Digital Audio/Video Recording Technology (DART) Committee

Evaluation of Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Background on this evaluation: The DART Committee invited four widely known DART vendors to install one of their systems in one courtroom in Iowa's district courts. The committee selected five courtrooms in different parts of the state to ensure that the test would be done in various settings (urban and rural) involving various case types. The locations and vendors included the following:

Location	Vendor
Black Hawk County, a felony trial courtroom	Jefferson Audio/Video Systems
Dickinson County, a district associate judge's courtroom:	High Criteria, Inc.
District 8, associate juvenile judge who travels to 5 counties	For the Record (FTR) – portable
Polk County, district associate judge's courtroom	For the Record, Inc. (FTR)
Story County, district judge's courtroom (civil & criminal)	Voice IQ Solutions (VIQ)

The installations occurred in mid-to-late September. Each vendor trained one or two court support staff on how to run the system and enter log notes (annotations) during the course of a hearing (e.g., case number and title, names of persons who speak during the hearing).

After each courtroom had been using the DART systems for at least a month, the DART Committee co-chairs instructed the judge in each test courtroom to select a recently conducted hearing of 15 to 30 minutes and to send the digital recordings to state court administration (SCA) staff. The digital recordings were copied onto CDs and sent to each committee member, who was asked to listen to each of the recordings to determine clarity and completeness. SCA staff also asked the court reporter in each of the test courtrooms to produce a written transcript of the selected hearing. SCA staff further arranged to have the digital recordings transcribed by an independent transcription company in Phoenix, AZ, which employs transcriptionists certified by the American Association of Electronic Recorders and Transcribers (AAERT). Copies of all ten transcripts (two for each of the five selected hearings) were emailed to all DART Committee members. Each member was specifically assigned to evaluate the two transcripts from one of the five hearings – by reading each transcript while listening to the digital recording of that hearing. Members who had time to do so evaluated the transcripts from multiple hearings. Software from each vendor allowed listeners to: (1) isolate individual tracks on the recordings by listening to just the track associated with the microphone on which the speaker was speaking; and (2) slow down the speed of the replay in case a speaker was speaking too fast. Using headphones also significantly enhanced the clarity of the recordings. Members wrote their evaluations on a standard evaluation form. This document is a compilation of the evaluation forms received from committee members.

Evaluation of

Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Black Hawk County

Probation Revocation Hearing

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Black Hawk

Evaluator's name: TABOR Date: _____

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 Devries' vs. Devries's	1 1:44
	2 You are vs. You're	2 2:06
	3	3
	4	4
	5	5
	6	6
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 final lea (sic) vs. fine only	1 1:29
	2 (counsel + client confer)	2 3:18
	3 vs. "Is that your	3
	4 understanding?	4
	THE D: Yeah"	
	5	5
	6	6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 none really	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

Court repater's transcript was more thorough and better reflected hard to hear portions.

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Blackhawk**

Evaluator's name: **Judge Bill Pattinson** Date: November 15, 2009

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 Omitted the word "order" (see page 4, line 16) 2 Wrote "You have the right to appeal." Judge stated "You have no right to appeal" (see line 1, page 5)	1 3:25 2 3:45
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 Wrote "... agreeing with his probation..." Speaker said "... agreeing that his probation..." see line 23, page 3. 2 Wrote "... for the final lee (sic)..." Speaker said "... for the fine only..." see line 25, page 3.	1 1:28 2 1:30

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
None	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) _XX__Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

I gave this particular recording a "good/acceptable" rating solely because the assistant County Attorney was a bit difficult to hear in some spots if I didn't isolate her microphone channel. She was harder to hear than the other participants because she had positioned herself a goodly distance (at least 5 or 6 feet) from the system's microphone, and she exacerbated that problem by standing to make her comments. Whomever was operating the DART system should have caught that problem.

Otherwise, the Judge's speech was clear as a bell as was defense counsel's. The defendant's voice was also a bit faint as he was slouched back in his seat and was several feet from the microphone.

While I do not necessarily consider this to be a error, the AVTranz transcriptionist omitted a couple of short comments made between defense counsel and the defendant and not to the court. Instead that transcriptionist referred to that portion only as "(Counsel and client confer)." See page 5, line 16. The official court reporter did include that tête-à-tête but not get it all.

Finally, the JAVS video system that flips the camera from speaker to speaker seemed like it would make transcription a lot easier than having just the voices to identify the various players.

