



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on February 26, 2013

Title

Trial Courts: Update of the Resource
Assessment Study Model

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Effective Date

February 26, 2013

Recommended by

SB 56 Working Group
Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair

Date of Report

February 8, 2013

Contact

Dag MacLeod, 415-865-7660
dag.macleod@jud.ca.gov
Leah Rose-Goodwin, 415-865-7708
leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The SB 56 Working Group recommends approving the updated parameters of the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) as the data become available. The RAS model is used to evaluate the workload of nonjudicial staff in the trial courts and was first approved by the Judicial Council in 2005. The updated parameters consist of new caseweights and new formulas that produce more accurate workload estimates.

Recommendation

The SB 56 Working Group recommends that the Judicial Council approve the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by AOC staff as the data become available.

Previous Council Action

At its July 25, 2005, meeting, the Judicial Council approved the Resource Allocation Study model methodology to allocate resources on the basis of workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments would continue to be made by AOC staff as the data became available.

Rationale for Recommendation

The RAS model is used to estimate the need for nonjudicial staff in the trial courts based on workload. The model was used in three fiscal years (FY 2005–2006 through FY 2007–2008) to identify historically underfunded courts and redirect a portion (approximately 10 percent) of new State Appropriations Limit funding to courts that were identified as the most underfunded, based on their workload.

The updated parameters that the council is being asked to approve fall outside the scope of technical adjustments but represent a necessary step to ensure that the workload model is as accurate and up to date as possible. Changes in the law, technology, and practice all affect the amount of time required for case processing and thus require that the workload model used to estimate case processing staff need be revised and updated periodically.

SB 56 Working Group

The SB 56 Working Group was formed in August 2009 to provide advice and guidance to the AOC's Office of Court Research (OCR) on both judicial officer and staff workload studies.¹ The working group, consisting of judges and court executives from 15 courts, determined that its first priority should be to update the model parameters used for both the judicial and the staff workload assessment models.²

Time studies of judicial officers and court staff were conducted in 2010, and in December 2011 the working group brought a recommendation to the Judicial Council to approve the updated judicial workload assessment. Following council approval of the assessment, the working group turned its attention to the finalization of the model used to estimate nonjudicial staff in the trial courts—the RAS model.

In addition to providing oversight and input on research design and study methodology, the working group has periodically met to review preliminary findings and evaluate the impact of updating the model. At its January 16, 2013, meeting, the SB 56 Working Group passed a motion to approve the updated RAS model parameters and forward them to the Judicial Council for its review and approval. The study methodology and resulting model parameters are summarized below.

¹ The working group charter and most recent membership roster are included as Attachments A and B.

² The updated judicial workload model was approved by the Judicial Council at its December 2011 meeting. See www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-121211-item3.pdf.

Staff workload study update (2009–2012)

OCR staff and the SB 56 Working Group were supported in their work by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). In addition to being a recognized leader in the analysis of court workload and having conducted similar studies in almost 30 other states, the NCSC served as the consultants to the previous workload study that resulted in the creation of the RAS model approved by the council in 2005. The project also benefitted from the assignment of staff from the AOC's Center for Families, Children & the Courts, who provided invaluable subject-matter expertise in the areas of family and juvenile law. The resulting proposed staff workload model builds and improves on the well-established methodological foundation employed in the 2005 study.

Methodology for updating the RAS model

Workload measurement in the trial courts generally involves using filings data as a “driver” and then estimating the amount of time required to process different types of cases. The estimated time required for processing different types of cases—generally referred to as the *caseweight*—allows for an evaluation of the workload in different courts, taking into account different numbers and types of filings.

Casetypes. The precise number of casetypes to be studied depends largely on:

- Whether the amount of time required for case processing differs significantly across categories (if not, a simpler model with fewer categories of cases will be just as accurate);
- Whether data are available to determine how many cases the courts process in the different categories.

The SB 56 Working Group reviewed the available data and discussed data quality and the major differences across case categories before settling on a strategy for creating caseweights.

The final list of casetypes and their respective caseweights is shown in table 2. These 20 different casetypes represent significantly greater detail than was captured in the 2005 time study, in which data was collected on only 7 casetypes. The expansion of the number of casetypes is the result of improved data collection methods as well as improvements in the quality of filings data submitted by the courts.

Time-study data collection. The casetypes identified by the SB 56 Working Group as both relevant and available served as the framework within which workload data would be collected. A time study was conducted to measure how much time staff spend on each of the 20 casetypes and also on specific tasks and activities within these casetypes.

The project team conducted the time study in October and November 2010 using two data collection methodologies. Eight courts participated using a traditional time diary approach, in which participants recorded their work activities by casetype and functional areas (e.g.,

document processing) over the course of the entire day for a set period of time. An additional 16 courts participated using a web-based survey method, which collected a sample of data at random moments during the day and then aggregated the sample data to construct a composite of case processing in the courts.

Because the latter method did not require a complete accounting of every day’s case processing activity, it allowed for the collection of additional detail on the types of tasks that court staff perform. Both methodologies also captured non-case-related workload, such as general customer service, meetings and staff development, work-related travel, vacation and sick leave, and lunch and other breaks.

