

Agenda

Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties

August 10, 2007
12:00 to 1:30 p.m.

Administrative Office of the Courts
Scott M. Matheson Courthouse
450 South State Street
Judicial Council Room, Suite N31

Approval of minutes	Judge John Baxter
Report on attorney pilot program	Jessica Van Buren Mary Boudreau
Report from the Chair	Judge John Baxter
Next steps: Review strategic plan	Committee
Review meeting schedule	Committee

Committee Web Page: <http://www.utcourts.gov/committees/ProSe/>

Meeting Schedule: Matheson Courthouse, 12:00 to 2:00, Judicial Council Room

September 14, 2007
October 12, 2007
November 9, 2007
December 10, 2007
January 11, 2008
February 8, 2008
March 14, 2008
April 11, 2008

May 9, 2008
June 13, 2008
July 11, 2008
August 8, 2008
September 12, 2008
October 10, 2008
December 12, 2008

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RESOURCES FOR SELF-REPRESENTED PARTIES
Meeting Minutes**

**July 13, 2007
Matheson Courthouse
Salt Lake City, Utah**

Members Present: Hon. John L. Baxter, Chair; Fred Anderson; Prof. James H. Backman; Mary Jane Ciccarello; Joe Derring; Chris James; Hon. Rodney Page; Stewart Ralphs; Hon. James Shumate; Prof. Linda Smith; V. Lowry Snow; Jessica Van Buren.

Members Excused: Pat Bartholomew; Hon. Christine S. Decker; Rep. Neil Hansen; Jay Kessler; James Upton.

Guests Present: Megan Risbon, Access to Justice Council

Staff Present: Mary Boudreau; Tim Shea; Carolyn Carpenter

WELCOME AND REVIEW OF 6/8/07 MEETING MINUTES

Judge Baxter welcomed all present. The minutes of 6/8/07 were approved by acclamation with minor amendments.

Judge Baxter noted that the committee's strategic plan is being positively mentioned with some frequency at various conferences throughout the country.

Mary Boudreau asked the committee if their meeting preference for 2008 is to meet every month, or to meet every month except November or December. The committee members agreed to meet every month except November, 2008. The meetings will continue to be held on the second Friday of each month from noon until 1:30 p.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Bar Liaison: Judge Shumate noted that the Southern Utah Bar List of attorneys offering limited legal services is now on the court website. Judge Shumate reported that there has been less interest in lawyers providing limited legal services in 8th District. Ms. Boudreau suggested a possible solution could be to offer a perk to the attorneys at their fall forum to participate. Judge Page indicated that this is not a project to generate income for attorneys, but rather an opportunity for the bar to help solve a problem.

Lowry Snow stated he made the presentation to the bar in the Uintah Basin and both 8th district court judges were present. There were a lot of questions. This was an effort to energize the local bar to do what the local bar in St. George did with Judge Shumate. It was approached from the standpoint of access to justice as well as providing new opportunities in providing limited legal services. The Uintah Basin Bar's structure is not as cohesive as that of the Southern Utah Bar.

The meetings are held just once a year. It was hoped the attorneys and judges would see this as more than a revenue-producing device.

Judge Baxter asked Mr. Snow if he has any ideas about how to approach the issue. Mr. Snow indicated that something more intensive could likely be done with the Uintah Basin's local leadership. The Southern Utah Bar and its leadership have had as their agenda this year to promote and enhance pro bono work and took this on as a leadership initiative. It will require leadership from the Uintah Bar. The Utah Bar is working on encouraging that. The Access to Justice Council is divided into subcommittees and one of its active committees is a pro bono committee. Mr. Snow stated he is trying to coordinate what that committee is doing with the subcommittee of the Utah Bar as he takes the reigns as Utah Bar President.

Stewart Ralphs asked if the presentation in 8th district included materials. Mr. Snow said the documents provided by the Southern Utah Bar for the 5th District, which included the list of attorneys who are providing the unbundled services, was given to them.

Mr. Ralphs said that the description distributed by Ms. Van Buren, along with the attorney list from the Southern Utah Bar, should provide a model. It is easier to adopt something that is working somewhere else. Whether presentations are made to big groups like the Sun Valley Bar Conference, or in small local bar groups, they can be told that this is already being done, is easy to do, and is helping people who do not have access. Mr. Ralphs asked if the Bar is coordinating the attorney lists or is housing a central list.

