

# NORTH CAROLINA COURTS

## Statistical and Operational Report



COURT PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

# Court Programs Report

## Table of Contents

July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

- 3 Child custody and visitation mediation
- 6 Drug treatment court
- 9 Family court
- 10 Family financial settlement
- 13 Superior Court mediated settlement conferences
- 16 Court-ordered arbitration
- 19 Clerk's mediation program
- 21 Interpreting services
- 21 Court improvement program

## Child Custody and Visitation Mediation

Pursuant to G.S. 7A-494 and 7B-202, the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (NCAOC) is required to provide statewide, uniform child custody mediation services to assist parents with resolving custody and / or visitation disputes and to provide permanency mediation services in “cases in which a juvenile is alleged or has been adjudicated to be abused, neglected, or dependent, or in which a petition or motion to terminate a parent’s rights has been filed.” These two mandates authorize the operation of both the Child Custody and Visitation Mediation Program and the Permanency Mediation Program.

The Child Custody Mediation Program, first established in 1983, comprises 41 district mediation programs across the state. The Custody Mediation Program provides a professional and neutral third party to help the parties develop a consensual parenting agreement, which when signed by a judge, becomes an order of the court. During state fiscal year (SFY) 2009 – 2010, custody mediators conducted 9,415 mediation sessions and drafted 5,982 parenting agreements, resolving issues in more than 60 percent of the cases sent to mediation.

The Permanency Mediation Program, initially authorized and funded in 2006, was operational in five districts during SFY 2009 – 2010. A trained contract mediator is selected by district officials to conduct the mediation, addressing crucial issues of adjudication, permanency, and provision of services in cases alleging abuse or neglect of children.

During SFY 2009 – 2010, permanency mediators conducted 135 mediation sessions, created 102 case plans for families, and helped provide stability for 211 children.

For more information on these programs, including annual reports, rules and best practices, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Child/Default.asp](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Child/Default.asp)

## Child custody and visitation mediation, caseload by district

District	Caseload information			Cases closed				Agreements			Sessions	
	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases referred (includes new and reopened cases)	Total caseload	Cases closed: Mediated	Cases closed: Not mediated	Total cases closed	End pending (6/30/10)	Agreements drafted (first draft only)	Agreements signed	Consent orders (if known)	# of mediation sessions held	# of third party cases
1	32	207	239	187	24	211	28	117	79	8	194	15
2	16	105	121	76	37	113	8	82	27	26	132	6
3B	36	233	269	150	72	222	47	96	34	3	159	12
4	281	462	743	372	114	486	257	210	109	144	344	28
5	55	593	648	355	246	601	47	174	80	1	357	32
6A	8	110	118	74	31	105	13	54	39	0	93	5
6B	17	75	92	32	32	74	18	25	18	1	47	5
7	8	237	245	126	58	186	59	207	89	20	234	17
8	13	281	294	219	73	292	2	190	118	27	336	19
9	15	133	148	120	20	140	8	68	45	13	158	13
9A	7	59	66	57	5	62	4	32	16	3	69	1
10	130	1,385	1,515	830	594	1,424	91	466	396	5	982	9
11	40	588	628	311	254	565	63	138		0	311	20
12	277	1,231	1,508	449	564	1,013	495	244	176	158	567	23
13	0	385	385	346	21	367	18	304	147	73	350	7
14	41	390	431	192	158	350	81	90	73	18	221	5
15A	31	220	251	195	23	218	33	123	93	5	394	8
15B	2	166	168	159	6	165	3	116	86	19	168	2
16A	0	28	28	25	3	28	0	10	6	0	25	0
16B	5	212	217	175	34	209	8	155	117	50	206	18
17A	12	112	124	91	17	108	16	50	36	0	113	7
17B	33	152	185	162	13	175	10	84	67	0	216	13
18	90	843	939	648	179	827	112	424	318	3	790	33
19A	59	217	276	153	23	176	100	108	91	14	216	0