Study participation. Study courts included small, medium, and large courts; rural, suburban, and urban courts; and courts from all geographic regions of the state. Research of this type is impossible without the active assistance and participation of the courts, and those that volunteered to participate (see table 1) contributed a significant amount of staff time and resources to ensure the success of the study. Nearly 5,000 staff participated during a two- to four-week data collection period, and participation rates averaged just over 95 percent.

Table 1: Time-Study Participants

Time Diary Courts	Web-Based Survey Courts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alameda • Fresno • Glenn • Lake • Merced • San Diego (selected locations) • San Francisco • Sonoma 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amador • Butte • Calaveras • El Dorado • Imperial • Inyo • Marin • Placer • Riverside • San Benito • San Bernardino • Santa Clara • Siskiyou • Solano • Ventura • Yolo

Quality adjustment phase. Time studies invariably measure actual resource levels. As a result, the initial estimates of time per case derived from a time study must be evaluated carefully to avoid inferring that actual resource levels are appropriate. Time-study participants and SB 56 Working Group members expressed their concern that the time-study methodology would capture only what they currently do under existing resource constraints.

To overcome this inherent limitation in the time-study methodology, a second phase of work was required to adjust the caseweights to ensure that they represent effective and efficient case processing. Consistent with the previous workload study and with nationally recognized standards for the evaluation of workload, this phase of the study consisted of three quality adjustment steps:

1. *Noncourt staff survey.* Most courts rely on contracted services, outside vendors, or paid/unpaid noncourt staff to perform at least some portion of case processing work. Failing to capture the contribution that these types of resources contribute to case processing would result in an underestimate of the actual workload in the courts. Examples include self-help centers operated by Legal Aid centers, contracted mediator services, or vendors who do initial data entry for traffic infractions cases. Study courts were asked to complete a survey following the data collection to document the workload performed by these noncourt staff. About 209 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff in case processing workload were documented and added to the workload estimates.
2. *Site visits:* Site visits or conference calls were scheduled with each of the study courts to review and validate the time-study data collected. Court administrators, supervisors, and court staff were also asked to identify specific elements of case processing that are not being performed satisfactorily as a result of budget cuts and staff reductions and where more time might be needed for more effective case processing.
3. *Delphi sessions:* Data from the time study, survey of noncourt staff, and site visits were compiled and shared with subject-matter experts from the courts, usually supervisory staff, to inform a series of “Delphi” sessions held over a two-day period in June 2011. Case processing staff in case-type-specific groups of 8 to 10 participants reviewed the time-study results and recommended some adjustments to the caseweights. Fifty-eight staff from 20 courts participated in the sessions, which were facilitated by NCSC staff and subject-matter experts from the AOC.

Final model parameters

Preliminary estimates of staff need based on the new model parameters were shared with the SB 56 Working Group at its May 2012 meeting. At that time, the working group directed staff to form a subgroup to review the details of the proposed staff workload model and to bring a summary of the subgroup’s findings to the next working group meeting. In a series of conference calls held in summer and fall 2012, the caseweight subgroup reviewed the caseweights and other model parameters that, together, provide an estimate of staff need for the trial courts. The final model parameters were presented to and approved by the SB 56 Working Group in January 2013 and are summarized below.

Caseweights. Most case processing staff workload is estimated using caseweights. Caseweights represent the amount of staff time, in minutes, that a case should take, on average, from filing

through disposition, including any postdisposition activity. The caseweights in table 2 capture the work of the following court staff:

- All operations staff, reported by the trial courts to the AOC as “Program 10” staff on Schedule 7A, including but not limited to clerk, judicial assistant, judicial secretary, courtroom clerk, legal research attorney, mediator, investigator, facilitator, legal processing clerk, self-help center staff, records management clerk, and jury management
- Court reporters for the mandated casetypes—criminal, juvenile, conservatorship and guardianship, and mental health (Lanterman-Petris-Short Act cases)
- Case processing work performed by contractors, contract employees, volunteers, or off-site vendors

Table 2: RAS 2013 Casetypes and Caseweights

Case Category	RAS 2013: Final Casetypes	Caseweight (in minutes)	Location in Appendix C
Infractions	For courts with more than 100k annual filings (large court)	28	Column C
	For courts with fewer than 100k annual filings (small court)	40	
Criminal	Felony	944	Column D
	Misdemeanor—Traffic*	109	
	Misdemeanor—Non-Traffic	298	
Civil	Asbestos	3,546	Column E
	Unlimited civil	797	
	Limited civil	179	
	Unlawful detainer	235	
	Small claims	201	
	Employment Development Department (EDD) (Sacramento only)**	16	
Mental health/probate	Conservatorship/guardianship	3,729	Column F
	Estates/trusts	835	
	Mental health	627	
Juvenile	Dependency	1,428	Column G
	Delinquency	602	
Family law	Dissolution/separation/nullity	1,057	Column H
	Child support	484	
	Domestic violence	770	
	Parentage	1,158	
	All other family law petitions	478	

* **Bold** indicates casetypes that are new to the 2010 time study.

