



Court Record Workgroup Charge

The Branch FY18-19 draft strategic plan identifies the need to examine and evaluate Judicial Branch business practices and access and service delivery levels in light of enhanced technology developments in the Branch, which includes reviewing current practices around creation and maintenance of the court record. The Workgroup's charge, broadly defined, is to explore cost effective and efficient ways to create and maintain the court record.

The Workgroup will develop recommendations for the Judicial Council regarding:

- Ensuring judicial branch control of the court record.
- Examining if changes should be made in the manner in which transcripts are created.
- Developing priorities for which proceedings should have the court record created by an in-person stenographic or electronic court reporter and/or real time court reporter, and those to be created through digital recording.

The Workgroup shall explore the role of a court reporter and possible changes to scope of job duties to be performed as well as court reporter supervision and reporting structure. The digital court recording technology installed throughout the Minnesota Judicial Branch in recent years provides a viable alternative for making and/or preserving the court record. Given the fact that digital court recording is now in place in nearly all courtrooms, the Branch has new opportunities for reliable record keeping and efficient transcript production. The Workgroup's recommendations shall consider efficiencies that can be derived from digital recording. Reduction in number of positions is not the goal of the workgroup.

In developing recommendations, the Workgroup shall include the cost impact of options; access and service impact to the court and the public; time to implement; and feasibility; and compatibility with the Branch FY18-19 Strategic Plan timeline and beyond.

As part of its work, the Workgroup should consider:

- Current statutes or rules regarding court reporters and court record, and necessary changes to allow recommended changes.
- Impact to stakeholders in regards to suggested changes in transcript production model (i.e., State Public Defender, public, etc.).
- Similarities and differences between court reporting methods, and best practices of using one method or multiple methods (i.e., realtime, Stenographic, Electronic).
- Bargaining Agreement implications.
- Any necessary staffing recommendations.
- Note technical standards that would need to be created if a recommendation was adopted.

Proposed Timeline:

- January 2017 – Workgroup formed
- February 2017 – Workgroup first meeting
- December 2017 – Workgroup recommendations presented to Judicial Council