



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
ceac@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR August 5, 2024

Meeting Contents

Notice and Agenda	1
Minutes	
Minutes from the March 15, 2024 , Meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Case Criminal Aging	6
Item 2 – Juvenile Case Aging	13
Item 3 – Misdemeanor Aging	18
Item 4 – Parent / Child Row Issues	23
Information Only Items	
Info 1 – Case Aging Intervals	29



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
tcpjac_ceac@jud.ca.gov

Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business
days before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: August 5, 2024
Time: 10:00 A.M.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3643>

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

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to tcpjac_ceac@jud.ca.gov.

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

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the March 15, 2024, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System subcommittee meeting(s).

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

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 tcpjac_ceac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA , 94102, attention: Paarth Malkan. Only written comments received by

10:00 A.M. August 2, 2024 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Item 1: Criminal Case Aging (Action Required)

Review and determine whether the date of the disposition occurs on either the date of conviction or the date of sentencing.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

Item 2: Juvenile Case Aging Calculation (Action Required)

Review and determine whether the juvenile case aging calculation should capture the total length of time a ward/dependent case is in the court system or the length of time a minor is under court supervision.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Paarth Malikan, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services
Mr. Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

Item 3: Misdemeanor Case Aging (Action Required)

Review and approve recommendation to align misdemeanor case aging with the Standards of Judicial Administration 2.2 and the Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

Item 4: Parent/Child Row Issues (Action Required)

Review and make recommendations for reporting data in parent and child rows in various JBSIS reports.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1: Case Aging Intervals (No Action Required)

Receive update on staff work to standardize case aging intervals.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

Info 2: Trial Courts: Standard 2.2 Diversion Reporting (No Action Required)

Update on Rules Committee action and next steps.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Paarth Malkan, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
tcpjac_ceac@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 15, 2024

2:00 PM

Via Conference Call

Advisory Body Members Present: Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair; Mr. Chad Finke; Mr. Kevin Harrigan; Mr. Michael M. Roddy; Mr. David Slayton; Ms. Nocona Soboleski; Ms. Kim Turner; Mr. David Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present: Mr. Jonatan Alzate; Ms. Anne Adiele; Ms. Mary Carter; Ms. Savet Hong; Mr. Austin Hulbert; Ms. Donna Ignacio; Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; Mr. Paarth Malkan; Mr. Jonathan Sibayan

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the September 29, 2024, Judicial Branch Statistics Information System Subcommittee meeting. Motion was approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

Item 1

Revision to Standard 2.2(m)(2)(c) Diversion Reporting

Mr. Malkan provided an update regarding an action item that the subcommittee reviewed at its last meeting to revise Rule of Court 2.2(m)(2)(C), reporting that on Feb 2nd, 2024, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) adopted the subcommittee's recommendation to amend standard 2.2(m)(2)(C). and that the item has been sent to the Rules Committee in preparation for its March 28, 2024 meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

JBSIS 4.0 Matrices – Clarification (Action Required)

Ms. Rose-Goodwin summarized two issues that affect JBSIS 4.0 data reporting standards. The first item related to how juvenile dependency workload data are reported and proposes moving some data elements from the state report to the local report. The second item concerned CARE Act data reporting in JBSIS 4.0. Committee staff requested that the committee review and approve the proposed changes. A motion was made to move the juvenile dependency workload data to the local report and remove it from the statewide report. The motion passed unanimously. The committee then discussed the proposed recommendations to CARE Act data reporting. A motion was made to approve the staff recommendation with the exception of moving lines 3750 to 3790 to the local report and leaving lines 3800 to 3830 on the statewide report.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on.



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

July 29, 2024

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Subcommittee

Deadline

N/A

From

Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research

Contact

Austin Hulbert
415-865-7429 phone
austin.hulbert@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Criminal Case Aging in JBSIS

Issue

In JBSIS 3.0, criminal cases have aging rows to assess trial court case disposition time goals set by standard 2.2 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration.¹ For criminal cases, felonies, and misdemeanors and infractions, the final date of disposition occurs at certain events—for example, “dismissal,” “bail forfeiture,” and “acquittal,” as clearly defined in *Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS): Version 3.0*. However, for cases where dispositions involve conviction and sentencing (“sentenced—plea of guilty/nolo contendere,” “sentenced—court finding of guilt,” and “sentenced—jury verdict of guilt”), the disposition date is unclear because conviction and sentencing may occur on different dates. This definitional ambiguity has resulted in trial court case management systems (CMSs) counting the date of disposition differently for cases in which the defendant is convicted and sentenced. Some courts currently count the date of *sentencing* as the final disposition date, whereas others count the date of *conviction*. This discrepancy allows for inconsistencies in case aging for criminal case data reported in JBSIS 3.0 and needs to be addressed for JBSIS 4.0. Office of Court Research Staff

¹ Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., std. 2.2, www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=standards&linkid=standard2_2. All future references to standards are to the California Standards of Judicial Administration, unless otherwise stated.

have researched this issue in the JBSIS manual, court standards, and other resources to present and provide recommended options to the JBSIS Subcommittee.

Analysis

JBSIS 3.0 Manual

In the JBSIS 3.0 manual for criminal cases, three disposition types group both conviction and sentencing together. Furthermore, these disposition types are listed in the case aging sections as an option for final disposition. Following are the disposition types and their definitions:

sentenced—plea of guilty/nolo contendere A final disposition in which the defendant admits having committed the offense(s) with which he or she is charged or a lesser included charge, or pleads no contest to the charge(s) and is sentenced.

sentenced—court finding of guilt A disposition after court trial in which the court finds the defendant guilty of one or more of the charges and the defendant is sentenced.

sentenced—jury verdict of guilt A disposition after jury trial in which the jury finds the defendant guilty of one or more of the charges and the defendant is sentenced.

For criminal cases, standard 2.2 and the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (Gov. Code, § 68604) are explicitly referenced for case aging.

