



NORTH CAROLINA COURTS

Statistical and Operational Report

COURT PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Court Programs Report

Table of Contents

July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

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
20	Clerk's Mediation Program
22	Interpreting Services
22	Court Improvement Program

Child Custody and Visitation Mediation and Permanency Mediation

In 1989, the General Assembly enacted G.S. 7A-494 requiring the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (NCAOC) to provide statewide, uniform child custody mediation services to assist parents in the resolution of custody and / or visitation lawsuits. The Custody Mediation Program provides a confidential and non-adversarial setting where parents meet with a professional mediator who is neutral to the outcome of their dispute. The mediator structures and facilitates a collaborative process that fosters a productive exchange of information. As a result, parents are afforded the opportunity to design a Parenting Agreement which is incorporated into a court order, sparing the family from the stress and anxiety of extended litigation.

Currently 41 of 42 districts offer custody mediation. During FY 2011 – 12, mediators conducted 11,205 mediation sessions and drafted 5,945 parenting agreements. Almost 10,000 custody cases were mediated and 18,408 people attended custody mediation orientation.

In 2006, the General Assembly enacted G.S. 7B-202 authorizing the NCAOC to establish in phases a statewide permanency mediation program 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. Goals for the program include the permanent placement of children in a timely manner within the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) guidelines, improving the participants understanding of the nature and purpose of the proceeding, as well as a reduction in the number and length of court hearings and a decline of re-litigation. Mediators are contract employees and utilize a co-mediation model.

Child Custody and Visitation Mediation, Caseload by District

District	Caseload information				Sessions				Agreements drafted			Cases mediated and closed				
	Initial custody cases filed FY 11/12*	Begin year pending (7/1/2011)	Initial custody mediation cases opened	Returning custody mediation cases opened**	Total caseload	Number of people attended orientation	Number of first mediation sessions	Number of subsequent mediation sessions	Number of full parenting agreements drafted	Number of temporary parenting agreements drafted	Number of partial parenting agreements drafted	Number of cases mediated and closed with parenting agreement	Number of cases mediated and closed with no agreement	Number of cases not mediated***	Total cases closed	End year pending caseload (6/30/2012)
1	212	35	186	47	268	271	164	15	93	0	5	87	85	51	223	45
2	119	4	96	1	101	162	67	6	39	0	0	17	47	28	92	9
3A	245	5	115	17	137	224	112	14	50	8	2	33	69	17	119	18
3B	348	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	611	179	343	34	556	601	287	23	112	20	10	60	238	62	360	196
5	501	77	463	127	667	640	329	11	135	6	14	73	280	257	610	57
6A	83	15	77	10	102	140	72	11	46	1	0	38	35	18	91	11
6B	73	25	81	4	110	108	50	5	29	0	0	29	28	29	86	24
7	370	102	198	2	302	361	152	1	121	0	0	78	54	17	149	153
8	396	32	193	65	290	378	183	0	116	3	0	76	99	39	214	76
9	258	12	141	13	166	237	109	13	50	12	1	39	62	20	121	45
9A	96	6	50	3	59	89	42	3	18	5	0	13	19	5	37	22
10	1,281	58	1,235	484	1,777	1,691	979	233	488	34	0	357	602	692	1,651	126
11	624	48	375	128	551	699	332	15	111	22	8	0	189	125	314	237
12	1,087	284	1,077	300	1,661	1,273	676	43	363	1	39	283	388	717	1,388	273
13	366	7	224	78	309	344	220	1	153	0	0	63	140	38	241	68
14	306	79	253	89	421	415	217	15	102	11	4	90	122	102	314	107
15A	236	33	116	64	213	227	169	24	94	0	1	101	76	11	188	25
15B	201	44	72	15	131	120	68	24	36	2	6	19	38	11	68	63
16A	130	4	60	5	69	111	55	1	23	0	3	13	40	4	57	12
16B	270	9	236	22	267	375	172	22	110	0	0	73	98	54	225	42
17A	174	15	93	31	139	161	109	2	48	0	0	40	64	17	121	18
17B	218	21	133	65	219	238	168	2	89	0	0	69	91	20	180	39
18	815	103	561	354	1,018	999	773	79	374	111	20	404	359	121	884	134

