

Appendix 1: *Methodology*

Methodology

Court Statistics Project: Goals and Organization

The Court Statistics Project of the National Center for State Courts compiles and reports comparable court caseload data from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Project publications and technical assistance encourage greater uniformity in how individual state courts and state court administrative offices collect and publish caseload information. Progress toward these goals should result in more meaningful and useful caseload information for judges, court managers, and court administrators.

The *State Court Caseload Statistics: Annual Report* series is a cooperative effort of the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). Responsibility for project management and staffing is assumed by the NCSC's Court Statistics Project. COSCA, through its Court Statistics Committee, provides policy guidance and review. The Court Statistics Committee includes members of COSCA and representatives of state court administrative office senior staff, the National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks, the National Association for Court Management, and the academic community. Preparation of the 2002 caseload report was funded by an ongoing grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2003-BJ-CX-K103) to the NCSC.

In addition to preparing publications, the Court Statistics Project responds to thousands of requests for information and assistance each year. These requests come from a variety of sources, including state court administrative offices, local courts, individual judges, federal and state agencies, legislators, the media, academic researchers, students, and NCSC staff.

Evolution of the Court Statistics Project

During the Court Statistics Project's original data compilation efforts, the *State of the Art* and *State Court Caseload Statistics: 1975 Annual Report*, classification problems arose from the multitude of categories and terms used by the states to report their caseloads. This suggested the need for a model annual report and a statistical dictionary of terms for court usage.

The *State Court Model Statistical Dictionary* provided the first set of common terminology, definitions, and usage for reporting appellate and trial court caseloads. Terms for reporting data on case disposition methods were provided in the *Dictionary* and in other project publications. The classification scheme and associated definitions served as a model framework for developing comparable and useful data. A second edition of the *State Court Model Statistical Dictionary* was published in 1989, consolidating and revising the original 1980 version and the 1984 *Supplement*.

Once a set of recommended terms was adopted, the project's focus shifted to assessing the comparability of caseload data reported by the courts to those terms. It became particularly important to detail the subject matter jurisdiction and methods of counting cases in each state court. Problems related to categorizing and counting cases in the trial and appellate courts were resolved through the development of the *1984 State Trial Court Jurisdiction Guide for Statistical Reporting* and the *1984 State Appellate Court Jurisdiction Guide for Statistical Reporting*. The introduction to the 1981 report detailed the impact of the *Trial Court Jurisdiction Guide* on the Court Statistics Project data collection and the introduction to the 1984 report described the effect of the *Appellate Court Jurisdiction Guide*.

The *State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting, 2003* represents the Court Statistics Project's new data reporting format. Building upon the *State Court Model Statistical Dictionary*, the *Guide* includes expanded case type classification matrices, definitions for case types that were not included in the original *Dictionary*, and more detailed manner of disposition categories. The *Guide* serves as the model reporting framework for developing comparable and useful data.

The *State Court Organization* series, updated for 1998, serves as a valuable complement to the *Report* series. *State Court Organization 1998* is a reference book that describes in great depth the structure, organization, and management of the state trial and appellate courts.

Sources of Data

Information for the national caseload databases comes from published and unpublished sources supplied by state court administrators and appellate court clerks. Published data typically come from official state court annual reports, which vary widely in form and detail. Although constituting the most reliable and valid data available at the state level, they arrive from statistical data filed monthly, quarterly, or annually by numerous local jurisdictions and, in most states, several trial and appellate court systems. Moreover, these caseload statistics are primarily collected to assist states in managing their own systems and are not prepared specifically for inclusion in the COSCA/NCSC caseload statistics report series.

Some states either do not publish an annual report or publish only limited caseload statistics for either trial or appellate courts. The Court Statistics Project receives unpublished data from those states in a wide range of forms, including internal management memos, computer-generated

output, and the project's statistical and jurisdictional profiles, which are updated by state court administrative office staff.

Extensive telephone contact and follow-up correspondence are used to collect missing data, confirm the accuracy of available data, and determine the legal jurisdiction of each court. Information is also collected concerning the number of judges per court or court system (from annual reports, offices of state court administrators, and appellate court clerks); the state population (based on Bureau of the Census revised estimates); and special characteristics regarding subject matter jurisdiction and court structure. Appendix 2 lists the source of each state's 2002 caseload statistics.