Tim Shea suggested talking with Lincoln Mead about that, and suggested that in the Bar's database there be a feature for an attorney to check willingness to offer limited legal services, geographic districts, and subject matters. Putting that information into the database could generate a webpage of limited legal help lawyers that could be search by name, geographic area and subject matter. The court's webpage could link to that. One of the problems of relying on a local bar list is that the information is soon outdated, but the state bar's information is continually regenerated.

Mr. Snow indicated the Utah Bar has been working on that. The Bar is currently under contract with Lawyer Match, but Mr. Snow has met with Lincoln to determine what the database referral program will look like. Having attorneys mention their fees and specifically if they offer limited legal services was discussed. The Utah Bar can go online with their database as early as April. Mr. Snow stated this is high on his priority list, but the Bar must avoid interfering with their contractual obligation right now.

Linda Smith suggested when talking with the 8th district attorneys and judges, it may be useful to distinguish between a new way to practice law vs. providing limited legal services pro bono. Being explicit about a dual route with limited legal help might be a good idea. Since 8th District is a pilot district for the self-help attorney, it is important to entuse them about this.

Judge Shumate indicated he had a concern when many of his colleagues were opposed to the limited legal help concept in the beginning. Once the process was explained, they came around.

There will be an effort to win over the district court judges at their conference in September. Once judges are won over, it may be easier for the Bar to follow.

Fred Anderson said he was in the Uintah Basin for about 3 years and became familiar with the judges there. He expressed that the judges prefer that people have an attorney, but while he was there, was able to sell them on the forms Utah Legal Services developed for self-represented litigants, and expressed that unbundled services would be satisfactory to the judges. The practical side is that when the oil industry was not booming like it is now, attorneys were scrambling to get enough work. Now the attorneys, which are few in number, do not have enough time.

Ms. Boudreau wondered about the possibility of a judge-attorney team from the 5th district presenting to 8th district. Judge Shumate indicated he would be willing to do that with a 5th district attorney if the leadership in the Uintah Basin was willing to set up a CLE.

Judge Baxter reported the letter (Tab 2) about Utah State Bar's possible promotion of unbundled legal services by attorneys that was signed by Judge Baxter, Judge Shumate and Lowry Snow was sent to Gus Chin, President of the Utah State Bar, and copied to Nate Alder, President-elect of the Utah State Bar.

Judge Page stated he has met with the Weber County Bar and disseminated the information from 5th district to them. There are many new attorneys in Weber County and they were very receptive. The older attorneys were not opposed to it. Judge Page will inform the Weber County Bar that Judge Shumate and a 5th district attorney are willing to present to them, and that perhaps the Davis County Bar Association can be included.

Education: Judge Baxter indicated he met with Diane Cowdrey, the Director of the Education Department, about the possibility of obtaining Richard Zorza for a session at the judicial fall conference and negotiations with him are under way. Ms. Cowdrey is trying to confirm the date of September 27, sometime between 1 and 3 p.m. Conference organizers will make an effort to see to it that members of this committee can hear Mr. Zorza speak at the conference.

Judge Baxter stated that based on being able to obtain Mr. Zorza on that date, a decision was made that they would not have a break-out session at this conference to talk about the limited legal services project, but would instead push for a break-out at the spring conference in May, 2008. That gives this committee more time to work with Commissioner Evans on a presentation at that time. Mr. Snow added that this will also allow more time to generate a statewide database.

Ms. Smith said she would be willing to ask her college dean if money is available to have Mr. Zorza speak to law students at the University while he is here.

Ms. Boudreau indicated that Mr. Zorza expressed interest in a more extended opportunity to speak, but the court's education department did not have the budget for this. His fee is approximately \$1,000 a day, but he could possibly speak in the morning or evening of the day he is here, in addition to his presentation at the conference in the afternoon.

Ms. Smith said she does not have a budget for this. Having Mr. Zorza come to the law school and opening it to law students and lawyers for CLE credit would be a possibility. It could even be a fundraiser. She indicated she is teaching a combined skills and ethics class on September 26th from 4-6 p.m. Perhaps Mr. Zorza could speak to the entire law school that evening. Ms. Smith will check with the college dean and get back to Ms. Boudreau.

Ms. Boudreau asked Mr. Backman whether he thought BYU would be interested. Mr. Backman responded that he will talk to Stan Needham, and see if he is interested in discussing the possibility with the dean.

Forms – Mr. Backman said Wayne Riches and Mary Boudreau will be attending the subcommittee meeting today. The temporary order packet is in the process of becoming available. Mary Jane Ciccarello is on the way to a guardianship packet and that will dovetail with what Wayne Riches is doing. The subcommittee has a clean slate after that so will await guidance. He reported that Stewart Ralphs is joining the subcommittee, as well as non-committee members April Hollingsworth and Judge Mower.