Continued on next page

Child Custody and Visitation Mediation, Caseload by District

District	Caseload information				Sessions				Agreements drafted			Cases mediated and closed				
	Initial custody cases filed FY 11/12*	Begin year pending (7/1/2011)	Initial custody mediation cases opened	Returning custody mediation cases opened**	Total caseload	Number of people attended orientation	Number of first mediation sessions	Number of subsequent mediation sessions	Number of full parenting agreements drafted	Number of temporary parenting agreements drafted	Number of partial parenting agreements drafted	Number of cases mediated and closed with parenting agreement	Number of cases mediated and closed with no agreement	Number of cases not mediated***	Total cases closed	End year pending caseload (6/30/2012)
19A	341	97	155	71	323	320	202	62	106	16	1	104	94	14	212	111
19B	498	45	391	93	529	676	364	35	226	14	0	129	214	124	467	62
19C	257	75	179	51	305	347	221	49	110	23	2	99	132	13	244	61
20A	236	18	188	51	257	329	182	8	121	9	1	91	84	57	232	25
20B	359	26	310	113	449	424	252	21	139	16	2	113	135	154	402	47
21	534	65	348	80	493	621	325	25	187	1	1	114	198	102	414	79
22A	353	47	116	6	169	169	80	0	40	0	0	15	56	56	127	42
22B	390	58	150	22	230	257	129	1	59	0	0	29	91	44	164	66
23	266	20	195	59	274	382	205	19	115	4	1	103	96	47	246	28
24	154	61	113	15	189	208	106	17	59	19	4	27	74	14	115	74
25	720	56	498	214	768	863	478	19	260	4	1	163	307	236	706	62
26	1,818	127	972	599	1,698	1,295	823	29	417	30	28	335	494	703	1,532	166
27A	419	60	173	49	282	328	194	30	78	10	0	71	123	30	224	58
27B	374	76	210	28	314	398	195	24	72	12	0	60	135	42	237	77
28	461	267	433	251	951	861	418	60	219	70	10	233	197	247	677	274
29A	225	24	200	38	262	349	171	19	82	27	6	70	104	66	240	22
29B	261	1	198	33	232	313	153	34	73	0	0	26	142	43	211	21
30	332	35	226	24	285	404	167	20	73	1	0	28	133	80	241	44
Total	17,018	2,355	11,433	3,755	17,543	18,408	10,170	1,035	5,236	492	170	3,865	6,032	4,527	14,424	3,119

*Any complaint or counterclaim filed for custody or visitation in FY 11/12. Only one claim per case is counted.

**Custody/visitation issues that come to custody mediation after the initial claim was resolved

***Cases are not mediated for a variety of reasons: exemption, dismissal, entry of consent order, lack of service, and failure of parties to attend mediation

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 is comprised of 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 termination of parental rights 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 addressing 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. During SFY 2011-12 there were 32 operational adult, family, and youth drug treatment courts in 19 districts.

The North Carolina Drug Treatment Court Act of 1995 (GS 7A-790 et seq.) directs the NCAOC director to provide necessary staff for planning, organizing, and administering the Drug Treatment Court Program. A state advisory committee was created to recommend guidelines to the director and monitor local programs. NCAOC, along with the state Drug Treatment Court Advisory Committee, has developed best practices and minimum standards for the operation of North Carolina drug treatment courts. Judicial districts desiring to operate an adult, juvenile, or family drug treatment court program must operate under the North Carolina Drug Treatment Court Act of 1995 and established guidelines. As of July 1, 2011, the General Assembly eliminated all state funding for drug treatment court coordinators responsible for managing local drug treatment courts. However, the majority of drug treatment courts were able to continue after July 2011 because they found county, city, or other resources for staff to manage their courts locally.

For more information on Drug Treatment Court, including legislative reports, minimum standards and best practices, visit 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	19	32	79
5 – New Hanover	112	44	32	73
9A – Person	66	41	34	63
10 – Wake A	113	45	38	76
B	60	18	6	33
C	28	17	47	100
12 – Cumberland	34	16	69	100
13B – Brunswick	61	23	13	70
14 – Durham	82	34	15	59
15B – Orange	59	32	44	69
18 – Guilford	70	43	25	49
18 – High Point	45	23	30	43
24 – Avery/Watauga	48	25	52	88
25 – Catawba	39	8	0	100
26 – Mecklenburg	60	26	42	54
28 – Buncombe	54	22	55	82
29A – Rutherford	32	19	42	89
29A – McDowell	31	15	40	87
Total/Average %	1,037	470	38%	76%

