

# **Trial Court Funding Commission Solution Workgroups Responses**

11.29.18





**PUBLIC SECTOR  
CONSULTANTS**

*Prepared by*

Public Sector Consultants  
Lansing, Michigan  
[www.publicsectorconsultants.com](http://www.publicsectorconsultants.com)

*Prepared for*

Michigan Department of Treasury  
Lansing, Michigan  
<https://www.michigan.gov/treasury/>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TRANSFORMATIVE MODEL FOR MICHIGAN COURTS - RESPONSES</b> .....	4
Grouped Idea #1 .....	4
Grouped Idea #2 .....	6
Grouped Idea #3 .....	7
Standalone Ideas .....	8
<b>ESTABLISH ETHICAL, LOGICAL, AND SUSTAINABLE COURT FUNDING MODEL - RESPONSES</b> .....	11
Grouped Idea #1 .....	11
Grouped Idea #2 .....	12
Grouped Idea #3 .....	13
Grouped Idea #4 .....	14
Grouped Idea #5 .....	15
Grouped Idea #6 .....	16
Standalone Ideas .....	17
<b>ACTION AREAS (RESULTS COMBINED FROM WORKGROUPS)</b> .....	19
Preserve and Enhance Judicial Independence .....	19
Address Systemic Issues That Burden the Court .....	20
Focus on Actionable Outcomes .....	21
Educate Stakeholders and the Public .....	21

# TRANSFORMATIVE MODEL FOR MICHIGAN COURTS - RESPONSES

## GROUPED IDEA #1

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short- term	Medium-term	Long-term
A. State provides centralized collections	3.83	2.33	2	2	2
B. Simplify collections remittance functions	3.17	2.33	4	1	1
C. Centralized collection by the state	3.83	2.33	1	3	2
D. Remove collection by the state	1.5	2.33	3	2	1
E. Centralize and standardize collection fines, fees, and costs with state	3.67	2.17	1	4	2
F. Centralize collections of court collections/assessments with state	3.83	2.33	2	3	1
G. Centralize receipts and disbursements	3.17	2.17	1	4	1
H. Separate court from business functions: define	3.17	1.83	0	4	2
I. Take unrelated activity out of the court - centralize	3.17	1.83	0	4	2

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Centralize collections and court business functions.

Consolidate fine/fee collection operations throughout the State

Centralize court business that promotes efficiency

Michigan Trial Court Operational Efficiency Reforms

Centralize collections and disbursement of funds.

Consolidation of core services

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

In order to improve Court operational efficacy consolidate the collection processes into a single state wide system. The goal is to allow our courts to focus on administering justice as opposed to being a collection agency.

A variety of court business functions can be performed centrally that would reduce cost, promote efficiency and with respect to collections, would eliminate the ethical dilemma of judges being incentivized to maximize revenue from parties to support their budgets. This would build public confidence in the impartiality of the justice system.





Efficiency in the overall operation of the court system can be enhanced by focusing on specialization of core business functions of the court. Even within local court systems, each court operates its own collection function rather than by court system. Much efficiency, best practices and one stop court customer service could be achieved through a more focused effort on specialization. The only way to realize this is from a mandate from the Supreme Court or legislation that requires this focused specialization of the business functions of the court. An element of the centralized collection process is to standardize fees, costs and fines. That is one of the elements of the Cunningham decision to have the legislature establish the fees and costs.

Creating a centralized system within the state that handles the collection functions of the court. In turn, also creating a centralized and standard method to determine fines, fees and costs that are imposed on a litigant. This system would separate the business aspect of the court function; creating a centralized system.

Collections, receipts, and disbursements will be standardized by providing a centralized State managed business function. The State will collect all fines, fees, and costs assessed by the courts, and disburse them as directed by statutes (i.e. DNA fees, and Crime victims rights fees).

## GROUPED IDEA #2

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short- term	Medium-term	Long-term
A. Mandate central records management court administration system	3.57	2.14	0	7	0
B. Develop plan to centralize IT statewide	3.29	2.14	2	3	2
C. Centralize technology services	3.57	2.29	0	6	1

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Centralized court technology services

Automated and centralized records management into a statewide system.

Virtual unification through technology

Centralized Services

Statewide Managed Technology Tools for Michigan Trial Courts

Centralized case management systems.

Records Management and Retention

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

Create a system that provides a centralized court record management and administration system. This system would include all IT.

