doing. Judge D. Thomas noted that we should be focusing on the gaps around the state.

Judge Lawrence asked why we are creating or updating the strategic plan and Judge M. Thomas said this committee started with a strategic plan and it is really a continuation of the committee's history. Judge Lawrence went through each of the subcommittees and noted that he will set up some meetings with the members. Several members noted that some of the subcommittees should probably be reworked.

Judge Roberts said she would like to be involved in making things in more plain language for litigants.

## **(5) Subcommittee Updates**

Judge M. Thomas went over the subcommittee updates. Jaclyn Howell forwarded an update from the U about the use of the law student practice rule and Prof. Hernandez discussed that there were quite a few students at BYU also using it.

Ms. Ciccarello went over her suggestions and specifically focused on posting notices, which is what Alaska does. If granted alternative service, the courts post the notices for the litigants on their webpage. She said it's been successful and the federal courts are even starting to do it. Committee members present thought it was a great idea and people are actually getting notice because it shows up when someone

Draft: Subject to approval

Minutes of the Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties

December 9, 2016

Page 3

types in their name in Google. She said this benefits the rural areas a lot. She passed around several items: the Alaska courts' webpage on notices and a Trends in State Courts article that discusses what Alaska is doing.

Judge D. Thomas invited this committee to pass suggestions to him through Mary Jane about potential recommendations for the Domestic Case Improvements Process Committee. They are in the process of formulating the recommendations right now. They are talking about, for example, using the commissioners early on and using proactive intervention in cases to move them through. He said the average contested custody case costs \$15-20K and they go on for on average 780 days. They are talking about dividing cases into tracks, too, to get quick deadlines to move cases through. Pretrials would also be scheduled early as part of early case management process. They will be focusing on post-divorce modifications, too. The idea is to do more upfront to save time on the back end.

#### **(6) Other Business/Future Meetings**

The next committee meeting will be February 10, 2017.

The meeting adjourned at 1:58 pm.

# Tab 2



December 2, 2016

To Utah State Courts Self-Help Center:

On behalf of the Moab Valley Multicultural Center we are grateful for the support of Utah State Courts Self-Help Center. You are an important partner agency for the work we do serving the Moab community, especially low-income, immigrant and Spanish-speaking residents.

There is a real need in our community for the services offered Utah State Courts Self-Help Center and together we have improved the lives for many people.

We have had the pleasure of working with staff of Utah State Courts Self-Help Center. We hope to have the opportunity to partner with your organization in the future.

If I can answer any questions or provide additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "Rhiana Medina".

Rhiana Medina  
Executive Director  
Moab Valley Multicultural Center

# 2016

## Certificate of Recognition

This certificate is awarded to  
**Utah State Courts Self-Help Center**  
For his partnership with  
**The Moab Valley Multicultural Center**



*Advocate. Collaborate. Celebrate.*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rhiana Medina".

Rhiana Medina, Executive Director

11/22/16

Date

Building bridges across language  
and culture through family support,  
community collaboration and education.

Thank you! ¡Gracias!



# Tab 3

# ROLES BEYOND LAWYERS

## Summary and Recommendations

of an Evaluation of the  
New York City Court  
Navigators Program and its  
Three Pilot Projects

December 2016

*Prepared by Rebecca L. Sandefur, American Bar Foundation,  
and Thomas M. Clarke, National Center for State Courts,  
with support from the  
Public Welfare Foundation*



**Public Welfare**  
Foundation

**© 2016 Rebecca L. Sandefur and Thomas M. Clarke**

**All Rights Reserved**

# Research Summary and Recommendations

## Introduction

There is now a major movement in the United States to expand the use of appropriately trained and supervised individuals without full formal legal training to provide help to people who would otherwise be without legal assistance of any kind. The general approach has been endorsed by The Commission on the Future of Legal Services of the American Bar Association,<sup>1</sup> and by the *Guidance* issued by the National Center for State Courts in support of the Justice for All Strategic Planning Initiative developed in response to a recent resolution of the Conferences of Chief Justices and State Court Administrators.<sup>2</sup>