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 A	80	47	45	57
B	72	37	54	62
12 – Cumberland	23	12	0	67
5 – New Hanover	40	16	56	88
20B – Union	39	17	24	71
Total/Average %	254	129	45%	69%

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 A	33	16	50	50
B	45	26	55	60
Total/Average %	78	42	54%	55%

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
5 – New Hanover	2	0	0	0
6A – Halifax	7	5	20	100
8 – Lenoir	8	3	33	100
8 – Wayne	8	6	67	83
12 – Cumberland	11	7	71	100
15A – Alamance	12	2	0	0
15B – Chatham	3	3	33	92
15B – Orange	19	7	43	57
16B – Robeson	43	24	33	92
20B – Union	5	5	40	60
26 – Mecklenburg	56	35	29	66
28 – Buncombe	33	23	26	78
Total/Average %	207	120	40%	80%

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
26 – Mecklenburg	52	32	41	53
Total/Average %	52	32	41%	53%

Total Drug Treatment Court Activity

Type of DTC	Total number served	Total number of exit
Adult	1,037	470
DWI	254	129
Pre-sentencing	78	42
Family	207	120
Juvenile	52	32
Total	1,628	793

Family Court

Directed by Session Law 1998-202 §25, the 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.

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.

As of July 1, 2012, the General Assembly has funded 13 family court districts that serve 22 counties and 45 percent of North Carolina's population. Family court staff members provide active case management to monitor and support time standard goals for legal issues or specific hearings/events in the life of domestic cases and juvenile abuse, neglect, and dependency, and termination of parental rights.

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 claims(s) to the disposition of these legal claim(s). For FY 2011 – 12 the median age of pending domestic relation cases (excluding IV-D child support) was 106 days in family court districts as compared to 372 days in non-family court districts.

For more information about family court, including annual reports and best practices, visit www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Family.

Family Financial Settlement

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 (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 about family financial settlement, including program rules, visit www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/FFS.

Family Financial Settlement Conferences, Caseload by District

District	Cases ordered to alternative dispute resolution (ADR)						Cases exiting from alternative dispute resolution process							
	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Ordered to mediation settlement conference	Voluntarily submitted to mediation settlement conference	Ordered to judicial settlement conference	Submitted to other settlement procedure	Total caseload	Ordered exempt from ADR	Settled or disposed without ADR	All issues resolved with ADR	Some issues resolved with ADR	No issues resolved with ADR	Disposed without ADR	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/2012)
2	29	37	0	0	0	66	10	10	4	3	5	3	35	31
3A	40	66	0	0	0	106	0	0	28	0	21	29	78	28
3B	764	320	0	0	0	1,084	1	34	58	18	29	9	149	935
5	272	264	0	0	0	536	0	0	46	0	14	160	220	316
6A	3	11	0	3	0	17	0	0	4	0	3	6	13	4
8	17	28	0	0	0	45	3	2	6	0	10	8	29	16
10	269	124	0	0	0	393	2	6	47	8	57	124	244	149
11^	29	315	0	0	0	344	51	60	59	51	67	17	305	39
12	369	276	0	103	0	748	71	0	51	31	56	253	462	286
14	3	51	0	13	1	68	2	19	22	3	9	7	62	6
16A^	34	35	0	0	0	69	1	9	7	3	2	13	34	35
17A	11	38	0	0	0	49	0	4	12	3	5	9	33	16
18	438	355	3	3	3	802	1	22	74	11	27	192	327	475
19A	1	45	2	0	0	48	0	0	9	6	20	4	39	9
19B	75	81	0	49	0	205	5	47	41	10	38	6	147	58
19C	17	44	1	0	0	62	0	6	23	0	21	0	50	12
20A	5	53	0	0	0	58	0	3	34	0	7	5	49	9
20B	54	83	5	0	0	142	0	0	59	0	1	26	86	56
24	19	37	13	0	0	69	0	3	13	0	6	18	40	29
25	155	296	5	0	0	456	12	6	27	11	26	45	127	329
26	583	182	1	97	0	863	6	23	31	1	57	29	147	716
27A	34	62	10	0	0	106	0	3	16	0	0	18	37	69

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Family Financial Settlement Conferences, Caseload by District