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Black Hawk**

Evaluator's name: **Potterfield** Date: 11-17-09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 "Is that your understanding" vs. Does that sound right? This was mumbled between defense counsel and defendant – able to hear only be isolating mike 2 "the" right to appeal vs. "no" right to appeal – this was clear – an error from doing this many times	1 1:55 2 1:55
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 Daniel "d" vs. Daniel Dean 2 "with" his probation vs. "that" his probation 3 "final lee" vs. "fine only" – this one is serious 4 (counsel and client confer) vs. what was said	1 1:52 2 1:53 3 1:53 4 1:55

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 I was able to pick up defense counsel's inaudible by isolating the mike – never could pick up prosecutor's "It's in the order" although both court reporter and transcriptionist were able to hear "That's in the" and transcriptionist was able to hear "order" apparently. 2 play back function is jerky and hard to get precisely 3 the video was great to have and a big help.	1 1:55 2 3 4 5 6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Black Hawk County**

Evaluator's name: **John Goerdt** Date: Nov. 15, 2009

A. Transcript Evaluation:	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 – p. 3, line 22: "agreeing that his probation.." [correct: ""agreeing with his probation.."] 2 – p. 4, line 12: "Is that your understanding?" [correct: "Does that sound right?"] Note: The digital transcriber reported this as: "(Counsel and client confer)". 3 – p. 5, line 1: "You have **a** right to appeal." [correct: "You have **no** right to appeal."] **<< substantive error**	1 – 1:18 2 – 3:17 3 – 3:44
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 – p. 3, line 25: "final lee (sic)" [correct: "fine only"] 2 – p. 5, line 16: The digital transcriber reported "(Counsel and client confer)". The recording says: "Does that sound right?"	1 – 1:30 2 – 3:17

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

_**XX**__ Excellent (3)___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

This is a very short probation revocation hearing. The recording is very clear. The video allowed one to see that the defendant's attorney leaned over to talk to his client at 3:17 on the recording, which the digital transcriber recorded as "(Counsel and client confer)".

Using headphones/ear-buds significantly improves the audio quality on **all the recordings from all vendors**.

Evaluation of

Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Dickinson County

Civil Motion Hearing

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Dickinson County**

Evaluator's name: **Judge Bobbi M. Alpers** Date: November 16, 2009

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 Wrote name as spelled and not the one as pronounced when there was a difference (Page 3, Line 12) Element of style vs. accuracy? 2 Wrote "insured" and it is the "insurer" (page 3, Line 16) 3 Left out "the court" (Page 4, Line 2)	1 3:03:48 2 3:04:18 3 3:05:02
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 Left out (sic) when the LLC was incorrectly identified as Iowa Dental and not Broadway Dental (Page 3, LINE 23) while court reporter caught this and marked it at the same place	1 3:04:50

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 I did not find much range in the volume; it may have been my problem. 2 The sound on the "All Channels" was very similar to the sound on the individual channels for the judge/attorneys/ etc. so I did not receive much help from use of the individual channels feature.	1 Throughout 2 Throughout

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) _XX_Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

The differences between the two transcripts I reviewed are minor. When there was noise interference in the courtroom, that noise affected the court reporter's ability to be accurate so the reporter stopped the proceeding to get the language down. Under the same circumstances the transcriptionist was presumably able to use the individual channels later to clarify and then get the language down. Although produced differently, each transcript was short and accurate.

This is a very brief hearing with no witnesses so the production of the transcript for either the reporter or the transcriptionist may not be representative of transcript issues in longer evidentiary hearings when witnesses, jurors and court personnel are the ones speaking rather than attorneys. Finally, I thought the sound level of the lawyer who called in was very similar to the sound level of the lawyer who was present in the courtroom.

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Dickinson County**

Evaluator's name: **Beth Baldwin** Date: 11/16/09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 p. 3, line 3 missing "there" 2 p. 3, line 12 attorney said the first time, "Estate of Ravencroft" but transcript says Ravenstein. 3 p. 3, line 14, "right" was singular as I heard the recording. 4 p. 4, line 2 missing, "the court" 5 p. 4, line 20 missing "you know" 6 p. 4, line 22 missing a sentence but the court reporter did acknowledge she was having trouble hearing over the speaker phone and asked to stop, and the judge joined in. Still, we missed the sentence from the attorney and never got back to it.	1 -6:47 2 -5:56 3 -5:40 4 – 4:43 5 - 3:20 6 -3:08
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 p. 2, line 4 No initial "E" stated in defendant's name on recording. 2 p. 3, line 20 same problem	1 ? 2 ?

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 If we did this fully, I would want the speaker phone to be hooked into a specific microphone channel not going through the entire PA system. It would be hard for a court reporter or a transcriber to hear what was said. This is particularly problematic for a court reporter who can't go back and listen to the tape but has one shot to get it right. Otherwise, the recording was fine/great.	**1**

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) **XX** Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

I do think that at -3:52 and right before that at -3:50 the attorney called the defendant "Brian" instead of "Ryan." Neither transcript caught this and I could have been hearing things, but I listened to it 5 times and I would have said "Brian" (sic) both times if I had prepared the transcript. (Maybe my ears are just old).