Ms. Smith said that Jessica Van Buren now has a link from the court's website to the law school website that shows her students' PowerPoint on what self-reps should expect when they come to court. Some corrections to the PowerPoint still need to be finalized and made. Ms. Smith reported that she has also pursued meeting with law-related education people to provide more community education. She indicated she has drafted a memo of understanding that has not been sent out to anyone yet, which she passed out to the committee.

Pilot Project – Jessica Van Buren reported that Mary Boudreau has been hired as the self-help attorney. She distributed a draft one-page summary of the project that will be ready for the press, the Judicial Council, attorneys, judges, pilot districts, etc. Ms. Smith asked that the committee review the summary and give her feedback.

Ms. Boudreau indicated computer monitors and other equipment are ready for the pilot districts. Ms. Van Buren added that the court just got a new PBX and there is a free call management system that comes with it.

Judge Page asked what the timeline is for receiving starting the public service. Ms. Van Buren stated that part of that will depend on how soon Ms. Boudreau has materials ready to start receiving calls. It is hoped it will begin sometime in the fall, sooner rather than later.

Two Building Block Requests Submitted

Ms. Boudreau reported she submitted the draft building block requests to Tim Shea for the second year of the pilot project and for the legal writing specialist. There is nothing more to report on them at this time.

Review Draft Letter for Submission to Supreme Court

Ms. Smith distributed copies of some edits she made in the materials supporting the change to Rule 14-802 that will be sent to Matty Branch. She reviewed her suggested language with the group. The memo will be on the agenda of the Supreme Court's August meeting.

After review, Stewart Ralphs made a motion to submit the letter with the revised memo to Matty Branch. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

New/Other Business

Judge Baxter informed the group that Truman, the therapy dog, died quickly after being hit by a car recently. There was a memorial service held at the Lincoln Center Courtyard, which was attended by Judge Baxter, Mary Boudreau and Jay Kessler. There was good press coverage, both on TV and in the newspapers, since Truman was a special dog to many people, serving as a therapy dog and obtaining the title of Therapy Dog of the Year at one point. The funds for a tree that was planted in his honor were raised by the employees of Catholic Community Services and by the homeless community. His ashes were placed at the base of the tree.

The meeting was adjourned.

Guidelines for Operation of the Utah State Courts' Self-Help Center

Independence and integrity

Self-Help Center staff should always uphold the independence and integrity of the Center, recognizing its role within the courts and the legal system.

Role as representative of the court

Self-Help Center staff members are representatives of the courts, and should avoid all acts of impropriety and the appearance of impropriety at all times.

Impartiality and diligence

Self-Help Center staff should perform their duties impartially and diligently. Impartiality means delivering services to all eligible parties in a neutral manner. Diligence requires the staff to provide parties with information pertinent to their inquiries. This may include appropriate referrals to other resources as well as direct information and assistance through the Center.

Respect and patience

Self-Help Center staff should respect the social, economic, and personal differences that exist among individuals, and maintain patience for all who seek Center services. However, if a Center patron becomes unruly or abusive, staff may terminate the conversation.

Bias and prejudice

Self-Help Center staff should assist parties who seek assistance without bias or prejudice based on race, sex, religion, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or other factors.

Competent legal information

Self-Help Center staff should provide parties who seek assistance with procedural and legal information and education so they will have increased access to the courts. However, the Center's staff may not give legal advice, and do not replace private counsel.

Full notification of limits of service

Self-Help Center staff should give conspicuous notice that no attorney-client relationship exists between the Center or its staff, and the litigant. Notice should include advice that the absence of an attorney-client relationship means communications between the party and the Center are not privileged, and that Center services may be provided to the opposing party.

Public comment

Self-Help Center staff must not make any public comment about parties who use Center services and the information they share with staff, or about any court cases or other court matters.

Gifts or payments

Self-Help Center staff should not accept any gifts, favors, bequests, or loans from the people they assist, since this violates state law and also creates the appearance of partiality.

Communications with bench officers

Self-Help Center staff should avoid all *ex parte* communications with bench officers. Communications about purely procedural matters or the functioning of the court are allowed and encouraged.

Communications with represented litigants

Self-Help Center staff should not assist parties known to be represented by an attorney unless the party's attorney consents, a court has referred the litigant for assistance, or the party requires referral to information about attorney conduct.

