

Table 1.67

Staff and budget of judicial conduct organizations

By State, 1995-96

State	Total employed	Administrative or executive director	Attorneys	Investigators	Administrative assistants, secretaries	Other staff	Budget amount ^a	Judges subject to jurisdiction
Alabama ^b	2	1	0	0	1	0	\$175,411	535
Alaska	2	1	0	0	1	0	228,000	57
Arizona	4	1	0	1	2	0	208,700	444
Arkansas	4	1	0	1	1	1	280,175 ^c	400
California	25	1	14	0	8	2	2,997,000	1,554
Colorado	2	1	0	0	1	0	110,000	284
Connecticut	2	1	0	0	1	0	191,263 ^c	278
Delaware ^d	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	111
District of Columbia	3	1	1	0	1	0	124,000 ^e	88
Florida	3	1	1	0	1	0	457,775	779
Georgia	3	1	0	1	1	0	157,718	1,800
Hawaii	1	0	0	0	1	0 ^f	58,967	123
Idaho	2	1	0	0	1	0	104,000	140
Illinois	5	1	0	2	2	0	341,000	850
Indiana	2	1	0	0	1	0	(g)	500 ^h
Kansas	5	1 ⁱ	1	2	1	0	32,944	495 ^h
Kentucky	4	1	1	1	1	0	69,559	404
Louisiana	7	1	3	1	1	1	410,000	639
Maryland	4	1	0	1	1	1	225,416	284
Michigan	7	1	3	0	3	0	920,600	1,100
Minnesota	2	1	0	0	1	0	260,126 ^j	442
Mississippi	4	1	1	1	1	0	257,269	600
Missouri	3	1	0	0	2	0	190,581	650
Nebraska	3	1	0	1	1	0	40,000 ^c	135
Nevada	2	1	0	0	1	0	317,811	140
New Hampshire	3	1	0	0	2	0	10,000	150
New Jersey	3	1	0	1	1	0	165,000	825
New Mexico	3	1	1	0	1	0	145,800	274
New York	21	1	7	4	8	1	1,696,000	3,500
North Carolina	2 ^k	1	0	0	1	0	116,304	306
North Dakota	4	0	2	0	2	0	236,567	125
Ohio	18	1	6	1	7	3	1,068,323	1,125
Oklahoma	4	1	2	0	1	0	(m)	300
Oregon	1	1	0	0	0	0	65,000 ⁿ	600
Pennsylvania ^o	9	1	2	2	3	1	838,000	1,000
Rhode Island	1	0	0	0	0	1	84,914	95
South Carolina	2	1	0	0	1	0	65,140 ^c	775
South Dakota ^p	X	X	X	X	X	X	20,000 ^c	56
Tennessee	4	1	1	0	1	1	100,000	571
Texas	16	1	7	0	5	3	699,554	3,500
Utah	5	1	0	3	1	0	207,000	440
Virginia	3	1	1	0	0	1	386,941	741
Washington	6	1	0	2	2	1	663,120	405
West Virginia ^q	8	2	0	5	0	1	(r)	342

Note: The Center for Judicial Conduct Organizations conducts annual surveys of judicial conduct organizations. These organizations typically are State agencies created by statute or constitutional amendment with the mandate to receive, investigate, and dispose of complaints regarding judicial misconduct. Figures presented include both full- and part-time staff. Information was not available for Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Judicial conduct organizations use different reporting periods. Most of the figures reported are for fiscal year 7/95 to 6/96. Other reporting periods are: 7/94 to 6/95 for Arizona; calendar year 1995 for Ohio; 4/96 to 3/97 for New York; 9/95 to 8/96 for Texas; 10/95 to 9/96 for the Alabama Judicial Inquiry Commission and the District of Columbia; 7/96 to 6/97 for Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and South Dakota; and 10/97 to 9/98 for Michigan. Kansas provided figures for calendar year 1996. California, Nebraska, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Washington provided figures for 7/96 to 6/97.

^aCross-jurisdiction comparisons of budgets should be done with caution. Some judicial conduct organizations have their offices in private buildings and must pay rent, while other organizations are located in State buildings and incur no rental expense. The budgets of some judicial conduct organizations include all salaries of their personnel, while other organizations receive personnel support from State agencies.

^bAlabama has a two-tier judicial disciplinary system; figures are for the Judicial Inquiry Commission, the first tier.

^cDoes not include litigation costs. In most cases, these costs are borne by the State attorney general's office.

^dThe Court on the Judiciary does not have a budget or staff. The court designates a clerk and may designate one or more deputy clerks, who have powers prescribed by the court. At the time of the survey, a staff attorney with the supreme court was designated as the clerk.

^eThe budget of the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure also covers the costs for its evaluation of active judges who seek reappointment and the reviews of retired judges who wish to continue their judicial service as senior judges.

^fThe seven members of the Commission on Judicial Conduct perform many staff functions.

^gThe Commission on Judicial Qualifications is part of the supreme court and has no separate budget.

^hIn addition, the Commission has jurisdiction over certain other court personnel, such as retired judges and pro tem judges.

ⁱThe appellate clerk serves as the executive director of the Commission on Judicial Qualifications.

^jDoes not include litigation costs.

^kThe attorney general's office provides investigative services and special counsel to the Judicial Standards Commission.

^lStaff and budget are shared by the Judicial Conduct Commission and the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court.

^mStaff are paid by the supreme court. There is a reserve fund for special investigative or attorney services.

ⁿThe commission may request additional funds for investigations and hearings.

^oPennsylvania has a two-tier judicial disciplinary system; figures are for the Judicial Conduct Board, the first tier.

^pPersonnel are hired as needed.

^qWest Virginia has a two-tier judicial discipline system; figures are for the Judicial Investigation Commission, the first tier.

^rThe budget of the Judicial Investigation Commission is part of the supreme court budget.

Source: American Judicature Society, Center for Judicial Conduct Organizations, *Judicial Conduct Reporter*, Vol. 19, No. 2-3 (Chicago: American Judicature Society, Summer-Fall 1997), pp. 4, 5. Table adapted by SOURCEBOOK staff. Reprinted by permission.