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

District	Caseload information			Cases closed				Agreements			Sessions	
	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases referred (includes new and reopened cases)	Total caseload	Cases closed: Mediated	Cases closed: Not mediated	Total cases closed	End pending (6/30/10)	Agreements drafted (first draft only)	Agreements signed	Consent orders (if known)	# of mediation sessions held	# of third party cases
19B	20	452	472	296	163	459	13	185	118	59	396	16
19C	80	253	333	231	34	265	68	150	112	7	291	0
20A	39	211	250	142	58	200	50	103	66	2	178	4
20B	11	309	320	173	104	277	43	112	77	2	225	12
21	60	430	490	314	103	417	73	170	110	1	282	17
22A	37	98	135	56	25	81	54	48	22	1	62	0
22B	26	129	155	72	25	97	58	57	31	1	122	0
23	25	204	229	157	36	193	36	95	74	4	242	11
24	50	137	187	122	17	139	48	83	45	32	146	0
25	50	688	738	443	214	657	81	260	141	0	466	24
26	154	1,338	1,492	787	609	1,396	96	492	326	25	829	49
27A	113	213	326	154	41	195	131	95	65	11	222	7
27B	108	185	293	140	40	180	113	4	46	14	185	10
28	216	616	832	387	185	572	260	260	165	18	588	22
29A	6	158	164	109	30	139	25	90	42	3	161	11
29B	9	253	262	183	77	260	2	91	56	47	190	2
30	60	256	316	133	127	260	56	74	15	7	195	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,272</b>	<b>14,354</b>	<b>16,632</b>	<b>9,403</b>	<b>4,489</b>	<b>13,904</b>	<b>2,728</b>	<b>5,936</b>	<b>3,771</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>11,462</b>	<b>488</b>

## Drug Treatment Court

Drug Treatment Court (DTC) is an intensive, judicially supervised court sanction that targets addicted, high-risk and high-need adult offenders, juvenile delinquents, and parents involved in the abuse / neglect / dependency cases. DTC comprises a team of court and community professionals who closely manage cases so that participants can become healthy, law-abiding and productive family and community members. Adult DTC is an intermediate punishment in the community that targets repeat offenders. Family DTC works with parents and guardians who are in danger of parental rights being terminated due to the abuse or neglect of their children. Juvenile DTC works with community-based, high-risk, high-need juvenile offenders whose drug and / or alcohol use is negatively impacting their lives at home, in school and in their community.

Drug treatment court typically lasts a minimum of one year and includes intensive outpatient treatment, frequent and random drug / alcohol testing, intensive case management, and, for adult and juvenile offenders, probation supervision. The DTC participant works with the DTC team of community professionals to develop a single, comprehensive, treatment case plan to address the individual's specific needs in regards to substance abuse, mental health, occupational / vocational, educational, housing, parenting and other areas of concern. Participants appear in court every two weeks before a specially trained judge who monitors the individual's progress on his / her treatment plan and compliance with other court conditions. The judge may order sanctions and / or incentives as appropriate to promote success. In SFY 2009 – 2010 Pitt and New Hanover counties opened a Family Drug Treatment Court and Wake County closed its Juvenile Drug Treatment Court. During SFY 2009 – 2010, 42 adult, family and youth drug treatment courts were operational in 21 districts.

For more information on Drug Treatment Court, including legislative reports, minimum standards and best practices, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/DTC](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/DTC)

## Drug treatment court activity

### Adult sentencing offenders drug treatment court

District – county	Number served	Number of exits	Of exits, percent graduated	Of exits, percent accessed more than six months of treatment
3A – Pitt	43	23	57	83
3B – Carteret	17	10	30	60
3B – Craven	14	6	50	67
5 – New Hanover	109	60	48	78
9A – Person	58	36	47	69
10 – Wake	90	35	40	77
	17	0	0	0
12 – Cumberland	59	27	44	81
13B – Brunswick	62	33	33	70
14 – Durham	50	20	65	95
15B – Orange	40	22	32	68
18 – Guilford	74	39	33	64
18 – High Point	50	28	25	43
19B – Randolph	41	23	22	61
21 – Forsyth	65	37	27	62
24 – Avery	57	35	60	91
25 – Catawba	59	29	31	66
26 – Mecklenburg	51	21	33	57
28 – Buncombe	60	26	54	85
29A – Rutherford	37	15	33	67

