



**COURT STATISTICS AND WORKLOAD COMMITTEE**  
**TAMPA, FL**  
**JANUARY 2014**

Upon request by a qualified individual with a disability, this document will be made available in alternative formats. To order this document in an alternative format, please contact:

Shelley L. Kaus  
500 South Duval Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1900  
(ph) 850.617.1854  
[kauss@flcourts.org](mailto:kauss@flcourts.org)

## AGENDA

### 09:00am Meeting Convenes

#### Item I. Welcome

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

#### Item II. Committee Housekeeping

- A. Minutes of 10/11/2013 meeting
- B. Travel Reimbursement
- C. Revised Committee Protocols

#### Item III. Judicial Workload Model (Case Weight) Review

- A. Full Case Weight Study
- B. Results of Event Proportion Recalculation
- C. Results of Misdemeanor and Criminal Traffic Modifier

#### Item IV. Performance Measures Required by Fl. R. Jud. Adm. 2.225(a)(2)

- A. Project Review
- B. Progress on CSWC Recommendations
- C. Example of Case Age Data Collection

### 12:00pm-01:00pm Lunch

#### Item V. Status Reports (For information only)

- A. Judicial Data Management Services
- B. FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative
- C. Uniform Data Reporting – Court Interpreters Data Collection
- D. Statutory and Rule Changes to Stalking Violence Reporting
- E. Case Event Definitions

#### Item VI. End of FY 2012-14 Term

- A. End of Term Report
- B. Supreme Court Reauthorization
- C. Next Term CSWC Membership

#### Item VII. Next Meeting

### 03:00pm Meeting Adjourns

**COMMISSION ON TRIAL COURT  
PERFORMANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY**  
Court Statistics and Workload Committee

---

**Chair:**

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni  
County Judge, Charlotte County  
350 East Marion Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Punta Gorda, Florida 33950  
Phone: 941.505.4826  
Fax: 941.505.4825  
e-mail: [paul.alessandroni@co.charlotte.fl.us](mailto:paul.alessandroni@co.charlotte.fl.us)  
JA: Patricia Twardzik  
e-mail: [patriciat@co.charlotte.fl.us](mailto:patriciat@co.charlotte.fl.us)

**Members:**

Mr. Fred Buhl  
Director/Court Technology Officer  
Alachua County Family and Civil Justice Center  
Eighth Judicial Circuit  
201 E. University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601  
Phone: 352.337.6100  
Fax: 352.384.3018  
e-mail: [buhlf@circuit8.org](mailto:buhlf@circuit8.org)

The Honorable G. Keith Cary  
Circuit Judge, Twentieth Judicial Circuit  
1700 Monroe Street  
Fort Myers, Florida 33901  
Phone: 239.533.9140  
Fax: 239.485.2588  
email: [gcary@ca.cjis20.org](mailto:gcary@ca.cjis20.org)  
JA: Susan Kellum  
Email: [skellum@ca.cjis20.org](mailto:skellum@ca.cjis20.org)

Ms. Holly Elomina  
Trial Court Administrator  
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit  
Freeman Justice Center  
302 Fleming Street  
Key West, FL 33040  
Phone: 305.295.3644  
Fax: 305.292.3435  
e-mail: [holly.elomina@keyscourts.net](mailto:holly.elomina@keyscourts.net)  
Executive Assistant: Vivien Segel  
e-mail: [vivien.segel@keyscourts.net](mailto:vivien.segel@keyscourts.net)

The Honorable David H. Foxman  
County Court Judge, Volusia County Court  
125 E. Orange Avenue  
Daytona Beach, FL 32114  
Phone: 386.257.6033  
Fax: 386.257.6077  
e-mail: [dfoxman@circuit7.org](mailto:dfoxman@circuit7.org)  
JA: Jennifer Derleth  
e-mail: [jderleth@circuit7.org](mailto:jderleth@circuit7.org)

The Honorable Ilona M. Holmes  
Circuit Court Judge, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit  
Broward County Courthouse  
201 S.E. Sixth Street, Room 5760  
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
Phone: 954.831.7797  
Fax: 954.831.5572  
e-mail: [jholmes@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:jholmes@17th.flcourts.org)  
JA: Alicia Huff  
e-mail: [ahuff@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:ahuff@17th.flcourts.org)

**COMMISSION ON TRIAL COURT  
PERFORMANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY  
Court Statistics and Workload Committee**

---

Ms. Diane M. Kirigin  
General Magistrate, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit  
South County Courthouse  
200 W Atlantic Avenue  
Delray beach, Florida 33444  
Phone: 561.274.1410  
Fax: 561-330-1789  
e-mail: [dkirigin@pbcgov.org](mailto:dkirigin@pbcgov.org)  
Assistant: Rita Sinofsky  
e-mail: [rsinofsk@pbcgov.org](mailto:rsinofsk@pbcgov.org)

