REPORT OF THE KANSAS SUPREME COURT'S BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	17
HISTORY OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION	
THE CURRENT KANSAS JUDICIAL SYSTEM	21
A. Judicial Districts	22
B. Judges	22
C. Financing the Judicial System	24
WEIGHTED CASELOAD STUDY	26
FORMATION OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION	27
THE WORK OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION	29
RECOMMENDATIONS I. STRUCTURAL CHANGES	
1. The Supreme Court should recommend legislation to end the one-resident-judge-per-county restriction on the placement of judges.	31
Other statutes requiring the placement of judges in specific districts and counties should be eliminated	31
2. Judicial districts should not be consolidated	45
Consolidation or redistricting of judicial districts is not a viable alternative to eliminating the one-resident-judge-per-county restriction.	45

II. DISTRICT MAGISTRATE JUDGES

1.	The ratio of district magistrate judges to district judges should be increased.	49
	Consistent with the Weighted Caseload Study, this should be achieved by increasing the number of district magistrate judges while reducing (through attrition) the number of district judges.	49
2.	All future district magistrate judges should be lawyers	56
	The selection of lawyers to become district magistrate judges will increase flexibility and public faith in the judicial system.	56
	Existing district magistrate judges who are not lawyers should be able to continue in office and to run for reelection or retention.	56
	Current non-lawyer district magistrate judges who leave the bench should not be eligible to hold future judicial positions unless they become lawyers	56
3.	The Supreme Court should seek to expand the subject matter jurisdiction of district magistrate judges	60
	District magistrate judges should be permitted to hear uncontested or less complicated matters which they are currently not permitted to hear.	60
	Expanded district magistrate judge subject matter jurisdiction should not include more complex issues, except by consent of the parties involved	60 [°]

4.	judge from a final order or decision on the record by a lawyer district magistrate judge	62
	Appeals from final decisions of district magistrate judges who are lawyers should follow the normal appeal process to the Court of Appeals or Supreme Court.	
	All final orders and decisions by any district magistrate judge (lawyer or not) should be on the record.	62
5.	Counties should not be allowed to hire their own district magistrate judges.	64
	Counties should continue to be able to hire and pay for lawyers to serve as pro tem judges.	64
	Counties should continue to be able to supplement the pay of district magistrate judges	64
m.	ELECTRONIC FILING	
1.	Electronic filing and centralized case and document management systems should be developed and implemented statewide as soon as possible.	65
	The costs for the systems should be paid by state funds and user fees.	65
	E-filing should be implemented first	65

	Modifications to permit statewide accessibility of the case management and document management systems should follow as quickly as possible.	65
2.	Statewide e-filing should be mandatory (with exceptions only for pro se, small claims, and indigent litigants)	69
	There should be an e-filing fee for civil cases to supplement state funds for development, maintenance, and enhancement of the e-filing, case management, and document management systems, and to establish a fund for future updating of software and hardware	69
3.	All e-filers, including pro se litigants, small claims litigants, and indigent litigants who choose to e-file, should be required to pay civil e-filing fees.	71
4.	All e-filing fees, without exception, should go to the Judicial Branch.	71
5.	The e-filing system should be phased in to eventually cover all counties and judicial districts and the appellate courts.	72
	In order to generate e-filing fees quickly, high volume courts should be phased in first, followed by courts with a lower volume of cases, followed by the appellate courts.	72
6.	Statewide implementation of e-filing should be accomplished within three years	74

7.	If leasing would result in quicker statewide implementation, the Supreme Court should consider	
	leasing the e-filing system rather than using a purchase/license payment structure.	74
8.	Decisions on hardware acquisitions should be left to the counties.	75
	But the Court's Office of Judicial Administration should develop a list of recommended hardware	75
9.	The Supreme Court should permit e-filing access for prose and inmate litigants that assures access to justice without abuses or breaches of privacy rights	76
	The Court should consult with the National Center for State Courts for information regarding pro se and inmate use of e-systems.	76
10.	The Supreme Court should develop appropriate rules to allow late filings by litigants who are unable to timely efile because of the unavailability of e-filing systems due to technical or other problems.	77
11.	All court records and documents should be e-accessible statewide.	78
	The Supreme Court should establish access standards for both represented parties and pro se litigants	78
	Before making e-access available to the public and to litigants, the Court should adopt policies and procedures designed to protect privacy rights	78