### Adult DWI treatment court

District – county	Number served	Number of exits	Of exits, percent graduated	Of exits, percent accessed more than six months of treatment
26 – Mecklenburg	86	33	73	88
	83	31	68	77

### Adult deferred prosecution treatment court

District – county	Number served	Number of exits	Of exits, percent graduated	Of exits, percent accessed more than six months of treatment
26 – Mecklenburg	67	36	42	72
	73	43	60	86

## Family drug treatment court

District – county	Number served	Number of exits	Of exits, percent graduated	Of exits, percent accessed more than six months of treatment
3A – Pitt*	1	0	0	0
5 – New Hanover*	3	0	0	0
6A – Halifax	5	4	50	75
8 – Lenoir	25	14	43	57
8 – Wayne	20	10	30	70
12 – Cumberland	47	22	36	68
14 – Durham	33	12	42	83
15B – Chatham	10	8	25	62
15B – Orange	20	7	14	86
16B – Robeson	40	15	27	73
20B – Union	11	6	50	50
26 – Mecklenburg	72	49	45	65
28 – Buncombe	36	28	50	79

\*Pitt and New Hanover family drug treatment courts were implemented in April 2010.

## Juvenile drug treatment court

District – county	Number served	Number of exits	Of exits, percent graduated	Of exits, percent accessed more than six months of treatment
10 – Wake	27	12	25	83
14 – Durham	28	16	25	81
21 – Forsyth	36	11	45	64
26 – Mecklenburg	50	36	42	67

## Total drug treatment court activity

Type of DTC	Total number served	Total number of exit
Adult	1,093	544
DWI	169	64
Pre-sentencing	140	79
Family	323	185
Juvenile	156	75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,881</b>	<b>947</b>

## Family Court

Directed by Session Law 1998-202 §25, the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (NCAOC) established pilot family court programs in 1999 in three judicial districts to bring consistency, efficiency and fairness to the resolution of family matters and to positively impact caseloads in the district court division. As of June 30, 2010, the General Assembly has funded 13 family court districts that serve 22 counties and 45 percent of North Carolina's population.

Family courts are primarily guided by recommendations in the North Carolina Best Practices for Family Courts (October 2006) and national court performance standards promulgated by the National Center for State Courts. At the core of a Unified Family Court Model is the consolidation of a single family's legal issues before their assigned judge or team of judges. In a family court, one judge, or a team of judges, is assigned to one family. Family court case coordinators provide active case management to monitor and support time standard goals for legal issues or specific hearings / events in the life of a case. The median pending age of cases is an indicator of how quickly domestic lawsuits move through the court system from the filing of the initial legal claim(s) to the disposition of these legal claim(s). For SFY 2009 – 2010, the median age of pending domestic relation cases (excluding child support) was 90 days in Family Court districts as compared to 280 days in non-family court districts.

For more information on Family Court, including annual reports and best practices, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Family/](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Family/)

## Family Financial Settlement (FFS)

In 1997, the General Assembly authorized the design and implementation of a pilot program for pretrial mediation of equitable distribution and other family financial cases (N.C.G.S. §7A-38.4A). The Supreme Court of North Carolina adopted rules on December 30, 1998, which became effective March 1, 1999, for pilot sites to use to implement the program. The Supreme Court revised these rules to make the program mandatory statewide by March 1, 2007.