** EDD caseweight developed outside of the 2010 time study.

Filings data. To estimate staff workload, the caseweights shown above are multiplied by the most recent three-year average filings data. Averaging the filings data over three years smoothes out unusual annual growth or decline in filings, which may not represent a typical workload in the courts. The staff need estimates presented in this report are based on the most current filings available, FY 2008–2009 through FY 2010–2011. Future updates of the RAS model will be made with the most current filings data available at that time.

Staff-year value. The staff-year value of 95,900 minutes, equivalent to a work year of 219 days, is an empirically-based estimate of the amount of time that staff have for work activities, after subtracting out weekends, holidays, lunch and other breaks, and vacation and sick leave. After

multiplying caseweights by the average filings by casetype, the staff-year value is used to calculate the full-time-equivalent staff need. NCSC staff workload studies over the past 10 years have shown an average staff year of 214 days (with a range from 196 to 222 days).

Supervisory staff need. Consistent with the previous staff workload study, the estimated need for operations managers and supervisors is calculated using ratios that are based on the median number of staff to managers and supervisors reported in Schedule 7A over a five-year period (FY 2007–2008 through FY 2011–2012). A five-year period is used to ensure that any staffing reductions seen in more recent years do not lead to an underestimate of the need for supervisory staff.

Ratios are different for different-sized courts because the data show that larger courts can take advantage of economies of scale that are unavailable to the smaller courts.

Administrative staff (Program 90) need. Administrative support (Program 90 in Schedule 7A) consists of human resources, finance, and information technology and provides necessary support to court operations staff. Program 90 staff need is estimated using ratios that are based on the size of the court, recognizing that, as with the ratios of supervisory staff to line staff, larger courts can take advantage of economies of scale unavailable to smaller courts.

In the previous RAS model, the ratios used to calculate Program 90 need were applied only to the RAS, or case processing, staff need estimate. In the RAS model update, the ratios are applied to *all* staff in the court—both RAS staff and non-RAS staff, such as enhanced collections staff, court interpreters, and court attendants.

Staff excluded from the model. Table 3 lists the staff whose workload is excluded from the RAS model. Note that when staff need is evaluated relative to existing resources, two options are available to ensure that the model does not underrepresent staff need:

1. The staff in the table below can be added back into the model on a one-for-one basis.
2. The staff in the table below can be excluded from the point of comparison so that available resources match the same categories used to estimate staff need.

Table 3: Staff Excluded from RAS Model

Staff Excluded From Time Study	Rationale
Enhanced collections staff	Non–case processing; separate funding source
Subordinate judicial officers (commissioners, referees, and hearing officers)	Studied in judicial officer study
Court interpreters	Workload correlated with jurisdiction demographics, not filings; separate funding source
Court attendants and marshals; detention release officers	Separate funding source

Impact of new RAS model on statewide workload need

Using the parameters described above, the RAS model estimates a statewide need of 21,005 FTE staff in the trial courts (table 4). In addition to these staff, an additional 1,872 positions that are outside the RAS model are included here to show the total staff need in the courts: 22,877 FTE.

Table 4: Statewide Staff Need Calculated Using 2013 RAS Model

Staff Types	FTE Need
Program 10 staff FTE need (computed using caseweights)	16,472
Program 10 Manager/Supervisor FTE Need	1,624
Total Program 10 staff FTE need	18,127*
Program 90 FTE need	2,878
Total RAS Staff FTE Need	21,005
Non-RAS staff (from Schedule 7A FY 2012–2013 filled positions; used to compute Program 90 need)	1,872
Total staff need (RAS and Non-RAS)	22,877

*Rounding is done at the court level, so totals may not add up.

The estimated staff need for each court is shown in attachments C and D. Both attachments show the same data, but in slightly different formats. Attachment C, columns C through H, shows the detail of how many staff the model estimates the courts need in each of six major case categories. In attachment C, the estimated manager/supervisor need is included *within* each of the case categories. The table in attachment D shows the total estimated need for operations line staff (Program 10) in column C and the manager/supervisor need separately in column D.

Comparison with previous RAS model

Although the model parameters have been updated, the basic premise of the RAS model remains the same: the RAS estimates court workload based on weighted filings. The updated RAS model projects staff need for the same staff as the previous model—operations staff (Program 10) and court administration (Program 90)—with slight methodological changes made to improve model precision.

In addition to the recalculation of the caseweights, the 2005 RAS model and the current model differ in two major ways:

1. The previous model relied on 15 casetypes. Improved data quality and a new methodology for conducting the time study allowed for the addition of five more casetypes to the analysis.
2. The previous model estimated the need for judicial officer support using a fixed ratio of staff per judicial officer. The new model includes the need for judicial officer support staff within the caseweight. The inclusion of judicial officer support staff in the caseweight made sense for a number of reasons:
 - Trial courts found it difficult to use the previous model for making workload estimates locally because the number of staff per judge did not reflect the types of cases that were being processed at a given location.
 - Time-study data showed significant differences in the number and type of staff that judicial officers required as support, depending on the type of case that the judicial officer heard.
 - Staff-to-judge ratios appeared overly prescriptive because case processing practices vary widely from one court to another. Depending on a court's technology, work that in one court might be considered "back-office processing" may actually be performed in the courtroom of another court, making the distinction between "judicial officer support" and other staff less relevant. The point of the model is not to prescribe how court use staff but, rather, to estimate how many they need and provide maximum flexibility for local deployment of the resources.