Committee on Resources for Self-Represented Parties
 Strategic Planning Initiative
 Report to the Judicial Council
 July 25, 2006

Table of Contents

1)	Background.....	2
2)	Self-Represented Parties in Utah.....	2
a)	Nature of self-represented parties.....	2
b)	Perceptions by judges, attorneys and court staff of self-represented parties.....	3
c)	Services desired or needed by self-represented parties	3
d)	Legal representation.....	4
e)	Other sources of information and assistance	4
f)	On-line resources	4
g)	Satisfaction with clerk’s office.....	4
h)	Satisfaction in the courtroom.....	5
3)	The Challenge.....	5
4)	A Program for Resources for Self-Represented Parties	6
a)	Goals.....	6
b)	Principles.....	6
c)	Conceptual Model	7
d)	Court-Sponsored Resources	7
i)	Self-help support center.....	7
ii)	Clinics and workshops	8
iii)	Assistance from clerks.....	9
iv)	State Law Library.....	9
v)	Forms, instructions and information.....	10
vi)	Court website.....	10
vii)	Clerical and judicial training	11
e)	Community-Sponsored Resources.....	11
f)	Lawyer-Sponsored Resources	11
5)	Summary.....	12
6)	Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties.....	12

1) Background

The Committee on Resources for Self-Represented Parties is a standing committee established by Judicial Council Rule 3-115. The Committee's purpose is to "study the needs of self-represented parties within the Utah State Courts and propose policy recommendations concerning those needs to the Judicial Council."

The duties of the Committee are to:

(A) provide leadership to identify the needs of self-represented parties and to secure and coordinate resources to meet those needs;

(B) assess available services and forms for self-represented parties and gaps in those services and forms;

(C) ensure that court programs for self-represented litigants are integrated into statewide and community planning for legal services to low-income and middle-income individuals;

(D) recommend measures to the Judicial Council, the State Bar and other appropriate institutions for improving how the legal system serves self-represented parties; and

(E) develop an action plan for the management of cases involving self-represented parties.

Since its first meeting in June, 2005, the Committee has been reviewing services provided to self-represented parties in Utah and programs provided in other states. In early 2006, the Committee conducted an empirical study of the experience of self-represented parties in sixteen limited and general jurisdiction trial courts. Based on that study and the Committee's previous investigations, the Committee has developed this strategic plan for investigating, developing and providing resources for self-represented parties.¹

2) Self-Represented Parties in Utah

The data collected present the following picture of self-represented parties and their experiences.

a) Nature of self-represented parties

1. 52% of self-represented parties appearing at a trial or hearing are between the ages of 25 and 44. 55% seeking assistance from the clerk's office are between 25 and 44.

¹ The Committee would like to thank Mr. John Greacen, the Center for Court Solutions, the State Justice Institute, the National Center for State Courts, and the Center for Effective Public Policy for their help in preparing this report and in conducting the survey upon which it is partly based.

2. 65% of self-represented parties appearing at a trial or hearing have one or no children in their household. 61% seeking assistance from the clerk's office have one or no children.
3. 47% appearing at a trial or hearing and 41% seeking assistance from the clerk's office report annual household incomes of \$24,000 or less. 60% make \$36,000 or less annually. About 15% make over \$96,000 annually.
4. 19% of self-represented people coming to the clerk's office and 23% of those appearing at a hearing or trial identify themselves as minorities. About 3% identify themselves as Native American. About 12% identify themselves as Hispanic.
5. 95% of clerk's office users and 97% of people appearing for a hearing or trial report English as their primary language.
6. About 75% of self-represented parties are very infrequent court users.

b) Perceptions by judges, attorneys and court staff of self-represented parties

1. Judges of both district and justice courts find consistent problems with self-represented parties expecting judges and court staff to provide legal advice, failing to understand rules of procedure and evidence, failing to bring necessary witnesses and evidence to court, and refusing to accept the court's rulings.
2. Attorneys emphasize the parties' lack of reasonable expectations concerning case outcomes and the difficulties attorneys face in negotiating with self-represented parties.
3. Court clerks report that self-represented parties require more time than represented parties, that self-represented parties expect the clerks to provide advice that court staff are not allowed to provide, and they expect court staff to do the work for them.
4. Justice court judges rate the performance of self-represented parties more highly than do district court judges.
5. Justice court judges do not perceive a significant need to reschedule cases due to the lack of preparation of self-represented parties. More district court judges perceive this to be a problem. 63% of the district court judges report that it affects fewer than 25% of the cases.