The Honorable Shelley J. Kravitz  
County Court Judge, Miami-Dade County  
73 W. Flagler Street, Room 615  
Miami, Florida 33130-1709  
Phone: 305.349.7091  
Fax: 305.349.7093  
e-mail: [skravitz@jud11.flcourts.org](mailto:skravitz@jud11.flcourts.org)  
JA: Milly Hancock  
e-mail: [mhancock@jud11.flcourts.org](mailto:mhancock@jud11.flcourts.org)

The Honorable Ellen S. Masters  
Circuit Court Judge, Tenth Judicial Circuit  
Polk County Courthouse  
255 N. Broadway  
Post Office Box 9000 Drawer J-145  
Bartow, Florida 33831  
Phone: 863.534.4669  
Fax: 863.534.4094  
e-mail: [emasters@jud10.flcourts.org](mailto:emasters@jud10.flcourts.org)  
JA: Linda Grubbs  
e-mail: [lgrubbs@jud10.flcourts.org](mailto:lgrubbs@jud10.flcourts.org)

Ms. Kathleen R. Pugh  
Trial Court Administrator  
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit  
Broward County Courthouse  
201 SE Sixth Street, Room 880  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: 954.831.7740  
Fax: 954.831.6258  
e-mail: [kpugh@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:kpugh@17th.flcourts.org)  
Executive Assistant: Fran Norcia  
e-mail: [fnorcia@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:fnorcia@17th.flcourts.org)

The Honorable Sharon Robertson  
Clerk of Court, Okeechobee County  
Okeechobee County Courthouse  
312 NW 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Okeechobee, Florida 34792  
Phone: 863.763.2131  
Fax: 863.763.1557  
e-mail: [srobertson@clerk.co.okeechobee.fl.us](mailto:srobertson@clerk.co.okeechobee.fl.us)  
Executive Assistant: Sharon Bennett  
e-mail: [sbennett@clerk.co.okeechobee.fl.us](mailto:sbennett@clerk.co.okeechobee.fl.us)

Mr. Philip G. Schlissel  
Administrative General Magistrate  
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit  
Broward County Courthouse  
201 S.E. Sixth Street, Suite 6360  
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
Phone: 954.831.6390  
Fax: 954.831.5533  
e-mail: [pschliss@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:pschliss@17th.flcourts.org)  
Assistant: Marilena DiLiddo  
email: [mdiliddo@17th.flcourts.org](mailto:mdiliddo@17th.flcourts.org)

**COMMISSION ON TRIAL COURT  
PERFORMANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY**  
Court Statistics and Workload Committee

---

The Honorable Barbara T. Scott  
Clerk of Court, Charlotte County  
Charlotte County Justice Center  
350 E. Marion Avenue  
Punta Gorda, Florida 33950  
Phone: (941) 505-4716  
Fax: (941) 505-4749  
e-mail: [barbara.scott@co.charlotte.fl.us](mailto:barbara.scott@co.charlotte.fl.us)  
Assistant: Cathy Ingegnere  
e-mail: [cathy.ingegnere@co.charlotte.fl.us](mailto:cathy.ingegnere@co.charlotte.fl.us)

Mr. Grant Slayden  
Trial Court Administrator  
Second Judicial Circuit  
Leon County Courthouse, Suite 203  
301 S. Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
Phone: 850.577.4420  
Fax: 850.487.7947  
e-mail: [slaydeng@leoncountyfl.gov](mailto:slaydeng@leoncountyfl.gov)

Mr. David M. Trammell  
Trial Court Administrator  
Fifth Judicial Circuit  
Marion County Courthouse  
110 NW 1st Avenue  
Ocala, FL 34475  
Phone: 352.401.6796  
Fax: 352.401.7883  
e-mail: [dtrammell@circuit5.org](mailto:dtrammell@circuit5.org)  
Executive Assistant: Tameka Gordon  
e-mail: [tgordon@circuit5.org](mailto:tgordon@circuit5.org)

**OSCA Staff:**

Mr. PJ Stockdale  
Senior Court Statistics Consultant  
Supreme Court of Florida  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Phone: 850.410.1523  
Fax: 850.414.1342  
e-mail: [stockdap@flcourts.org](mailto:stockdap@flcourts.org)

Ms. Shelley Kaus  
Senior Court Analyst II  
Supreme Court of Florida  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Phone: 850.617.1854  
Fax: 850.414.1342  
e-mail: [kauss@flcourts.org](mailto:kauss@flcourts.org)