The differences between the two models are summarized in table 5, with changes underlined.

Table 5: Comparison Between 2005 and 2013 Model Parameters (changes underlined)

RAS I (2005)	RAS II (2013)
Caseweights for 15 casetypes To measure noncourtroom staff need	Caseweights for <u>20</u> casetypes To measure <u>all Program 10</u> staff need, including judicial support staff; <u>court reporter need included in the caseweights for the statutorily mandated casetypes of criminal, juvenile, and LPS (probate and mental health)</u>
+ Ratios to measure judicial support staff (courtroom clerk, legal researcher, judicial secretary, court reporter)	+ <u>Judicial support staff measured by caseweights (see above)</u>
+ Manager/supervisor need calculated using cluster-based ratios	+ Manager/supervisor need calculated using cluster-based ratios
+ Program 90 staff need calculated using cluster-based ratios applied to Program 10 RAS staff need	+ Program 90 staff need calculated using cluster-based ratios applied to all staff (Program 10 RAS staff need <u>and non-RAS staff</u>)
Divided by staff-year value of 96,300	Divided by a staff-year value of <u>95,900³</u>
= Estimated RAS Staff Need	= Estimated RAS Staff Need

To evaluate the impact of the new caseweights and model parameters on the estimates of staff need, we apply the same set of filings data to the updated RAS model and the “old” RAS model and compare the results. Using the same filings data holds constant any changes in the estimated workload that might result from changes in the number and type of filings and, thus, allows for a clear comparison of the implications of the new model parameters relative to the old.

Table 6 shows the statewide estimated FTE need using the updated RAS model and compares that result to the estimates using the 2005 model, holding filings constant. The comparison shows that the new model projects a slightly lower need for staff than the previous model—about 2.6 percent lower statewide. Although the difference between the two models is relatively small, the

³ The final staff-year value differs from the previous year value in two ways. For one, the amount of vacation/sick leave is calculated using time study data that captured actual patterns of sick leave and vacation time used by court staff. In contrast, the previous model used an estimate of average vacation/sick leave allowance based on a survey of courts. Second, the previous year value included a small allowance for training and professional development. In the new model, time required for training and professional development is included in the caseweight. Both the previous and current staff year values are consistent with staff year values used in other state court workload studies conducted by the NCSC.

differences in the workload estimates using the two models may be larger in individual courts, depending on the case mix in the court.

Table 6: Comparison of New and Old RAS Model

2013 and 2005 RAS Models, Holding Filings Constant	FTE Need
Statewide case processing staff need using 2013 RAS model parameters	21,005 FTE
Statewide case processing staff need using 2005 RAS model parameters	21,557 FTE
Difference	-2.6 percent

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The 15 courts represented on the SB 56 Working Group have provided input and guidance for the update of the RAS model and unanimously approved recommending the updated parameters to the Judicial Council. In addition to the oversight provided by the SB 56 Working Group, OCR staff repeatedly solicited input from judicial branch leaders while providing status updates on the work.

- Site visits allowed the leadership of all 24 courts that participated in the time study—including 13 that were not members of the SB 56 Working Group—to review detailed findings from the time study and provide comment and input.
- Status updates were given and comments sought at Court Executives Advisory Committee and Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee meetings in August 2009, September 2010, February 2011, November 2011, August 2012, and January 2013.
- Status updates were also given and comments sought at numerous meetings of the Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG), and OCR staff have given detailed updates to the TCBWG subgroup that is working on developing a budget process.
- Finally, the Trial Court Funding Workgroup is scheduled to be given a detailed briefing on the updated RAS model on February 19.

Various alternatives to a weighted caseload model have been considered, discussed, and rejected in meetings with the various groups listed above. Two of the alternatives considered are discussed below:

1. *Estimate staff need based on county population:* County population data are more easily understood than weighted caseload. However, they are not as strongly correlated with trial court workload as filings, nor do they provide any information that might be used to weight caseload to take into account complexity of the case mix.

2. *Link workload estimates directly to judicial workload estimates:* Because the legislature is already familiar with the judicial workload methodology and has incorporated it into Government Code section 69614(b), staff workload estimates that borrow from the judicial workload study might be more readily accepted by external stakeholders and within the branch. However, different types of cases that judges hear require different complements of support staff. For example, the number of staff required per judge for infractions processing is very different from the number of staff required per judge for felony case processing. Moreover, the only way that we can estimate the number of staff required per judge is by conducting a time study. In effect, tying staff needs to judicial officer needs would add an extra, unnecessary layer of complexity to the calculation without any improvement to the fit of the model.