c) Services desired or needed by self-represented parties

1. The district court case types in which people most often appear without counsel are domestic relations matters, small claims, landlord/tenant, probate, other civil, and protective orders, in that order. In justice court the most frequent case types are traffic, parking, and small claims, in that order.
2. Most people coming to the courthouse do so to file a new case, to file papers in an existing case, or to inquire about an existing case.
3. The district court clerks serve primarily plaintiffs or petitioners. The justice court clerks serve primarily defendants or respondents (due to the high volume of people with traffic and parking cases).

d) Legal representation

1. 18% of self-represented people coming to the clerk's office in district court and 8% of those coming to the clerk's office in justice court have consulted a lawyer beforehand. 27% of people coming to a district court proceeding have consulted a lawyer.
2. About 60% of unrepresented users in justice court are unrepresented because they do not feel their cases are complicated enough to need a lawyer. The second most frequent reason (another 20%) is inability to afford a lawyer. In the district court, about 40% of unrepresented people coming to the clerk's office feel their cases are not complex enough to need a lawyer and about 33% cannot afford a lawyer. Of those appearing without counsel at a district court hearing or trial, about 50% report inability to pay as the reason for not hiring a lawyer and about 33% that their cases were not sufficiently complicated.
3. Another 7% in each court do not want to pay the money required for a lawyer, and about 7% say they have obtained enough information from a lawyer to handle the case by themselves.

e) Other sources of information and assistance

1. 80% of self-represented people coming to the district court clerk's office seek additional help before coming to the courthouse. About 60% used the court's website. 19% sought help from a friend or relative, 11% from the court clerk, and 7% went to a library. In the justice courts, by contrast, 59% sought no help. Those who sought help went to a court clerk, a friend or relative, or another information source.
2. This changes dramatically at the time of a hearing or trial. Use of the court's website decreases to 17% in the district court and to zero in the justice court, which reflects the website's focus on forms, information and preparing pleadings, rather than in-court assistance. Court clerks, family and friends are the major sources of help beyond legal consultation, which takes place primarily in district court cases.

f) On-line resources

1. Respondents prefer a personal interaction over web services, rating the web information lower than all other aspects of court services other than the ease of parking.
2. Judges, attorneys and court clerks rate highly the effectiveness of OCAP forms and website information and forms in producing more complete and correct pleadings from self-represented parties.

g) Satisfaction with clerk's office

1. Litigant surveys rate clerk's services quite highly.

2. Users give the highest ratings to small courts, followed by mid-sized courts, followed by large courts.
3. User comments suggest that the most appreciated services are courtesy, friendliness, quickness of service, and knowledgeable information.
4. Most user complaints arise from parking problems, long waiting times, inefficient processes, and problems with internet forms.

h) Satisfaction in the courtroom

1. As with the satisfaction scores for clerk’s office services, the average satisfaction scores for courtroom experiences are inversely proportional to court size. Overall, justice court courtroom satisfaction scores are higher than the scores for district courts. The differences in these scores are insignificant.
2. Self-represented parties reported higher satisfaction scores in uncontested than in contested cases and in cases involving another self-represented litigant than in cases with a lawyer.

3) The Challenge

Large numbers of parties appear in our courts without lawyers. The table below shows the percentage of self-represented parties in select case types in cases filed in 2005.

Case type	Filings	Percent w/		Percent Self-		
		2 Attorneys	1 Attorney	Attorneys	represented	represented
					Petitioners	Respondents
Divorce	12,828	17%	36%	47%	49%	81%
Protective Orders	5,219	13%	33%	54%	59%	82%
Stalking	898	7%	17%	76%	84%	84%
Evictions	8,251	3%	79%	19%	19%	97%
Small Claims	15,692	0%	2%	98%	99%	99%
Debt Collections	56,733	2%	97%	1%	1%	97%
Guardianship	1,319	1%	41%	58%	59%	2%

A layperson faces obstacles to effective participation in our courts such as the complicated nature of the law and unfamiliarity with complex rules of evidence and procedure. Some parties face additional barriers, such as limited English proficiency, lack of literacy, or less than full mental functioning. As a result of these barriers, an unrepresented litigant may not obtain the same benefits from the courts that a represented litigant does.

An essential component of any program to assist self-represented parties is to inform them of the benefits of legal representation and to refer them to affordable publicly and privately provided legal services. Beyond that, the challenge is to provide self-represented parties with the resources needed to overcome these obstacles. The data collected by the Committee show that most people representing themselves will

not obtain the services of a lawyer because they lack the means to do so or because they believe the matter is relatively simple.