The need for such innovations is clear. At the time this evaluation was conducted, approximately 90 percent of tenants facing eviction in New York City did not have a lawyer, while the vast majority of landlords did.<sup>3</sup> Research from the National Center for State Courts shows that in 70 percent of non-domestic civil cases in urban counties, one party is unrepresented while the other has lawyer representation.<sup>4</sup>

***The first comprehensive evaluation of programs providing assistance through staff or volunteers without full formal legal training provides important evidence that these initiatives can influence the experiences of unrepresented litigants in positive ways and can also shape the outcomes of court cases, including legal and real-life outcomes.***

The umbrella program, New York City Court Navigators, makes use of trained and supervised individuals with no prior formal legal training to provide one-on-one assistance to unrepresented litigants in the City's Housing and Civil Courts. Navigators provide information, assist litigants in accessing and completing court-required simplified forms, attend settlement negotiations and accompany unrepresented litigants into the courtroom. If judges address direct factual questions to a Navigator, the Navigator is authorized to respond.

In February 2014, three distinct Navigator pilot projects began operation in New York City Courts as part of the larger Navigator program. Two of these pilot projects involve volunteer Navigators. A third pilot project involves experienced caseworkers on the staff of a non-profit organization; these caseworkers had previously performed more limited roles.

The evaluation of the New York City Court Navigators program was conducted by researchers from the American Bar Foundation and the National Center for State Courts, under a research project supported by the Public Welfare Foundation. The research assessed the *appropriateness, efficacy, and sustainability* of each of the three Navigator pilot projects. The program design and evaluation frameworks, published

---

<sup>1</sup>ABA Commission on the Future of Legal Services, Report on the Future of Legal Services in the United States (2016), [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/images/abanews/2016FLSReport\\_FNL\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/images/abanews/2016FLSReport_FNL_WEB.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> National Center for State Courts, <http://www.ncsc.org/jfap>.

<sup>3</sup> SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS: CHARACTERISTICS, NEEDS, SERVICES: THE RESULTS OF TWO SURVEYS. SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS IN THE NEW YORK CITY FAMILY COURT AND NEW YORK CITY HOUSING COURT, Office of the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Justice Initiatives. New York, NY: Office of the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Justice Initiatives, 2005. At time of the release of this report (October 2016), increased funding for lawyer representation in eviction cases has reduced the percentage of unrepresented tenants to around 83 percent.

<sup>4</sup>National Center for State Courts Civil Litigation Project, *The Landscape of Civil Litigation in State Courts* (2015), <https://www.ncsc.org/~media/Files/PDF/Research/CivilJusticeReport-2015.ashx>.

elsewhere<sup>5</sup>, were newly developed for the evaluation as models for general use in access to justice evaluation research.

The positive results of the three Navigator pilot projects were produced in a context that is both adverse and supportive. The New York City Courts are among the most chaotic and overloaded in the United States. That the pilot projects showed evidence of positive contributions in such environments suggests that such programs could be effective in a wide range of jurisdictions. At the same time, the New York City Courts are leaders in developing innovations to provide fairness for unrepresented litigants. The fact that the courtrooms in which Navigators worked were those in which other significant efforts had already been made to improve the experiences of unrepresented parties may have been an important support to the pilot projects, making some results easier to achieve here than might be the case elsewhere. Alternatively, Navigators working in courts that have not made efforts to improve the experiences of unrepresented litigants could be found to have comparatively larger influence on litigant experience and case outcomes.

### Key Findings: Evidence of Program Impact

The three Navigator pilot projects differ in important respects, but all involve the same core capacities: providing to unrepresented litigants the services of information, moral support, and accompaniment to negotiations with the other side's attorneys and into courtrooms. Navigators are authorized to respond to questions from court attorneys and judges and to prompt litigants to provide additional information. Complete descriptions of each pilot project are available in the full Report.<sup>6</sup> The evaluation uncovered evidence that assistance from appropriately trained and supervised individuals without formal legal training is associated with changes in a range of outcomes, including both legal and real-life outcomes.