Weighted caseload remains the gold standard for evaluating court workload. It allows for the unique mix of cases in each court to be factored into workload analysis by not treating all filings as if they were equivalent. As a result, weighted caseload accounts for differences across courts in both case mix and case volume and provides an objective, accurate evaluation of workload.

The policy implications of adopting the new RAS model parameters are not immediately clear. Although the new workload estimates generated from the update to the model will be more accurate than the previous model estimates, they will also very likely point to a number of challenges facing the branch that the previous model also highlighted.

The first policy challenge highlighted by the updated model is a rigorous confirmation of what many already know: that successive years of budget cuts have left the trial courts in severe distress. Exactly how badly underfunded the courts are cannot be determined without converting the FTE estimates into a dollar figure.

The second policy challenge that the model presents would be true of any workload model: not all courts are equally underfunded. Although one of the most important reasons for developing workload models is to ensure that resources are equitably allocated, the model is not, nor should it be, self-executing. A process needs to be developed for taking the findings of the model into account without unduly harming courts that the model may show are less underfunded than others.

Given current levels of funding and the large variations that persist across courts in technology, service level, and operational practices, the new RAS model provides a vital tool for policy development and resource allocation, both locally and statewide. The model allows for court workload to be evaluated on the basis of filings volume and casetype composition without specifying the business or operational practices that courts may employ to address the workload. It provides broad estimates of workload paired with maximum local flexibility.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

If approved, the new parameters will be incorporated into the model used to calculate the statewide staff need in the trial courts. There is no associated cost for implementation.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The workload study update is consistent with Goal II, Independence and Accountability, of the Strategic Plan, in that the RAS model aims to “[a]llocate resources in a transparent and fair manner that promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of justice, supports the strategic goals of the judicial branch, promotes innovation, and provides for effective and consistent court operations” (Goal II.B.3).

It also meets with related Operational Plan Objective III, Modernization of Management and Administration, in that a statewide workload model creates “[s]tandards for determining adequate resources for all case types—particularly for complex litigation, civil and small claims, and court venues such as family and juvenile, probate guardianship, probate conservatorship, and traffic; accountability mechanisms for ensuring that resources are properly allocated according to those standards” (Objective III.A.2.c).

Attachments

1. Attachment A: SB 56 Working Group Charter
2. Attachment B: SB 56 Working Group Roster
3. Attachment C: RAS Staff Need Projections FY 12–13 by Casetype Group with Manager/Supervisor Need by Casetype Group
4. Attachment D: RAS Staff Need Projections FY 12–13 with Program 10 Manager/Supervisor Need Broken Out Separately from Program 10 Staff

SB 56 WORKING GROUP CHARTER **July 27, 2009; Updated 2012**

In 2006, the California State Legislature passed Senate Bill 56 (SB 56) directing the Judicial Council to adopt and report to the Legislature concerning “judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice.” Improving the administration of justice is one of the founding purposes of the Judicial Council enshrined in Article VI of the California State Constitution. Since the advent of state funding of the trial courts, the Judicial Council has adopted standards and measures that allow for the equitable allocation of resources across courts and to prioritize the allocation of those resources.

The Judicial Council has approved two essential tools for these purposes: the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Allocation Study (now termed the Resource Assessment Study, or RAS). The Judicial Workload Assessment was approved by the council in 2001 and updated in 2004, 2007, 2008, and 2010. In 2006, the basic parameters of the model were incorporated into statute under SB 56, which mandates that the trial court workload estimates be updated every two years. Since 2006, 100 new judgeships have been created by the legislature in SB 56 and Assembly Bill 159 (AB 159) using the judicial workload model to estimate the number of new judgeships needed by the courts and to prioritize where new judgeships are most urgently needed.

The RAS model was approved by the council in 2005 to use in the budget allocation process and is updated annually to identify the most underfunded courts and supplement their budgets to adjust for historic underfunding. Since 2005, using workload estimates derived from the RAS model, the Judicial Council authorized the allocation of approximately \$31 million in new funding to the baseline budgets of the most severely underfunded courts in the state using a portion of State Appropriations Limit (SAL) funding.

The *SB 56 Working Group* is established to ensure that these models are regularly revised to adequately capture standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice and to provide input from the trial courts on these and other measures and standards of trial court performance.

Charge

The AOC Office of Court Research (OCR) is responsible for developing a comprehensive model for a discreet number of performance measures for court systems and developing an implementation plan for performance measurement in a timely, efficient manner. OCR is also responsible for preparing amendments to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study models as they relate to standards and measures of court administration. The *SB 56 Working Group* is responsible for responding to proposed performance measures and implementation plans and modifications to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study Model by providing advice and suggestions to improve and to effectively implement the plans and models. Specifically, the *SB 56 Working Group* will review and provide

advice to the OCR on proposals for instituting performance measures and implementation plans in areas such as:

- Processes, study design, and methodologies that should be used to measure and report on court administration; and
- Amendments to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study models as they relate to standards and measures of court administration.

Members will also advise the AOC on studies and analyses undertaken to update and amend case weights through time studies, focus groups, or other methods.