To make a common system to consolidate court records management. Create a system to allow for real time retrieval of all records required by administrators to perform their duties.

By providing for the technology needs of the trial courts, Michigan's One Court of Justice can be made a reality that would reduce cost and increase efficiency and access to justice. This would promote uniformity in practice across the State along with reducing demands on staff in the trial courts to provide data to the State Court Administrative Office.

#### Centralize services

In order to provide a uniform experience for all Michigan court users, there must be a standard of resources for users to expect when interacting in any Michigan court. In addition, in order to provide uniformity in reporting and understanding court performance across all communities, there must be standard technology platform for all courts to operate within. There remains many different court computer operating systems and reporting is both inconsistent and inefficient due to the different systems. The manner to solve this is for the state to lead in the arena of technology to ensure equity in resources in all courts.

The State will provide a unified case management system to each court, which will support consistent case processing state-wide. The State should provide an electronic document management system because many courts that don't have the resources to secure adequate systems. The logistics have having the state provide all IT services needs to be clarified for me.

### GROUPED IDEA #3

	Priority Average	Practicalit y Average	Short- term	Medium- term	Long- term
A. Make judges state employees	3.67	3.83	5	0	1
B. Make court administrators and probate registers state employees	3.5	3	2	2	2
C. Unify employee salary and benefits	2.83	2	0	2	3
D. Single statewide payroll/employment/compensation system	3.33	2.83	1	2	3
E. Uniformity of judicial employment	3.33	3	2	2	2
F. Uniform employment structures	2.67	1.83	0	2	4
G. Minimum standard for training and conduct	3.33	3	2	2	2

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Single statewide court employment system

Standardize employment practices in the judiciary

Uniform State Court Services

Unified Michigan Court Organization

Make judges and court administrators state employees and develop uniform employment structures.

Employment Consolidation

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

This system would create a statewide court system. This system would provide for uniform compensation; wages and benefits. Standardized training and employment structures would be provided.

The trial courts as a key component of Michigan's One Court of Justice should be state employees to reduce the burden on local government, discourage the use of the courts to fund local government and to promote uniformity.

**Make Courts one Court if Justice**

As the other recommendations are considered, it is logical to think of one court of justice and from a organizational theory perspective, all court employees should be under a single employer and not like the manner that is in place today throughout the state. Employees are compensated under a vast array of standards and based on resources of each local unit of government. This results in a myriad of challenges and essentially no uniformity of court employees across the state. Think of it this way, does the DHHS have its employee's compensation determined at the local level where offices are located? No. And it makes no sense for the Court system to operate and have a structure the way it is assembled today.

By providing a single statewide employment structure for judges and court administrators, there will be consistency. I have difficulty expounding on the remaining ideas because I don't believe we should unify employee salary and benefits.

**STANDALONE IDEAS**

Define the following standalone idea (between 2 and 4 sentences).

**A. Provide uniform security**

Priority Average: 2.8

Practicality Average: 2.6

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
1	2	2

Establish minimum standards for providing security in the trial courts.

Provide a standard of security measures that should be in place at every location where court operations take place. The standards would have a cost sharing element in order to support equitable and uniform security measures across all courts.

Each court should have the same protections for judges and staff. A statute provides a sheriff should be present in court when a court is in session.

Fund statewide security for all courts, not just constitutionally mandated courts.



## B. Regionalize court systems = efficiency

Priority Average: 3.33

Practicality Average: 2.0

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
2	2	2

This system would provide a inform standard. This would include employment, IT and business related functions of the court. Ideally this would create an efficient system.

Promote better access to justice and the efficient use of judicial resources by sharing work across traditional jurisdictional lines.

Provide chief judges and court administrators who would oversee a similar geographic, case volume or population based number of courts. This would provide a level of uniformity across regions instead of differences between counties. Such a structure may be a precursor to a full state leadership role over all courts.

Similar to what is done in specialty courts, have courts in contiguous counties delegate certain case types to be heard in certain courts.

Create streamlined processes to allow sharing of judicial resources regionally. Perhaps include financial incentives to prompt participation and not sap the Judges that are team players all the time.

## C. Share best practices (from scrubbed data)

Priority Average: 3.67

Practicality Average: 3.33

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
6	0	0

Identify court practices that are efficient and effective and share them with all other courts.

What is working in one court or courts must be implemented in others. Sharing the best practice data should encourage the adoption of the practice across other courts to achieve higher outcomes based on the tried and known practices of other courts who have had success.