Data Collection Procedures

The following outline summarizes the major tasks involved in compiling the 2002 caseload data reported in this volume:

A. The 2002 state reports were evaluated to note changes in the categories and terminology used for data reporting, changes in the range of available data, and changes in the state's court organization or jurisdiction. This entailed a direct comparison of the 2002 material with the contents of individual states' 2001 annual reports. Project staff used a copy of each state's 2001 trial and appellate court statistical spreadsheets, trial and appellate court jurisdiction guides, and the state court structure chart as worksheets for gathering the 2002 data. Use of the previous year's spreadsheets provides the data collector with a reference point to identify and replicate the logic used in the data collection and ensures consistency over time in the report series. The caseload data were entered onto the 2002 spreadsheets. Caseload terminology is defined by the *State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting, 2003*.

B. Caseload numbers were screened for significant changes from the previous year. A record that documents and, where possible, explains such changes is maintained. This process serves as another reliability check by identifying statutory, organizational, or procedural changes that potentially had an effect on the size of the reported court caseload.

C. The data were then transferred from the handwritten copy to computer databases that are created as Excel spreadsheets. Mathematical formulas are embedded in each spreadsheet to compute the caseload totals. Linked spreadsheets contain the information on the number of judges, court jurisdiction, and state population needed to generate caseload tables for the 2002 report.

D. After the data were entered and checked for entry errors and internal consistency, individual spreadsheets were generated for the

appellate and trial courts using Excel software. The spreadsheet relates the total for each model reporting category to the category or categories the state used to report its caseload numbers.

E. Trial and appellate court spreadsheets for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are sent directly to the states' administrative offices of the courts and/or the appellate court clerks' offices for verification. This step in the data collection process (which began with the 1989 report) provides further assurance of data accuracy and often yields the bonus of additional caseload data or improved information on the content and accuracy of the data.

F. The final databases are stored in SPSS and Excel at the NCSC. The annual CSP databases are also archived with the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

Ongoing Data Collection

Four basic types of data elements are collected by the Court Statistics Project: (1) trial court caseload statistics, (2) trial court jurisdictional/organizational information, (3) appellate court caseload, and (4) appellate court jurisdictional/organizational information.

For trial courts, emphasis is placed on reporting the total number of civil, domestic relations, criminal, juvenile, and traffic/other violation cases according to the model reporting format. Each of these major case types can be reduced to more specific caseload categories. For example, civil cases consist of tort, contract, real property rights, small claims, mental health, and estate cases, as well as trial court civil appeals and appeals of administrative agency cases. In some instances, these case types can be further refined; for example, tort cases can be divided into automobile tort, intentional tort, medical and legal malpractice, premises liability, product liability, and slander/libel/defamation cases..

Currently, only filing and disposition numbers are entered into the database for each case type. Data on pending cases were routinely collected by the project staff until serious comparability problems were identified when compiling the 1984 report. Some courts provide data that include active cases only; others include active and inactive cases. The COSCA Court Statistics Committee recommended that the collection of pending caseload be deferred until a study determines whether and how data can be made comparable across states.

The trial court jurisdictional profile collects an assortment of information relevant to the organization and jurisdiction of each trial court system.

Before the use of Excel spreadsheets for reporting statistical data, the main purpose of the profile was to translate the terminology used by the states when reporting statistical information into generic terms recommended by the *State Court Model Statistical Dictionary, 1989*. Each court's spreadsheet captures the state's terminology, and the jurisdiction guide format has been streamlined. The jurisdictional profile currently collects information on number of courts, number of judges, methods of counting cases, availability of jury trials, and dollar amount jurisdiction of the court.

There are also statistical spreadsheets and jurisdiction guides for each state appellate court. Two major case types are used on the statistical spreadsheet: mandatory cases that the court must hear on the merits as appeals of right and discretionary petition cases that the court decides whether to accept and then reach a decision on the merits. The statistical spreadsheet also contains the number of petitions granted if it can be determined. Mandatory and discretionary petitions are further differentiated by whether the case is a review of a final trial court judgment or some other matter, such as a request for interlocutory or postconviction relief. When possible, the statistics are classified according to subject matter, chiefly civil, criminal, juvenile, disciplinary, or administrative agency.

The appellate court jurisdiction guide contains information about each court, including number of court locations, number of justices/judges, number of legal support personnel, point at which appeals are counted as cases, procedures used to review discretionary petitions, and use of panels.