Standards of Judicial Administration

Standard 2.2 outlines the trial court case disposition time goals. Standard 2.2(j) through (l) sets disposition time goals for misdemeanor and felony cases, on which JBSIS 3.0 case aging is based. However, the definitions in standard 2.2 do not explicitly define when disposition occurs:

Except for capital cases, all felony cases disposed of should have a total elapsed processing time of no more than one year from the defendant's first arraignment to disposition.

(Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., std. 2.2(j).)

Standard 2.2 does not state whether the time goals end at conviction date or sentencing date for criminal cases disposed by conviction (guilty plea / finding of guilt / verdict of guilt).

Trial Court Delay Reduction Act

The criminal time goals set in standard 2.2 were adopted under Government Code section 68603 via the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act:

The Judicial Council may adopt the standards of timely disposition adopted by the National Conference of State Trial Judges [NCSC] and the American Bar Association [ABA] or may adopt different standards, but in the latter event shall specify reasons for approval of any standard which permits greater elapsed time for the resolution of litigation than that provided in the standards of the National Conference of State Trial Judges.²

Therefore, the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act is intended to set disposition time standards that align with those of the NCSC and ABA.

Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts

*Model Time Standards*³ was developed by the NCSC to establish time-to-disposition standards based on a review of the experiences of state courts. These model standards were approved by the ABA House of Delegates. Additionally, members of the National Conference of State Trial Judges (NCSTJ) were on the steering committee for this document.

In *Model Time Standards*, the time standards “run from *the date of filing to the date of disposition by entry of judgment.*” (*Id.*, p. 2.) More specifically for felony cases:

The standards run from the filing of the initial complaint through disposition (e.g., dismissal or sentencing).

(*Id.*, p. 4.)

In summary, via *Model Time Standards*, the NCSTJ and ABA define criminal case aging from filing date to sentencing date.

Effective Criminal Case Management Project

The NCSC’s Effective Criminal Case Management (ECCM) project⁴ was designed to discover effective practices in the state courts for resolving felony and misdemeanor cases. One goal of the ECCM project was to assess the how well courts follow the time standards set in *Model Time Standards*. Similarly, researchers for the ECCM project aged cases from filing to the date of

² Gov. Code, § 68603(b), https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68603.&lawCode=GOV.

³ National Center for State Courts, *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* (Aug. 2011), www.ncsc.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0032/18977/model-time-standards-for-state-trial-courts.pdf.

⁴ National Center for State Courts, *Effective Criminal Case Management: Project Overview* (Aug. 2020), www.ncsc.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0013/53311/ECCM-Project-Overview-final.pdf.

disposition. However, in *Criminal Case Management Basics*,⁵ which was designed to allow courts to adopt the ECCM methodology, date of disposition is defined as follows:

Disposition date is defined as the date of the legal disposition of the case (e.g., trial verdict, guilty plea, dismissal, etc.) OR entry into diversion or drug court or other problem-solving court program, whichever comes first. It refers to the date of the *final disposition of the original criminal case*, not to the date of disposition for post-judgment events such as probation violations.

In those instances where a case has multiple charges with multiple disposition dates, this date is defined as the “first final disposition” date. That is, the date when **all** the charges are initially disposed (not the first disposition date when, say, one of the charges is dismissed but others are still pending disposition). In addition, as noted above, for purposes of this study the disposition date is the date of **entry** into diversion or a problem-solving court program, not the date where there may be a subsequent disposition such as ‘dismissal’ (if conditions of diversion are met) or “conviction” (if conditions are not met).

(*Criminal Case Management Basics*, p. 26 (emphasis original).)

Additionally, date of sentencing is defined as:

The date when judgment is entered, and sentence imposed.

(*Ibid.*)

Therefore, for cases that involve a conviction and sentencing, the ECCM project ages those cases from date of filing to date of conviction (trial verdict / court finding / plea of guilty).

Options

Office of Court Research staff recommend that the JBSIS Subcommittee consider the options described below to ensure consistency in criminal case aging.

Option 1: Establish the date of sentencing as the disposition date.

The JBSIS 3.0 manual, standard 2.2, and the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act can be linked to the standards set in *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*, which uses the sentencing date as the date of disposition. If *sentencing date* is established as the date of disposition, JBSIS 3.0

⁵ National Center for State Courts, *Criminal Case Management Basics: Data Elements, Performance Measures, and Data Presentation Strategies* (Aug. 2020), www.ncsc.org/data/assets/pdf_file/0012/53220/Criminal-Case-Management-Basics.pdf.

and future JBSIS versions should indicate this clarification. This change could be reflected on row 3125 in Report 07c, Felonies (see changes in red text, below):

Case Aging (Gov. Code, § 68604; Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., § 2.2)

The number of cases falling into each of the following time intervals. Exclude the time the case was removed from the court’s control, capital cases, and cases filed prior to 1991.

- If the capital charge is subsequently dropped, age from the arraignment date on the complaint.
- Cases transferred in are aged from the complaint/information arraignment date in the original jurisdiction.
- Do not age felony petitions or reopened cases.
- *For cases in which the final disposition is either “sentenced—plea of guilty/nolo contendere,” “sentenced—court finding of guilt,” or “sentenced—jury verdict of guilt,” calculate case aging with the sentencing date as the final disposition date.*

(Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS): Version 3.0 (July 2018), p. 197.)

In Report 11a, Misdemeanor and Infraction, the Case Aging description page in the JBSIS manual already states to age cases to the sentencing date.

Case Aging (Gov. Code, § 68604; Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., § 2.2)

Misdemeanor cases are aged until defendants are *sentenced* or the case is otherwise disposed.

Additionally, courts and their CMS vendors that currently calculate criminal case aging to the *conviction* date would need to be contacted to update their CMSs to calculate criminal case aging to the *sentencing* date.

Option 2: Establish the date of conviction as the disposition date.

The NCSC’s ECCM project uses date of conviction as the disposition date for criminal case aging calculations. If conviction date is established as the date of disposition, future versions of JBSIS might be proactively set to adopt updated standards by the NCSC. Additionally, the Trial Delay Reduction Act allows, with the following phrase, some flexibility in the standards adopted:

. . . may adopt different standards, but in the latter event shall specify reasons for approval . . .

