



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

DATA ANALYTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR January 27, 2026

Meeting Contents

Agenda	2
Minutes	
Minutes from November 4, 2025, Meeting	5
Discussion and Possible Action Item	
Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept.....	8



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

www.courts.ca.gov/daac.htm
research@jud.ca.gov

DATA ANALYTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS
THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: January 27, 2026
Time: 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Location: Remote
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/4920>

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call, 1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m. (15 minutes)

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of November 4, 2025, Data Analytics Advisory Committee meeting.

New members / Member changes

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))

Written Comment

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to research@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102, attention: Ms. Kristin Greenaway. Only written comments received by January 26, 2026, 12:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–4)

Item 1

Judicial Workload Study (JWS), 2:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. (75 min)

Provide overview of judicial workload study (JWS) items to be reviewed and approved by committee.

- Work Year Value
- Outliers
- Complex Civil Caseweight

Presenter(s): Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Manager, JCC

Mr. Mustafa Sagir, Supervising Analyst, JCC

Item 2

Budget Change Concept for Data Analytics Modernization, 1:30 p.m. - 1:45 p.m. (15 min)

Approve submission of a concept

Presenter(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, JCC

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Judicial Workload Study (JWS) Overview, 2:00 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. (45 min)

NCSC will provide an overview of the Judicial Workload Study

Presenter(s): Mr. Mustafa Sagir, Supervising Analyst, JCC

Ms. Suzanne Tallarico, National Center for State Courts (NCSC)

Info 2

Update on RAS Supplemental, 1:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. (15 min)

- Provide update on RAS supplemental work

Presenter(s): Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair, CEO, Placer Superior Court

Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, JCC

Info 3

Update on JCC Dashboard Roadmap 1:15 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. (15 mins)

Provide update on upcoming JCC dashboard activities.

Presenter(s): Mr. Jack Madans, Project Manager, JCC.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn, 4:00 p.m.



DATA ANALYTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 4, 2025
1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Electronic

Advisory Body Members Present: Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair; Hon. Thomas Kuhnle, Vice-Chair; Hon. Tara M. Desautels; Mr. Sharif Elmallah; Ms. Nocona Soboleski; Mr. David Yamasaki; Dr. Bryan Borys; Mr. Christopher Roman; Mr. Travis Trapp; Hon. Benjamin Coats; Ms. Nicole Le; Mr. Robert Oliver; Hon. Lawrence R. Riff

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Brandon Henson; Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs; Mr. Darrel E. Parker

Others Present: Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; Ms. Kristin Greenaway; Mr. Mustafa Sagir; Mr. Kyle Capuli; Mr. Jonathan Alzate; Mr. Jack Madans; Ms. Kelly Ragsdale

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and Ms. Kristin Greenaway took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 5, 2025, Data Analytics Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 4)

Item 1

2026 DAAC Annual Agenda Overview

Presenter(s): Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair

Mr. Jake Chatters highlighted key changes to the annual agenda and described an increased specificity regarding committee goals and projects. Proposed subcommittees relate to projects such as staff workload measurement, judicial needs study, data visualization, and future workload methodology. A new project intends to define the use of RAS for workload and performance evaluation.

Action:

The committee voted to approve the annual agenda for submission to the Executive & Planning Committee.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEMS 1–7)

Item 1**DAAC Chair Update**

Presenter(s): Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair

Mr. Jake Chatters first thanked Judge Hinrichs for her leadership as previous chair of DAAC and announced Darrel Parker will be retiring by the end of the year. Mr. Chatters then provided an overview of the annual agenda planning process and shared that new subcommittees will be created. In 2026, DAAC will have meetings every other month with one in-person meeting planned for March.

Item 2**Dashboard Update (1): Operational Metrics**

Presenter(s): Mr. Jack Madans, Project Manager

Mr. Jack Madans first reviewed the pilot dashboard four-step release process and explained DAAC's role in this process. Mr. Madans then highlighted refinements to the Operational Metrics dashboard which include the addition of current year filings and dispositions, improved tooltips, and clearance rates only for JBSIS certified courts. Next steps include responding individually to all court feedback and sending the next version to CEAC for verification.

Item 3**Dashboard Update (2): CARE Act**

Presenter(s): Mr. Jack Madans, Project Manager
Ms. Kelly Ragsdale, Senior Analyst

Ms. Kelly Ragsdale described how the data surrounding the CARE Act continues to generate significant interest from the media, the public, and other state-level entities. The CARE Act dynamic fact sheet intends to present key statewide data elements reported by the courts in an effort to reduce the number of individual data requests and increase transparency. Using this dynamic fact sheet as an example, Mr. Madans requested an exception to the dashboard release policy that expedites the review of dashboards with statewide-only data. The committee agreed that these types of exceptions should only be allowed in urgent cases.

Item 4**Alameda Adjustment Request (ARP): Subcommittee Update**

Presenter(s): Mr. David Yamasaki, CEO, Orange Superior Court

Mr. David Yamasaki gave an update from the DAAC subcommittee that met to discuss whether there should be a workload adjustment in courts where there are more allocated judgeships than needed judgeships. The subcommittee concluded that additional information is needed such as subordinate judicial officer usage.

Item 5

Judicial Workload Study Update

Presenter(s): Mr. Mustafa Sagir, Supervising Analyst

Mr. Mustafa Sagir provided more details on recent progress relating to the judicial workload study. The overall participation rate for the time study was 98% of judicial officers across 17 courts. Mr. Sagir then shared preliminary findings from the sufficiency of time survey. Many participants indicated that perceived complexity in cases has increased.