The Family Financial Settlement Program creates a settlement opportunity for parties and their attorneys who might otherwise fight a protracted court battle over issues of property division, child support or alimony. Parties referred to the program will participate in mediation or another dispute resolution alternative such as early neutral evaluation or judicial settlement procedure. Once a settlement procedure is ordered, the parties and their counsel must attend, unless excused by the court. During mediation, the most commonly used procedure, the parties and their attorneys will sit down with a mediator to discuss and attempt to resolve the issues in dispute. If they are successful, the parties will settle their dispute on their own terms. They will also eliminate the need for their litigation to drag on or to result in a costly and often bitterly-fought trial. Parties who have been victims of domestic violence may be excused by the court from physically attending or participating in a mediated settlement conference or other settlement procedure.

For more information on Family Financial Settlement, including program rules, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/FFS/](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/FFS/)

## Family financial settlement conferences, caseload by district

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases entering family financial settlement			Total cases pending	Resolution of cases attending ADR conference			Cases not attending ADR conference		Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
		Ordered to mediated settlement conference	Ordered to judicial settlement conference	Ordered or submitted or other settlement procedure		Resolved with ADR conference	Partially resolved with ADR conference	Not resolved with ADR conference	Ordered removed from ADR	Disposed without ADR		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	26	0	0	26	0	0	0	1	4	5	21
3A	33	80	0	0	113	30 (57%)	0 (0%)	23 (43%)	2	31	86	27
3B	543	365	0	0	908	45 (57%)	16 (20%)	18 (23%)	27	171	277	631
5	160	310	0	0	470	65 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0	207	273	197
6A	7	11	4	0	22	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	0	3	19	3
8	21	54	1	0	76	24 (62%)	6 (15%)	9 (23%)	0	23	62	14
9	13	23	0	0	36	19 (83%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	0	1	24	12
10	118	246	0	0	364	62 (55%)	9 (8%)	41 (37%)	4	39	155	209
11	13	181	0	0	194	56 (57%)	22 (22%)	21 (21%)	31	35	165	29
12	118	374	124	0	616	25 (22%)	26 (23%)	62 (55%)	50	153	316	300
14	6	20	31	13	70	14 (64%)	2 (9%)	6 (27%)	8	38	68	2
16A	41	37	0	0	78	7 (54%)	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7	6	26	52
17A	9	44	0	0	53	15 (48%)	1 (3%)	15 (48%)	1	9	41	12
18	111	274	1	0	386	71 (76%)	7 (7%)	16 (17%)	3	107	204	182
19B	48	76	62	0	186	53 (70%)	3 (4%)	20 (26%)	2	54	132	54
19C	18	35	0	0	53	18 (51%)	3 (9%)	14 (40%)	0	7	42	11
20A	15	47	0	0	62	26 (90%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	1	13	43	19
24	24	40	15	0	79	18 (60%)	2 (7%)	10 (33%)	0	15	45	34
25	142	181	0	0	323	29 (32%)	6 (7%)	57 (62%)	13	77	182	141
26	423	168	228	0	819	152 (73%)	3 (1%)	53 (25%)	0	76	284	535
27A	68	74	0	0	142	25 (60%)	0 (0%)	17 (40%)	0	48	90	52

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

District	Cases entering family financial settlement				Resolution of cases attending ADR conference				Cases not attending ADR conference		Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Ordered to mediated settlement conference	Ordered to judicial settlement conference	Ordered or submitted or other settlement procedure	Total cases pending	Resolved with ADR conference	Partially resolved with ADR conference	Not resolved with ADR conference	Ordered removed from ADR	Disposed without ADR		
27B	54	124	0	0	178	54 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	69	123	55
28	20	130	0	6	156	25 (69%)	1 (3%)	10 (28%)	0	58	94	62
30	36	79	0	0	115	23 (50%)	5 (11%)	18 (39%)	2	10	58	57
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,041</b>	<b>2,999</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5,525</b>	<b>867 (62%)</b>	<b>117 (8%)</b>	<b>424 (30%)</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>1,254</b>	<b>2,814</b>	<b>2,711</b>

Data not available from districts: 4, 6B, 7, 9A, 13, 15A, 15B, 16B, 17B, 19A, 20B, 21, 22A, 22B, 23, 29A, and 29B.