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Dickinson

Evaluator's name: Tabor Date: _____

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 It's been the long-standing law of Iowa 2 McCann vs. Cann 3 Ravenscroft v. Ravenstein 4 extra quotes 5 missing "giving rise to incident in question" 6	1 5:42 2 5:49 3 6:29 4 6:47 5 9:11 6
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 in longstanding vs. long-standing 2 misses "that is" (repeated) 3 4 5 6	1 5:42 2 11:25 3 4 5 6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 none 2 - picked up speaker phone well 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

Court reporter added (sic) p 3 line 25 - not in transcription otherwise transcription just, if not more, accurate.

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Dickinson County**

Evaluator's name: **John Goerdt** Date: Nov. 15, 2005

NOTE: One attorney appeared via telephone conference call, which was broadcast in the courtroom via the PA speakers. Therefore, the recording captures his voice from the PA system, not from directly speaking into a microphone. This challenging situation is the reason this hearing was chosen for evaluation by the committee.

A. Transcript Evaluation:	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 – p. 3, line 3: "..that no claim arises.." [correct: "..that there... no claim arises.."]	1 – 5:25
	2 – p. 3, line 7: "McCann.." [correct: "Cann.."]	2 – 5:45
	3 -- p. 3, line 12: "Estate vs. Ravenstein" [correct: "Estate vs. Ravenscroft"]	3 – 6:20
	4 -- p. 3, line 14: "..no rights" [correct: "..no right"]	4 – 6:28
	5 -- p. 3, line 17: "until a judgment against the insur**ed** is returned unsatisfied" [correct: "until a judgment against the insur**er** is returned unsatisfied"] **<< substantive error! [SEE COMMENT]**	5 – 6:43
	6 – p. 4, line 2: "I would ask that.." [correct: "Iowa would ask the court that.."]	
	6 – p. 3, line 25: "Iowa (sic) Dental..." [The "(sic)" is apparently here because the attorney misspoke: Broadway Dental LLC is the owner of the condo, not IA Dental. The digital transcriber did not note this.]	6 – 7:20
	7 – p. 4, line 22: ".. were negligent individually. I think..." [correct: "..were negligent individually, giving rise to the incident in question. So while...] << At about this point the court reporter interrupts the attorney –who appeared via telephone conference call -- due to difficulty hearing the attorney (which the CR acknowledges parenthetically immediately after "So while...".	7 – 9:04
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 – p. 2, line 3: "Ryan E. Bygness" [correct: "Ryan Bygness"]	1 – 4:12
	2 -- p. 3, line 20: "Ryan E. Bygness" [correct: "Ryan Bygness"]	2 – 7:00

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

_X__ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

NOTE on CR error #5: Being able to significantly slow down the speed of the replay on the digital recording was critical to hearing what that attorney said at 6:43 on the recording pertaining (insur**er** – *not insur**ed**)*. Given the attorney who appeared via conference call was heard only through the PA system – and because he spoke rather fast – this would have been a difficult hearing for a court reporter to capture accurately.

Evaluation of

Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Jefferson County

Juvenile Hearing

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Jefferson County**

Evaluator's name: **Beth Baldwin** Date: 11/16/09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 p. 3, line 4, missed "the" before "...counsel Steve Small." 2 p. 3, line 24 should say, "First Resource" that's what was said, but says "Fist Resources" in transcript. 3 See Comments	1 12:02:03 2 12:02.37 3
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 See Comments	1

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1. The audio recording was just not fresh and clear like the other test recordings. I would not consider this recording acceptable for purposes of making a court record day in and day out. You could make a transcript from the recording but I would not want this to be an official record without significant improvement on the portable unit's performance. I could not recommend use of the portable unit based upon this example. It would need great improvement.	1 2 3 4

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) **XXX** Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

Both the court reporter and the transcriptionist did a lot of cleaning up for the speakers in these transcripts. There were a multitude of uhms and ahs, stutters and repetition of words. I do not know the professional standard or rules for cleaning up various speakers' language. I would say that both the court reporter and the transcriptionist did basically the same thing in their clean up efforts, so there is no appreciable difference between the two on this issue.

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Jefferson County**

Evaluator's name: **John Goerdt** Date: Nov. 15, 2009

A. Transcript Eval:	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 – p. 3, line 24: "First Resources" [correct: "First Resource"] 2 – p. 8, line 6: "What services did Dustin participate in with you?" [correct: What services did Dustin participate in with you and the department?"] 3 – p. 9, line 5: "..around that time.." [correct: "..around the time.."] 4 – p. 9, line 10: "No. Dustin's father..." [correct: "No. Q: To your knowledge? A: Dustin's father..." 5 – p. 10, line 2: "counseling" [correct: "cancelling"] 6 – p. 10, line 23: "provisions" [correct: "provision"]	1 –12:02:25 2 – 12:07:24 3 – 12:08:05 4—12:08:48 5 – 12:09:37 6 –12:10:16
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 – P. 4, line 13: "...do you have something for the record?" [correct: "..do you have some further record?"] 2 – p. 10, line 23: "..ask the court to consider.." [correct: "..ask the court consider.."] 3 – p. 11, line 7: "..what further record did you.." [correct: "..what further record do you.."]	1 –12:02:10 2 –12:10:33 3 – 12:10:46

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): **None** (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

_**XX**_ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

I used **headphones/earbuds, which were very helpful; they made a significant difference.** I also **isolated tracks** to shut off the track nearest the baby, who made noises, and adjusted the volume of the track on which the speaker was recorded – as necessary – to improve the ability to understand the speaker.