Item 6

Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Supplemental Work Update

Presenter(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer

Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin clarified that the goal of RAS supplemental work is to gather information to help explain changes in caseweights. In October 2025, four additional focus group sessions were conducted featuring 133 participants from 21 courts.

Item 7

Data Analytics Budget Change Proposal (BCP)

Presenter(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer

Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin shared that a BCP will be reintroduced for fiscal year 2027-28 that will aim to pay for additional technological components for a new data platform.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m..

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

Requesting Entity	Data Analytics Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Proposal Title	Branch Data Analytics Modernization
-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council of California requests 9 positions and \$7,240M in one-time funding in FY 2027-28; 9 additional positions and \$7,240M one time funding in FY 2028-29; 7 additional positions and \$7,240M one time funding in FY 2029-30; and \$5,120M one time funding in FY 30-31. Additionally, the branch is seeking \$1,555M in ongoing funding, starting in FY 27-28, in addition to ongoing funding for positions described above. This request will support needed FTE and technology to improve and modernize branch data collection to enhance data reporting, improve accountability and transparency, and better serve the public.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes ☒ No ☐

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed fund source: General Fund

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) *

Fiscal Year	2027–28 (BY)	2028–29 (BY+1)	2029–30 (BY+2)	2030–31 (BY+3)	2031–32 (BY+4)
Positions	9	18	25	25	25
Personal Services	964	3,698	5,083	5,083	5,083
Operating Expenses & Equipment	8,795	8,795	8,795	6,675	1,555
Local Assistance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	9,759	12,493	13,878	11,758	6,638
One-time	7,240	7,240	7,240	5,120	
Ongoing	3,483	5,253	6,638	6,638	6,638

*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

Problem or Issue

The Judicial Branch seeks to modernize outdated analytics technology to: 1) move beyond basic data reporting; 2) increase data validation cycles to provide more current data for decisionmaking; 3) give courts access to basic analytics to give insights into case management system data and make business decisions; 4) be better able to respond to requests for information about branch programs and outcomes; and 5) provide better data and analytics to support Branch budget requests and analysis of proposed legislation.

The proposal will lower data management costs and increase efficiency by utilizing a single technology platfor, to fulfill multiple data reporting requirements and will replace aging technical infrastructure. By way of illustration, in 2024, the Judicial Council managed over 170 different data collections to fulfill required statewide reporting. Most data collections are completed by survey or other manual data entry. More modern solutions can replace some manual processes, resulting in greater efficiency and better data quality and completeness. Regarding aging technical infrastructure, the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), a statewide data repository for court workload data, is housed on outdated technology that is no longer supported and must be replaced. Additionally, more modern systems can reduce the data reporting burden on courts, freeing up court staff who must devote a considerable amount of time to fulfilling data requests.

Improved data management and access directly helps courts serve the public more effectively and equitably. Whether identifying blockers in court processes, allocating court resources to meet workload need, or gathering public feedback on court processes, data analytics helps courts be more responsive to the needs of the public.

Background/History of Problem

Better data driven decision-making in California courts helps courts plan for the future, provides valuable insights needed for policymaking, and serves the public more effectively. Those benefits were especially realized during the COVID-19 pandemic when access to timely data became critical for the Legislature to understand the impact of the pandemic on courts.

Many judicial branch data systems reside on antiquated technology and systems that were designed in the 1990s. It's costly, if not impossible, to find programmers with the skills to program and debug this technology. In addition, older technologies cannot meet modern day security standards nor interface with other modern technology.

Prior Legislative investments in modern case management systems for trial courts and pilot programs for data analytics have shown that new approaches to data management can improve statewide data reporting. However, case management systems are not equipped with analytic capabilities. Data reporting and analytic packages pair with case management systems to provide insights on workflow, identify inefficiencies, and allocate resources to where needed.

Through a series of pilot programs that were made available to a subset of courts that represented different court sizes and case management systems, prior BCP investments were utilized to pilot test analytic solutions for courts. These pilots allowed the branch to prototype a data model, pilot test it in a limited group of courts, and iterate on the model to increase complexity and scale.

This concept will build on these prior investments to build a modern technical data platform for trial and appellate courts and the Judicial Council. This solution will pair with modern case management systems to provide data management, data validation, and analytics solutions to help courts track and manage case flow in the interest of providing timely access to justice.

Impact of Denial of Proposal

- The aging infrastructure housing the current JBSIS reporting, which is the key data asset necessary for caseflow data reporting and analysis, would be at risk of failure and would no longer live on secure and supported hardware and software.
- The branch would have to continue to maintain outdated technologies used to manage critical data assets.
- The value of prior BCP investments would not be fully actualized since some but not all trial courts were able to participate in those earlier phases and pilots.

Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal

Increased number of courts with access to data analytics needed for workload and caseflow management decision-making.

Increased number of validated datasets on the data reporting platform.

Increased ability to respond to data requests to understand court operations.

Decreased number of ad hoc data requests to trial courts.

Required Review/Approval

Data Analytics Advisory Committee

Choose from drop down, advisory body(ies) who should review this proposal

Choose from drop down, advisory body(ies) who should review this proposal.

Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations

Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Goal III: Modernization and Management of Administration

Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public

Please use this space to add any additional considerations.

Approval

I certify that I have reviewed this concept, and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.

Director Signature:

Leah Rose-Goodwin

Contact Name: Leah Rose-Goodwin