## Superior Court Mediated Settlement Conference (MSC)

A Mediated Settlement Conference facilitates pre-trial court ordered mediations for civil cases filed in superior court. Pursuant to N.C.G.S. §7A-38.1 and the Supreme Court of North Carolina's Rules Implementing Mediated Settlement Conferences (MSC Rules), referral to mediated settlement is mandatory for civil actions pending in superior court, unless the parties agree to participate in one of the other options available to them through the dispute resolution menu. The only cases excluded from mandatory referral are actions in which a party is seeking the issuance of an extraordinary writ or is appealing the revocation of a motor vehicle operator's license.

For more information on the Mediated Settlement Conference Program, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/MSC/](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/MSC/)

## Mediated settlement conferences, caseload by district

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases entering mediated settlement conference		Resolution of cases attending ADR conference				Cases not attending ADR conference		Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
		Ordered to MSC	Ordered or submitted to other settlement procedure	Total cases pending	Resolved with ADR conference	Partially resolved with ADR conference	Not resolved with ADR conference	Ordered removed from ADR	Disposed without ADR		
1	101	86	14	201	40 (57%)	1 (1%)	29 (41%)	6	33	109	92
2	179	97	0	276	17 (59%)	1 (3%)	11 (38%)	2	57	88	188
3B	432	178	0	610	70 (51%)	0 (0%)	67 (49%)	1	15	153	457
4A	254	98	0	352	15 (47%)	1 (3%)	16 (50%)	0	16	48	304
5	832	413	0	1,245	110 (66%)	0 (0%)	57 (34%)	1	247	415	830
6A	18	26	1	45	15 (65%)	0 (0%)	8 (35%)	0	7	30	15
6B	41	43	1	85	31 (69%)	0 (0%)	14 (31%)	11	12	68	17
7A	180	167	12	359	22 (56%)	10 (26%)	7 (18%)	33	4	76	283
7B	114	189	0	303	60 (53%)	3 (3%)	50 (44%)	11	88	212	91
7C	37	46	1	84	9 (31%)	0 (0%)	20 (69%)	1	17	47	37
8A	15	57	0	72	18 (58%)	0 (0%)	13 (42%)	2	12	45	27
8B	157	286	2	445	38 (54%)	2 (3%)	31 (44%)	2	161	234	211
9	78	156	0	234	53 (63%)	0 (0%)	31 (37%)	0	59	143	91
9A	7	21	0	28	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1	0	11	17
10	355	1,091	0	1,446	300 (58%)	8 (2%)	209 (40%)	24	540	1,081	365
11A	88	173	0	261	63 (54%)	0 (0%)	53 (46%)	5	52	173	88
11B	218	452	4	674	66 (63%)	1 (1%)	38 (36%)	10	402	517	157
12	65	380	0	445	101 (54%)	6 (3%)	79 (42%)	50	135	371	74
13A	386	82	0	468	26 (67%)	1 (3%)	12 (31%)	0	0	39	429
14	261	447	0	708	110 (28%)	64 (16%)	225 (56%)	2	19	420	288
15A	111	163	0	274	25 (28%)	0 (0%)	63 (72%)	27	50	165	109
15B	151	222	6	379	53 (59%)	0 (0%)	37 (41%)	0	70	160	219