Both the court reporter's and digital recording transcriber's transcripts excluded a multitude of "um" and "ah" sounds. In fact, this appeared to be the case in all the transcripts from the five counties – with the exception of the court reporter's transcript from Story County (in which almost all the se sounds are included).

Evaluation of

Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Polk County

Sentencing Hearing

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Polk**

Evaluator's name: **Scott Hand** Date: 11-15-2009

A. Transcript Evaluation:	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 word 'this' should be 'that'	1 11:13:39
	2 words 'all right' added	2 11:14:57
	3 missing 'yes'	3 11:14:59
	4 'through' replaced with 'throughout'	4 11:15:52
	5 missing word 'both'	5 11:16:23
	6 should say 'and the next memory'	6 11:16:32
-→ ct rpt stopped & corrected #6	7 missing word 'tried'	7 11:18:23
	8 wrong word 'when' should be 'where'	8 11:18:28
	9 missing 'because'	9 11:28:55
	10 missing 'very'	10 11:29:44
	11 missing 'that'	11 11:31:46
	12 wrong word, 'concurrently' in xscript, word 'concurrent' in audio	12 11:31:55
	13 missing 'your honor'	13 11:32:04
	14 missing 'of values'	14 11:33:25
	15 wrong word, 'whatever' should be 'every'	15 11:34:26
	16 'don't' should be 'didn't'	16 11:35:57
	17 'on' should be 'in'	17 11:37:15
	18 'review' should be 'view'	18 11:38:24
	19 'that' should be 'the'	19 11::38:37
	20 missing word 'so'	20 11:40:02
	21 "can't" should be "can"	21 11:40:54
	22 missing word "today"	22 11:41:57
	23 missing word 'distractions'	23 11:43:26
	24 added word "other"	24 11:43:30

Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 missing word 'the' 2 'concurrently' used in xcript, 'concurrent' in audio	1 11:29:36 2 11:31:55

B. <u>Problems with the Digital Recording</u> (describe): None (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

__X__ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

Polk County – Scott Hand's evaluation

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Polk

Evaluator's name: David C. Larson Date: 11-16-09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 "defendant" should have been "victim"	1 pg. 2 line 21
	2 "--or both 18--1995" should have been "or both 8/3/1995"	2 pg. 3 line 15
	3 "Identify" should have been "Identity"	3 pg. 3 line 16
	4 "when I called 911" should have been "when I tried to call 911"	4 pg. 6 lines 12-13
	5 "when Gary punched me" should have been "where Gary punched me"	5 pg. 6 line 14
Continued on page 2	6 "Panicking in public" should have been "Panicky in public"	6 pg. 8 line 13
	7. "Your honor" omitted at start of line 20 pg. 14	7. Pg. 14 line 20
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 "knees" should have been "knee"	1 pg. 6 line 25
	2 "file a supplemental order" should have been "follow a supplemental order"	2 pg. 13 line 15
	3 "helplessness" should have been "hopelessness"	3 pg. 16 line 19
	4 "because" should have been "It's ..."	4 pg. 18 line 23
	5 "p.m." should have been "a.m."	5 pg. 24 line 3
	6	6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 No problems noted	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary): I left out several minor transcription errors on the Court Reporter's transcript such as: This/That; are/were; have/had; my/the; I'm/am; singular vs. plural issues; repeats (stuttering) not included and statements by the Court Reporter such as "repeat" or "slow down" Over all, the transcript from the digital recorder was more accurate on a word for word basis.

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 -- OR -- EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

Page 2 of 3

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Polk

Evaluator's name: David C. Larson Date: 11-16-09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	8 "THE DEFENDANT: I wasn't either" omitted on line 1 pg-15 after the words "great deal" 9 "fault" should have been "fall" 10 "the cause" should have been "Because" 11 "in whatever way" should have been "in every way" 12 "If I have to do that" should have been "I have to do that" 13 "review" should have been "view" 14. "can't" should have been "can".	8 pg-15 line 1 9 pg-15 line 22 10 pg-15 line 23 11 pg-16 line 1 12 pg-16 line 24 13 pg-18 line 9 14. pg-20 line 6
Continued on page 3		
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

Page 3 of 3

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Polk

Evaluator's name: David C. Larson Date: 11-16-09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	15 "Meaning" should be "leading" 16 "I'm not going to appeal" omitted 17 "No other--" should have been "No other distractions" 4 5 6	15 pg.20 line 19 2 pg.21 line 10 3 pg.22 line 10 4 5 6
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Polk County**

