



DATA ANALYTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 27, 2026

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; Mr. Brandon Henson; Mr. Kevin Harrigan; Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present: Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; Ms. Kristin Greenaway; Mr. Mustafa Sagir; Mr. Kyle Capuli; Ms. Anna Stenkamp; Mr. Jonathan Alzate; Ms. Suzanne Tallarico; Mr. Jack Madans

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 November 4, 2025, Data Analytics Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Judicial Workload Study (JWS)

Presenter(s): Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Manager
Mr. Mustafa Sagir, Supervising Analyst

Mr. Mustafa Sagir presented three key methodological considerations relating to the Judicial Workload Study. First, Mr. Sagir explained that the judicial work year value (WYV) has two components: total available working days and total available case related time per day. Next, Mr. Sagir highlighted a methodology used to identify and treat outliers. Lastly, Mr. Sagir reviewed the asbestos and complex civil caseweights.

During the presentation, the committee gave their feedback regarding each methodological consideration. These three items will be brought to the judicial workload subcommittee for further discussion.

Action:

None.

Item 2

Budget Change Concept for Data Analytics Modernization

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

Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin highlighted a budget change concept relating to the data analytics program for FY 2027-28. The proposal requests funding and positions that will support the expansion of the statewide data warehouse and analytics platform.

Action:

The committee voted to approve the budget change concept.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 3)

Item 1

Judicial Workload Study (JWS) Overview

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

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

Ms. Suzanne Tallarico provided key information regarding the most recent judicial officer time study in California. During a 4-week data collection period in 2025, judicial officers tracked their work time across various case types and case activities. Overall, there was a 98% participation rate among judicial officers across 17 counties.

After the time study was conducted, the NCSC sent out a sufficiency of time survey to participants and held validation meetings. Focus groups are scheduled for March to review case complexity. Once the committee finalizes a work year value (WYV), the data collected from the time study will be used to update the caseweights for the judicial workload model.

Item 2

Update on RAS Supplemental Work

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

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

Mr. Jake Chatters gave an overview of the RAS supplemental work. The purpose of this work is to not re-weight individual caseweights but to find environmental factors that may help explain changes in caseweights. A subcommittee recently met to review certain factors such as new laws since 2018 and filings data. This subcommittee is expected to meet again in February and will provide a summary of this work at the March DAAC meeting.

Item 3

Update on JCC Dashboard Roadmap

Presenter(s): Mr. Jack Madans, Consultant

Mr. Jack Madans reviewed the pilot dashboard four-step release process and highlighted upcoming JCC dashboard activities. Mr. Madans clarified that authority for this policy will come from the Judicial Council's Administrative Director. Committee members raised concerns about authority and governance structure, with some members questioning if DAAC should have more formal voting authority on data publication.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m..

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.