(Gov. Code, § 68603(b).)

If conviction date is established as the date of disposition, JBSIS 4.0 should indicate this clarification. First, disposition row titles and their definitions would need to be updated to *not* include sentencing. For example, row 2900 in Report 07c, Felonies, would need to change from:

sentenced—jury verdict of guilt A disposition after jury trial in which the jury finds the defendant guilty of one or more of the charges and the defendant is sentenced.

to:

jury verdict of guilt A disposition after jury trial in which the jury finds the defendant guilty of one or more of the charges.

Furthermore, the following change would need to be reflected on row 3125 in Report 07c, Felonies (see changes in red text, below):

Case Aging (Gov. Code, § 68604; Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., § 2.2)

The number of cases falling into each of the following time intervals. Exclude the time the case was removed from the court’s control, capital cases, and cases filed prior to 1991.

- If the capital charge is subsequently dropped, age from the arraignment date on the complaint.
- Cases transferred in are aged from the complaint/information arraignment date in the original jurisdiction.
- Do not age felony petitions or reopened cases.
- *For cases in which the final disposition is either “plea of guilty/ nolo contendere,” “court finding of guilt,” or “jury verdict of guilt,” calculate case aging with the conviction/plea date as the final disposition date.*

Report 11a, Misdemeanors and Infractions, would also need to be updated as follows to reflect this shift:

Case Aging (Gov. Code, § 68604; Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., § 2.2)

Misdemeanor cases are aged until defendants are *convicted/ plead guilty* or the case is otherwise disposed.

Additionally, courts and their CMS vendors that currently calculate criminal case aging to the sentencing date would need to be contacted to update their CMSs to calculate criminal case aging to the conviction/plea date.

Summary

Currently, courts are counting the date of disposition differently (date of conviction vs. date of sentencing) for criminal cases where conviction and sentencing both occur (guilty pleas / court

Members of the JBSIS Subcommittee

July 29, 2024

Page 7

findings / jury verdicts). This discrepancy allows for inconsistencies in case aging for criminal case data reported in JBSIS and needs to be addressed for future versions. Based on the research provided, Office of Court Research staff recommend that the JBSIS Subcommittee explicitly establish either date of conviction or date of sentencing as the disposition date in criminal case aging.

AH



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

July 26, 2024

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Subcommittee

Deadline

N/A

From

Paarth Malkan, Senior Analyst
Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research

Contact

Paarth Malkan
415-865-7588 phone
paarth.malkan@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Juvenile Case Aging in JBSIS 3.0 and Future Versions of JBSIS

Austin Hulbert
415-865-7429 phone
austin.hulbert@jud.ca.gov

Summary

In juvenile delinquency and dependency cases, case aging begins with the filing of a petition or notice of hearing alleging that the minor committed a crime or that there are concerns the minor is not safe from abuse or neglect.

Juvenile case aging is currently collected in JBSIS for cases in which the minor became a ward or dependent of the court. It is collected under two subcategories of case aging, “age of terminated cases” and “age of cases under court’s supervision.” The current aging calculation does not align with the wording of the subcategory “age of cases under court’s supervision” because it suggests that the calculation captures how long cases were under a court’s supervision. Currently, juvenile case aging reflects how long cases that ultimately result in wardship or dependency were in the court system because the aging calculation starts from the filing date, which could occur before the minor was declared a ward or dependent of the court. However, if the intent is to understand how long a minor was under court supervision, then the calculation should start on the date the minor became a ward or dependent.

The JBSIS Subcommittee is asked to review and determine whether juvenile case aging should capture the total length of time a ward or dependent case is in the court system, or a minor is under court supervision.

Context and Case Flow of Juvenile Cases

Juvenile cases are reported in two categories, juvenile delinquency and juvenile dependency. Juvenile delinquency includes cases filed against a minor or nonminor dependent when that person is accused of breaking the law. Juvenile dependency includes cases on behalf of a minor or nonminor dependent when there is concern that person is being abused, neglected, exploited or is at risk of harm.

Case flow for juvenile delinquency begins with the filing of a petition or notice of hearing. Under section 725(b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code,¹ the court can make a disposition of wardship, declaring that the minor is a ward of the court, which moves the case under the court's supervision. The minor remains a ward of the court until the court orders a termination of wardship, which occurs either when the ward turns 21 or the minor's jurisdiction changes. Currently, case aging is calculated from when the initial petition is filed until the wardship is terminated or until the end of the reporting period.

Case flow for juvenile dependency also begins with the filing of a petition or notice of hearing. Under section 360(d) of the Welfare and Institutions Code,² the court can make a disposition of dependency, declaring that the minor is a dependent of the court, which moves the case under the court's supervision. The minor remains a dependent of the court until the court orders a termination of dependency, which occurs when the minor turns 18, the rights of the guardian are fully restored, or another responsible adult is appointed to make decisions for the minor. Currently, case aging is calculated from when the initial petition is filed until the dependency is terminated or until the end of the reporting period.

Issue

Currently, case aging data is captured in two subcategories: "age of terminated cases" and "age of cases under court's supervision." "Age of terminated cases" calculates the amount of time elapsed in dependent or ward cases from filing date to the termination of court supervision. "Age

¹ Welf. & Inst. Code, § 725(b), https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WIC&division=2.&title=&part=1.&chapter=2.&article=18.

² Welf. & Inst. Code, § 360(d), https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WIC&division=2.&title=&part=1.&chapter=2.&article=10.

of cases under court’s supervision” calculates the length of time a dependent or ward continues to be under court supervision from the filing date until the end of the reporting period. With the current calculation, juvenile case aging reflects how long cases that are in dependency or wardship were in the court system starting from the filing date, which could occur before the minor was declared a dependent or ward of the court. However, the title of the subcategory “age of cases under court’s supervision” may suggest that it captures the time elapsed since the minor came under court supervision. If the intent is to understand how long a minor was under court supervision, then the calculation should start at the date the minor became a ward or dependent of the court.