Evaluator's name: **Martha Lucey** Date: October 20, 2009 (sentencing hearing)

A. Transcript Eval	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1. p. 3 L21 - "this" should be "that" 2. p. 4 L11 ? "All right." Did not hear that 3. p. 5 L5 - "throughout" should be "through" 4. p. 6 L12 ? "when I tried to call 911" instead of "when I called 911" 5. p. 12 L14 omitted "totals" between "those" & "will" 6. p. 13 L2 omitted "very" between "was" & "smart" 7. p. 14 L5-16 – ?? some verbal stumbling cleaned up? 8. p. 14 L24-25 – omitted "Qualley: I'm sorry, I'm sorry." 9. p. 15 L17 "in jail" should be "of values" 10. p. 16 L1 "whatever" should be "every" 11. p. 16 L24 ?? "if" (added?) 12. p. 18 L9 'review' should be "view" 13. p. 20 L18 "had" should be "have" 14. p. 20 L24 omitted 'today" after "end" 15. p. 21 L2 ?? "exist" instead of "exists"	1. 11:13:38 2. 11:14:55 3 11:15:53 4. 11:18:24 5. 11:29:07 6. 11:29:44 7. 11:31:18-:40 8. 11:32:16 9. 11:33:25 10. 11:34:25 11. 11:36:27 12. 11:38:24 13. 11:41:42 14. 11:41:57 15. 11:42:09
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1. p. 3 L9 ??? did not hear court say that 2. p. 13 L14 "fold" should be "totals" 3. p. 13 L15 ?? "file" think he actually said "follow" 4. p. 16 L19 "helplessness" should be "hopelessness" 5. p. 18 L10-11 - not necessary to include 6. p. 23 L 7 – I could not hear this statement – but did not isolate the tracks.	1. 11:11:06 2. 11:29:07 3. 11:29:09 4. 11:33:16 5. 11:36:37 6. 11:43:02

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1. At times, it is difficult to hear the lawyers if they are away from microphones. 2. Mostly, the judge was clear and easily understood. Did not hear some of the statements the transcriber had attributed to the judge. 3. The defendant, Jones, was hard to understand at times. 4. The camera needs to be re-positioned to include the judge or have multiple cameras.	1 2 3 4

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

___ Excellent (3) _X__Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary): See next page

Polk County Recording (Martha Lucey's comments)

1. I did not think it was important to distinguish between "yeah" and "yep". On occasions, the court reporter and the transcriber had different words.
2. I am not sure whether the official record does or should include all of the statements made by the people who are not supposed to be speaking. Some of the statements made by Jones and the victim are not ordinarily included in the transcripts.
3. I was told the microphones were so sensitive that when attorneys were at the back of the court room and a proceeding was occurring at the bench, the attorneys who were not a part of the on-the-record proceeding were picked up. After viewing and hearing the recording, I am not sure that anyone would be easily recorded if not right at counsel table.
4. I did not isolate the tracks. I did, however, listen to the recording 4 times.
5. The transcriber's transcript is pretty complete. The only concern if whether the transcriber understands Iowa Rules of Court.

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Polk County**

Evaluator's name: **John Goerdt** Date: 11-15-09

A. Transcript Eval:	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 – p. 2, line 20: "...and the defendant..." [correct: "...and that the defendant..."]	1 –11:11:30
	2 – p. 2, line 23: "Other than the specific..." [correct: "So other than that specific..."]	2 – 11:11:44
	3 – p. 3, line 13: "There are two offenses..." [correct: "On sec... there are two offenses..."]	3 – 11:12:47
	4 – p. 3, line 15: "...or both 18 – 1995.." [correct: "...or both 8/3/1995..."	4– 11:12:56
	5 – p. 3, line 21: "Other than this..." [correct: "Other than that..]	5 – 11:13:26
	6 – p. 4, line 1: "... shows as those..." [correct: "... those shows as those...]	6 – 11:13:47
	7 –p. 4, line 7: "... there's also a fighting in public..." [correct: "... there's also a pub... or a fighting in public...]	7 – 11:14:14
	8 –p. 5, line 5: "..throughout the years.." [correct: "through the years.."]	8 – 11:15:46
	9 – p. 5, line 15: "My next memory..." [correct: "And the next.."]	9 – 11:16:27
	10 – p. 5, line 17: Omitted the court reporter's interruption: "Ma'am, I'm sorry. You're going to have to slow it... I'm sorry but you're going to have to slow down." Then Ms. Steen: "Where do you want me to go back to?...	10 – 11:16:30
	11 – p. 6, line 13: "...when I **called** 911..." [correct: "...when I **tried to call** 911..."]	11 – 11:18:21
	12 – p. 6, line 14: "...when Gary punched me.." [correct: "... where Gary punched me..."]	12 – 11:18:26
	13 – p. 7, line 11: "my pillow" [correct: "the pillow"]	13 –11:19:48
	14 – p. 7, line 25: "nightmares" [correct: "nightwares... mares"]	14 – 11:20:41
	15 – p. 12, line 14: "...those will become available..." [correct: "... those folds (?) become available.."]	15 – 11:29:02
	16 – p. 13, line 2: "he was smart" [correct: "he was very smart"]	16 – 11:29:42
	17 – p. 13, line 13: "This is a case.." [correct: "Well, this is a case"]	17 – 11:30:20
	18 – p. 13, line 23: "..that he's not responsible.." [correct: "..that, you know, he's not responsible..."]	18 – 11:30:56
	19 – p. 14, line 2: "When he's been incarcerated.." [correct: "In prison, when he's been incarcerated..."]	19 – 11:31:05
	20 – p. 14, line 3: "attended several classes, been in jail..." [correct: "attended several classes, he's been in jail..."	20 – 11:31:28
	21 – p. 14, line 8: "request to the court" [correct: "request the court"]	21 – 11:31:25
	22 – p. 14, line 9: "the following things..." [correct: "the following issue... one of the following things"]	22 – 11:31:28
	23 – p. 14, line 13: "mistake" [correct: "mistakes"]	23 -- 11:31:39

