The Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model Components:
Staff Categories and Casetypes Captured in Workload Estimates

READING THE TABLES

The tables that follow shows RAS estimates of staff need in the trial courts divided into different categories and added together until reaching the total estimate of trial court staff need.

Tables 1 and 2 shows the same numbers but have them organized somewhat differently. The principal differences between Table 1 and Table 2 are the following:

- Table 1 (Columns C through H) shows the detail of how many staff the model estimates the courts need in six major case categories;
- Table 1 includes the estimated need for Program 10 (operations) managers & supervisor *within* the estimated need for line staff by the six major case categories;
- Table 2 rolls up the estimated need for Program 10 staff in the different case categories into a single column (Column C) but shows the estimated need for Program 10 managers and supervisors separately, in Column D;
- Column I in Table 1 is equal to Column E in Table 2;
- The remaining columns are identical in the two tables.

The following notes provide documentation for Tables 1 and 2.

PROGRAM 10 STAFF ESTIMATES

The estimated need for Program 10 staff – shown in Table 1, Columns C - I and in Table 2, Columns C – E – is calculated using:

- Caseweights for 20 different casetypes (See Figure A on the following page);
- Filings data for the same 20 casetypes averaged over the three most recent years to smooth out anomalies in the data;
- A staff-year value of 95,900 minutes to reflect all weekends, court holidays, average vacation and sick leave taken, weekends and lunch and breaks;
- Ratios of managers & supervisors to line staff (See Figure B on the following page). The ratios are calculated differently depending on which of three size groupings each court belongs to.

The caseweights were designed to capture all of the following staff by including their work in the time study:

1

- All Program 10 (Operations) staff. Representative job classifications include but are 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, jury services;
- Court reporters for the mandated casetypes of criminal, juvenile, conservatorship & guardianship and mental health (LPS);
- Case processing work performed by contractors, contract employees, volunteers, or off-site vendors. Examples include: self-help centers operated by Legal Aid Centers; contracted mediator services; vendors that do the initial data entry for traffic infractions.

PROGRAM 90 STAFF ESTIMATES

The estimated need for Program 90 staff – shown in Table 1, Columns J and in Table 2, Column F – is calculated using:

- Ratios of Program 90 staff to Program 10 staff (See Figure C on the following page);
- Separate ratios are applied to each of four different clusters of courts, based on size, since larger courts can take advantage of economies of scale that aren't always available to smaller courts:

STAFF EXCLUDED FROM THE MODEL

The table below lists the staff whose workload is excluded from the RAS model. Note that when staff need is evaluated relative to existing resources there are two options for ensuring that the model does not under-represent staff need:

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

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

2

FIGURE A: CASETYPES, CASEWEIGHTS AND LOCATION OF FTE ESTIMATES

RAS II: Final Casetypes	Caseweight (in minutes)	Case Category	Location in Table 1	Notes
Infractions > 100k filings (large court)	28	Infractions	Column C	*RAS I used a cut-off of 75k filings to distinguish small courts*
Infractions < 100k filings (small court)	40			
Felony	944	Criminal	Column D	*RAS I had a single misdemeanor caseweight*
Misdemeanor- Traffic	109			
Misdemeanor- Non-Traffic	298			
Asbestos	3,546	Civil	Column E	*RAS I did not have an asbestos caseweight or a caseweight for EDD filings*
Unlimited Civil	797			
Limited Civil	179			
Unlawful Detainer	235			
Small Claims	201			
Employment Development Department (EDD) (Sacramento only)*	16			
Conservatorship/Guardianship	3,729	Mental Health / Probate	Column F	*RAS I lumped probate conservatorships & guardianships together with estates and trusts*
Estates/Trusts	835			
Mental Health	627			
Dependency	1,428	Juvenile	Column G	*Same categories as RAS I*
Delinquency	602			
Dissolution/Separation/Nullity	1,057	Family Law	Column H	*Time-study data was used to create more precise estimates in family law. RAS I did not have a parentage caseweight*
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

