



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

August 15, 2019

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Judicial Council San Francisco Office, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 3rd Floor, Sequoia Room

Advisory Body Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Hon. Kirk H. Nakamura, Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Ms. Arlene D. Junior, Mr. Michael Planet, Hon. Lawrence P. Riff, Hon. Jennifer K. Rockwell, Ms. Bonnie Sloan (by phone), Ms. Kim Turner, Hon. Garrett L. Wong

Advisory Body Hon. Charles R. Brehmer, Hon. Joyce Hinrichs, and Mr. James Kim
Members Absent:

Others Present: Nicholas Armstrong,Carolynn Bernabe, Khulan Erdenebaatar, Leah Rose-Goodwin, Kristin Greenaway

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m., and took roll call. A public comment was received from the presiding judge of the Superior Court of San Benito County urging the committee to continue to support the workload needs of smaller courts.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 29, 2019 and July 29, 2019, Workload Assessment Advisory Committee meetings.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

2018 Judicial Workload Study Update (Action Required)

Review and discuss the Judicial Workload Study (JWS) focusing on additional analysis performed at the direction of the Judicial Council following the July 2019 meeting.

Presenters: Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair

Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Office of Court Research
At the May 29, 2019 meeting, the committee approved the use of median and a single set of caseweights for most casetypes to give voice to all courts and the use of overall average for complex civil separately. Staff made presentation on the proposed additional models for the JWS caseweights which reflects direction from the Judicial Council, at its July 18, 2019 meeting, to perform additional analysis to ensure the model best represents courts of all sizes. Staff

highlighted pros and cons of the models, explained variations in the weights and looked at ways to adjust for outliers.

The committee recommended using the aggregated average instead of median for calculating the caseweight for complex civil and unlimited civil. Complex civil is a subset of unlimited civil and similar on how they are represented in large courts.

Action:

The committee will recommend that the Judicial Council adopt the proposed Judicial Workload Study updated model parameters that are used as part of the formula for assessing judicial need in the trial courts:

- 1. adopt a model that applies a single set of caseweights, but excludes cluster 1 courts from the calculation of the caseweights;*
- 2. adopt the use of the median for the development of those caseweights with the proposed amendment to use the overall means method instead of median for complex civil and unlimited civil.*

Item 2:

2019 Judicial Needs Assessment and Prioritization

Once the proposed amendment to the judicial caseweights gets approval from the Judicial Council at its September meeting, staff will update the Judicial Needs Assessment biennial report to the Legislature based on the updated caseweights and filings data which will generate the ranking and prioritization for new judgeships.

Presenter: Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Office of Court Research

Action:

The committee will recommend to the Judicial Council to approve an updated Judicial Needs Assessment per Government Code section 69614(c)(1) based on the new judicial workload measures and the established methodology for prioritization of judgeships. The updated needs assessment would replace a preliminary version that was completed in 2018 using workload measures developed in 2011.

Next Steps

1. Submit report proposing adoption of the updated 2018 Judicial Workload Study Model at the Judicial Council September 23-24 meeting.
2. Resubmit the 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment with New Model Parameters and updated filings proposing adoption of the priority ranking list for judgeships based on the 2018 Judicial Workload Study Model update.

Additional Action Items:

1. Look at how AB 1058 cases are assessed on judicial need and how the authorized position related to 1058 funding is reported;
2. Contemplate and refine ways to study the small courts;
3. JWS refresh every 5 years whether to consider work on shorter turnaround time;

4. Ms. Sherri R. Carter to provide a copy of a document on judicial workload impact not measured
5. Staff to provide committee an updated Judicial Needs Assessment; and
6. Committee proposed to form a subcommittee to look at complex civil and unlimited civil.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:39 a.m..

Approved by the advisory body on November 18, 2019.