



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 3, 2020

10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

Judicial Council, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 3rd Floor, Redwood Room, San Francisco, California 94102

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair; Hon. Charles R. Brehmer; Hon. Pamela L. Butler; Hon. Stephanie Cameron; Hon. Joyce Hinrichs; Hon. Kirk H. Nakamura; Hon. Lawrence P. Riff; Hon. Jennifer K. Rockwell; Ms. Sherri R. Carter; Ms. Arlene D. Junior; Mr. Michael D. Planet; Ms. Kim Turner

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. James Kim; Ms. Bonnie Sloan

Others Present: Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; Ms. Kristin Greenaway; Mr. Nicholas Armstrong; Ms. Carolyn Bernabe; Ms. Rose Butler

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the March 3, 2020, Workload Assessment Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Policy

Action:

The committee reviewed and discussed a proposed draft RAS policy document provided by the JC staff. To address the ask from courts' constituents, the committee identified possible approaches to do the studies differently:

1) **Driver: Filings-based model – 22 case type caseweights**

The committee discussed the number of case types and caseweights in the RAS and judicial needs models and talked about developing subset categories to break-down the more complex felony, unlimited civil, family, and dependency cases, placing a higher priority on felony and unlimited civil cases. The current reporting process requires the courts to report filings based on casetype without the sub casetype distinctions, which

leaves all cases of the same type to be lumped into the current casetype category. The proposed subset categories should capture nuances in cases, e.g., complex, multiple parties or defendants cases; how much time it takes to process cases of the same case types, e.g., a standard felony case takes three to four weeks while a capital felony case takes years.

2) Data Collection Period

The committee discussed about changing the collection period from spring to January of each year.

3) Court Participation

The committee discussed the benefits of using the same participants from year to year. Committee noted that over time participants get better with the study.

4) Update Cycles

The committee discussed changing the time study from a 5-year cycle to a 3-year cycle to address yearly legislative shifts and filings trends. The committee deems the change to be a priority. To move forward, JC staff will meet with the JC Chief Operating Officer to go over the proposed change, and the committee will raise the subject to the courts presiding judges and court executive officers (TCPJAC/CEAC).

5) Methodology: Ratios used to compute FTE Need (Staff only)

The committee discussed the disparity in clusters and the effect of measures in the formula for Manager/Supervisor Need Cluster Based Ratios (use Schedule 7A) and Program 90 Administrative Staff Need Cluster Based Ratios (use Schedule 7A). JC staff mentioned that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee is already discussing to establish a subcommittee to address 'clustering' in the courts. It is certain that WAAC will be involved in many of the new subcommittee's work.

Item II

Adjustment Request Process (ARP) Referred to WAAC

Action:

The committee discussed the recommendations concerning the requests from the following courts:

1) Monterey Superior Court ARP

The committee voted unanimously to explore the subject and directed staff to provide a report at the next in-person meeting. The report should include a representative sample of courts that includes courts with all level of language service workload in the next RAS Model update.

2) El Dorado Superior Court ARP

The committee voted to deny the request based on the current RAS model policies and absent specific criteria to establish and maintain locational needs.

3) Los Angeles/San Diego Superior Courts ARP

The committee voted to pass the recommendation for the workload (Mental Health filings) to be captured as part of the RAS Model, and directed staff to develop an interim solution to capture the workload until the next RAS update. Presiding Judge Lorna Alksne, Chair, abstained from the vote. Ms. Sherri R. Carter and Judge Lawrence P. Riff also abstained. The three abstained because the ARP was submitted by the courts represented by these members.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on September 9, 2020.