12.	The Supreme Court should adopt rules or propose legislation to recognize the courts' electronic version of documents as the official court record	79
IV.	OTHER TECHNOLOGY	
1.	The Supreme Court should encourage district courts and counties to use video equipment and strongly encourage them to use audio equipment in order to preserve a record in the event a court reporter is not available in the courtroom.	80
•	Appellate courts should examine the use of video conferencing for some appellate arguments	80
	The Supreme Court should set mandatory standards for audio/visual equipment to be used by counties in their purchasing decisions.	80
	The Office of Judicial Administration should develop for the district courts a list of the types of hearings appropriate for audio/visual use.	80
	The Office of Judicial Administration should explore the possibility of statewide purchasing agreements which would give counties financing options that are not currently available.	80
2.	As recording technology advances, the Supreme Court should review the number and use of court reporters in Kansas.	83

3.	The Supreme Court should monitor developments in the use of electronic versions of appellate decisions for official reports as an alternative to the current published bound volumes of the Kansas Supreme Court Reports and the Kansas Court of Appeals Reports.	88
V.	DOCKET FEES	
1.	The Supreme Court should promote legislation to require all docket fees without exception to go to the Judicial Branch.	90
2.	The Supreme Court should promote legislation or adopt Court Rules to increase all current docket fees	97
3.	The Supreme Court should promote legislation or adopt Court Rules to assess higher docket fees in civil cases which by their nature impose more costs on the court system by consuming an extraordinary amount of court resources.	102
4.	The Supreme Court should promote legislation or adopt Court Rules which require the payment of a docket fee upon filing a civil action (Chapters 59, 60, and 61 only), unless excused due to the filing of a poverty affidavit or an action for protection from abuse or protection from stalking.	102
5.	The Supreme Court should use federal poverty guidelines as a model for poverty affidavits used to defer docket fees at the commencement of a case.	105
	Any deferral of docket fees should be for an initial term of not more than 60 days after commencement of	105

	If the district court defers payment further, the court should make a final determination on the imposition of docket fees at the end of the case when more information is available regarding the financial resources of the parties. 105
6.	The Supreme Court should promote legislation or adopt Court Rules to assess additional docket fees for the filing of motions that by their nature require an extraordinary amount of court resources
VI.	DISTRICT COURT FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES
1.	The Supreme Court should encourage district courts to identify and vigorously pursue outstanding collectible court costs, fees, and fines
	Collection methods (including debt setoff and the like) should be developed and standardized
	Court personnel should be educated on collection processes
	The Supreme Court's Office of Judicial Administration should seek grant funding and the assistance of the National Center for State Courts to assist with implementation
2.	The issue of court cash surety bonds was presented at a public hearing. While the Commission makes no recommendation at this time, the issue is not without merit and deserves further study and consideration
3.	The Supreme Court should seek state funds for translators

	The Court should consider regionalizing translator services
	The Office of Judicial Administration should expand its current efforts to develop resources to provide qualified translators and interpreters, including the use of Skype, Google Voice, or other newly developed services.
4.	The Supreme Court should review and seek to modify the case types entitled to priority in the district court and the time standards for expedited disposition of such cases 126
5.	The Supreme Court should promote statewide development of district court best practices
	In doing so, the Court should consider using the National Center for State Courts' CourTools
6.	The Supreme Court should implement uniformity in court processes and procedures in all judicial districts 134
	The Court should examine local rules that (1) make it difficult for practitioners to function in courts in different districts and (2) may impede the uniform adoption of statewide e-filing
7.	The Supreme Court and its Office of Judicial Administration should continue examining the efficacy of specialty courts, including veterans' courts

	DISTRICT AND APPELLATE COURTS
	The Supreme Court should examine the timeliness of decisions of the district and appellate courts
	The Court should set standards and reevaluate and implement appropriate enforcement mechanisms to assure that decisions and opinions are issued timely 141
VIII.	APPELLATE COURT FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES
1.	Both the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals should consider the use of mediation at the appellate level 141
2.	The Supreme Court should examine the types of cases entitled to priority appellate review and the time standards for those reviews
IX.	OFFICE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
1.	The Office of Judicial Administration should conduct more of its training electronically, through conference calls, GoToMeeting-like processes, and webinars
2.	The Supreme Court should examine the efficiencies of its Office of Judicial Administration's operations, including its Information Technology Department
	The Court should seek grant funding and the

VII. FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO

assistance of the National Center for State Courts to

X. LAWYERS

1.	The Supreme Court's Office of Judicial Administration	
	should examine expansion of current programs that	
	permit lawyers to provide limited advice and assistance	
	to pro se litigants	. 149
2.	The Supreme Court should consider suggesting a number	
	of hours that attorneys are encouraged to voluntarily	•
	devote to pro se litigants, the indigent, and general pro	
	bono work.	. 151
XI.	LEGISLATION AND COURT RULES	
	The Supreme Court should promote legislation or adopt	
	Court Rules to implement the foregoing	
	recommendations	. 154