	24 – p. 14, line 13: "Or if the ..." [correct: "Or that if the..."]	24 -- 11:31:39
	25 – p. 14, line 15: "concurrently" [correct: "concurrent"]	25 – 11:31:49
	26 – p. 14, line 15: "That further... the defense.." [correct: "That further... with that the defense..."]	26 – 11:31:49
	27 – p. 14, line 20: "Before ..." [correct: "Your Honor, before..."]	27 – 11:32:02
	28 -- p. 14, line 23: "That's why..." [correct: "As you... that's why"]	28 -- 11:32:10
	29 -- p. 14, line 23: completely omitted: "Mr Qualley: 'I'm sorry, I'm sorry..."	29 -- 11:32:15
	30 – p. 15, line 3: "After the domestic..." [correct: "After, after the domestic.."]	30 – 11:32:35
	31 -- p. 15, line 5: "..emotions have surfaced" [correct: ".. emotions surfaced"]	31 – 11:32:41
	32 – p. 15, line 12: "Fear is – I'm fearful.." [correct: "Fear is.. fear... I'm fearful..."]	32 – 11:33:08
	33 – p. 15, line 17: "a real sense **in jail.**" [correct: "a real sense **of values.**"]	33 – 11:33:20
	34 -- p. 15, line 18: "begun" [correct: "began"]	34 – 11:33:22
	35 -- p. 15, line 23: the speaker pauses and is weeping at this point; clearly audible [correct?: "(pause... weeping)]	35 – 11:33:45
	36 – p. 15, line 24: omitted: "Court Reporter: 'I'm sorry. What was the last thing you said?'"	36 – 11:34:09
	37 – p. 16, line 1: "in whatever way" [correct: "in every way"]	37 – 11:34:24
	38 – p. 16, line 15: "some peace of mind and serenity" [correct: "peace of mind and some serenity"]	38 -- 11:35:46
	39 – p. 16, line 16: "don't" [correct: "didn't"]	39 – 11:35:55
	40 – p. 17, line 4: "reviewed" [correct: "review"]	40 – 11:36:40
	41 – p. 17, line 13: "And it's not based on alcohol..." [correct: "And that it's not based in alcohol..."]	41 – 11:37:09
	42 – p. 17, line 19: After the judge says: "your criminal history goes back for 30 years..." the DEFENDANT says "I know." This is omitted	42 – 11:37:29
	43 – p. 18, line 9: "my **review**" [correct: "my **view**"]	43 – 11:38:19
	44 – p. 18, line 12: "that therapy" [correct: "the therapy"]	44 – 11:38:36
	45 – p. 18, line 18: "the court" [correct: "this court"]	45 – 11:38:55
	46 – p. 19, line 7: "Sir, I need to" [correct: "Sir, you're... I need to"]	46 – 11:39:30
	47 – p. 19, line 8: "... the statutory – from the mandatory.." [correct: "...the statutory mandatory... from the mandatory..."	47 – 11:39:36
	48 – p. 19, line 16 "...between now..." [correct: "so between..."]	48 – 11:39:58
	49 – p. 20, line 1: "If I'm made aware on my own motion..." [correct: "If I'm made aware the... on my own motion..."	49 – 11:40:33
	50 – p. 20, line 12: "penalties" [correct: "penalty"]	50 -- 11:41:13
	51 – p. 20, line 18: "had been" [correct: "have been"]	51 -- 11:41:39
	52 – p. 20, line 24: "needs to end.." [correct: "needs to end today"]	52 -- 11:41:55
	53 – p. 21, line 2: "exists" [correct: "exist"]	53 -- 11:42:07
	54 – p. 21, line 12: "important if..." [correct: "important that if..."]	54 -- 11:41:32
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 – p. 3, line 18: "and I think..." [correct: "...I think..."]	1 – 11:11:22
	2 – p. 4, line 7: "...are indicate..." [correct: "..are an indicate..."]	2 – 11:12:15
	3 –The Court Report included a few words here in the transcript between counsel and defendant; the digital recording transcriber notes: "(Counsel and client confer) Is this an omission?	3 – 11:12:24
	4 – p. 14, line 5: "...to court" [correct: "...with a court"]	4 – 11:29:52
	5 – p. 15, line 7: "that the court..." [correct: "the court..."]	5 – 11:31:25