*Principal findings of the evaluation include:*

- The ***Access to Justice Navigators Pilot Project*** is built around trained volunteer Navigators “for-the-day.” These Navigators assist unrepresented litigants in understanding and moving through nonpayment or debt collection proceedings. Access to Justice Navigators currently operate in a variety of housing courts and in consumer debt cases in civil court in New York City. ***Surveys of litigants revealed that litigants who received the help of any kind of Navigator were 56 percent more likely than unassisted litigants to say they were able to tell their side of the story.***
- The ***Housing Court Answers Navigators Pilot Project*** involves trained volunteer Navigators “for-the-day,” operating in the Brooklyn Housing Court. These Navigators provide individualized assistance with tenants’ preparation of a legal document, the “answer” to the landlord’s petition for nonpayment of rent, in which the tenant responds to the petition by asserting defenses. Litigants assisted by Housing Court Answers Navigators ***asserted more than twice as many defenses as litigants who received no assistance.*** A review of case files reveals that ***tenants assisted by a Housing Court Answers Navigator were 87 percent more likely than unassisted tenants to have their defenses recognized and addressed by the court. For instance, judges ordered landlords to make needed repairs about 50 percent more often in Navigator-assisted cases.***

---

<sup>5</sup> INCREASING ACCESS TO JUSTICE THROUGH EXPANDED ‘ROLES BEYOND LAWYERS’: PRELIMINARY EVALUATION AND CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORKS, Rebecca L. Sandefur and Thomas M. Clarke, American Bar Foundation and National Center for State Courts, Chicago, IL and Williamsburg, VA, 2015. Available at [americanbarfoundation.org/research/A2J](http://americanbarfoundation.org/research/A2J).

<sup>6</sup> The full report may be found here: [americanbarfoundation.org/research/A2J/RolesBeyondLawyers](http://americanbarfoundation.org/research/A2J/RolesBeyondLawyers).

- The ***University Settlement Navigators Pilot Project*** employs trained caseworkers who are employees of a nonprofit organization. These Navigators, operating in the Brooklyn Housing Court, are Navigators “for-the-duration,” working the case from initial appearance through resolution and beyond. This pilot project’s aim is to prevent evictions by providing both the in-court services that all Navigators are able to provide as well as an ongoing relationship with litigants in which the Navigator both accompanies the unrepresented litigant to all of the court activities related to her case and assists the tenant outside of court in connecting with benefits and services for which she may be eligible. ***In cases assisted by these University Settlement Navigators, zero percent of tenants experienced eviction from their homes by a marshal. By contrast, in recent years, one formal eviction occurs for about every 9 nonpayment cases filed citywide.***

The programs were found to be appropriate uses of trained personnel without full formal legal training and to have potential for sustainability. Navigator programs, through their impact on both legal and life outcomes, thus can result in *financial savings to society as well as a reduction in the hardships experienced by unrepresented litigants in civil cases.*<sup>7</sup>

## Description of the Program, Evaluation, and Pilot Projects

On February 11, 2014, then New York State Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman announced in his State of the Judiciary speech what he described as:

*[A] series of court-sponsored incubator projects to expand the role of non-lawyers in assisting unrepresented litigants. This idea of finding ways for non-lawyers to help pro se litigants is one that has only just begun to emerge in the United States. But it has taken hold elsewhere in the common-law world, including the United Kingdom, to great positive effect. With the new projects that we announce today, it is my hope that we can graphically illustrate the tremendous difference non-lawyers can make in closing the justice gap.*

The three pilot projects commenced operation in 2014 under the general guidance of a special task force, the Committee on Non-Lawyers and the Justice Gap,<sup>8</sup> appointed by the Chief Judge. The pilot projects operated within the New York Civil Court, under the Supervision of Deputy Chief Administrative Judge Fern Fisher and with close participation of community groups and regular input from legal aid agencies and bar associations.