District	Cases ordered to alternative dispute resolution (ADR)						Cases exiting from alternative dispute resolution process							
	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Ordered to mediation settlement conference	Voluntarily submitted to mediation settlement conference	Ordered to judicial settlement conference	Submitted to other settlement procedure	Total caseload	Ordered exempt from ADR	Settled or disposed without ADR	All issues resolved with ADR	Some issues resolved with ADR	No issues resolved with ADR	Disposed without ADR	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/2012)
27B	110	47	6	5	0	168	0	17	5	0	2	76	100	68
28	11	213	0	0	0	324	0	0	32	7	11	139	189	135
29A [^]	82	29	0	0	0	11	0	0	2	2	0	28	32	79
30	56	51	0	0	0	107	0	3	32	7	12	5	59	48
Total	3,850	3,143	46	273	4	7,046	165	277	742	174	506	1,229	3,093	3,953

[^] Begin pending number adjusted from FY 2010 –11 end pending by local audit.

District 1 does not offer FFS at this time.

Other districts did not report.

Superior Court Mediated Settlement Conference

A Mediated Settlement Conference (MSC) facilitates pre-trial court ordered mediations for civil cases filed in superior court. Pursuant to 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 about the Mediated Settlement Conference Program, visit www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/MSC.

Mediated Settlement Conferences, Caseload by District

Superior Court District	Cases entering mediated settlement conference (MSC)					Cases exiting from mediated settlement conference process							
	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Ordered to MSC	Voluntarily submitted to MSC	Ordered or submitted to other settlement procedure	Total caseload	Ordered removed	Reported settled prior to or during MSC recess	Resolved through conference	Not resolved through conference	Disposed without MSC session	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/2012)	
1	87	124	1	7	219	1	31	47	27	9	115	104	
2^	77	110	0	0	187	0	9	24	23	37	93	94	
3A*	0	125	5	3	133	2	0	28	15	18	63	70	
3B^	463	297	0	0	760	0	0	50	60	258	368	392	
4A	338	84	0	0	422	0	2	31	18	7	58	364	
4B	71	114	3	1	189	1	3	26	11	45	86	103	
5	851	535	0	0	1,386	1	160	82	63	288	594	792	
6A**	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
6B	50	59	0	0	109	0	0	37	1	1	39	70	
7BC^	128	145	10	0	283	4	13	60	49	7	133	150	
8A	39	60	0	0	99	4	0	14	12	7	37	62	
8B	172	183	0	2	357	2	0	42	28	160	232	125	
9	88	104	7	0	199	1	16	46	20	42	125	74	
10	347	1027	0	0	1,374	20	225	323	260	184	1012	362	
11A	92	177	3	0	272	2	63	58	53	0	176	96	
11B	282	344	0	0	626	17	0	75	36	414	542	84	
12	61	380	0	0	441	41	109	109	67	0	326	115	
13A	229	125	1	0	355	0	5	45	32	51	133	222	
14	274	370	0	1	645	0	2	130	67	177	376	269	
15A	123	84	0	14	221	2	22	22	49	18	113	108	
15B	203	198	1	18	420	5	33	40	30	81	189	231	
16A***	34	24	0	0	58	1	9	4	4	10	28	30	
17A	47	53	0	0	100	4	22	19	25	4	74	26	
17B	144	194	0	21	359	12	0	16	62	19	109	250	

Continued on next page

Mediated Settlement Conferences, Caseload by District

Superior Court District	Cases entering mediated settlement conference (MSC)				Cases exiting from mediated settlement conference process							
	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Ordered to mediated settlement conference	Voluntarily submitted to MSC	Ordered or submitted to other settlement procedure	Total caseload	Ordered removed	Reported settled prior to or during MSC recess	Resolved through conference	Not resolved through conference	Disposed without MSC session	Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/2012)
19A	126	142	1	0	269	3	32	39	48	70	192	77
19B	50	97	1	0	148	0	23	31	28	33	115	33
19C	87	142	2	0	231	2	12	44	54	32	144	87
19D	340	123	4	0	467	1	16	30	31	14	92	375
20A	56	96	0	0	152	3	26	29	18	6	82	70
20B	131	305	9	0	445	13	32	126	70	108	349	96
21	1,067	330	2	2	1,401	0	50	98	87	9	244	1,157
22A	817	184	2	30	1,033	1	13	49	56	35	154	879
22B	433	70	2	0	505	7	6	30	25	64	132	373
23	49	76	2	0	127	2	12	24	15	8	61	66
24	138	156	1	0	295	0	18	58	52	17	145	150
25A^	78	115	1	4	198	0	0	7	24	1	32	166
25B	200	200	0	4	404	5	0	61	43	125	234	170
26	820	1,601	23	16	2,460	43	915	456	515	72	2,001	459
27A	199	161	0	0	360	3	14	41	48	28	134	226
27B	102	87	4	1	194	3	5	51	37	21	117	77
28	408	232	6	5	651	7	19	212	13	15	266	385
29A^	129	77	0	1	207	2	6	12	8	2	30	177
29B	195	148	0	0	343	0	43	56	39	0	138	205
30A	100	169	0	0	269	6	0	20	19	96	141	128
30B^	206	56	0	0	262	0	1	17	15	6	39	223
Total	9,931	9,484	91	130	19,636	221	1,967	2,820	2,257	2,599	9,864	9,772