Case Aging in the Standards of Judicial Administration

Standard 2.2 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration provides guidance on trial court case disposition time goals that are “intended to improve the administration of justice by encouraging prompt disposition of all matters coming before the courts.”³ However, standard 2.2 does not contain a standardized framework for determining case time goals: the start of case aging varies in other case types. For example, civil cases start aging from the filing date, criminal cases start from the date of arraignment, and probate cases start from the date of issuance of permanent letters.

Time Standards by the National Center for State Courts

The *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*⁴ establishes time standards to unify the current sets of disparate national time standards to the greatest degree possible. For juvenile delinquency cases, the standards measure the period from filing of the complaint or petition to the issuance of the dispositional order. For neglect and abuse cases, the standards measure the periods from filing of the petition to the adjudicatory hearing and to the permanency hearing. These standards neither align with case aging related to juvenile delinquency or dependency as defined in the JBSIS manual nor relate to the time a juvenile is under court supervision.

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee provides recommendations for improving the administration of justice in cases involving marriage, family, or children. Staff to this committee recommend calculating juvenile case aging from the filing of the initial petition. Their reasoning

³ Cal Stds. Jud. Admin, std. 2.2(b), www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=standards&linkid=standard2_2.

⁴ National Center for State Courts, *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* (Aug. 2011), www.ncsc.org/data/assets/pdf_file/0032/18977/model-time-standards-for-state-trial-courts.pdf.

is that if case aging started from the declaration of dependency or wardship, subsequent and amended petitions might introduce confusion regarding the exact timing of the declaration.

Current Reporting of Juvenile Case Aging in JBSIS 3.0

Report 08a, Juvenile Delinquency

In report 08a, case aging is outlined in four rows under the Case Aging section.

Case Aging.

Age of terminated cases. The number of cases falling into time intervals, beginning with the date the initial petition was filed and ending with the date of termination of wardship.

- 0–Less than 3 months
- 3–Less than 6 months
- 6–12 months
- Greater than 12 months

Age of cases under court's supervision. The number of cases that are pending termination of wardship at the end of the reporting period and that fall into each of the time intervals from the date the initial petition was filed.

- 0–Less than 3 months
- 3–Less than 6 months
- 6–12 months
- Greater than 12 months

Report 09a, Juvenile Dependency

In report 09a, case aging is outlined in three rows under the Case Aging section.

Case Aging

Age of terminated cases. The number of cases falling into time intervals, beginning with the date the initial petition was filed and ending with the date of dependency termination.

- 0–Less than 18 months
- 18 months–Less than 3 years
- 3–5 years
- Greater than 5 years

Age of cases under court's supervision. The number of cases that are pending termination of dependency at the end of the reporting period and that fall into time intervals from the date the initial petition was filed.

- 0–Less than 18 months
- 18 months–Less than 3 years

3–5 years

Greater than 5 years

Proposed Actions for Future Versions of JBSIS

There are two options for consideration:

Option 1. Maintain the current juvenile case aging calculation from the date of the initial petition filing.

This option aligns with the recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee staff, who highlighted some of the potential difficulties of Option 2, measuring case aging from date of wardship. The Option 1 approach measures how long a juvenile case was in the court system and ensures consistency in reporting from JBSIS 3.0 to future JBSIS versions.

Option 2. Amend the juvenile case aging calculation to start when the minor became a ward or dependent of the court.

This approach measures the duration a minor was a ward or dependent of the court. Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee staff advised that the timing of declaration of wardship might be harder to measure. Adopting Option 2 would require modifying the court's case management system to calculate case aging based on the amendment. Additionally, the JBSIS manual would need to be updated to note the amendment in juvenile case aging sections to clarify that historical and future case aging data will differ because of the revised calculation method.



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

July 29, 2024

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Judicial Branch Statistical
Information System Subcommittee

Deadline

N/A

From

Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research

Contact

Austin Hulbert
415-865-7429 phone
austin.hulbert@jud.ca.gov

Subject

JBSIS 4.0 Misdemeanor Aging

In reviewing the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) 4.0 data collection matrices, staff discovered that the approved case-aging rows for Report 11a (Misdemeanor and Infraction) no longer align with California Standards of Judicial Administration, standard 2.2.¹ The case-aging rows were reviewed and approved in a JBSIS Subcommittee meeting; however, the JBSIS 4.0 case-aging rows were mistakenly indicated as in alignment with California Standards of Judicial Administration, standard 2.2. The approved JBSIS 4.0 rows currently align with the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*² but not with California Standards of Judicial Administration, standard 2.2. As the time standards for all other case types align with the Standards of Judicial Administration as well as the model time standards, staff are seeking the subcommittee's clarification on and approval of the case-aging intervals that should be used for misdemeanor cases in JBSIS 4.0.

¹ Standard 2.2 is available at www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=standards&linkid=standard2_2.

² *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* is available at www.ncsc.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0032/18977/model-time-standards-for-state-trial-courts.pdf.

California Standards of Judicial Administration, Standard 2.2

JBSIS 3.0 and older versions of JBSIS use the California Standards of Judicial Administration, standard 2.2 to inform the case-aging data collected from courts. Standard 2.2 contains the recommended time goals for case disposition. Standard 2.2(k) states the following:

The goals for misdemeanor cases are:

- (1) 90 percent disposed of within 30 days after the defendant's first arraignment on the complaint;
- (2) 98 percent disposed of within 90 days after the defendant's first arraignment on the complaint; and
- (3) 100 percent disposed of within 120 days after the defendant's first arraignment on the complaint.