All of the pilot projects shared a general approach, as described by Chief Judge Lippman in the 2014 State of the Judiciary speech:

*...This kind of one-on-one assistance will include providing informational resources to litigants and helping them access and complete court do-it-yourself forms and assemble documents, as well as assisting in settlement negotiations outside the courtroom.*

*Most significantly, for the first time, the trained non-lawyers, called Navigators, will be permitted to accompany unrepresented litigants into the courtroom in specific locations in Brooklyn Housing Court and Bronx Civil Court. They will not be permitted to address the court on their own, but if the judge directs factual questions to them, they will be able to respond. They will also provide moral support and information to litigants, help them keep paperwork in order, assist*

<sup>7</sup> For estimates of the costs and benefits of providing lawyer assistance in eviction cases, see Stout Risius Ross, Inc., *The Financial Costs and Benefits of Establishing a Right to Counsel in Eviction Proceedings Under Intro 214-A*, (2016).

<sup>8</sup> See the press release at [http://www.nycourts.gov/press/pdfs/pr13\\_07.pdf](http://www.nycourts.gov/press/pdfs/pr13_07.pdf).

*them in accessing interpreters and other services, and, before they even enter the courtroom, explain what to expect and what the roles are of each person in the courtroom.*

*Clear guidelines govern what a non-lawyer can and cannot do to ensure that they do not cross the line into the practice of law. They will receive training and develop expertise in defined subject areas. When these non-lawyers confront situations where the help of a lawyer is crucial, they will have access to legal service providers for help and referrals.*

An Order issued by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Courts codified these protections and authorizations.<sup>9</sup> The courthouses in which the Navigators projects were piloted are chaotic, loud, confusing and overwhelming, perhaps even to new lawyers as well as to the approximately 90 percent of tenants who, at the time of this research, were there without legal representation.<sup>10</sup>

In 2014, the Public Welfare Foundation made a grant to the National Center for State Courts and the American Bar Foundation to fund the development of frameworks for the design and evaluation of such programs and the use of that evaluation framework to assess two distinct initiatives, i) the New York Court Navigators program, reported on here, and, ii) the Washington State Limited License Legal Technicians program, which authorizes trained, licensed and regulated legal technicians to provide a range of services in a provider-client relationship without attorney supervision.<sup>11</sup>

The evaluation of the New York Court Navigators program included review of court files, surveys of litigants and Navigators, and interviews with stakeholders such as lawyers, judges, court staff, staff in nonprofit organizations that work in these areas, and current and potential funders as well as Navigators themselves. The majority of the data were collected in the Brooklyn Housing Court, as this was the only site of two of the three pilot projects. Following the evaluation framework, the data collected were reviewed for evidence of 1) *appropriateness*: whether the services as designed could potentially produce the kinds of outcomes desired; 2) *efficacy*: whether the services showed evidence of producing those outcomes; and 3) *sustainability*: whether it was reasonable to anticipate that the project could be maintained, expanded and replicated in other jurisdictions.

## Recommendations for Enhancements of the New York Navigators Program

The New York City Court Navigators Program shows evidence of achieving the goals of the program as a whole and of its individual pilot projects. One broadly shared benefit from the launch and evaluation of pilot innovations is the opportunity to learn about both what works and what could work better. Some improvements to the existing projects can be achieved at minimal cost. Expanding the projects' size to have greater impact on legal and life outcomes would be more expensive, but also likely accompanied by substantial savings to society as well as reductions in hardship.

<sup>9</sup> See Administrative Order of the Chief Administrative Judge of the Courts 42-14, February 11, 2014. Available at <https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/nyc/SSI/pdfs/AO-42-14.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS: CHARACTERISTICS, NEEDS, SERVICES: THE RESULTS OF TWO SURVEYS. SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS IN THE NEW YORK CITY FAMILY COURT AND NEW YORK CITY HOUSING COURT, Office of the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Justice Initiatives. New York, NY: Office of the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Justice Initiatives, 2005. At time of the release of this report (October 2016), increased funding for lawyer representation in eviction cases has reduced the percentage of unrepresented tenants to around 83 percent.