Supplementary Data Collection

The Court Statistics Project supplements its ongoing, general data collection efforts by collecting manner of disposition data from the states' general jurisdiction courts. All of the states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico were contacted and asked to supply manner of disposition data to the project. Disposition statistics from these courts present a picture of the way cases are disposed in state trial courts nationally. They are useful in comparing court backlogs, case management systems, and the impact of specialized programs such as arbitration and mediation.

Several obstacles hinder the achievement of comprehensive national statistics on manner of disposition for court cases. First, some states do not collect any disposition data. Second, other states define disposition categories differently, so information may not be comparable. For example, many states have a different definition of what a bench trial is and what is considered a hearing before a judge. States with a very high bench trial rate are using a more liberal definition of what

constitutes a bench trial. Third, the mix of cases included in disposition totals may vary. For example, some states report contested and uncontested divorce cases together, while others do not. Also, differences in subject matter jurisdiction, court structure, and units for counting cases will affect the use of manner of disposition statistics.

Completeness

States vary in their ability to report comprehensive and complete manner of disposition data. For example, in criminal cases, Arizona and Maryland reported only trial dispositions while Louisiana provided the number of criminal cases disposed by jury trials only.

Comparability

Comparability is possible when states count trials similarly, use similar methods for counting cases, and report information for a similar range of case types. The point at which a state counts a jury trial varies widely. The table below shows the relative use of alternative trial definitions.

The definitional differences for trials explain some of the variation in trial rates. Generally, most states providing data define a trial in a way that inflates the number of cases disposed at trial.

Definitions	Number of states which use definition for criminal	Number of states which use definition for civil
A) A jury trial is counted when a jury is selected, empaneled, or sworn. A nonjury trial is counted when evidence is first introduced or first witness is sworn.	36	35
B) A jury trial is counted at introduction or swearing of first witness. A nonjury trial is counted when evidence is first introduced or swearing of first witness.	2	2
C) A jury trial is counted at verdict or decision.	14	15

On the criminal side, courts vary in the point at which they count a case as initially filed. Most states count a criminal case as filed at the information or indictment, although some use the arraignment. Courts also differ in case unit of count. As shown on the opposite page, states differ on whether they count charges, defendants, or indictments.

Definitions for unit of count—Criminal	Number of states
Single Defendant/Single Charge	3
Single Defendant/Single Incident	30
Single Defendant/Single Incident (maximum number of charges)	0
Single Defendant/One or More Incidents	6
Single Defendant/Varies with Prosecutor	3
One or More Defendants/Single Incident	4
One or More Defendants/One or More Incidents	5
One or More Defendants/Varies with Prosecutor	0
Varies with Prosecutor/Varies with Prosecutor	1

Definition of point of count—Criminal	Number of states
At the filing of the Information or Indictment	34
At the filing of the Information or Complaint	6
At the filing of Complaint (Warrant/Accusation)	5
At the Arraignment (First Appearance)	5
Varies (at filing of the complaint, information, indictment)	2

Footnotes

Footnotes indicate the degree to which a court’s statistics conform to the Court Statistics Project’s reporting categories defined in the *State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting, 2003*. Footnoted caseload statistics are either overinclusive in that they contain case types other than those defined for the term in the *Guide* or underinclusive in that some case types defined for the term in the *Guide* are not included. It is possible for a caseload statistic to contain inapplicable case types while also omitting those which are applicable, making the total or subtotal simultaneously overinclusive and underinclusive.

The 2002 report uses a simplified system of footnotes. An “A” footnote indicates that the caseload statistic for a statewide court system does not include some of the recommended case types; a “B” footnote indicates that the statistic includes some extraneous case types; a “C” footnote indicates that the data are both incomplete and overinclusive. The text of the footnote explains for each court system how the caseload data differ from the reporting category recommended in the *State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting, 2003*. Caseload statistics that are not qualified by a footnote conform to the *Guide*’s definition.

Case filings and dispositions are also affected by the unit and method of count used by the states, differing subject matter and dollar amount jurisdiction, and

different court system structures. Most of these differences are described in the figures found in this volume and are summarized in the court structure chart for each state. The most important differences are reported in summary form in the main caseload tables.

Variations in Reporting Periods

As indicated in Figure A, most states report data by calendar year, others by fiscal year, and a few appellate courts by court term. Therefore, the 12-month period covered in this report is not the same for all courts.