^ Begin pending corrected by local audit

** Started tracking in June 2012

* Started tracking in January 2012

*** July 2011 – February 2012 only

Court-Ordered Arbitration

In 1989, following successful experience in a pilot program, the General Assembly authorized court-ordered, non-binding arbitration statewide. The program is currently operating in 71 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's "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.

According to statistical data reported by 65 counties in SFY 2011–12, approximately 3,603 court cases were ordered to arbitration and 1,613 cases were arbitrated. The remaining cases were either exempt from arbitration or settled prior to the arbitration hearing. By rule, the arbitration hearing is scheduled to begin within 60 days after (i) the docketing of an appeal from a magistrate's judgment, (ii) the filing of the last responsive pleading, or (iii) the expiration of the time allowed for the filing of such pleading. Parties may stipulate to an arbitrator or, if no agreement is reached, the court will appoint an arbitrator from its list of trained attorneys who have been approved to serve as arbitrators. Unless determined to be indigent, parties are required to pay a pro rata share of a \$100 arbitration assessment fee for each arbitration hearing. Upon making application for payment to the NCAOC, arbitrators are paid a \$100 fee for each arbitration hearing they conduct.

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. According to statistical data reported by 65 counties in SFY 2011–12, approximately 394 trial de novo appeals were filed.

For more information about Court-Ordered Arbitration, visit www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Arbitration/Default.asp.

Court-Ordered Arbitration, Caseload by District

District	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Cases ordered to court-ordered arbitration			Total caseload	Cases exiting from arbitration process						End pending (6/30/2012)
		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	
1	10	37	0	47	20	5	17	13	1	35	12	
3A	18	16	0	34	19	1	16	8	0	25	9	
3B	16	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
5	3	81	95	179	102	0	55	11	4	66	113	
6A	2	7	0	9	8	0	7	0	1	7	2	
8	7	47	0	54	31	3	24	18	1	45	9	
10	0	380	0	380	374	5	213	105	76	323	57	
12	0	749	0	749	415	9	160	196	6	365	384	
13	14	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
14	11	192	0	203	180	0	147	59	10	206	-3	
15A	6	27	0	33	24	2	22	2	1	26	7	
16A	1	3	0	4	4	0	2	1	0	3	1	
17A	2	20	0	22	20	1	14	5	2	20	2	
18	8	149	0	157	134	0	91	32	6	123	34	
19B	0	46	0	46	32	0	13	5	1	18	28	
19C	10	115	0	125	75	3	40	72	8	115	10	
20A	17	43	0	60	50	0	42	7	2	49	11	
20B	68	233	0	301	150	2	90	121	5	213	88	
22A	0	30	0	30	25	1	19	10	1	30	0	
22B	0	13	0	13	13	0	7	4	0	11	2	
23	3	24	0	27	17	0	17	9	0	26	1	

Continued on next page

Court-Ordered Arbitration, Caseload by District

District	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Cases ordered to court-ordered arbitration		Total caseload	Cases exiting from arbitration process						End pending (6/30/2012)
		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	
24	0	68	0	68	52	6	33	16	0	55	13
25	53	545	0	598	222	4	131	372	0	507	91
26	123	570	0	693	674	3	407	136	96	546	147
27A	40	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
27B	8	41	0	49	43	0	22	13	1	35	14
29A	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
30	0	72	0	72	47	2	24	23	0	49	23
Total	421	3,508	95	4,024	2,731	47	1,613	1,238	222	2,898	1,126
Percent resolved						1.612%	55.66%	42.72%	7.66%		