<sup>11</sup> "Limited License Legal Technician Program," <http://www.wsba.org/licensing-and-lawyer-conduct/limited-licenses/legal-technicians>. The Roles Beyond Lawyers Evaluation report on the Limited License Legal Technicians is scheduled to appear later this year.

Lower-cost changes to achieve improvements include:

- Providing dedicated, on-going supervision for Access to Justice Navigators in all the courthouses where they work. Volunteer Navigators should be supervised by trained and experienced staff who are on-site and available for questions, consultation, and support during all the hours Navigators are providing services. This supervision should include additional “on-the-job” training for Navigators about working with unrepresented litigants and court staff within the bounds of the Navigator role.
- Educating both the judges and the court attorneys who assist the judges about Navigators’ role and capacities, so that both groups are able to use Navigators as a resource in acquiring information they need to make decisions and in using courtroom time as efficiently as possible.
- Educating court staff about Navigators’ role, and working with court staff to develop means to better integrate Navigators into the case flow, so that Navigators’ work is a consistently helpful supplement to the work of clerks and other courthouse workers.
- Increasing availability of the DIY (“do-it-yourself”) computer kiosks for the preparation of answers and other legal documents.
- Developing a triage referral system that integrates the various services currently available in the courthouse, so that those cases that would benefit most from the enhanced services provided by some types of Navigators are more likely to receive them.
- Providing more information about all types of Navigators to the public, with the goal of increasing the use of all types of Navigators.

Cost projections for expansion of the projects appear in the full Report.

## General Conclusions About “Roles Beyond Lawyers” Programs

This is the first comprehensive evaluation of a “Roles Beyond Lawyers” program, in which appropriately trained and supervised individuals without full formal legal training provide help to litigants who would otherwise be without assistance. As in all empirical social science, questions remain to be answered by future research. Nonetheless, actionable conclusions about the range of Roles Beyond Lawyers initiatives can be drawn from this evaluation.

1. People without formal legal training can provide meaningful assistance and services to litigants who are not represented by a lawyer.
2. These services can impact several kinds of outcomes, ranging from litigants’ understanding of court processes and empowerment to present their side of the case, to providing more relevant information to the decision-maker, to formal legal outcomes and the real-life outcomes experienced by assisted litigants and their families.
3. The tasks Navigators are actually able to perform, and thus their impact, are influenced by the philosophy and attitude of the court in which the services are provided, including the attitudes of case processing staff and judges.
4. Contributions of Navigators’ work to legal outcomes and real-life outcomes such as eviction prevention are likely similarly influenced by court environment and by the range of services and



benefit programs available in the jurisdiction. The availability of such services and benefits to which Navigators can connect litigants is a major mechanism of Navigator impact. Some jurisdictions, such as New York City, have significantly more such resources than most.

5. The impact of Roles Beyond Lawyers programs on legal outcomes can be greatly assisted by the availability and use of plain language, standardized legal forms, such as the Answer form, and of software programs (what in New York are called “DIY” programs) that help litigants prepare legal documents such as answers. Such programs have been developed for many jurisdictions, facilitating the replication of Roles Beyond Lawyers programs.

## General Recommendations

### 1. Sustaining the Current Program

The Navigators projects produce goods valued by a range of stakeholders. Sustaining funding for the program is recommended, with sufficient increases to follow the Navigator supervision recommendations in the Report.

### 2. Replication in New York City and State

Replication is recommended, but with careful attention to changes of the kind described above to enhance efficacy and total cost effectiveness.

### 3. Replication Beyond New York State

The Navigators program shows potential to contribute to the national goal of providing meaningful access to justice for all, as urged for adoption by the states by the Conference of Chief Justices.<sup>12</sup> The findings of the Report suggest that these approaches can be an important tool in helping achieve this goal, and that they should be integrated with other initiatives developed to meet the goal.

### 4. The Overall Evaluation Framework

The framework is recommended for evaluations of all types of “Roles Beyond Lawyers” programs. It is offered as useful for evaluations of other access to justice innovations. Potential downsides of a standardized approach are likely to be outweighed by the benefits of being able to compare different innovations on their appropriateness, efficacy and sustainability.