Include MJI to create a mechanism to distribute and train best practices.

## D. Identify and put a price tag on all court functions that are uniform and consistent

Priority Average: 3.6

Practicality Average: 2.6

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
2	3	0

Standardize IT and collections as it relates to the court system. This would be a known cost without variation.

I think this is to quantify the value of having these functions administered by the state. Central collections and technology. The price tag will help support the initiative of change in the recommendations.

Collections, Friend of the Court.

### **E. Institute efficient review processes to help track outcomes**

Priority Average: 2.8

Practicality Average: 2.0

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
0	3	2

A system that measures outcomes. Collection as well as employment related issues.

Do not know the basis for the idea.

### **F. Provide more interjurisdictional coordination for access**

Priority Average: 3.4

Practicality Average: 2.8

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
0	5	0

Access to justice for all counties / courts. Each court is able to provide the same problem solving courts.

Do not know the basis for the idea.

Similar to the practice of having judges sit by assignment in different courts, (i.e. probate court judges handling circuit court family division matters)

### **G. Ensure uniformity of systems, data, and measurements (Note: Move budgeting only to the other group)**

Priority Average: 3.0

Practicality Average: 1.8

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
0	2	3

Standard IT system. This would provide consistent data intake across the state. Outcomes can be measured.

Justice Young previously provided reporting that the court operate on many different computer systems and most of them do not share data. This makes for cumbersome and very inefficient operations when it comes to court reporting on outcomes, etc.

## H. Direct a percentage of fines/costs to central funding unit

Priority Average: 3.4

Practicality Average: 2.2

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
1	4	0

Take the collection process out of the court. Centralized funding unit would disperse funds.

Whether, and to what extent, fines and costs collected by a court should be shared with the local funding unit and the state.

All costs that are assessed to defendants should be remitted to the local funding unit as the entity providing the resources to pay for court operations. The costs are a reimbursement of costs that are incurred to operate the court. Similar to inmates being charged room and board for incarceration.

## ESTABLISH ETHICAL, LOGICAL, AND SUSTAINABLE COURT FUNDING MODEL - RESPONSES

### GROUPED IDEA #1

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
A. Court revenues stay in court: court revenues utilized for courts	3.25	3	3	1	0
B. Protect court dollars for court	3.5	3.25	3	1	0

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Preservation of Court Generated Revenues

Dedicated Court Funding Stabilization Plan

Sustainable Court Funding

Pool and protect court dollars for courts

Courts should not be used to generate revenue

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

Sources of the funding should include fees, costs, fines, filing fees, motion fees and other taxable costs collected by the Courts for use in the judicial system and not be used for extraneous systems [i.e. the library] nor for non-court-related activities. However, the money should go to the state general fund or to a centralized agency versus being used to directly fund the court that generated the particular income item.

The fines and costs allowed pursuant to state law, that are assessed and collected, by the court shall be used to fund the state courts' budgets. The amount of each court's budget shall include, but shall not be limited by the amount of case related income is generated. Each court shall be guaranteed appropriate funding to include, but not limited, to the amount necessary for personnel, programming, technology and operations, building and maintenance,

Develop a system where funding for the courts is predictable, sustainable, and sufficient.

As the current structure of court revenues, some revenues from counties goes back to the state and some stay with the county to fund courts. The percentage going back to the state should not be greater than what is funded by the state. Restructure court dollars and state dollars.

I do not agree with the premise of these ideas. We are conflating two separate concepts. The first is that the courts should not be used to generate revenue (i.e., state minimum fee and crime victims assessment). I agree the courts should not be used to generate revenue. The second concept is denying courts a profit motive. In my view this second idea trumps the first. Since Michigan's original constitution in 1835, policy makers have sought to reduce courts motives for generating revenue. The method chosen was to send all penal fines to the public libraries. We should not abandon this safeguard.

The TCFC has work to do in understanding these two distinct concepts. The way it articulated here will make the problem WORSE. I strongly object!

**GROUPED IDEA #2**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
A. Eliminate state surplus from court operations	3.8	2	3	2	0
B. State should not make money from courts	3.2	2	3	2	0

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Ethical, Logical and Sustainable Court Funding

Courts

Courts should not be a state profit center

Restructure state process for court revenues

Courts should not be used to generate revenue

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

This is not the issue to me - rather it is the outcome. Monies generated should be collected by a central agency [i.e. the general fund] and expenditures to pay for the court system should be supported by general fund monies versus putting the onus on the courts to raise money to sustain their revenues and pay their expenses.