JBSIS 3.0 Case Aging

In JBSIS 3.0, Report 11a, case aging is established specifically to capture data for standard 2.2(k). The case-aging intervals are as follows for disposed and pending misdemeanor cases:

- 0–30 days
- 31–90 days
- 91–120 days
- 121 or more days

JBSIS 4.0 Case Aging

In the approved JBSIS 4.0 matrices for Report 11a, the original aging rows from Version 3.0 were removed, and new rows were created with an updated set of intervals that align with the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*. No subcommittee meeting notes explain why the new intervals were adopted. However, in the subcommittee meeting recording, the intervals were mistakenly stated as in alignment with California Standards of Judicial Administration, standard 2.2. The new, approved case aging intervals are as follows for disposed and pending misdemeanor cases:

- 0–60 days
- 61–90 days
- 91–181 days
- 181 or more days

Options for Consideration

Misdemeanor case aging for Report 11a in JBSIS 4.0 should, at a minimum, align with standard 2.2(k), but there are a few paths that the subcommittee could choose to take. The JBSIS Subcommittee should consider the following options.

Option 1: Change JBSIS 4.0 intervals to match Standards of Judicial Administration and JBSIS 3.0 intervals

The JBSIS 4.0 case-aging rows can be adjusted to align with standard 2.2(k). For misdemeanor case aging, new rows do not need to be created; the old rows from JBSIS 3.0 that align with standards 2.2(k) can be added back instead of removed. Then, the previously approved new case-aging rows that align with the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* can be removed.

Additionally, new rows for infraction cases were added in JBSIS 4.0 with the intention to match misdemeanor cases per previous subcommittee discussion; therefore, these new case-aging rows can be modified to match misdemeanor case aging if this option were selected. Standard 2.2 does not contain time goals for infraction cases, so the subcommittee would have to consider whether this option would provide relevant information about infractions case aging. See the attached matrices for the proposed changes.

Option 2: Change JBSIS 4.0 intervals to align with both standard 2.2(k) and the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*

Alternatively, the JBSIS 4.0 misdemeanor case-aging rows can be modified to account for both standard 2.2(k) and the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*. If this option were selected, the following intervals would be established:

- 0–30 days
- 31–60 days
- 61–90 days
- 91–120 days
- 121–180 days
- 181 or more days

With the expanded interval ranges, new rows can be created to cover both standard 2.2(k) and the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*. Furthermore, this change would be applied to infractions cases, and the greater number of intervals are more likely to provide relevant information about those cases. See the attached matrices for detailed changes.

Option 3: Update standards to match approved JBSIS 4.0 intervals and *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*

Alternatively, standard 2.2(k) could be updated to match the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* and JBSIS 4.0. To update standard 2.2(k), a rules change would be needed, along with Judicial Council approval on the rules change before incorporation into JBSIS 4.0.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend Option 2. For JBSIS 4.0, approved case-aging rows related to standard 2.2 in other reports additionally follow the *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts*. Therefore, with Option 2, misdemeanor and infraction cases would be consistent with other reports in the reasoning behind case-aging intervals.

AH

Attachment

Approved

3690	Case Aging
3700	Age of disposed misdemeanor cases
3710*	0-60 days
3720*	61-90 days
3730*	91-180 days
3740*	GE 181 days
4200	Age of pending misdemeanor cases
4205*	0-60 days
4210*	61-90 days
4215*	91-180 days
4220*	GE 181 days
4230*	Age of disposed infraction cases
4235*	0-60 days
4240*	61-90 days
4245*	91-180 days
4250*	GE 181 days
4260*	Age of pending infraction cases
4265*	0-60 days
4270*	61-90 days
4275*	91-180 days
4280*	GE 181 days

Option 1

3690	Case Aging
3700	Age of disposed misdemeanor cases
3800	0-30 days
3900	31-90 days
4000	91-120 days
4100	GE 121 days
4200	Age of pending misdemeanor cases
4300	0-30 days
4400	31-90 days
4500	91-120 days
4600	GE 121 days
4230*	Age of disposed infraction cases
4235*	0-30 days
4240*	31-90 days
4245*	91-120 days
4250*	GE 121 days
4260*	Age of pending infraction cases
4265*	0-30 days
4270*	31-90 days
4275*	91-120 days
4280*	GE 121 days

Option 2

3690	Case Aging
3700	Age of disposed misdemeanor cases
3705*	0-30 days
3710*	31-60 days
3715*	61-90 days
3720*	91-120 days
3725*	121-180 days
3730*	GE 181 days
4200	Age of pending misdemeanor cases
4205*	0-30 days
4210*	31-60 days
4215*	61-90 days
4220*	91-120 days
4225*	121-180 days
4230*	GE 181 days
4240*	Age of disposed infraction cases
4245*	0-30 days
4250*	31-60 days
4255*	61-90 days
4260*	91-120 days
4265*	121-180 days
4270*	GE 181 days
4280*	Age of pending infraction cases
4285*	0-30 days
4290*	31-60 days
4295*	61-90 days
4305*	91-120 days
4310*	121-180 days
4315*	GE 181 days

* represent new rows for 4.0



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

July 29, 2024

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee

Deadline

N/A

From

Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research

Contact

Austin Hulbert
415-865-7429 phone
austin.hulbert@jud.ca.gov

Subject

JBSIS 4.0 Parent and Child Row Issues

In early 2020, the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Subcommittee undertook a project to review all the data elements collected in JBSIS to determine whether improvements could be made to increase the reliability and accuracy of JBSIS data reporting. The subcommittee's work resulted in a recommendation to adopt a new JBSIS data reporting (JBSIS 4.0) standard that established three tiers of data reporting—mandated, supplemental, and local—for each of the JBSIS reports (4a through 13a). JBSIS 4.0 was adopted by the Judicial Council in July 2022, and its expected implementation date is July 1, 2025.

In preparation for JBSIS 4.0, staff discovered several issues regarding parent and child rows in multiple reports. Parent rows are typically summary rows that are calculated based on the total of their child rows. Two kinds of issues are occurring:

1. The parent summary row for certain case types is marked as invalid (i.e., data cannot be entered or a summary will not be calculated), while the child rows are marked as valid (i.e., data can be entered).
 2. The parent summary row for certain case types is marked as valid, while the child rows are marked as invalid.
-

There is no consistent pattern on when a parent or child row is marked valid or invalid. The JBSIS Subcommittee is being asked to review and address these issues for JBSIS 4.0.