---

<sup>12</sup> Resolution 5: Reaffirming the Commitment to Meaningful Access to Justice for All. Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators (2015).  
[http://www.ncsc.org/~media/microsites/files/access/5%20meaningful%20access%20to%20justice%20for%20all\\_ fi  
nal.ashx](http://www.ncsc.org/~media/microsites/files/access/5%20meaningful%20access%20to%20justice%20for%20all_final.ashx)

# Tab 4

**UTAH JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES FOR SELF-REPRESENTED PARTIES  
WHERE WE ARE / February 2017**

<b>SUBCOMMITTEE &amp; STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITY</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHAT</b>
<b>Support Self-Help Center</b>	All	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Navigator</li> <li>2) Pro Se Calendars</li> <li>3) Court staff training</li> <li>4) Drafting Orders</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renew funding request to Judicial Council in April.</li> <li>• Idea of putting on notice attorney may be present (for Pro Se Calendars)</li> <li>• Idea of texting for notices (SL City grant money and CORIS rewrite)</li> <li>• Lawyer of the Day</li> <li>• One-on-one clerk training</li> </ul>
<b>Education/Outreach Subcommittee (combined with Rules/Legislation/ Funding and Lawyer Directories)</b>	Professor Hernandez Jaclyn Howell-Powers Lisa Collins Nancy Sylvester Mary Jane Ciccarello Tyler Cameron Shaunda McNeill Jessica Van Buren Judge Elizabeth Knight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentations to Law Schools on opportunities for students to assist pro se litigants</li> <li>• Presentation to Bar at summer convention on pro bono opportunities</li> <li>• Article on highlighting inactive rule for retired attorneys and other inactive rule promotion.</li> <li>• Survey monkey on needed training? (Spanish; judges; clerks; law school providers)</li> <li>• Analyze and improve the third year practice rule</li> <li>• Appointment of counsel in termination of parental rights in district court cases</li> <li>• Support opportunities for educating those who interact with self-represented parties (1-on-1 clerk training).</li> <li>• Take an informal survey of which districts accept email/faxes &amp; which don't.</li> <li>• AAA Taskforce Updates</li> <li>• Monitor progress of Lawyer Directory</li> </ul>

<b>Virtual Services / Navigator Subcommittee</b>	Leti Bentley Mary Jane Ciccarello Sue Crismon Carol Frank Susan Griffith Judge D. Thomas Jessica Van Buren	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the development and implementation of virtual services in rural areas</li> <li>• Develop and implement a court navigator program (New York program as model?)</li> <li>• Virtual Clinic grant – Susan &amp; Sue</li> <li>• Survey gathering on navigator pilot project in Grant County – Leti</li> <li>• Increase virtual connection between courts self-help center/library. Tried Vidyo (didn't work so well) - Carol</li> <li>• Use of phone appts./State Law Library - Jessica</li> </ul>
<b>Rule 16 Subcommittee</b>	Nancy Sylvester Mary Jane Ciccerello Chris Martinez Virginia Sudbury Judge Lawrence Commissioner Sagers Commissioner Conklin Commissioner Patton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamline domestic case processes</li> <li>• Bring in litigants earlier (when attorneys are still involved)</li> <li>• Proposed changes in required hearings</li> <li>• Proposed language changes on notices</li> </ul>

### **Rule 16 Subcommittee Update from Commissioner Conklin:**

My status really hasn't changed since we last spoke. I'm waiting on two factors: getting pro bono attorneys, and for the Domestic Case Process committee (which I'm on) to make a decision as to how these pro se calendars should fit into our ultimate process. The DCPIC is supposed to have a recommendation to the Judicial Council in five months, and it doesn't make sense to me to organize a pro se calendar if I may be altering it so soon.

I can tell you that Commissioner Sagers's calendar is brought up at almost every meeting as a tremendous tool and a model that everyone should follow. The 4th District also receives kudos for having followed suit. I don't have any doubt that the pro se calendars will continue to be part of how we do domestic cases, so they will be in the 2nd district eventually.