The purpose of fines and costs is to encourage the general public to follow state and local statutes and ordinances. If an individual fails to comply with a particular law or statute the court's authority to assess fines and costs is designed to punish that individual or entity and to deter future illegal activity. A court should not be concerned whether the fines and costs it is assessing will be adequate to fund the court and/or outside entities that currently receive a portion of the money assessed and collected. The money generated by the courts is an unintended consequence of its enforcement powers and should not be used as a dedicated revenue stream to fund non-court activities.

The State should not reap the reward of court revenue. Excess court revenues should be committed to the operations of the courts including establishing a stabilization fund as a part of establishing a sustainable court funding system.

As the current structure of court revenues, some revenues from counties go back to the state and some stay with the county to fund courts. The percentage going back to the state should not be greater than what is funded by the state. Restructure court dollars and state dollars. I feel this is basically the same idea as Protecting Court dollars for courts.

This is a more narrow/targeted statement of the first. The term "state surplus" is confusing. It adds nothing to the discussion. We need to focus on courts not being used to generate revenue. The idea conveyed here is to stop the assessment of state minimum costs and the CVR (especially in non-victim cases).

**GROUPED IDEA #3**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium- term	Long-term
A. Create a single trial court restricted fund	2.5	2.25	1	3	2
B. Equity funding from state based on need	3.25	2.5	0	5	0
C. Allocate new state investment by case weight	2.75	2.0	1	3	1

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Centralize Revenue Collections

State Trial Court Fund

Establish logical court funding

Revamping Court Funding

All courts should be adequately funded based on operational need



**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

Again, a centralized fund such collect all revenues and use them to pay the trial courts' operations. The manner and method of doing this is a goal we are still working on.

Based upon a combination of the number of judges sitting within the jurisdiction, its case load, the population within the jurisdiction and the geographic size of the jurisdiction each court of this state shall receive guaranteed funding.

Develop a system that allocates funding for courts in a logical manner. Eliminate the current system of complicated and confusing allocations and distributions/receipts of court revenue.

The first two grouped ideas will be a result of how we consider revamping court funding. Once it has been determined how to create a single trial court funding process, by need and by case weight, that part of our commission goal will be complete.

Courts should be funded based on operational need. The judiciary is a co-equal branch of government and as such must be adequately funded. Trial court funding and, therefore, services vary widely across the state. The result of inequity in funding is both disparity in services provided and sanctions imposed. Fundamental principles of due process and equal protection require more uniformity in trial court resources.

**GROUPED IDEA #4**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium- term	Long-term
A. State pay for all technology needs	4.0	2.6	1	3	1
B. State funds technology--> = Equitable	3.8	2.8	2	3	0

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Centralized & Standardized Court Technology

Court Technology Fund

Establish consistency and efficiency in court operations

Establish uniform state funded technology needs

One court of justice should begin with data management

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

The state should at the very least establish specific standards for technology needs and requirements and require each trial court to utilize the systems and/or software necessary to accomplish the goals set.

Each court shall apply and receive the funds necessary to install, upgrade and maintain the technology necessary to run the court. The Court Technology fund shall also provide to all courts any and all technology that is necessary to create a unified system throughout the state.

As a part of the new funding model, the State should bear the cost of all technology mandates. In the end, this should create efficiencies and a better working court model to further improve the court system.

This group will tackle the how to establish the financing for a uniform state funded system that will simplify current processes and flow of revenues.

The 1963 Michigan Constitution declares [t]he judicial power of the state is vested exclusively in one court of justice . . . . Local court funding is the single largest reason we don't really have one court of justice. The resulting fractured court system violates fundamental principles of due process and equal protection. We should take tangible steps toward the 1963 aspiration of one court. State mandated case management and data collection is a perfect place to start.

## GROUPED IDEA #5

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short- term	Medium- term	Long- term
A. Tie state funding to suggested reforms/benchmarks: investing for outcomes	2.5	1.8	1	0	3
B. More state funding	4.0	1.6	2	3	0
C. Fund specialty courts with recreational marijuana, tax receipts	2.6	2.75	1	3	0
D. Invest excess use tax by dedicating to court funding (PPT/EMPP Reimbursement)	2.2	2.0	0	2	1
E. Child care fund-100 percent state funded	3.6	2.2	2	1	1
F. Allocate additional state shared revenue to courts (state revenue sharing)	2.2	2.0	1	0	2

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Non-Court Generated Revenue Sources

Continue to refine the funding model

Reform current court processes, revenue streams, and funding sources

Reform must address financial incentives and disincentives

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

What sources of funding are necessary to support the trial courts over and above the monies generated by the court system itself.