The judicial branch does not stand alone in addressing this resource gap. There are some programs and individuals currently assisting self-represented parties, but the supply is insufficient. This plan provides a structure for supplementing existing resources and pursuing new resources to give self-represented parties the information and assistance needed to participate effectively in court proceedings.

4) A Program for Resources for Self-Represented Parties²

a) Goals

The Committee recommends the following goals for programs to assist self-represented parties:

1. To ensure access to the legal system.
2. To increase education of court users about the courts, and to increase education of court personnel and community organizations about self-represented parties' needs.
3. To clarify the court system so that it is understandable by ordinary citizens.
4. To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the court system by
 - a. reducing the time required of judges and staff to explain court procedures and
 - b. reducing the number of continuances required to give self-represented parties a further opportunity to prepare.
5. To increase understanding of court orders and compliance with their terms.

b) Principles

We recommend the following basic principles applicable to court services described in this plan:

1. Services provided by the court should be equally available throughout Utah. While it will be necessary to develop programs on a pilot basis, the Committee's ultimate goal is to provide the same services to citizens throughout Utah. People in urban areas, for instance, should not receive more, better, or different services than people in rural areas. Programs and services developed by the judicial branch should be equally available in the justice court.
2. Services provided by the judicial branch should be available to all people regardless of income. This principle does not necessarily apply to legal service providers and social service agencies with whom the courts collaborate. Their funding sources and program philosophies often limit their services to indigents.

² This plan does not address resources for self-represented defendants in criminal cases. The Committee limited the scope of its survey and of this report to civil and, in justice courts, traffic cases. The Committee may address criminal cases in the future, as well as the needs of self-represented parties in the juvenile court.

3. Services provided by the judicial branch should be available equally to all parties. Defendants and respondents are as entitled to court services as plaintiffs and petitioners.
4. Court-provided services to self-represented parties are designed to supplement and not to supplant legal representation. Legal representation – either through public legal services programs or through the services of members of the private bar – remains the preferred method for parties to obtain information and advice, and court staff will continue to inform self-represented parties of the value of legal representation and how to obtain the services of a lawyer.

c) Conceptual Model

The Committee envisions a web of services for self-represented parties, some provided by the courts, some by community organizations, some by lawyers. The Committee proposes investigate the details of the proposal that follows, to build pilot programs as appropriate, and to implement those programs that show success as measured by the satisfaction of self-represented parties, judges, clerks and attorneys. Most of our approach to resources for self-represented parties is to build on the successes Utah has already experienced. Based on our work so far, the committee recommends building a pilot program for a self-help support center described below.

d) Court-Sponsored Resources

Much of the work for the court resources plan that follows is possible only because the Judicial Council and the state court administrator had the foresight to have put in place a manager and coordinator for programs involving accessibility to the courts, such as our program for self-represented parties and the program for court interpreters.

i) Self-help support center

Self-represented parties give very high marks to clerks for their courtesy and respect. And self-represented survey respondent report that the information is itself correct and helpful. The strategic plan here is simple: more of the same. To provide more of the same, the committee recommends a pilot program for a self-help support center. In this pilot phase the self-help center would serve the district and justice courts in one rural and one urban court district. We recommend the Second and Eighth Districts. If the program is successful, it would eventually serve all judicial districts.

The center would be staffed by an experienced attorney, preferably Spanish-speaking. The attorney's duties would include providing a broad range of information and assistance to self-represented parties but not representation. As time is available the attorney would develop and conduct informational workshops and create court forms.

The attorney would provide information and assistance exclusively by toll-free phone number and through video conferencing equipment located in courthouses, subject to the limitations of the existing infrastructure. The attorney would not provide in-person services, so we recommend that the attorney be housed in the State Law Library.

The committee decided on this model for several reasons:

1. Telephone and video conferencing allow efficient delivery of information statewide, ensuring that self-represented parties throughout Utah will receive the same level and type of service regardless of their location.
2. Alaska's study of their telephone help line showed that telephone services are an effective means of communication, require less staff time, and are less stressful for staff.
3. A program in California's Butte, Glenn and Tehama counties has shown that video conferencing is an effective way to conduct workshops simultaneously in several locations.
4. This model is more cost-effective than providing a resident expert in every courthouse, or having a circuit rider who periodically visits each court.
5. The infrastructure to support this program is in place in some locations, but the pilot may be limited to avoid increasing computer response time in locations in which bandwidth is insufficient.