Court-Ordered Arbitration Trial de Novo, Caseload by District

District	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Appeals filed	Trial by judge	Trial by jury	Dismissal / other	End pending (6/30/2012)	District	Begin pending (7/1/2011)	Appeals filed	Trial by judge	Trial by jury	Dismissal / other	End pending (6/30/2012)
1	0	2	1	0	0	1	19C	9	16	6	0	5	14
3A	0	6	0	0	2	4	20A	4	4	1	0	3	7
3B	1	0	0	0	0	1	20B	26	11	9	1	13	14
5	0	13	0	0	0	13	22A	0	7	0	0	0	7
6A	0	2	2	0	0	0	22B	0	1	0	0	0	1
8	2	4	3	0	2	1	23	11	4	4	0	4	7
10	0	45	5	1	30	9	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	28	9	0	13	6	25	9	11	6	0	9	5
13	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	174	133	20	24	47	216
14	0	37	8	0	21	8	27A	1	0	0	0	0	1
15A	0	1	1	0	0	0	27B	0	14	2	0	9	3
16A	0	0	0	0	0	0	29A	1	0	0	0	0	1
17A	2	6	2	0	1	5	30	1	9	2	0	2	6
18	3	34	2	0	21	14	Total	245	394	90	26	182	344
19B	0	8	8	0	0	0							

Clerk Mediation Program

On May 23, 2005, the General Assembly adopted legislation, 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.

Clerk Mediation Program, Caseload by District

County	Cases ordered to mediation				Cases completing mediation																					
	Begin pending (7/1/11)	Guardianship	Estate	Boundary	Other	Total # of CMP cases	G - Complete	G - Partial	G - Impasse	G - Settled outside mediation	E - Complete	E - Partial	E - Impasse	E - Settled outside mediation	B - Complete	B - Partial	B - Impasse	B - Settled outside mediation	O - Complete	O - Partial	O - Impasse	O - Settled outside mediation	# of Cases completing process	End pending (6/30/12)	Unsuccessful mediation; heard by CSC	
ASHE *	1					1							1											1	0	
BUNCOMBE	0			5	1	6									1		1		2	1				5	1	
CASWELL	4		1			5																		0	5	
FRANKLIN	0	1				1								1										1	0	
MACON *	1		1			2					1		1											2	0	
MONTGOMERY	0	1				1								1										1	0	
RANDOLPH	0	1				1	1																	1	0	
WAKE	0		1			1					1													1	0	
WILKES	0		1		6	7						1								3		2	1	7	0	3
Total	6	3	4	5	7	25	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	2	1	19	6	3	

* County corrected begin pending number from FY 2010-11 published report.

Forty-seven counties reported that they have no cases currently pending or are not using CMP at this time. Those counties are Alexander, Alleghany, Anson, Avery, Bladen, Brunswick, Caldwell, Camden, Chatham, Chowan, Clay, Cleveland, Craven, Cumberland, Dare, Davidson, Duplin, Durham, Gaston, Graham, Granville, Greene, Halifax, Harnett, Hyde, Iredell, Jackson, Johnston, Lee, Martin, McDowell, Mitchell, Moore, Orange, Pasquotank, Person, Robeson, Rutherford, Scotland, Stanly, Surry, Transylvania, Tyrell, Union, Warren, Wayne, Wilson.

Forty-four counties did not report status.

Interpreting Services

The purpose of Interpreting Services is to facilitate access to justice in North Carolina courts for limited-English proficient (LEP) 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 LEP speakers statewide by providing 10 staff court interpreters (for the Spanish language) in eight districts and an 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 standards for court officials and interpreters, advising the courts on the proper use of interpreters, training court officials on cultural and interpreting issues, and translating court forms. During FY 2011 – 12, the program trained more than 123 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). Sixty-nine state and/or federally certified Spanish court interpreters, one state certified Vietnamese interpreter, and 110 qualified court interpreters work throughout the state.

North Carolina is one of 45 member states of the National Center for State Courts' Council of Language Access Coordinators (CLAC). Interpreting Services administers the CLAC's oral proficiency examination for court interpreters 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.



Prepared by



NORTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
of the COURTS

Court Programs and Management Services
919 890-1200
nccourts.org