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases entering mediated settlement conference		Total cases pending	Resolution of cases attending ADR conference			Cases not attending ADR conference		Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
		Ordered to MSC	Ordered or submitted to other settlement procedure		Resolved with ADR conference	Partially resolved with ADR conference	Not resolved with ADR conference	Ordered removed from ADR	Disposed without ADR		
16A	36	34	0	70	16 (57%)	0 (0%)	12 (43%)	1	23	52	18
17A	36	75	0	111	33 (67%)	0 (0%)	16 - (33%)	1	17	67	44
17B	68	150	0	218	43 (28%)	4 (3%)	104 (69%)	1	0	152	66
19A	117	190	0	307	43 (48%)	1 (1%)	45 (51%)	12	92	193	114
19B	38	168	0	206	35 (42%)	2 (2%)	46 (55%)	9	37	129	77
19C	90	142	0	232	39 (42%)	0 (0%)	54 (58%)	2	55	150	82
19D	275	128	0	403	24 (38%)	20 (32%)	19 (30%)	3	17	83	320
20A	59	98	0	157	29 (48%)	0 (0%)	31 (52%)	1	33	94	63
20B	41	178	0	219	70 (65%)	0 (0%)	37 (35%)	1	21	129	90
21	894	392	8	1,294	126 (54%)	2 (1%)	107 (46%)	1	72	308	986
22A	626	265	42	933	67 (50%)	8 (6%)	58 (44%)	2	74	209	724
22B	430	122	1	553	79 (65%)	31 (26%)	11 (9%)	1	14	136	417
23	54	111	0	165	52 (56%)	1 (1%)	40 (43%)	5	28	126	39
24	59	215	0	274	53 (49%)	2 (2%)	54 (50%)	0	69	178	96
25B	219	240	1	460	59 (50%)	0 (0%)	60 (50%)	13	128	260	200
26	454	1,606	17	2,077	454 (46%)	26 (3%)	499 (51%)	38	430	1,447	630
27A	384	260	0	644	53 (37%)	6 (4%)	84 (59%)	6	39	188	456
27B	30	103	2	135	48 (57%)	5 (6%)	31 (37%)	3	42	129	6
28	348	210	12	570	105 (74%)	21 (15%)	15 (11%)	10	24	175	395
29A	168	121	0	289	20 (67%)	1 (3%)	9 (30%)	3	24	57	232
29B	132	190	6	328	32 (42%)	3 (4%)	42 (55%)	7	71	155	173
30A	122	112	0	234	24 (59%)	0 (0%)	17 (41%)	7	62	110	124
30B	92	128	0	220	21 (39%)	0 (0%)	33 (61%)	1	4	59	161
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,852</b>	<b>10,111</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>19,093</b>	<b>2,772 (50%)</b>	<b>235 (4%)</b>	<b>2,495 (45%)</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>3,372</b>	<b>9,191</b>	<b>9,902</b>

Data not available from districts: 3A, 4B, 13B, 16B, 18, 25A

## Court-Ordered Arbitration

In 1989, following successful experience in a pilot program, the General Assembly authorized court-ordered, non-binding arbitration statewide. In SFY 2009 – 2010, approximately 2,771 cases were arbitrated in 65 counties.

In these counties, civil cases involving claims for money damages of \$15,000 or less are subject to court-ordered, nonbinding arbitration in accordance with the Supreme Court of North Carolina “Rules for Court-Ordered Arbitration in North Carolina,” pursuant to G.S. 7A-37.1. The rules specifically exclude from arbitration certain property disputes, family law matters, estates, special proceedings, collections on an account, and class actions. Parties may, however, voluntarily submit many civil disputes to arbitration, with court approval.

By rule, the arbitration hearing is conducted within 60 days of the filing of the last responsive pleading. Parties may stipulate to an arbitrator; otherwise, the court appoints an arbitrator from its list of trained attorneys who have been approved to serve as arbitrators. An arbitrator is paid a fee by the court for each arbitration hearing.

As a rule, arbitration hearings take place in the courthouse and are limited to one hour. The hearings are conducted in a serious but relaxed atmosphere, with the rules of evidence serving only as a guide. Once the hearing is concluded, the arbitrator renders an award, which is filed with the court. A party dissatisfied with the award may proceed to a trial de novo by filing a written request with the court; otherwise, the court enters judgment on the award.