	6 – p. 15, line 14: "concurrently" [correct: "concurrent"] 7 – p. 16, line 14: "I wish" [correct: "I would wish"] 8 – p. 17, line 3: "Because..." [correct: "The cause..."] 9 – p. 17, line 4: "disastrous state" [correct: "disastrous fate"] 10 – p. 18, line 23: "because a lot..." [correct: "it's a lot..."]	6 – 11:31:49 7 – 11:32:55 8 – 11:34:04 9 – 11:34:08 10 – 11:37:16

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): Background noise, but being able to isolate tracks and listen multiple times helped.	Note the time on recording where problem occurred

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

_ X __ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

The vast majority of the errors by the court reporter and the AV Tranz transcriber are minor. They would not change the essential meaning of most sentences. Depending on the context or the type of testimony, however, the court reporter's errors **#11, 33, and 43 could be substantive**.

There was quite a bit of background noise (e.g., phone ringing). I did isolate tracks on occasion. This helped reduce background noise. **I also wore headphones/earbuds – which helped a lot.**

The digital recording, which provides the ability to listen to selected segments multiple times – as needed, is a big advantage for the AV transcriber vs. the court reporter, who gets just one opportunity to get it right.

Evaluation of

Digital Recordings of Court Hearings in 5 Iowa Counties

(November 2009)

Story County

Dissolution of Marriage Hearing

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Story County**

Evaluator's name: **Beth Baldwin** Date: 11/16/09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 p. 6, line 13 should be , "And what is the residence" not "where's the residence 2 p. 9, line 2 should be, "And does that also include..." not "And does the allowance..." 3 p. 14, line 8 should be "the summer before when" not "be when" 4 p. 27, line 12 should say "$21,600...$21,620" not just "$21,620."	1 5:20 2 7:58 3 13:05 4 27:50
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 p. 6, line 17 missing, "And..." at the beginning of the line. 2 p. 14, line 3 says DMAT , should be DMACC 3 p. 15, line 10 missing "has" should say "Dee has asked..." 4 p. 14, line 12 should say summer before when 5 p. 20, line 16, not "what" but "which"	1 5:06 2 12:31 3 14:05 4 13:05 5 20:47

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 None that I noticed. I thought it was very clear. The lawyer and client were very easy to understand.	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

XXX Excellent (3)___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary): The Transcriptionist says the case is in Story County, the Court Reporter's Transcript says Boone County. Transcriptionist is wrong, but I can see why the mistake was made as she/he did not do the whole case and is just doing a portion for a test. Neither transcript was perfect, but neither had any major, case changing mistakes. Both would be an acceptable transcript for a divorce/dissolution case.

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Story County

Evaluator's name: Esther J Olson Date: 11-13-09

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 2 3 4 5 6 * None noted	1 2 3 4 5 6
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 DMACC was taken as DMAT 2 3 4 5 6 * Page 14, line number 3 of Transcript	1 ? 2 3 4 5 6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4

When completed – return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

5	5
6	6
* None noted	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):
X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

A. Transcript Evaluation
1. Court Reporter's Transcript
I did not note any errors.
I did note that the court reporter was very diligent about taking down the "um" & "uh" by witnesses.
The court reporter also, verbatim, when a person said "ya" as opposed to you or left the ending off a word, as "gonna" versus "going". The independent transcriptionist "cleaned it up."
2. Transcript from Recording See above
B. Digital Recording
The recording was very clear & audible.