This report reflects court organization and jurisdiction in 2002. Since 1975, new courts have been created at both the appellate and trial level, additional courts report data to the Court Statistics Project, and courts may have merged and/or changed counting or reporting methods. The dollar amount limits of civil jurisdiction in many trial courts also vary. Care is therefore required when comparing 2002 data to previous years. The trend analysis used in this report offers a model for undertaking such comparisons.

Final Note

Comments, corrections, suggestions, and requests for information can be sent to:

Director, Court Statistics Project
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23185-4147

Phone: (800) 616-6109
Fax: (757) 564-2098

www.ncsconline.org/D_Research/csp/CSPFORM.HTM

Appendix 2: *Sources of 2002*

State Court Caseload Statistics

Sources of 2002 State Court Caseload Statistics

State	Courts of Last Resort	Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction	Limited Jurisdiction
Alabama	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court.	Data provided by the clerks of these courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Alaska	Alaska Court System 2002 Annual Report.	Alaska Court System 2002 Annual Report.	Alaska Court System 2002 Annual Report.	Alaska Court System 2002 Annual Report.
Arizona	2002 Data Book, Volume 1-Appellate/General Jurisdiction. www.supreme.state.az.us	2002 Data Book, Volume 1-Appellate/General Jurisdiction. www.supreme.state.az.us	2002 Data Book, Volume 1-Appellate/General Jurisdiction. www.supreme.state.az.us	2002 Data Book, Volume 2-Limited Jurisdiction. www.supreme.state.az.us
Arkansas	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
California	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Court.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Court.
Colorado	Colorado Judicial Branch FY2002 Annual Statistical Report www.courts.state.co.us	Colorado Judicial Branch FY2002 Annual Statistical Report www.courts.state.co.us	Colorado Judicial Branch FY 2002 Annual Statistical Report www.courts.state.co.us	Colorado Judicial Branch FY 2002 Annual Statistical Report www.courts.state.co.us
Connecticut	Data provided by the Appellate Court Clerk.	Data provided by the Appellate Court Clerk.	Data provided by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator.	Data provided by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator.
Delaware	2002 Statistical Report of the Delaware Judiciary www.courts.state.de.us	-----	2002 Statistical Report of the Delaware Judiciary www.courts.state.de.us	2002 Statistical Report of the Delaware Judiciary www.courts.state.de.us
District of Columbia	Data provided by the Office of the Clerk.	-----	District of Columbia Courts Annual Report, 2002.	-----
Florida	Data provided by the Office of the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the Office of the State Court Administrator.	Florida's Trial Courts FY2001-2002 Statistical Reference Guide	Florida's Trial Courts FY2001-2002 Statistical Reference Guide
Georgia	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.
Hawaii	The Judiciary State of Hawaii: 2002 Statistical Supplement www.courts.state.hi.us	The Judiciary State of Hawaii: 2002 Statistical Supplement www.courts.state.hi.us	The Judiciary State of Hawaii: 2002 Statistical Supplement www.courts.state.hi.us	The Judiciary State of Hawaii: 2002 Statistical Supplement www.courts.state.hi.us
Idaho	Data provided by the Office of the Court Administrator.	Data provided by the Office of the Court Administrator.	Data provided by the Office of Trial Court Services and Information Systems.	Data provided by the Office of Trial Court Services and Information Systems.
Illinois	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court	Annual Report of the Illinois Courts: Statistical Summary 2002	Annual Report of the Illinois Courts: Statistical Summary 2002	-----
Indiana	Indiana Supreme Court Annual Activity Report July 1, 2001-June 30, 2002 www.in.gov/judiciary	Indiana Court of Appeals 2002 Annual Report. Data also provided by the Tax Court Administrator. www.in.gov/judiciary	Data provided the the Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration	Data provided the the Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration

Sources of 2002 State Court Caseload Statistics

State	Courts of Last Resort	Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction	Limited Jurisdiction
Iowa	Data provided by the Clerk of the Appellate Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Appellate Court.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	-----
Kansas	Annual Report of the Courts of Kansas: FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Courts of Kansas: FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Courts of Kansas: FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Kansas Municipal Courts: FY 2002.
Kentucky	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Louisiana	Annual Report 2002 of the Judicial Council of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Judicial Administrator.	Data provided by the Judicial Administrator.	Data provided by the Judicial Administrator.
Maine	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	-----	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Maryland	Data provided by Office of the Court Administrator.	Data provided by Office of the Court Administrator.	Data provided by Office of the Court Administrator.	Data provided by Office of the Court Administrator.
Massachusetts	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Appeals Court.	www.state.ma.us/courts	www.state.ma.us/courts
Michigan	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.	www.courts.michigan.gov	www.courts.michigan.gov
Minnesota	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	-----
Mississippi	Data provided by the Appellate Court Clerk.	Data provided by the Appellate Court Clerk.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Missouri	Missouri Judicial Report Supplement, FY 2002.	Missouri Judicial Report Supplement, FY 2002.	Missouri Judicial Report Supplement, FY 2002.	Missouri Judicial Report Supplement, FY 2002.
Montana	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	-----	2002 Annual Report www.lawlibrary.state.mt.us www.dli.state.mt.us	2002 Annual Report www.lawlibrary.state.mt.us
Nebraska	The Courts of Nebraska 2002 Annual Caseload Report.	The Courts of Nebraska 2002 Annual Caseload Report.	The Courts of Nebraska 2002 Annual Caseload Report.	The Courts of Nebraska 2002 Annual Caseload Report.
Nevada	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	-----	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
New Hampshire	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	-----	Data provided by the Director, Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Director, Administrative Office of the Courts.
New Jersey	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Appellate Court.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
New Mexico	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.	Data provided by the Judicial Information Division.	Data provided by the Judicial Information Division.

State	Courts of Last Resort	Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction	Limited Jurisdiction
New York	2001 Annual Report of the Clerk of Court, Court of Appeals of the State of New York. Additional data were provided by the Clerk.	Data provided by the Office of Court Administration.	Data were provided by the Chief Administrator of Courts.	Data were provided by the Chief Administrator of Courts.
North Carolina	2001-02 North Carolina Courts Statistical and Operational Summary. www.nccourts.org	2001-02 North Carolina Courts Statistical and Operational Summary. www.nccourts.org	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
North Dakota	Data provided by the Clerk.	-----	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	North Dakota Courts Annual Report, 2002. www.court.nd.us
Ohio	The Ohio Courts Summary, 2002	The Ohio Courts Summary, 2002	The Ohio Courts Summary, 2002	The Ohio Courts Summary, 2002
Oklahoma	Court of Criminal Appeals data provided by the Communications Administrator. Supreme Court data not available.	Data not available.	Data not available.	Data not available.
Oregon	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of Court of Appeals.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.
Pennsylvania	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the clerks of these courts.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.	Data provided by the State Court Administrator.
Puerto Rico	Data provided by the Office of Courts Administration.	Data provided by the Office of Courts Administration.	Data provided by the Administrative Director of Courts.	-----
Rhode Island	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	-----	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
South Carolina	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.	Data provided by the Office of South Carolina Court Administration.	Data provided by the Office of South Carolina Court Administration. Magistrate Court and Municipal Court data not available.
South Dakota	South Dakota Courts, The State of the Judiciary and FY 2002 Annual Report.	-----	FY 2002 Annual Report of South Dakota Unified Judicial System. Additional data provided by the Administrative Office of the Court.	-----
Tennessee	Annual Report of the Tennessee Judiciary, 2002.	Annual Report of the Tennessee Judiciary, 2002.	Annual Report of the Tennessee Judiciary, 2002. Data also provided by the Clerks of Probate Court.	Annual Juvenile Court Statistical Report, 2002. Additional data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Sources of 2002 State Court Caseload Statistics

State	Courts of Last Resort	Intermediate Appellate	General Jurisdiction	Limited Jurisdiction
Texas	Annual Report of the Texas Judicial System, FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Texas Judicial System, FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Texas Judicial System, FY 2002.	Annual Report of the Texas Judicial System, FY 2002.
Utah	2003 Annual Report to the Community. www.utcourts.gov	2003 Annual Report to the Community. www.utcourts.gov	www.utcourts.gov	www.utcourts.gov
Vermont	www.vermontjudiciary.org	-----	www.vermontjudiciary.org	www.vermontjudiciary.org
Virginia	Virginia 2002 State of the Judiciary Report. www.courts.state.va.us	Virginia 2002 State of the Judiciary Report. www.courts.state.va.us	Virginia 2002 State of the Judiciary Report. www.courts.state.va.us	Virginia 2002 State of the Judiciary Report. www.courts.state.va.us
Washington	www.courts.wa.gov	www.courts.wa.gov	Data provided by the Office of the Administrator for the Courts.	Data provided by the Office of the Administrator for the Courts.
West Virginia	Data provided by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.	-----	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.	Data provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Wisconsin	Data provided by the Clerk of Court.	Data provided by the Clerk of Court.	www.courts.state.wi.us	www.courts.state.wi.us
Wyoming	Data not available for 2002.	-----	Data not available for 2002.	Data not available for 2002.