For more information on Court-Ordered Arbitration, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Arbitration/Default.asp](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Arbitration/Default.asp)

### Court-ordered arbitration, caseload by district

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases ordered to court ordered arbitration		Total cases pending	Cases exiting from arbitration process						
		District court cases ordered to arbitration	Superior court cases ordered to arbitration		Cases scheduled for hearing	Cases exempted from arbitration	Cases arbitrated	Cases dismissed prior to hearing	Cases dismissed prior to entry of judgment	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
1	0	18	0	18	9	5	8	0	0	13	5
3A	5	14	0	19	15	0	7	8	2	15	4
3B	17	57	0	74	54	1	40	15	3	56	18
5	56	140	1	197	193	5	98	41	7	144	53
6A	2	13	0	15	14	0	12	1	0	13	2
8	12	46	0	58	40	1	33	17	3	51	7
10	126	505	0	631	556	14	317	144	133	475	156
12	7	1,244	0	1,251	780	11	304	913	16	1,228	509
13	0	333	0	333	341	0	258	20	0	278	55
14	0	333	0	333	297	7	224	62	8	293	40
15A	0	44	0	44	38	0	33	2	0	35	9
16A	0	14	0	14	11	2	6	2	0	10	4
16B	0	2	1	3	6	1	1	1	0	3	0
17A	6	24	0	30	19	1	16	9	0	26	4
18	16	145	0	161	141	3	109	17	5	129	32
19B	46	136	0	182	161	4	88	27	9	119	63
19C	6	52	0	58	46	0	46	5	2	51	7
20A	15	112	1	128	94	2	78	22	2	102	26
20B	68	200	0	268	191	5	114	88	7	207	61
21	0	202	0	202	154	0	101	55	0	156	46
22A	0	45	0	45	37	0	34	8	3	42	3
22B	0	41	0	41	39	0	30	9	1	39	2

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases ordered to court ordered arbitration			Cases exiting from arbitration process						
		District court cases ordered to arbitration	Superior court cases ordered to arbitration	Total cases pending	Cases scheduled for hearing	Cases exempted from arbitration	Cases arbitrated	Cases dismissed prior to hearing	Cases dismissed prior to entry of judgment	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/10)
23	2	43	0	45	33	0	24	9	0	33	12
24	18	81	0	99	63	7	29	31	2	67	32
25	62	607	0	669	345	1	202	421	1	624	45
26	77	737	0	814	800	11	459	183	89	653	161
27A	25	71	0	96	73	1	38	13	5	52	44
27B	12	72	0	84	66	0	48	24	5	72	12
30	0	39	0	39	29	0	14	0	0	14	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>5,370</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5,951</b>	<b>4,645</b>	<b>82 (1.64%)</b>	<b>2,771 (55.42%)</b>	<b>2,147 (42.94%)</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>1,437</b>

Court-ordered arbitration trial de novo, caseload by district

District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Appeals filed	Trial by judge	Trial by jury	Dismissal / other	End pending (6/30/10)	District	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Appeals filed	Trial by judge	Trial by jury	Dismissal / other	End pending (6/30/10)
1	0	1	1	0	0	0	16A	0	0	0	0	0	0
3A	7	1	0	1	3	4	16B	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B	20	10	3	1	6	20	17A	2	3	3	0	2	0
5	4	17	15	0	3	3	18	12	46	23	0	19	16
6A	1	6	2	0	2	3	19B	3	19	12	1	1	8
8	6	9	7	1	5	2	19C	0	21	18	3	0	0
10	13	71	14	3	45	22	20A	1	18	2	0	9	8
12	7	20	6	0	5	16	20B	14	22	4	0	2	30
13	0	27	11	8	0	8	21	0	15	0	0	0	15
14	0	45	2	0	10	33	22A	0	8	1	0	2	5
15A	0	1	0	0	0	1	22B	0	3	1	0	1	1

Court-ordered arbitration and court-ordered arbitration trial de novo data not available from districts: 15B, 29A and 29B.

## Clerk Mediation Program (CMP)

On May 23, 2005, the General Assembly adopted legislation, N.C.G.S. §7A-38.3B, establishing a mediation program for matters referred to mediation by Clerks of Superior Court. Rules implementing the new legislation were adopted by the Supreme Court of North Carolina, effective March 1, 2006, and the program began to operate. A clerk may refer any eligible matter to mediation, including guardianship, estate, and boundary and partition disputes. Some matters are not eligible for referral, including adoptions and foreclosures.