Recommendations

Staff has provided options and recommendations for each impacted report in the attached document.

AH

Attachment

Issue: Parent row 2400 valid for 120, but child rows invalid.
Approved 4.0

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
1225	Judgment (total rows 1250 - 1300)													
1250	Entry of summary dissolution													
1300	Entry of judgment/order													

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, case type 120 has a count.

Recommendation: make parent row valid for case type 120

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
1225	Judgment (total rows 1250 - 1300)													
1250	Entry of summary dissolution													
1300	Entry of judgment/order													

Issue: Parent row 2400 valid for 120, but child rows invalid.
Approved 4.0

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
2400	After Court Trial (total of rows 2500 - 2600)													
2500	Dismissal													
2600	Entry of judgment/order													

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, case type 120 has 0 count.

Recommendation: make parent row invalid for case type 120

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
2400	After Court Trial (total of rows 2500 - 2600)													
2500	Dismissal													
2600	Entry of judgment/order													

Issue: Parent rows 3100 and 3200 show as summary row for all case types, but only case type 100 has child rows to total.
Approved 4.0

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
3100	Request for Order (RFO)motions filed (total rows 3110 - 3130)													
3110	RFOmotion filed—Initial													
3120	RFOmotion filed—Modification													
3130	RFOmotion filed—Enforcement													
3150	Hearings (total rows 3200, 3300)													
3200	Request for Order (RFO)motion hearings (total rows 3210 - 3230)													
3210	RFOmotion hearing—Initial													
3220	RFOmotion hearing—Modification													
3230	RFOmotion hearing—Enforcement													

Child rows only pertain to case type 100. Parent row is relevant for other case types.

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, all case types have data in parent row, but only case type 100 has data in child rows.

Option 1: Make parent rows as data entry rows instead of summary rows.

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
3100	Request for Order (RFO)motions filed (total rows 3110-3130)													
3110	RFOmotion filed—Initial													
3120	RFOmotion filed—Modification													
3130	RFOmotion filed—Enforcement													
3150	Hearings (total rows 3200, 3300)													
3200	Request for Order (RFO)motion hearings (total rows 3210-3230)													
3210	RFOmotion hearing—Initial													
3220	RFOmotion hearing—Modification													
3230	RFOmotion hearing—Enforcement													

Option 2: Add child entry row for RFOmotion filed for all columns besides case type 100; clarify parent row as a summary row.

Family Law 06a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
		Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Disposiion w/ Minor Children	Legal Separation w/ Minor Children	Nullity w/ Minor Children	Establish Parental Relationship	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	DV Prevention w/ Minor Children	Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)	DCSS-IFISA	Adoption	Other Family Law Petitions and Complaints
3100	Total Request for Order (RFO)motions filed (total rows 3105 - 3130)													
3105	RFOmotion filed													
3110	RFOmotion filed—Initial													
3120	RFOmotion filed—Modification													
3130	RFOmotion filed—Enforcement													
3150	Hearings (total rows 3200, 3300)													
3200	Total Request for Order (RFO)motion hearings (total rows 3205 - 3230)													
3205	RFOmotion hearing													
3210	RFOmotion hearing—Initial													
3220	RFOmotion hearing—Modification													
3230	RFOmotion hearing—Enforcement													

Issue: Parent summary row 3050 for case types 10, 30, 50, and 70 are valid, but child rows 3100 and 3150 that are totaled are not valid.
 Approved 4.0

Juvenile Delinquency 08a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70
		Status Offense (W&I § 601) Original	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Original	Status Offense (W&I § 601) Subsequent	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 777 Notices)	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)	Miscellaneous Juvenile Petition
3050	Prop 57: Minor remains in Juvenile court (total rows 3100 - 3150)							
3100	Uncontested							
3150	Contested							

Definition for 3050 is related to W&I 707, which directly talks about a "person described in Section 602". In JBSIS, the only case types for Section 602 are 20 and 40.
 Row 700 counts "Prop 57: juveniles transferred to adult court dispositions"; only case types valid are for 20 and 40.
 In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, 0 counts for case types 10, 30, 50, and 70.

Option 1: make parent row invalid for case types 10, 30, 50, and 70

Juvenile Delinquency 08a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70
		Status Offense (W&I § 601) Original	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Original	Status Offense (W&I § 601) Subsequent	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 777 Notices)	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)	Miscellaneous Juvenile Petition
3050	Prop 57: Minor remains in Juvenile court (total rows 3100 - 3150)							
3100	Uncontested							
3150	Contested							

Issue: Parent summary row 5800 for case types 10, 30, 40, 50, and 70 are invalid, but child row 6500 are valid.

Approved 4.0

Juvenile Delinquency 08a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70
		Status Offense (W&I § 601) Original	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Original	Status Offense (W&I § 601) Subsequent	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 777 Notices)	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)	Miscellaneous Juvenile Petition
5800	Reviews (total rows 5850, 6050, 6500)							
5850	6-month reviews (total rows 5900, 6000)							
5900	Uncontested (total rows 5925 - 5950)							
5925	LE 6 months							
5950	GT 6 months							
6000	Contested (total rows 6020 - 6040)							
6020	LE 6 months							
6040	GT 6 months							
6050	12-month reviews total rows (6100, 6200)							
6100	Uncontested (total rows 6150 - 6175)							
6150	LE 12 months							
6175	GT 12 months							
6200	Contested (total rows 6300 - 6400)							
6300	LE 12 months							
6400	GT 12 months							
6500	Other periodic reviews (total rows 6600 - 6700)							
6600	Uncontested							
6700	Contested							

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, there are counts for case types 10, 30, 40, 50, and 70 in child rows 6500-6700. However, there are no counts in parent row 5800 since it is an invalid row for those cas