In addition to the working group, OCR and the SB 56 members may employ other means of gathering information, analyses, and perspectives through interviews with national or state experts on relevant topics or roundtables of judges, lawyers, and court staff with experience in specific subject matters, as needed.

After review and approval by the SB 56 Working group, OCR will present final proposals in these areas to the Judicial Council.

Membership

Accounting for the dual focus of the working group, addressing both judicial workload and court staff workload issues, membership in the *SB 56 Working Group* consists of both judicial officers and court executive officers (CEOs). The working group will have sixteen members, with approximately half of the membership consisting of judicial officers and half CEOs. The membership will include both representatives from courts that have participated in previous workload studies and members from courts that have not previously participated.

SB 56 Working Group members will serve for staggered renewable four-year terms. The length of the term is slightly longer than that of other AOC working groups to allow for a member to serve through an entire workload model update cycle.

The judicial and court-executive membership of the *SB 56 Working Group* will broadly reflect the diversity of the Superior Courts, taking into account:

- Participation of urban, suburban, and rural courts;
- Diversity in size and adequacy of court resources;
- Participation of both small and large courts, expressed by the number of judgeships;
- For judicial officer members, diversity of case-type experience; and

- Recent service on the Civil and Small Claims, Collaborative Justice Courts, Family and Juvenile Law, Criminal Law, Probate and Mental Health, and/or Traffic Advisory committee.

No fewer than four courts will represent each of the AOC's three regional groupings.

Membership may include a judge and court executive from the same court.

SB56 Working Group meeting attendees also includes AOC staff from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee, the Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and others with knowledge of and experience with standards and measures of court performance.

A working group member serves as the chair of the group, serving for a two-year renewable term.

Appointment

Members will be appointed by the Administrative Director. The chair of the working group is also appointed by the Administrative Director.

Frequency of Meetings

The working group shall meet twice a year as a full body, with at least one meeting annually to be held in person.

SB 56 Working Group Roster (Updated January 7, 2013)

Member terms are in parenthesis next to the member's name. All terms begin/end in August.

Hon. Lorna A. Alksne (2013)

Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. James P. Kleinberg (2015)

Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Irma Poole Asberry (2015)

Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Richard C. Martin (2013)

Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Lake

Ms. Sheran Morton (2015)

Interim Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Hon. George A. Miram (2013)

Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Mateo

Mr. Jake Chatters (2015)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Placer

Mr. Stephen Nash (2013)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Mr. John A. Clarke (2013)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Glenn Oleon (2015)

Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Lee Smalley Edmon (2015)

Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Brian Taylor (2015)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Solano

Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury (2015)

Presiding Judge of
Superior Court of California,
County of El Dorado

Ms. Mary Beth Todd (2015)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Sutter

Hon. John D. Kirihara (2013)

Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Merced

Ms. Kim Turner (2013)

Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Marin

RAS Staff Need Projections FY 2012-2013 by Casetype Group With Manager/Supervisor Need by Casetype Group

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Cluster	Court	Total Staff Need by Casetype: Includes Managers and Supervisors by Casetype						Total Program 10 (includes mgr/supv) Need (rounded up)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	Total RAS Staff Need	Non-RAS Staff (Schedule 7A FY 2012-2013 filled positions)	Total Staff Need (RAS and non-RAS)
		Infractions	Criminal	Civil	MH/Prob	Juvenile	Family Law					
	Statewide	2,253.1	5,561.5	4,011.2	1,024.5	1,250.5	3,995.3	18,127	2,878	21,005	1,872.0	22,877
4	Alameda	96.7	179.4	162.8	40.4	29.0	122.8	632	101	733	93.6	827
1	Alpine	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.2	2	1	3	0.1	3
1	Amador	3.1	6.0	3.5	2.6	1.0	4.6	21	4	25	1.0	26
2	Butte	12.6	35.1	17.7	11.3	11.5	31.1	120	22	142	20.5	162
1	Calaveras	2.1	5.6	4.9	1.8	2.4	5.8	23	5	28	2.6	31
1	Colusa	4.7	4.9	1.3	0.8	1.2	1.9	15	3	18	1.5	19
3	Contra Costa	43.4	85.5	104.8	28.3	25.1	95.4	383	60	443	19.9	463
1	Del Norte	2.8	7.9	5.5	2.1	2.7	5.2	27	5	32	1.1	33
2	El Dorado	9.3	20.3	18.0	5.1	10.0	19.4	83	14	97	6.0	103
3	Fresno	43.1	171.2	88.9	22.1	40.4	113.6	480	75	555	27.7	583
1	Glenn	5.9	5.5	1.7	1.6	1.6	4.4	21	5	26	4.8	31
2	Humboldt	11.2	28.8	12.2	7.6	3.9	16.1	80	13	93	2.0	95
2	Imperial	29.4	36.5	19.1	3.7	8.2	29.1	127	23	150	16.1	166
1	Inyo	6.1	5.0	1.3	0.8	1.4	2.7	18	4	22	2.1	24
3	Kern	57.5	180.0	59.9	24.7	35.7	110.5	469	78	547	55.0	602
2	Kings	13.4	35.9	9.9	6.2	4.7	21.1	92	16	108	4.9	113
2	Lake	3.4	14.1	7.5	3.5	2.1	9.5	40	7	47	1.6	49
1	Lassen	4.1	8.8	4.9	2.1	1.6	5.1	27	6	33	5.3	38
4	Los Angeles	615.5	1,558.8	1,184.4	254.4	417.5	958.8	4,990	770	5,760	570.0	6,330
2	Madera	8.9	30.9	16.5	5.9	6.8	21.5	91	16	107	5.5	113
2	Marin	21.7	23.2	21.4	8.9	4.8	20.6	101	18	119	10.2	129
1	Mariposa	1.5	4.3	2.0	0.9	0.5	2.3	12	3	15	1.7	17
2	Mendocino	7.4	25.7	5.6	3.3	3.9	16.1	63	11	74	3.7	78
2	Merced	24.0	54.3	22.2	6.4	14.1	37.2	159	27	186	10.8	197
1	Modoc	0.7	1.7	0.9	0.7	0.5	2.0	7	2	9	2.0	11
1	Mono	3.7	4.1	1.3	0.2	0.3	1.0	11	3	14	1.8	16
3	Monterey	32.7	71.3	32.0	8.4	11.5	37.5	194	31	225	13.5	239
2	Napa	8.7	21.6	13.2	4.9	4.8	15.5	69	12	81	7.3	88
2	Nevada	8.6	14.7	8.9	3.8	2.9	10.1	50	9	59	6.9	66
4	Orange	151.4	373.7	350.7	63.1	69.7	279.8	1,289	204	1,493	184.7	1,678
2	Placer	27.0	41.0	34.1	8.9	12.5	41.8	166	28	194	7.5	202
1	Plumas	1.6	3.9	2.1	1.1	1.2	2.7	13	3	16	1.1	17
4	Riverside	108.7	274.1	274.7	52.6	89.3	267.3	1,067	165	1,232	121.7	1,354

