

Members of the Technology Committee of the BJA Court Recovery Taskforce inventoried courts' websites to determine whether certain information was posted and available to the public. It is important to note that this is not necessarily an inventory of information contained in the courts' websites, but rather an inventory of information *easily identifiable* in courts' websites. The following is a summary of the reviews from the court websites.

### **Filing Documents and Obtaining Records**

#### **Superior:**

- Fifteen superior courts indicated eFiling was available. For courts without eFiling, over half had unclear or unavailable information on how to file documents.
- Fourteen of those superior courts had easily identifiable instructions on how to use eFiling. Some of the instructions were difficult to find.
- Sixty-two percent of the superior courts offered the ability to obtain electronic court records. Registration was sometimes required. Most had easily obtainable instructions and information about costs.
- Less than half had information on the costs of using eFiling.
- Only one had an eFiling site and cost information that could be translated. Six courts without eFiling offered a translated site.

#### **District:**

- Only four district courts indicated the availability of eFiling.
- Less than one-half of the websites had readily identifiable instructions on how to file court documents.
- Nine district courts indicated that electronic court records are available to the public. These courts had clear instructions on how to obtain records, and posted information on costs.

### **Remote Hearings**

#### **Superior:**

- Twenty-nine superior courts posted information on remote hearings. Most (22) used Zoom. Other platforms included WebEx (5), AV Capture (1), and Teams (1).
- Seventy-two percent of the superior courts allowed for telephonic appearances.
- Twenty-five of those courts provided easily identifiable instructions on how to use the remote hearings, and 19 provided instructions for public viewing.
- Only eight were translated or made translation software available (Google Translate).

#### **District:**

- Most district courts post information about remote hearings and identify which platform they use. The majority use Zoom, and many have easily identifying instructions. Other platforms used include WebEx, GoToMeeting, Google Meetings, and Teams.
- In other courts either remote hearings are not available, or it is unclear whether remote hearings are used.
- Approximately one-half of the websites indicated that telephonic participation is permissible in remote hearings.
- More than one-half of the district courts' websites had clear instructions on remote viewing of court hearings.

## **Interpreters and Language Access**

### **Superior:**

- Thirty-one percent of the superior court websites had easily identifiable information about interpreters.
- Only 11 of those sites were translated.
- Many of the superior court sites had no or unclear translation sites. If a site was translated, Spanish was the most frequent translation, although there was a Vietnamese and Russian translation. Sometimes the superior court site had a translation but not the Clerk's site.

### **District:**

- In the majority of district court websites, none of the above listed information was available in languages other than English. Information on obtaining court records was translated on two courts' websites. Only one court had information on dockets or court calendars available in a non-English language. Four district courts had translated information on emergency orders. Instructions on filing documents were only available in English. Only six district courts posted translated information on remote hearings.
- Three district courts had easily identifiable information about requesting interpreter services. Two of those courts had instructions available in Spanish, and one had information in Spanish, Vietnamese and Russian.
- Some courts' websites have a Google Translate feature to allow for automated computerized translation of webpage content.

## **Dockets and Court Calendars**

### **Superior:**

- Eighty-seven percent of the superior courts had docket information easily available, although hearing confirmation information was harder to find. The information may be available on the Clerk's site, although links or directions to the Clerk's site were not always easily identifiable.

### **District:**

- Approximately one-half of the district courts had easily identifiable information about dockets or court calendars.
- Only five courts had easily identifiable instructions on how to confirm hearings.

## **Courts' Emergency Orders**

### **Superior:**

- Seventy-seven percent of the superior courts had emergency orders available.

### **District:**

- Approximately two-thirds of district courts' websites have easily identifiable information about the emergency orders. Some committee members noted that the language used may not be easily understandable for people unfamiliar with the court system.

## **Technical Support**

### **Superior:**

- Few superior courts had online technical support, including e-mail support. Forty-six percent had phone support available, usually a phone number.
- Less than one third of the superior courts had an FAQ page that was easily available, and many of the FAQ pages contained little technology information. One court had Zoom information, and one FAQ page included several important resources.

**District:**

- Two district courts had online chat features for technical support. More than one-half of the district courts websites offered technical support by telephone.
- Three district courts offered video tutorials about accessing remote hearings. Ten district courts offered online FAQs or Tips for accessing remote hearings.

**Publically Available Technology and Accessibility**

**Superior:**

- Three superior courts indicated public Wi-Fi available at the court. Only one had loanable laptops or tablets available for use, but only to counsel.
- Four had kiosks available for public use and seven had community resources.
- Seventeen superior courts appeared to have mobile friendly sites.
- It was difficult to determine if a site was ADA compliant. Some courts had links to request accommodations.

**District:**

- Very few district courts post information about publically available technology resources.
- Only two district courts posted information about public Wi-Fi availability at court.
- No district courts posted information about loanable laptops or tablets, but two stated that kiosks are available for public use.