Mr. Gregory Youchock  
Chief of Court Services  
Supreme Court of Florida  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Phone: 850.922.5108  
Fax: 850.414.1342  
e-mail: [youchocg@flcourts.org](mailto:youchocg@flcourts.org)

Ms. Kimberly Curry  
Senior Court Analyst II  
Supreme Court of Florida  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Phone: 850.488.2406  
Fax: 850.414.1342  
e-mail: [curryk@flcourts.org](mailto:curryk@flcourts.org)

## **Item I. Welcome & Introductions**

### **I.A. Opening Remarks**

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

## **Item II. Committee Housekeeping**

### **II.A. Minutes from 10/11/2013 Meeting:**

**Minutes  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee Meeting  
October 11, 2013  
Phone Conference**

#### **The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair**

#### **11:30 am Meeting convened**

- Eleven of the fifteen members were in attendance:  
The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, The Honorable David H. Foxman, The Honorable Shelley J. Kravitz, The Honorable Ellen S. Masters, The Honorable Barbara T. Scott, The Honorable Sharon Robertson, Mr. Philip G. Schlissel, Ms. Holly Elomina, Ms. Kathleen R. Pugh, Mr. David Trammell, & Mr. Fred Buhl
- Members absent:  
The Honorable G. Keith Cary, The Honorable Ilona M. Holmes, Ms. Diane Kirigin, & Mr. Grant Slayden
- Staff in attendance:  
Greg Youchock, P.J. Stockdale, Shelley Kaus, & Kimberly Curry

#### **Item I. Opening Remarks**

#### **Item II. Housekeeping**

- A.** Initially tabled the Meeting Minutes of 06/21/2013 until later in the meeting when a quorum was reached.
- B.** The Chair and staff expressed thoughts on the now retired Judge Silvernail and praised his contribution to this committee.
- C.** The Chair and staff expressed thoughts and sentiments on the passing of staff member Miriam Jugger.
- D.** Kimberly Curry was introduced as a new staff member to the CSWC.

#### **Item III. Judicial Workload Model (Case Weight) Review**

- A.** Recalculation of Event Proportion

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

1. The preliminary results of the event proportion recalculations completed by OSCA staff were introduced, and the methodology was explained.
  2. A side-by-side comparison of the 2007 case weights and the recomputed preliminary 2013 case weights was presented.
  3. Also presented was a comparison of the FY 2014-15 change in judicial need for circuit court and county court based on the 2007 case weights and the recomputed preliminary 2013 case weights.
  4. Staff explained that these preliminary results need to go through some validity checking before they are presented for the committee's consideration. The final results will be presented at the next CSWC meeting in winter of 2014.
- B. Adjustment Modifier for the County Criminal and Misdemeanor Traffic Division
1. Staff presented the proposed new county criminal division case weights for large counties and explained the methodology used to arrive at the new weights.
  2. A comparison of current county criminal division case weights and the proposed large counties' case weights was provided.
  3. Members voted (unanimously) to accept the County Criminal and Misdemeanor Traffic case weight modifier for use in the Judicial Weighted Workload Model.

**Item II. Housekeeping (cont'd)**

- A. Meeting Minutes of 06/21/2013
1. Now that a quorum had been reached, the minutes of the 06/21/2013 meeting were presented.
  2. Members voted (unanimously) to approve the minutes of 06/21/2013 meeting.

**Item IV. Status Reports (for information only)**

- A. Statutory and Rule Changes to Stalking Violence Reporting
1. Staff continues to monitor this issued. To date, no further activity had occurred on this matter.
- B. Case Event Framework
1. The Case-Event definitions were forwarded to the supreme court for adoption by the Commission on Trial Court Performance & Accountability on August 6, 2013. A copy of the transmittal letter was provided.
  2. Staff discussed possible implementation approaches if the framework is adopted by the supreme court.
  3. Staff also discussed the changes to each area of the SRS Manual that will be needed to incorporate the revised definitions in the future.

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

- C. Judicial Data Management Services
  - 1. No final decisions on the implementation of the JDMS project at this time.
  - 2. OSCA staff is currently developing a detailed project plan to guide work in the next few years, and has submitted a Legislative Budget Request for development of JDMS as an enterprise data management solution.
- D. Uniform Data Reporting – Court Interpreters Data Collection
  - 1. Due to the workload associated with the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative, the modification to the UDR system has temporarily been put on hold.
- E. Performance Measures Required by Fl. R. Jud. Adm. 2.225(a)(2)
  - 1. Due to the workload associated with the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative, the case age simulation has temporarily been put on hold.
  - 2. However, staff explained that the performance indicators calculated for the Foreclosure Initiative utilize the approved methodology of the performance measures required by Rule 2.225(a)(2). Staff believes that this initiative serves as an excellent pilot project that can later be expanded to all case types in order to satisfy the requirements of Rule 2.225(a)(2).
- F. FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative
  - 1. The initiative was explained and links to the Data Collection Plan and Foreclosure Initiative Workgroup report were provided.
  - 2. Staff informed that they will keep members apprised of all data collection and statistical reporting matters for the initiative, as many are closely related to the past and present work of the committee.