In order to establish a sustainable court funding model, details of programs and funding sources need to be discussed and adopted. These ideas appear to be the "details" that would need to be decided as a result of establishing the new model.

This is a plethora of ideas to work towards our goal of setting up an ethical, logical, sustainable court funding model. We still need to tie it all back to the purpose of our commission.

Trial Court funding must be stable and meet the courts basic operational needs. 46th Circuit Trial Court v County of Crawford, et al (2006). The existing inequity in trial court funding evidenced in the TCFC report demonstrates that the state must intervene to assure due process and equal protection. While the source of the funds is a legislative determination, the existing inequity cannot be allowed to continue.

## GROUPED IDEA #6

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium- term	Long-term
A. Uniformity in range for fines, fees, and costs: return to other workgroup	3.4	2.0	3	1	0
B. Consistent/uniform assessment of fines/costs: return to other workgroup	3.0	2.0	3	1	0
C. Develop policy for distribution of collections (court) on an equitable basis with local: court costs, fines, fees	3.6	2.8	3	2	0

**Provide a title that summarizes this group of ideas (3 to 7 words).**

Standardization of Court Assessed Penalties

Equitable Fines and Costs

Consistent application of revenue procedures.

Setting up the model for Sustainable Court Funding

Justice mandates state system for setting & collecting fines/costs

**Define the group of ideas (between 3 and 6 sentences).**

We need to eliminate the need to have the Courts fund its operations and standardizes fines, fees and costs to prevent judicial and/or government abuse of the system.

When assessing fines and cost a court shall consider the specific circumstances in reference to the matter pending before the court. Court fines and cost shall be based upon an individual's ability to pay

An important component of a logical court funding model is for the courts to "play by the same rule". Thus, having uniformity and consistency for revenue generation and distribution is critical to establishing a system that is perceived as fair for all involved.

This group is setting up the model or structure and the other group is setting up the how to part of the model.

The existing inequity in trial court funding evidenced in the TCFC report demonstrates that the state must intervene to assure due process and equal protection. While the source of the funds is a legislative determination, the existing inequity cannot be allowed to continue. The judiciary is a co-equal branch of government and as such must be adequately funded. Establishment of a uniform system of fines, costs and fees will begin to address these inequities. This system must address existing incentives to generate revenue for court operations through assessments on litigants.

## STANDALONE IDEAS

Define the following standalone idea (between 2 and 4 sentences).

### A. Identify all funding sources

Priority Average: 2.67

Practicality Average: 2.33

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
3	0	0

Simplify, standardize and determine the sources of revenues available and needed to have an "ethical, logical and sustainable funding system.

In order to develop an effective court funding model, it is imperative to know the current funding sources.

List all possible funding revenue sources

TCFC will have this done

### B. Keep local money local while leveraging state investment

Priority Average: 2.67

Practicality Average: 2.0

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
1	2	0

The centralized funding of the trial court system preempts this notion in my mind. However, having local fees, costs and fines be used for non-court related activities needs to be stopped.

Stop sending locally-generated revenue to other functions of the state.

Restructure the money

This is a bad idea

### C. Provide no additional funding from local funding units

Priority Average: 2.75

Practicality Average: 2.0

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
2	2	0

To me the question is what personnel or services, if any should the local funding units provide?

The perception that the locals are paying enough for court services.

Reform funding from local to state

The 1963 Michigan Constitution declares [t]he judicial power of the state is vested exclusively in one court of justice ....Local court funding is the single largest reason we don't really have one court of

justice. The resulting fractured court system violates fundamental principles of due process and equal protection. We should take tangible steps toward the 1963 aspiration of one court. The state must create and fund a system that balances expenditures fairly across the state.

#### **D. Offer state grants for access to justice programs**

Priority Average: 2.0

Practicality Average: 2.33

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
0	3	0

Grants should be for specialty courts or to diminish state funding demands for a centralized system.

More money is good.