Appendix 3: *State Populations*

State Populations

Resident Population, 2002

State or territory	Population (in thousands)		
	2002 Juvenile	2002 Adult	2002 Total
Alabama	1,135	3,351	4,487
Alaska	196	448	644
Arizona	1,451	4,005	5,456
Arkansas	688	2,022	2,710
California	9,587	25,529	35,116
Colorado	1,154	3,353	4,507
Connecticut	855	2,606	3,461
Delaware	200	607	807
District of Columbia	115	456	571
Florida	3,811	12,903	16,713
Georgia	2,268	6,292	8,560
Hawaii	304	941	1,245
Idaho	382	959	1,341
Illinois	3,289	9,312	12,601
Indiana	1,595	4,564	6,159
Iowa	737	2,200	2,937
Kansas	720	1,996	2,716
Kentucky	1,006	3,086	4,093
Louisiana	1,224	3,259	4,483
Maine	305	989	1,294
Maryland	1,397	4,061	5,458
Massachusetts	1,517	4,912	6,428
Michigan	2,623	7,427	10,050
Minnesota	1,315	3,705	5,020
Mississippi	784	2,088	2,872
Missouri	1,447	4,226	5,673
Montana	232	678	909
Nebraska	455	1,274	1,729
Nevada	556	1,617	2,173
New Hampshire	319	956	1,275
New Jersey	2,130	6,460	8,590
New Mexico	519	1,336	1,855
New York	4,732	14,426	19,158
North Carolina	2,030	6,290	8,320
North Dakota	159	476	634
Ohio	2,901	8,520	11,421
Oklahoma	905	2,589	3,494
Oregon	870	2,652	3,522
Pennsylvania	2,936	9,399	12,335
Puerto Rico	1,076	2,784	3,859

State Populations

Resident Population, 2002 (continued)

State or territory	Population (in thousands)		
	2002 Juvenile	2002 Adult	2002 Total
Rhode Island	252	817	1,070
South Carolina	1,035	3,072	4,107
South Dakota	204	557	761
Tennessee	1,426	4,371	5,797
Texas	6,142	15,638	21,780
Utah	746	1,570	2,316
Vermont	149	467	617
Virginia	1,794	5,499	7,294
Washington	1,560	4,509	6,069
West Virginia	402	1,400	1,802
Wisconsin	1,388	4,054	5,441
Wyoming	130	369	499

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2003.