When completed - return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: john.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **Story County**

Evaluator's name: **Lucy J. Gamon** Date: November 14, 2009

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	**Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)**	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 "name" should be "names" 2 "the allowance" should be "that also" 3 "the" should be "our" 4 "account" should be "accounts" 5 "a" should be "the" 6 "$21,600" is omitted from the answer	1 3:55 2 7:53 3 9:11 4 25:23 5 26:30 6 27:46
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 "DMAT" should be "DMACC" 2 "Petitioner Notes" should be "Petitioner's" 3 the word "has" is omitted 4 the word "premarital" actually stated twice by attorney	1 12:29 2 12:45 3 14:02 4 27:20

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 No problems noted.	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

_X__ Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

Comments on next page

D. Comments - by Judge Lucy Gamon

1. The digital recording is crystal clear. I really enjoyed learning how to use the VIQ player. Being able to slow down the recording was helpful at a few points. I would rate both the transcripts as excellent. They are functionally perfect—the minor errors noted are really not substantive in any way.
2. Interestingly, the court reporter included statements by the "DART Operator" in the beginning portion of her transcript and the independent transcriptionist did not. I could not hear those statements on the recording, so I presume the recorder does not pick up people who are not reasonably close to a microphone. I don't consider this a defect, just an observation.
3. The independent transcriptionist did not include the use of "um" and "uh" in her transcript and the court reporter did include the usage of these terms. I don't consider this a defect in the transcript prepared by the independent transcriptionist. My Webster's doesn't include these terms as words, although my Scrabble dictionary says they are!

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: Story

Evaluator's name: TABOR Date: _____

A. Transcript Evaluation: (If more than 6 errors, add an additional sheet)	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording where error occurred
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 Boone Co au carr	1
	2 wheredo the residence 'stead what is the residence.	2 9:04
	3 Arts in Science 'stead Arts and Science	3 9:05
	4 ya, ja stead you	4 9:09
	5 wanna – want to	5 9:14
	6 account(s) (singular shd be plural)	6 9:25
	7 leaves out $21,600	7 9:27
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 OMAT 'stead OMACC	1 9:12
	2 Add word "Notes"	2 9:12
	3 "Because"/ stead "so"	3 9:25
	4	4
	5	5
	6	6

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	Note the time on recording where problem occurred
1 none, clear audio	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

Court reporter includes many hesitation words "um" + colloquial pronunciation, transcriptionist does not e.g., doin' makin'

When completed -- return to John Goerdt at FAX#: (515) 242-0014 – OR – EMAIL: John.goerdt@iowacourts.gov

DART Committee

Evaluation of the Digital Recording and the Transcripts from a DART Test Courtroom

County where the recording was made: **STORY CO.**

Evaluator's name: **John Goerdt** Date: Nov. 15, 2009

NOTE: The independent transcription company was told that this was a "Story County" case, because that is where the hearing occurred. Therefore, the transcriber included at the top of the transcript "In the Iowa District Court for Story County." However, the case had actually been filed in BOONE County, but was heard in Story County. The court reporter correctly captioned the transcript as "In the Iowa District Court for Boone County".

A. Transcript Evaluation:	Transcript errors compared to the digital recording (describe)	Note the time on recording
Court Reporter's Transcript	1 – p. 9, line 12: "And does Craig get a cost ... cost of living.." [correct: "And does Craig get a cross... cost of living"] 2 – p. 18, line 5: "...as stated" [correct: "...it's stated..."] 3 – p. 25, line 7: "...savings account?" [correct word: "accounts"] 4 – p. 27, line 12: "$2,620" [correct: "$2,000... (pause).. $2,620"]	1 – 8:19 2 – 17:08 3 – 25:23 4 – 27:45
Transcript from the Digital Recording	1 – p. 7, line 12: "Bachelor of Arts and Science" [correct: "in science"] 2 – p. 8, line 7: "... what are your current earnings...?" [correct: "current job ... current earnings...?"] 3 – p. 14, line 3: "DMAT class..." [correct: "DMACC class..."] 4 – p. 14, line 12: "...during the summer when Joshua..." [correct: "during the summer be when Joshua..."] 5 – p. 20, line 16: "So what..." [correct: "So which..."] 6 – p. 20, line 20: "Family coverage..." [correct: "Family cov... coverage..."] 7 – p. 26, line 24: "...premarital money" [correct: "...premarital ... premarital money"]	1 – 5:47 2 – 6:42 3 – 12:25 4 – 13:01 5 – 20:35 6 – 20:44 7 – 27:21

B. Problems with the Digital Recording (describe): -- None (If more than 6 problems, add an additional sheet)	

C. I rate the overall clarity and completeness of the digital recording (*check one*):

X Excellent (3) ___Good/Acceptable (2) ___Poor/Unacceptable (1) ___Terrible (0)

D. Comments (write on an additional page, if necessary):

First, I would rate all the errors/omissions by both transcriptionists to be minor. **They would have no impact on the essential meaning of any sentence.**

Second, the court reporter accurately included many "uh" and "um" sounds and also accurately reported slang or lazy pronunciations (e.g., "gonna" rather than "going to") throughout the testimony. These were always omitted or "cleaned up" by the digital recording trancriptionist from AV Tranz – though the sounds were clearly heard on the recording. This appears to be a policy decision, rather than a systematic problem with the transcript from AV Tranz.

Finally, I found the recording to be exceptionally clear. This might be due in part to the excellent acoustics, everyone stayed near their microphones (as instructed by the judge), and everyone was very courteous – speaking one person at a time.