For more information on the Clerk Mediation Program, including program rules, visit [www.nccourts.org/courts/CRS/Councils/DRC/Clerks/Default.asp](http://www.nccourts.org/courts/CRS/Councils/DRC/Clerks/Default.asp)

## Clerk mediation program, caseload by county

County	Begin pending (7/1/09)	Cases ordered to Mediation			Cases completing mediation					End pending (6/30/10)
		Boundary	Other	Total # of cases	Boundary complete agreement	Boundary Impasse	Boundary settled outside of mediation	Other complete agreement	# of cases completing process	
Ashe	1			1			1		1	0
Avery	2			2					0	2
Caswell	2	1	2	5		1			1	4
Gaston	0	1		1	1				1	0
Wake	0		1	1				1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

No activity was reported for guardianship, estate or boundary cases ordered to mediation; results for guardianship cases that completed mediation; results for estate cases that completed mediation; boundary cases that had partial agreement; other cases that had partial agreement, reached an impasse, or were settled outside of mediation.

29 counties reported no clerk mediation program (CMP) activity: Burke, Caldwell, Camden, Chowan, Cleveland, Columbus, Davidson, Duplin, Franklin, Granville, Greene, Halifax, Harnett, Hyde, Johnston, Lenoir, Mitchell, Montgomery, Moore, Onslow, Orange, Randolph, Sampson, Stanly, Swain, Tyrrell, Washington, Wayne, Yadkin. The remaining 34 counties made no report on CMP activity.

## Interpreting Services

The purpose of Interpreting Services is to facilitate access to justice in North Carolina courts for non-English speaking persons, with a particular emphasis on the state's sizeable Hispanic / Latino population. The program strives to meet the needs of the court and non-English speakers statewide by providing staff court interpreters (for Spanish language) in eight districts and, an easily accessible online Spanish Foreign Language Registry of NCAOC-registered contract court interpreters for Spanish language interpreting needs, coordinating the assignment of foreign language interpreters for languages other than Spanish, and providing a link to the regional lists of licensed interpreters maintained by the Division of Services for the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing in the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services.

The program is involved in the development of policy and guidelines for interpreters, advising the courts on the proper use of interpreters, training court officials on cultural and interpreting issues, and translating court forms. During SFY 2009 – 2010, the program trained more than 105 prospective court interpreters on the code of ethics and professionalism required of the court interpreter and provided skills-building workshops to those who qualified to sit for the North Carolina Court Interpreter Certification Examination (NCCICE). Eighty-two Spanish court interpreters work throughout the state.

North Carolina is one of 40 member states of the National Center for State Courts' Consortium for Language Access in the Courts (CLAC). Interpreting Services administers the CLAC's oral proficiency examination as the NCCICE in all languages for which CLAC offers an examination.

For more information on Interpreting Services, including policies and training information, visit [www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Foreign/Interpreters/Default.asp](http://www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Foreign/Interpreters/Default.asp)

## Court Improvement Program

The North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (NCAOC) began using federal funds in 1995 to improve the performance of North Carolina's juvenile courts in abuse and neglect cases to achieve safety, permanence and wellbeing for children in a fair and timely manner. Funds are used for local court improvement projects, conducting assessments, coordinating training, supporting and cosponsoring comprehensive skills-based training for judges and attorneys, improving technology, and providing technical assistance.

In SFY 2009 – 2010 six district courts (1, 15A, 17B, 19A, 21, 22A) received federal funds for staff to provide case management activities and training. These districts focus on implementing best practices in juvenile court, including one judge-one family case assignment, child planning conferences, and shared decision making. During this period, more than 600 judges, juvenile court clerks, child welfare professionals, child advocates and attorneys for all parties in juvenile abuse / neglect / dependency and termination of parental rights proceedings participated in state, regional and district level trainings to improve their knowledge of juvenile law, best child welfare practices and court procedures.

Prepared by



NORTH CAROLINA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
*of the* COURTS

Court Programs and Management Services

919 890-1200

[nccourts.org](http://nccourts.org)