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Cluster	Court	Total Staff Need by Casetype: Includes Managers and Supervisors by Casetype						Total Program 10 (includes mgr/supv) Need (rounded up)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	Total RAS Staff Need	Non-RAS Staff (Schedule 7A FY 2012-2013 filled positions)	Total Staff Need (RAS and non-RAS)
		Infractions	Criminal	Civil	MH/Prob	Juvenile	Family Law					
	Statewide	2,253.1	5,561.5	4,011.2	1,024.5	1,250.5	3,995.3	18,127	2,878	21,005	1,872.0	22,877
4	Sacramento	72.9	206.5	173.1	36.1	42.8	214.5	746	112	858	61.6	920
1	San Benito	2.8	10.0	4.8	1.0	2.3	6.6	28	6	34	1.3	35
4	San Bernardino	105.5	442.9	249.5	63.9	71.7	308.5	1,243	184	1,427	85.0	1,512
4	San Diego	164.9	339.9	296.8	72.9	61.7	340.2	1,277	192	1,469	108.7	1,578
4	San Francisco	56.5	89.1	121.9	38.9	21.7	58.3	387	57	444	23.8	468
3	San Joaquin	35.4	136.0	73.9	22.5	20.5	80.6	370	57	427	14.1	441
2	San Luis Obispo	21.9	53.2	20.3	13.0	7.4	23.9	140	23	163	6.5	170
3	San Mateo	50.3	64.4	54.2	22.5	34.3	55.8	282	46	328	23.5	352
3	Santa Barbara	39.7	70.7	35.3	10.4	15.6	33.8	206	35	241	28.6	270
4	Santa Clara	78.8	192.3	143.0	38.8	25.2	123.5	602	90	692	44.0	736
2	Santa Cruz	15.3	41.1	21.3	5.7	9.5	24.0	117	22	139	19.5	158
2	Shasta	15.6	45.5	19.3	7.4	10.2	29.0	128	29	157	56.0	213
1	Sierra	0.3	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	3	1	4	1.1	5
2	Siskiyou	9.2	9.5	3.5	1.9	2.4	6.2	33	6	39	4.5	44
3	Solano	29.7	74.1	45.4	12.1	10.7	60.7	233	36	269	7.0	276
3	Sonoma	37.1	78.1	42.4	15.9	12.0	45.1	231	38	269	24.3	293
3	Stanislaus	31.5	102.5	46.6	15.4	13.6	77.6	288	44	332	8.6	341
2	Sutter	6.0	20.2	9.1	4.9	3.1	14.1	58	11	69	9.8	79
2	Tehama	7.0	17.4	6.0	2.9	3.9	10.0	48	8	56	2.8	59
1	Trinity	1.5	4.3	1.3	0.7	1.3	2.7	12	4	16	5.7	22
3	Tulare	30.6	74.2	40.5	11.6	15.3	48.1	221	37	258	24.5	282
2	Tuolumne	3.2	11.1	5.3	2.8	4.2	7.6	35	6	41	2.0	43
3	Ventura	48.1	90.6	81.5	25.0	29.7	78.7	354	64	418	76.5	494
2	Yolo	12.3	38.1	15.0	6.1	5.6	20.6	98	18	116	14.5	131
2	Yuba	5.8	14.7	6.7	3.3	2.4	11.7	45	8	53	4.8	58