Total State Population for Trend Tables, 1993-2002

State or territory	Population (in thousands)									
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Alabama	4,187	4,219	4,253	4,273	4,319	4,352	4,370	4,447	4,464	4,487
Alaska	599	606	603	607	609	614	620	627	635	644
Arizona	3,936	4,075	4,218	4,428	4,555	4,668	4,778	5,131	5,307	5,456
Arkansas	2,424	2,453	2,484	2,510	2,523	2,539	2,551	2,673	2,692	2,710
California	31,211	31,431	31,590	31,878	32,268	32,666	33,145	33,872	34,501	35,116
Colorado	3,566	3,656	3,746	3,823	3,893	3,971	4,056	4,301	4,418	4,507
Connecticut	3,277	3,275	3,275	3,274	3,270	3,274	3,282	3,406	3,425	3,461
Delaware	700	707	717	725	732	744	753	784	796	807
District of Columbia	578	570	555	543	529	523	519	572	572	571
Florida	13,679	13,953	14,165	14,400	14,654	14,916	15,111	15,982	16,397	16,713
Georgia	6,917	7,055	7,201	7,353	7,486	7,642	7,788	8,186	8,384	8,560
Hawaii	1,172	1,178	1,187	1,184	1,187	1,193	1,185	1,212	1,224	1,245
Idaho	1,099	1,133	1,163	1,189	1,210	1,229	1,252	1,294	1,321	1,341
Illinois	11,697	11,751	11,830	11,847	11,896	12,045	12,128	12,419	12,482	12,601
Indiana	5,713	5,752	5,803	5,841	5,864	5,899	5,943	6,080	6,115	6,159
Iowa	2,814	2,829	2,842	2,852	2,852	2,862	2,870	2,926	2,923	2,937
Kansas	2,531	2,554	2,566	2,572	2,595	2,629	2,654	2,688	2,695	2,716
Kentucky	3,789	3,827	3,861	3,884	3,908	3,936	3,961	4,042	4,066	4,093
Louisiana	4,295	4,315	4,342	4,351	4,352	4,369	4,372	4,469	4,465	4,483
Maine	1,239	1,241	1,241	1,243	1,242	1,245	1,253	1,275	1,287	1,294
Maryland	4,965	5,006	5,042	5,072	5,094	5,135	5,171	5,296	5,375	5,458
Massachusetts	6,012	6,041	6,074	6,092	6,118	6,147	6,175	6,349	6,379	6,428
Michigan	9,478	9,496	9,549	9,594	9,774	9,818	9,864	9,938	9,991	10,050
Minnesota	4,517	4,567	4,609	4,658	4,686	4,725	4,776	4,920	4,972	5,020
Mississippi	2,643	2,669	2,697	2,716	2,731	2,752	2,769	2,845	2,858	2,872
Missouri	5,234	5,278	5,324	5,359	5,402	5,439	5,468	5,595	5,630	5,673
Montana	839	856	870	879	879	880	883	902	904	909
Nebraska	1,607	1,623	1,637	1,652	1,657	1,663	1,666	1,711	1,713	1,729
Nevada	1,389	1,457	1,531	1,603	1,677	1,747	1,809	1,998	2,106	2,173
New Hampshire	1,125	1,137	1,148	1,162	1,173	1,185	1,201	1,236	1,259	1,275
New Jersey	7,879	7,903	7,946	7,988	8,053	8,115	8,143	8,414	8,484	8,590
New Mexico	1,616	1,653	1,685	1,713	1,730	1,737	1,740	1,819	1,829	1,855
New York	18,197	18,169	18,136	18,185	18,137	18,176	18,197	18,976	19,011	19,158
North Carolina	6,945	7,070	7,195	7,323	7,425	7,547	7,651	8,049	8,186	8,320
North Dakota	635	638	641	645	641	639	634	642	634	634
Ohio	11,091	11,102	11,151	11,173	11,186	11,209	11,257	11,353	11,374	11,421
Oklahoma	3,231	3,258	3,278	3,301	3,317	3,347	3,358	3,451	3,460	3,494
Oregon	3,032	3,086	3,141	3,204	3,243	3,282	3,316	3,421	3,473	3,522
Pennsylvania	12,048	12,053	12,072	12,056	12,020	12,002	11,994	12,281	12,287	12,335
Puerto Rico	3,622	3,686	3,719	3,733	3,806	3,857	3,890	3,809	3,857	3,859
Rhode Island	1,000	997	990	990	987	989	991	1,048	1,059	1,070
South Carolina	3,643	3,664	3,673	3,699	3,760	3,836	3,886	4,012	4,063	4,107
South Dakota	715	721	729	732	738	738	733	755	757	761
Tennessee	5,099	5,175	5,256	5,320	5,368	5,430	5,484	5,689	5,740	5,797
Texas	18,031	18,378	18,724	19,128	19,439	19,759	20,044	20,852	21,325	21,780
Utah	1,860	1,908	1,952	2,000	2,059	2,099	2,130	2,233	2,270	2,316
Vermont	576	581	585	589	589	591	593	609	613	617
Virginia	6,491	6,552	6,619	6,675	6,734	6,792	6,873	7,079	7,188	7,294
Washington	5,255	5,343	5,431	5,533	5,610	5,689	5,756	5,894	5,988	6,069
West Virginia	1,820	1,822	1,828	1,826	1,816	1,811	1,807	1,808	1,802	1,802
Wisconsin	5,038	5,081	5,123	5,160	5,170	5,223	5,250	5,364	5,402	5,441
Wyoming	470	476	480	481	480	481	480	494	494	499
TOTAL	257,904	264,026	266,477	269,018	271,442	274,156	276,578	285,231	288,654	292,228

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2003.

