



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
December 21, 2015	Please Review
To	Deadline
Hon. Irma Poole Asberry Hon. Mark A. Juhas Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl Cochairs, AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee	N/A
From	Contact
Hon. Lorna A. Alksne Chair, Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	Deana Farole Supervising Research Analyst, Office of Court Research 415-865-8997 phone deana.farole@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Recommendations of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee	

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) met on December 2, 2015, to review and discuss the recommendations, listed below, that were approved by the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee at its November 19, 2015, meeting.

1. Continue to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology, coordinate with California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and review the funding methodology for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators at the conclusion of the DCSS program review.

Hon. Irma Poole Asberry

Hon. Mark A. Juhas

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl

December 21, 2015

Page 2

2. When developing a funding methodology, determine whether there is sufficient data to determine the specific workload of the family law facilitator, which may be different than how workload for the child support commissioner is determined.
3. Adopt the recommendation of the mid-year reallocation subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources.

Judge Irma Asberry, cochair to the joint subcommittee on behalf of WAAC, provided an overview of the process that led to the recommendations and the rationale for the joint subcommittee's vote, and Stephen Nash, chair of the smaller subcommittee that explored specific allocation methodologies, provided an overview of his group's charge and the outcome of its work.

WAAC voted unanimously to support all three recommendations in concept, with the suggestion of a non-substantive amendment to Recommendation 2, in order to clarify its intent and avoid confusion with the workload measurement that is under WAAC's charge through the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). The proposed amendment to Recommendation 2 is as follows: "When developing a funding methodology, determine whether the family law facilitator methodology should use different underlying data than the child support commissioner methodology, and identify what data should be used, given that different factors drive commissioner and facilitator workloads."

In addition to voting in support of the joint subcommittee's recommendations, WAAC is committing to improving the data related to AB 1058 case processing through its own work, both by exploring with the Court Executives Advisory Committee the concerns expressed regarding the consistency and reliability of DCSS filings data (and associated JBSIS reporting guidelines), and by ensuring that the full range of AB 1058 workload is captured in the 2016 update of the staff workload study. Although WAAC recognizes that whatever funding methodology is eventually adopted may not function in the same way as the RAS model, the data from the staff workload study may nonetheless prove useful in the development of the methodology.