The telephone's computer system should be able to measure the number of calls, lost calls, wait time, talk time, and other metrics that may be useful. In addition to the statistics generated through the computer system, the attorney hired to provide the information should evaluate the types of cases and parties involved, the nature and availability of the information requested, the extent to which the person requests legal advice that cannot be provided, the nature and availability of community resources that can serve the caller, and other metrics that may be useful.

The Committee will submit a detailed budget for the pilot project at the Judicial Council's annual planning meeting in August.

ii) Clinics and workshops

The Committee proposes to spearhead efforts to research and develop materials and resources for clinics and workshops

1. for self-represented parties on topics most commonly of interest to them,
2. for clinic and workshop volunteers; and
3. for court personnel and community organizations on the needs of self-represented parties and the resources that are available.

Held live in one courthouse, a workshop might be broadcast through web technology to anyone interested in "attending" from home or office. In workshops for self-represented parties, the nature of the service provided will depend on the qualifications

of those presenting. A lawyer who donates the time will have different knowledge than for example, a self-help clerk.

iii) Assistance from clerks

To the extent that a court has not already done so, we recommend providing in each courthouse a self-help work space, which would have:

1. a small work space;
2. written materials, such as forms, instructions and informational guides;
3. a computer with internet access and access to the court's public database; and
4. in those courthouses participating in the pilot project, necessary telephone and web conferencing equipment.

We propose to investigate the effectiveness of a clerk assigned to the self-help work space either part-time or full-time. The designation as a self-help clerk should include with it additional pay to recognize the necessary concentration of knowledge and expertise. Some possible duties for a self-help clerk:

1. maintain a high level of knowledge about the issues raised by self-represented parties, maintain familiarity with judicial and community resources, assess the needs of particular court users and refer them to appropriate services, maintain interpersonal skills needed to interact with self-represented parties, instruct on the use of the 211 service in Utah;
2. serve as the court's liaison with the toll-free self-help support center;
3. schedule and promote local court and community-sponsored workshops;
4. ensure that equipment is working; and
5. train other clerks to ensure that self-represented parties receive correct and consistent information.

iv) State Law Library

The State Law Library already serves a significant number of self-represented litigants. More than half of the people who seek library services are representing themselves. Staff are accustomed to walking the thin line between showing people how to help themselves yet not giving them legal advice. The law library should continue to deliver these services in person, over the phone and via its web pages, and work to expand these services statewide.

In addition, the State Law Library should promote statewide access to legal information by:

1. educating academic and public library staff about the resources available for people representing themselves, including the court's website, OCAP and legal clinics;

2. educating academic and public library staff about online legal research resources;
3. providing reference services to staff in academic and public libraries;
4. working cooperatively with the State Library to disseminate information to libraries statewide; and
5. working cooperatively with Utah's academic law libraries to coordinate services to the public.

v) Forms, instructions and information

Forms and explanatory materials are fundamental resources for people representing themselves. The court has many forms in place and is developing more. Through an interactive web-based interview, the Online Court Assistance Program (OCAP) produces pleadings ready for filing in divorce, landlord-tenant, and cohabitant abuse cases. The court has many more forms on its website that can be printed and completed by hand or copied and completed on a word processor. Under the supervision of the Committee, students at J. Reuben Clark Law School are developing forms for credit. The Committee will evaluate the effectiveness of this program.

The Committee will work cooperatively with other providers to develop new forms and instructions and to review current forms for accuracy, currency and plain language. The Committee also recommends that the Judicial Council mandate court-approved forms for statewide acceptance.

vi) Court website

The ease of web publication makes it the primary means for providing forms, instructions and information. The court's website has won awards, but survey results indicate self-represented litigants make only modest use of it and their satisfaction is mixed. Paradoxically, website statistics show that the website is heavily used, but apparently not by our target population.

We have begun and we propose to continue to review web information to ensure that it is accurate, up-to-date, well-organized, ADA accessible, relevant, and easy to understand. We propose to undertake a careful review of the resources provided for self-represented litigants on the court's website seeking answers to the following questions:

1. Is the information meeting the needs of self-represented parties?
2. If not, what additional resources are needed?
3. Who will provide this additional content?
4. Is the information organized so that self-represented parties can find the information they need?
5. Is the information written in a way that they understand?
6. What government and organization websites exist with useful information?