Look at current and possible future state grant opportunities

Long term equity will not be found in a grant-based system

#### **E. Disconnect revenue from expenditures to ensure due process**

Priority Average: 3.0

Practicality Average: 2.5

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
3	1	0

This statement says it all and is a fundamental ethical consideration.

A critical concept to having an ethical judicial process. Should be accomplished quickly if a sustainable court funding model is adopted.

Part of restructuring state and local funding

Due process and equal protection mandate an impartial judge in each and every case. The judge is not impartial (or, at least, fails the appearance of impartiality standard) when he/she is responsible for assessing and collecting funds to operate the court properly. We must break the corrupting link between court revenue and court expenditures.

#### **F. Establish uniformity of budgeting (Note: Issue was split and sent from other group)**

Priority Average: 2.25

Practicality Average: 2.25

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
1	3	0

Self-explanatory but the courts have to identify and prepare budgets and stick to them.

Consistency should help when addressing the fairness or inequities of a new model.



Not sure

Courts should be funded based on operational need. The judiciary is a co-equal branch of government and as such must be adequately funded. Trial court funding and, therefore, services vary widely across the state. The result of inequity in funding is both disparity in services provided and sanctions imposed. Fundamental principles of due process and equal protection require more uniformity in trial court resources.

### **G. Include grant money for capital improvement to create more uniformity in court facility**

Priority Average: 2.0

Practicality Average: 2.33

Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
1	2	0

This depends on what the grant designates it can be used for.

More money is good.

Look for grant opportunities for capital improvement to create uniform court facilities

Long term equity will not be found in a grant-based system

## **ACTION AREAS (RESULTS COMBINED FROM WORKGROUPS)**

### **PRESERVE AND ENHANCE JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE**

#### **A. Transition to a system where fines, costs, fees, and assessments are limited to court-related functions**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.67	1.5	2	2	2
Ethical Workgroup	4.0	1.6	2	3	0

#### **B. Provide presumptive bonds for those awaiting trial**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.0	3.5	4	1	1
Ethical Workgroup	3.0	2.75	2	3	0

**C. Eliminate an assessment that benefits other entities**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.67	1.83	0	3	2
Ethical Workgroup	3.75	1.5	0	3	1

**D. Maintenance of discretion**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.67	2.5	6	0	0
Ethical Workgroup	3.80	3.0	4	1	0

**E. Impose fewer mandated sentences**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.0	1.83	3	1	1
Ethical Workgroup	2.75	2.75	1	3	0

**ADDRESS SYSTEMIC ISSUES THAT BURDEN THE COURT****F. Fix the mental health system**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.71	1.43	1	3	3
Ethical Workgroup	3.5	1.0	0	1	3

**G. Invest in evidence-based crime reduction strategies linked to specialty courts**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.0	2.33	1	5	1
Ethical Workgroup	3.0	2.75	0	3	1

**H. Eliminate cash bails**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	2.86	2.86	5	1	1
Ethical Workgroup	2.0	3.5	2	2	0

## **I. Adopt recommendations from the TCFC**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.29	2.57	3	1	2
Ethical Workgroup	4.0	3.2	3	2	0

## **J. Give court discretion to adjust fees, fines, and costs based upon ability to pay**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	1.42	2.67	3	3	1
Ethical Workgroup	3.6	3.4	3	2	0

## **FOCUS ON ACTIONABLE OUTCOMES**

### **K. Adopt court rules to facilitate changes**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.86	2.42	3	1	2
Ethical Workgroup	3.60	2.40	3	2	0

### **L. Create more problem-solving courts**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.14	2.29	2	2	2
Ethical Workgroup	3.0	3.0	0	3	1

## **EDUCATE STAKEHOLDERS AND THE PUBLIC**

### **M. Provide ombudsman/citizen advisory board(s)**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	1.71	2.57	2	3	2
Ethical Workgroup	1.6	2.2	2	2	1

### **N. Educate judiciary and court staff**

	Priority Average	Practicality Average	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Transformative Workgroup	3.28	2.57	5	1	1
Ethical Workgroup	3.60	3.0	4	1	0

## **O. Educate legislators and stakeholders**

	<b>Priority Average</b>	<b>Practicality Average</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Medium-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Transformative Workgroup	3.85	2.42	5	1	1
Ethical Workgroup	4.0	2.6	4	1	0



**PUBLIC SECTOR  
CONSULTANTS**

---

230 N. Washington Square  
Suite 300  
Lansing, MI 48933