Recommendation: make parent row valid for case types 10, 30, 40, 50, and 70

Juvenile Delinquency 08a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50	60	70
		Status Offense (W&I § 601) Original	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Original	Status Offense (W&I § 601) Subsequent	Delinquency (W&I § 602) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 777 Notices)	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)	Miscellaneous Juvenile Petition
5800	Reviews (total rows 5850, 6050, 6500)							
5850	6-month reviews (total rows 5900, 6000)							
5900	Uncontested (total rows 5925 - 5950)							
5925	LE 6 months							
5950	GT 6 months							
6000	Contested (total rows 6020 - 6040)							
6020	LE 6 months							
6040	GT 6 months							
6050	12-month reviews total rows (6100, 6200)							
6100	Uncontested (total rows 6150 - 6175)							
6150	LE 12 months							
6175	GT 12 months							
6200	Contested (total rows 6300 - 6400)							
6300	LE 12 months							
6400	GT 12 months							
6500	Other periodic reviews (total rows 6600 - 6700)							
6600	Uncontested							
6700	Contested							

Issue: parent summary rows are valid for case type 30, but child rows are invalid for case type 30

Approved 4.0

Juvenile Dependency 09a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50
		Dependency (W&I § 300) Original	Dependency (W&I § 342) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 387) Supplemental	Dependency or Non-minor Dependent Adoption	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)
1030	Entry of judgment (total rows 1040 - 1050)					
1040	Dependency					
1045	Non-minor dependency established					
1050	Other judgment					
1130	Entry of judgment (total rows 1140 - 1150)					
1140	Dependency					
1145	Non-minor dependency established					
1150	Other judgment					

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, only a count of 1 for case type 30 row 1030. 0 count for case type 30 row 1130.

Definitions for rows 1030 and 1130 point out W&I 387, which is case type 30: "A disposition after a jurisdictional hearing in which the court has determined that there is sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations in the petition (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 360) or the court has ordered a change or modification to a previous order by removing a minor from the physical custody of a parent, guardian, relative, or friend (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 387)."

Recommendation: make child rows for case type 30

Juvenile Dependency 09a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50
		Dependency (W&I § 300) Original	Dependency (W&I § 342) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 387) Supplemental	Dependency or Non-minor Dependent Adoption	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)
1030	Entry of judgment (total rows 1040 - 1050)					
1040	Dependency					
1045	Non-minor dependency established					
1050	Other judgment					
1055	Remove minor from physical custody					
1130	Entry of judgment (total rows 1140 - 1150)					
1140	Dependency					
1145	Non-minor dependency established					
1150	Other judgment					
1155	Remove minor from physical custody					

Issue: Parent row for case type 40 is valid, but child rows are invalid

Approved 4.0

Juvenile Dependency 09a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50
		Dependency (W&I § 300) Original	Dependency (W&I § 342) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 387) Supplemental	Dependency or Non-minor Dependent Adoption	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)
2790	Detention/First appearance hearing (total rows 2800 - 2850)					
2800	Detention hearing (in custody)					
2850	First appearance hearing (out of custody)					

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, 0 count for case type 40 in row 2790.

Recommendation: make parent row invalid for case type 40

Juvenile Dependency 09a - Data Matrix		10	20	30	40	50
		Dependency (W&I § 300) Original	Dependency (W&I § 342) Subsequent	Placement (W&I § 387) Supplemental	Dependency or Non-minor Dependent Adoption	Non-minor Dependent (AB 12)
2790	Detention/First appearance hearing (total rows 2800 - 2850)					
2800	Detention hearing (in custody)					
2850	First appearance hearing (out of custody)					

Issue: parent summary rows are valid for case types 290, 300, 310, and 320, but child rows that are totaled are invalid for those case types

Approved 4.0

Misdemeanors/Infractions 11a - Data Matrix		210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	290	300	310	320
		Assault and Battery	Property Offenses	Drug Offenses	Sexual Offenses	Other Nontraffic Misdemeanor/Ordinances	DUI	Other Traffic Misdemeanors	Driving While License Suspended	Traffic Infractions/Ordinances	Nontraffic Infractions/Ordinances	Parking Violation Appeals	Reduced to Infraction
▼1350	Conviction (total row 1400)												
1400	Bail forfeiture												

In JBSIS for fiscal year 2022, 0 count for case types 210, 220, 240 in row 1350.

Recommendation: make parent row invalid for case types 210, 220, and 240

Misdemeanors/Infractions 11a - Data Matrix		210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	290	300	310	320
		Assault and Battery	Property Offenses	Drug Offenses	Sexual Offenses	Other Nontraffic Misdemeanor/Ordinances	DUI	Other Traffic Misdemeanors	Driving While License Suspended	Traffic Infractions/Ordinances	Nontraffic Infractions/Ordinances	Parking Violation Appeals	Reduced to Infraction
▼1350	Conviction (total row 1400)												
1400	Bail forfeiture												

Issue: parent summary rows are valid for case types 290, 300, 310, and 320, but child rows that are totaled are invalid for those case types

Approved 4.0

Misdemeanors/Infractions 11a - Data Matrix		210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	290	300	310	320
		Assault and Battery	Property Offenses	Drug Offenses	Sexual Offenses	Other Nontraffic Misdemeanor/Ordinances	DUI	Other Traffic Misdemeanors	Driving While License Suspended	Traffic Infractions/Ordinances	Nontraffic Infractions/Ordinances	Parking Violation Appeals	Reduced to Infraction
▼5690	Mistrial (total rows 5700 - 5800)												
5700	Mistrial on hung jury												
5800	Other mistrial												

In JBSIS, for fiscal year 2022, 0 count for case types 290, 300, 310 in parent row 5690.