We have a substantial web presence now, and the website is the most obvious means of providing even more information. But these questions need to be answered before we simply throw more information onto the website. We will use the results of our investigation to work with the court's webmaster to ensure that we have an effective website.

vii) Clerical and judicial training

The success of our current training effort shows in the survey results. The courts should continue existing efforts to train clerks in distinguishing the help they can and cannot provide and in giving effective help when they can. The essential role for judges is to ensure that a self-represented litigant has an opportunity to present his or her case and to avoid miscarriages of justice without sacrificing the impartiality of the proceeding. We propose to investigate training for judges on techniques for accomplishing these results.

e) Community-Sponsored Resources

Public libraries, law libraries and library bookmobiles, senior centers, ethnic centers, special interest centers, and other community organizations exist to serve the public. They can easily serve as a source or conduit for self-help information. The information and assistance might be generated by the community organization itself, or the organizations might serve primarily as a means to reach the information provided by the courts. Some organizations and individuals may be willing to provide personal support for self-represented parties. In that way, people identified by court staff as unable to represent themselves successfully because of language, literacy, or mental or emotional impairments might be referred to an effective resource. We propose to investigate how to recruit such community organizations as an effective resource.

To support this community effort, we recommend that Rule 1.0, Chapter 13A of the Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice be amended to permit assistance with court-approved forms generally rather than only harassment and domestic violence forms:

(c) Whether or not it constitutes the practice of law, the following activity by a non-lawyer, who is not otherwise claiming to be a lawyer or to be able to practice law, is permitted:

...

(c)(3) Providing clerical assistance to another to complete a form provided by a court ~~for protection from harassment or domestic violence or abuse~~ when no fee is charged to do so.

f) Lawyer-Sponsored Resources

Representation, unbundled legal services, and clinics offering legal advice must be achieved outside the judicial branch, and the courts should support these efforts.

Programs already exist, but not in sufficient supply. The Supreme Court has recently approved unbundled legal services, but we have yet to see how this might affect availability for people who are unrepresented. Legal service organizations, lawyers and law firms, law schools and community organizations offer no-fee and low-fee representation and advice and free legal clinics and workshops.

The Committee recommends that a separate structure outside the judicial branch – either an existing entity or one to be established – recruit no-fee and low-fee attorneys to expand the availability of representation, unbundled legal services, and clinics for self-represented parties. The entity should raise and distribute funds to support those lawyers and ensure accountability for the funds.

5) Summary

The Committee recommends:

1. financing a pilot program in two judicial districts to make available by telephone and web communication a lawyer who would provide information and assistance;
2. researching and developing court-sponsored clinics and workshops;
3. setting up a work space in each courthouse to serve as a focal point for providing self-help information;
4. studying the efficacy of staffing such a self-help work space;
5. promoting the state law library as a resource for self-represented parties;
6. continuing to develop forms most needed by self-represented parties;
7. studying how best to meet the needs of self-represented parties through the court's website;
8. continuing training with clerks and studying training with judges on the needs of self-represented parties and effectively responding to those needs;
9. studying how community service organizations can assist in providing self-help information;
10. amending Rule 1.0, Chapter 13A of the Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice to permit unpaid non-lawyers to complete court forms;
11. promoting clinics and workshops, low-fee and no-fee legal representation, and unbundled legal services among the legal community; and
12. promoting a legal service organization to recruit lawyers to provide such services and to raise and distribute funds to do so.

6) Committee on Resources for Self-represented Parties

John L. Baxter, Chair	Judge, Salt Lake City Justice Court
Fred W. Anderson	Attorney, Utah Legal Services
James H. Backman	Professor, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University
Pat Bartholomew	Clerk of Court, Utah Supreme Court
Mary Jane Ciccarello	Attorney at Law

Christine Decker	Judge, Third District Juvenile Court
Joe Derring	Clerk of Court, First District Court
Neil A. Hansen	Representative, Utah State Legislature
Chris James	Assistant Clerk of Court, Fourth District Court
Jay Kessler	Attorney, Kessler Law Office, LLC
Rodney Page	Judge, Second District Court
James Shumate	Judge, Fifth District Court
Linda F. Smith	Professor, S. J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah
Lowry Snow	Utah State Bar Commission
Marsha C. Thomas	Attorney, Thomas Tax & Law
James Upton	Director, Emergency Services, Catholic Community Services of Utah
Jessica Van Buren	Director, Utah State Law Library
Mary Boudreau, Staff	Program Manager, Administrative Office of the Courts
Carolyn Carpenter, Staff	Administrative Assistant, Administrative Office of the Courts