FIGURE B: Ratios of Program 10 Staff to Managers & Supervisors

Cluster	Number of Program 10 Staff per Manager & Supervisor	Location in Tables	Notes
1	6.92	Table 1: Included in each casetype column C - H	• *Ratios are based on median number of staff to manager/supervisor reported in the Schedule 7A over a 5-year period: FY*

February 13, 2013

2 and 3	8.62	Table 2: Column D	*2007-08 through FY 2011-12.* • *The ratios are different for different sized courts because the 7A data indicate that larger courts are able to take advantage of economies of scale.* • *Clusters 2 and 3 were combined because results were so similar.*
4	11.12		

FIGURE C: Ratios of Program 90 Staff to Program 10 Staff

Cluster	Number of Program 90 Staff per Program 10 Staff	Location in Tables	Notes
1	5.71	Table 1: Column J	• *Ratios based on 2009 Schedule 7-A to prevent building understaffing due to fiscal crisis into the model;*
2	6.42		
3	6.79	Table 2: Column F	• *RAS I only applied these ratios to those staff who were calculated using the RAS model. RAS II applies the ratio to* all *staff (See notes below re: excluded staff).*
4	7.23		

4

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
		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 12-13 filled positions)	Total staff need (RAS and Non-RAS)
Cluster	Court	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**	**22,877**
4	Alameda	96.7	179.4	162.8	40.4	29.0	122.8	632	101	**733**	94	827
1	Alpine	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.2	2	1	**3**	0	3
1	Amador	3.1	6.0	3.5	2.6	1.0	4.6	21	4	**25**	1	26
2	Butte	12.6	35.1	17.7	11.3	11.5	31.1	120	22	**142**	20	162
1	Calaveras	2.1	5.6	4.9	1.8	2.4	5.8	23	5	**28**	3	31
1	Colusa	4.7	4.9	1.3	0.8	1.2	1.9	15	3	**18**	1	19
3	Contra Costa	43.4	85.5	104.8	28.3	25.1	95.4	383	60	**443**	20	463
1	Del Norte	2.8	7.9	5.5	2.1	2.7	5.2	27	5	**32**	1	33
2	El Dorado	9.3	20.3	18.0	5.1	10.0	19.4	83	14	**97**	6	103
3	Fresno	43.1	171.2	88.9	22.1	40.4	113.6	480	75	**555**	28	583
1	Glenn	5.9	5.5	1.7	1.6	1.6	4.4	21	5	**26**	5	31
2	Humboldt	11.2	28.8	12.2	7.6	3.9	16.1	80	13	**93**	2	95
2	Imperial	29.4	36.5	19.1	3.7	8.2	29.1	127	23	**150**	16	166
1	Inyo	6.1	5.0	1.3	0.8	1.4	2.7	18	4	**22**	2	24
3	Kern	57.5	180.0	59.9	24.7	35.7	110.5	469	78	**547**	55	602
2	Kings	13.4	35.9	9.9	6.2	4.7	21.1	92	16	**108**	5	113
2	Lake	3.4	14.1	7.5	3.5	2.1	9.5	40	7	**47**	2	49
1	Lassen	4.1	8.8	4.9	2.1	1.6	5.1	27	6	**33**	5	38
4	Los Angeles	615.5	1,558.8	1,184.4	254.4	417.5	958.8	4,990	770	**5,760**	570	6,330
2	Madera	8.9	30.9	16.5	5.9	6.8	21.5	91	16	**107**	6	113
2	Marin	21.7	23.2	21.4	8.9	4.8	20.6	101	18	**119**	10	129
1	Mariposa	1.5	4.3	2.0	0.9	0.5	2.3	12	3	**15**	2	17
2	Mendocino	7.4	25.7	5.6	3.3	3.9	16.1	63	11	**74**	4	78
2	Merced	24.0	54.3	22.2	6.4	14.1	37.2	159	27	**186**	11	197
1	Modoc	0.7	1.7	0.9	0.7	0.5	2.0	7	2	**9**	2	11
1	Mono	3.7	4.1	1.3	0.2	0.3	1.0	11	3	**14**	2	16
3	Monterey	32.7	71.3	32.0	8.4	11.5	37.5	194	31	**225**	14	239
2	Napa	8.7	21.6	13.2	4.9	4.8	15.5	69	12	**81**	7	88
2	Nevada	8.6	14.7	8.9	3.8	2.9	10.1	50	9	**59**	7	66
4	Orange	151.4	373.7	350.7	63.1	69.7	279.8	1,289	204	**1,493**	185	1,678
2	Placer	27.0	41.0	34.1	8.9	12.5	41.8	166	28	**194**	8	202
1	Plumas	1.6	3.9	2.1	1.1	1.2	2.7	13	3	**16**	1	17
4	Riverside	108.7	274.1	274.7	52.6	89.3	267.3	1,067	165	**1,232**	122	1,354