RAS Staff Need Projections FY 12-13 with Program 10 Manager/Supervisor Need Broken Out Separately From Program 10 Staff

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Cluster	Court	Total Program 10 Staff Need	Program 10 Manager/Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Staff Need (rounded up)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	Total RAS Staff Need	Non-RAS Staff (Schedule 7A FY 2012-2013 filled pos.)	Total Staff Need (RAS and non-RAS)
	Statewide	16,471.8	1,624	18,127	2,878	21,005	1,872.0	22,877
4	Alameda	579.0	52.1	632	101	733	93.6	827
1	Alpine	1.6	0.2	2	1	3	0.1	3
1	Amador	18.2	2.6	21	4	25	1.0	26
2	Butte	106.8	12.4	120	22	142	20.5	162
1	Calaveras	19.8	2.9	23	5	28	2.6	31
1	Colusa	13.0	1.9	15	3	18	1.5	19
3	Contra Costa	342.8	39.8	383	60	443	19.9	463
1	Del Norte	23.0	3.3	27	5	32	1.1	33
2	El Dorado	73.6	8.5	83	14	97	6.0	103
3	Fresno	429.5	49.9	480	75	555	27.7	583
1	Glenn	18.0	2.6	21	5	26	4.8	31
2	Humboldt	71.6	8.3	80	13	93	2.0	95
2	Imperial	112.9	13.1	127	23	150	16.1	166
1	Inyo	15.0	2.2	18	4	22	2.1	24
3	Kern	419.6	48.7	469	78	547	55.0	602
2	Kings	81.7	9.5	92	16	108	4.9	113
2	Lake	35.8	4.2	40	7	47	1.6	49
1	Lassen	23.1	3.3	27	6	33	5.3	38
4	Los Angeles	4,577.7	411.6	4,990	770	5,760	570.0	6,330
2	Madera	81.1	9.4	91	16	107	5.5	113
2	Marin	90.1	10.5	101	18	119	10.2	129
1	Mariposa	10.2	1.5	12	3	15	1.7	17
2	Mendocino	55.7	6.5	63	11	74	3.7	78
2	Merced	141.8	16.5	159	27	186	10.8	197
1	Modoc	5.8	0.8	7	2	9	2.0	11
1	Mono	9.3	1.3	11	3	14	1.8	16
3	Monterey	173.3	20.1	194	31	225	13.5	239
2	Napa	61.6	7.2	69	12	81	7.3	88
2	Nevada	43.9	5.1	50	9	59	6.9	66
4	Orange	1,182.2	106.3	1,289	204	1,493	184.7	1,678
2	Placer	148.0	17.2	166	28	194	7.5	202
1	Plumas	11.0	1.6	13	3	16	1.1	17
4	Riverside	978.6	88.0	1,067	165	1,232	121.7	1,354

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Cluster	Court	Total Program 10 Staff Need	Program 10 Manager/ Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Staff Need (rounded up)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	Total RAS Staff Need	Non-RAS Staff (Schedule 7A FY 2012-2013 filled pos.)	Total Staff Need (RAS and non-RAS)
	Statewide	16,471.8	1,624	18,127	2,878	21,005	1,872.0	22,877
4	Sacramento	684.3	61.5	746	112	858	61.6	920
1	San Benito	24.0	3.5	28	6	34	1.3	35
4	San Bernardino	1,139.6	102.5	1,243	184	1,427	85.0	1,512
4	San Diego	1,171.0	105.3	1,277	192	1,469	108.7	1,578
4	San Francisco	354.5	31.9	387	57	444	23.8	468
3	San Joaquin	330.7	38.4	370	57	427	14.1	441
2	San Luis Obispo	125.1	14.5	140	23	163	6.5	170
3	San Mateo	252.2	29.3	282	46	328	23.5	352
3	Santa Barbara	184.1	21.4	206	35	241	28.6	270
4	Santa Clara	552.0	49.6	602	90	692	44.0	736
2	Santa Cruz	104.7	12.2	117	22	139	19.5	158
2	Shasta	113.8	13.2	128	29	157	56.0	213
1	Sierra	2.1	0.3	3	1	4	1.1	5
2	Siskiyou	29.4	3.4	33	6	39	4.5	44
3	Solano	208.6	24.2	233	36	269	7.0	276
3	Sonoma	206.6	24.0	231	38	269	24.3	293
3	Stanislaus	257.3	29.9	288	44	332	8.6	341
2	Sutter	51.3	6.0	58	11	69	9.8	79
2	Tehama	42.3	4.9	48	8	56	2.8	59
1	Trinity	10.4	1.5	12	4	16	5.7	22
3	Tulare	197.5	22.9	221	37	258	24.5	282
2	Tuolumne	30.6	3.6	35	6	41	2.0	43
3	Ventura	316.8	36.8	354	64	418	76.5	494
2	Yolo	87.5	10.2	98	18	116	14.5	131
2	Yuba	39.9	4.6	45	8	53	4.8	58