Recommendation: make parent row invalid for case types 290, 300, 310, and 320

Misdemeanors/Infractions 11a - Data Matrix		210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	290	300	310	320
		Assault and Battery	Property Offenses	Drug Offenses	Sexual Offenses	Other Nontraffic Misdemeanor/Ordinances	DUI	Other Traffic Misdemeanors	Driving While License Suspended	Traffic Infractions/Ordinances	Nontraffic Infractions/Ordinances	Parking Violation Appeals	Reduced to Infraction
▼5690	Mistrial (total rows 5700 - 5800)												
5700	Mistrial on hung jury												
5800	Other mistrial												



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

July 26, 2024

Action Requested

Please review

To

Members of the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Subcommittee

Deadline

N/A

From

Austin Hulbert, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research

Contact

Austin Hulbert
415-865-7429 phone
austin.hulbert@jud.ca.gov

Subject

JBSIS 4.0 Case Aging Intervals

In preparation for JBSIS 4.0, staff discovered inconsistencies in the time intervals used for case aging rows. More specifically, the upper limit of the interval sometimes includes the last day, while other times the upper limit is specified as including less than that last day.

To ensure consistency, the case aging interval should either always include the last day or include less than that last day. Therefore, staff are seeking the Subcommittee's approval to standardize case aging intervals.

Case Aging Inconsistency in JBSIS

Case aging rows in JBSIS 3.0 either use days or months for time intervals. However, even when using months for time intervals, there are still day designations for the underlying calculations. For example, for the interval 0–LT 12 months, the day designation is 0–364 days. For case aging rows that use days, the upper-limit day for the interval is included in the interval. For example, the interval specified in row 3175 for report 07c is “91–365 days.” However, for case aging rows

July 26, 2024

Page 2

that use months, due to the description of the row, the upper-limit day for the interval is *not* included in the interval. For example, row 5300 for report 05a is “0–LT 12 months,” which is 0–364 days in the calculation.

Most case aging intervals are based on standard 2.2 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration¹ and the *Model Time Standards for State Courts*,² which define the aging intervals as “within X days/days.” Therefore, the verbiage is the same regarding months and days; however, our calculations in JBSIS are not consistent.

Recommendation

Due to inconsistencies in case aging intervals, the JBSIS Subcommittee should consider the following option:

Standardize case aging intervals to include upper limit in the aging interval.

To standardize aging intervals, the case aging rows involving months should include the upper-limit day in the aging interval, like the aging rows that use days. Definitions for rows in reports 05a, 05b, 08a, and 09a would need to be amended (see attached matrices). Additionally, the underlying calculations represented in days will need to be updated with the DADI team for JBSIS 4.0 case aging in those reports.

AH

Attachment

¹ Standard 2.2 is available at www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=standards&linkid=standard2_2.

² National Center for State Courts, *Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts* (2011), www.ncsc.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0032/18977/model-time-standards-for-state-trial-courts.pdf.

05a/05b Current 4.0 Case Aging	
5200	Age of disposed cases (all civil except unlawful detainers or exceptional)
5300	0–LT 12 months
5400	12–LT 18 months
5500	18–LT 24 months
5600	GE 24 months
5700	Age of disposed cases (exceptional)
5800	0 - LT 3 years
5900	GE 3 years
6000	Age of pending cases (all civil except unlawful detainers or exceptional)
6100	0–LT 12 months
6200	12–LT 18 months
6300	18–LT 24 months
6400	GE 24 months
6500	Age of pending cases (exceptional)
6600	LT 3 years
6700	GE 3 years

05a/05b Proposed 4.0 Case Aging	
5200	Age of disposed cases (all civil except unlawful detainers or exceptional)
5300	0–12 months
5400	GT 12–18 months
5500	GT 18–24 months
5600	GT 24 months
5700	Age of disposed cases (exceptional)
5800	0 - 3 years
5900	GT 3 years
6000	Age of pending cases (all civil except unlawful detainers or exceptional)
6100	0–12 months
6200	GT 12–18 months
6300	GT 18–24 months
6400	GT 24 months
6500	Age of pending cases (exceptional)
6600	0 - 3 years
6700	GT 3 years

08a Current 4.0 Case Aging

1850	Case Aging
1900	Age of terminated cases
2000	0 - LT 3 months
2100	3-LT 6 months
2200	6-12 months
2300	GT 12 months
2400	Age of cases under court's supervision
2500	0 - LT 3 months
2600	3-LT 6 months
2700	6-12 months
2800	GT 12 months

08a Proposed 4.0 Case Aging

1850	Case Aging
1900	Age of terminated cases
2000	0 -3 months
2100	GT 3-6 months
2200	GT 6-12 months
2300	GT 12 months
2400	Age of cases under court's supervision
2500	0 -3 months
2600	GT 3-6 months
2700	GT 6-12 months
2800	GT 12 months

09a Current 4.0 Case Aging

1690	Case Aging
1700	Age of terminated cases
1800	0 - LT 18 months
1900	18 months–LT 3 years
2000	3–5 years
2100	GT 5 years
2200	Age of cases under court's supervision
2300	0 - LT 18 months
2400	18 months–LT 3 years
2500	3–5 years
2600	GT 5 years
2900	Disposition hearings (total rows 2910 and 2920)
2910	Uncontested (total rows 2911-2913)
2911	0 - LT 9 months
2912	9 - LT 12 months
2913	GT 12 months
2920	Contested (total rows 2921-2923)
2921	0 - LT 9 months
2922	9 - LT 12 months
2923	GT 12 months

09a Current 4.0 Case Aging

1690	Case Aging
1700	Age of terminated cases
1800	0 - 18 months
1900	GT 18 months–3 years
2000	GT 3 years–5 years
2100	GT 5 years
2200	Age of cases under court's supervision
2300	0 - 18 months
2400	GT 18 months–3 years
2500	GT 3 years–5 years
2600	GT 5 years
2900	Disposition hearings (total rows 2910 and 2920)
2910	Uncontested (total rows 2911-2913)
2911	0 - 9 months
2912	GT 9 - 12 months
2913	GT 12 months
2920	Contested (total rows 2921-2923)
2921	0 - 9 months
2922	GT 9 - 12 months
2923	GT 12 months