February 13, 2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
		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 12-13 filled positions)	Total staff need (RAS and Non-RAS)
Cluster	Court	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**	**22,877**
4	Sacramento	72.9	206.5	173.1	36.1	42.8	214.5	746	112	**858**	62	920
1	San Benito	2.8	10.0	4.8	1.0	2.3	6.6	28	6	**34**	1	35
4	San Bernardino	105.5	442.9	249.5	63.9	71.7	308.5	1,243	184	**1,427**	85	1,512
4	San Diego	164.9	339.9	296.8	72.9	61.7	340.2	1,277	192	**1,469**	109	1,578
4	San Francisco	56.5	89.1	121.9	38.9	21.7	58.3	387	57	**444**	24	468
3	San Joaquin	35.4	136.0	73.9	22.5	20.5	80.6	370	57	**427**	14	441
2	San Luis Obispo	21.9	53.2	20.3	13.0	7.4	23.9	140	23	**163**	7	170
3	San Mateo	50.3	64.4	54.2	22.5	34.3	55.8	282	46	**328**	24	352
3	Santa Barbara	39.7	70.7	35.3	10.4	15.6	33.8	206	35	**241**	29	270
4	Santa Clara	78.8	192.3	143.0	38.8	25.2	123.5	602	90	**692**	44	736
2	Santa Cruz	15.3	41.1	21.3	5.7	9.5	24.0	117	22	**139**	19	158
2	Shasta	15.6	45.5	19.3	7.4	10.2	29.0	128	29	**157**	56	213
1	Sierra	0.3	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	3	1	**4**	1	5
2	Siskiyou	9.2	9.5	3.5	1.9	2.4	6.2	33	6	**39**	5	44
3	Solano	29.7	74.1	45.4	12.1	10.7	60.7	233	36	**269**	7	276
3	Sonoma	37.1	78.1	42.4	15.9	12.0	45.1	231	38	**269**	24	293
3	Stanislaus	31.5	102.5	46.6	15.4	13.6	77.6	288	44	**332**	9	341
2	Sutter	6.0	20.2	9.1	4.9	3.1	14.1	58	11	**69**	10	79
2	Tehama	7.0	17.4	6.0	2.9	3.9	10.0	48	8	**56**	3	59
1	Trinity	1.5	4.3	1.3	0.7	1.3	2.7	12	4	**16**	6	22
3	Tulare	30.6	74.2	40.5	11.6	15.3	48.1	221	37	**258**	24	282
2	Tuolumne	3.2	11.1	5.3	2.8	4.2	7.6	35	6	**41**	2	43
3	Ventura	48.1	90.6	81.5	25.0	29.7	78.7	354	64	**418**	76	494
2	Yolo	12.3	38.1	15.0	6.1	5.6	20.6	98	18	**116**	15	131
2	Yuba	5.8	14.7	6.7	3.3	2.4	11.7	45	8	**53**	5	58

February 13, 2013

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 12-13 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	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 12-13 filled pos.)	Total staff need (RAS and Non-RAS)
Cluster	Court	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	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

February 13, 2013