State Court Organization 1998

The Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Center for State Courts announce *State Court Organization, 1998*. Copies are available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service and also on the Internet at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/sco98.htm>. The newest edition covers most of the topics included in the 1993 edition and several new topics as well. Notable additions are tables on court automation, specialized courts, the administrative authority of presiding trial court judges, and the processing of domestic violence cases. A table of contents appears below:

- 1. Courts and Judges**
 - 1 Appellate Courts in the United States
 - 2 Number of Appellate Court Justices
 - 3 Trial Courts and Trial Court Judges of the United States
- 2. Judicial Selection and Service**
 - 4 Selection of Appellate Court Judges
 - 5 Terms of Appellate Court Judges
 - 6 Qualifications to Serve as an Appellate Court Judge
 - 7 Selection and Terms of Trial Court Judges
 - 8 Qualifications to Serve as a Trial Court Judge
 - 9 Judicial Nominating Commissions
 - 10 Provisions for Mandatory Judicial Education
 - 11 Judicial Performance Evaluation
 - 12 Judicial Discipline: Investigating and Adjudicating Bodies
- 3. The Judicial Branch: Governance, Funding, and Administration**
 - 13 Governance of the Judicial Branch
 - 14 The Rule Making Authority of Courts of Last Resort by Specific Areas
 - 15 Judicial Councils and Conferences: Composition and Function
 - 16 Judicial Compensation Commissions
 - 17 Preparation and Submission of the Judicial Branch Budget
 - 18 Sources of Trial Court Funding and Staffing by Selected Expenditure Items
 - 19 Appellate Court Responsibilities and Staffing by Function
 - 20 Administrative Office of the Courts: Trial Court Responsibilities and Staffing by Function
 - 21 Court Automation
- 4. Appellate Courts: Jurisdiction, Staffing, and Procedures**
 - 22 Mandatory and Discretionary Jurisdiction of Appellate Courts
 - 23 Structure of Panels Reviewing Discretionary Petitions
 - 24 Clerks of Appellate Courts: Numbers and Method of Selection
 - 25 Provisions of Law Clerks to Appellate Court Judges
 - 26 Expediting Procedures in Appellate Courts
 - 27 Special Calendars in Appellate Courts
 - 28 Limitations on Oral Argument in Appellate Courts
- 5. Trial Courts: Administration, Procedures, Specialized Jurisdiction**
 - 29 Type of Court Hearing Administrative Agency Appeals
 - 30 Authority of Administrative Judges
 - 31 Trial Court Clerks
 - 32 Trial Court Administrators
 - 33 Specialized Court Jurisdiction: Drug Courts
 - 34 Specialized Court Jurisdiction: Family Courts
 - 35 Provisions for Processing Domestic Violence Cases
 - 36 Tribal Courts
 - 37 Media Coverage of Trial and Appellate Courts
 - 38 The Defense of Insanity: Standards and Procedures
- 6. The Jury**
 - 39 Trial Juries: Qualifications and Source Lists for Juror Service
 - 40 Trial Juries: Exemptions, Excusals, and Fees
 - 41 Trial Juries: Who Conducts Voir Dire and the Allocation of Peremptory Challenges
 - 42 Trial Juries: Size and Verdict Rules
 - 43 Grand Juries: Composition and Functions
- 7. The Sentencing Context**
 - 44 Sentencing Statutes: Key Definitions and Provisions for Sentence Enhancement
 - 45 Jurisdiction for Adjudication and Sentencing of Felony Cases
 - 46 Sentencing Procedures in Capital and Non-Capital Felony Cases
 - 47 The Availability of Intermediate Sanctions
 - 48 Active Sentencing Commissions/Sentencing Guideline Systems
 - 49 Collateral Consequences of a Felony Conviction
 - 50 Good Time Accumulation and Parole
- 8. Court Structure Charts**

State Court Organization, 1998, the fourth in a series initiated in 1980, is a joint effort by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Conference of State Court Administrators, and the National Center for State Courts.

THE NATIONAL
CENTER
FOR STATE
COURTS



WILLIAMSBURG, VA

300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23185-4147

DENVER, CO

1331 17th St., Ste. 402
Denver, CO 80202-1554

ARLINGTON, VA

2425 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 350
Arlington, VA 22201

Association Services

(800) 616-6165

Consulting

(800) 466-3063

Education

(800) 616-6206

Government Relations

(800) 532-0204

Information

(800) 616-6164

International Programs

(800) 797-2545

Publications

(888) 228-6272

Research

(800) 616-6109

Technology

(888) 846-6746

The National Center for State Courts is an independent, nonprofit, tax-exempt organization in accordance with Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue code. To find out about supporting the work and mission of The National Center, contact The National Center's Development Office at 1-800-616-6110, or development@ncsc.dni.us.