**Item V. Next Meeting**

- A. Members were requested to email their availability for possible next meeting dates.
- B. The location of the in-person meeting was discussed.

**12:33 pm Meeting Adjourned**

**Decision Needed:**

- 1. Adopt the meeting minutes from 10/11/2013.

## **II.B. Travel Reimbursement**

Travel reimbursement forms are included as Enclosure I. Please fax or mail a completed reimbursement form with all reimbursable receipts to:

OSCA – Court Services  
ATTN: Jessica Miller  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1900  
Ph. 850-487-0749  
Fax: 850-414-1342

If you made a hotel reservation somewhere besides the CSWC block at the Tampa Airport Marriott, **please keep in mind there is a \$150 maximum limit.** If you chose a more expensive hotel, you will only be reimbursed for the first \$150.00 of the room cost. Please contact Shelley Kaus ([kauss@flcourts.org](mailto:kauss@flcourts.org)) if you have any issues booking through the CSWC room block hyperlink previously emailed to all members.

Self-parking fees will be reimbursed for members staying overnight or just attending the meeting. Please save your receipts and include them when submitting the reimbursement form. Please note that **valet parking fees cannot be reimbursed.**

## **II.C. Revised Committee Protocols**

The supreme court revised the Protocol for Supreme Court Committees in December of 2013. A copy is provided as Enclosure II.

### **Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

**Item II. Enclosure I**

**Voucher for Reimbursement of Travel Expenses**

<b>STATE COURT SYSTEM</b>  <b>VOUCHER FOR REIMBURSEMENT</b>  <b>OF TRAVEL EXPENSES</b>			TRAVELER		CHECK ONE	<input type="checkbox"/> STATE EMPLOYEE / OFFICER					
			ADDRESS			<input type="checkbox"/> NON-EMPLOYEE / INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR					
			CITY, STATE, ZIP			<input type="checkbox"/> OPS					
			TELEPHONE #		AGENCY						
			SOCIAL SECURITY		HEADQUARTERS						
					RESIDENCE (CITY)						
DATE	Travel Performed Point of Origin To Destination	Purpose or Reason (Name of Conference)	Hour of Departure And Hour of Return	Meals for Class A & B Travel	Per Diem or Actual Lodging Expenses	Class C Meals	Map Mileage Claimed	Vicinity Mileage Claimed	Other Expenses (Attach Original Receipts)		
									Amount	Type	
						N O T  R E I M B U R S A B L E					
Statement of Benefits to the State: (Conference or Convention)						Column Total	Column Total	Column Total	0 Mi. 0.445 \$ Mi.	Column Total	Summary Total
						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LESS ADVANCE RECEIVED											
LESS NON-REIMBURSABLE ITEMS INCLUDED ON PURCHASING CARD											
NET AMOUNT DUE TRAVELER											
NET AMOUNT DUE THE STATE											
I hereby certify or affirm and declare that this claim for reimbursement is true and correct in every material matter. That the travel expenses were actually incurred by me as necessary in the performance of official duties; that per diem claimed has been appropriately reduced by any meals or lodging included in the convention or conference registration fees claimed by me, and that this voucher conforms in every respect with the requirements of Section 112.061, Florida Statutes.						Pursuant to Section 112.061 (3) (a), Florida Statutes, I hereby certify or affirm that to the best of my knowledge the travel was on official business of the State of Florida and was for the purpose(s) stated above.					
TRAVELER'S SIGNATURE:						SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE:					
SIGNATURE DATE:			TITLE:			SUPERVISOR'S TITLE:					
*** For Finance & Accounting Use Only ***			ADVANCE TRAVEL:			SIGNATURE DATE:					
Description	Object Code	Amount									
Other	26_0		Advance Payment:								
Per Diem	26_1		Warrant Number:								
Meals	26_2		Warrant Date:								
Mileage	26_3		Statewide Doc. Number:						For Trial Courts Use Only		
Hotel	26_4		Agency Doc. Number:						Pursuant to S.939.08, F.S., I certify these costs are just, correct, and reasonable and contains no unnecessary or illegal item.		
Airfare	26_5										
Training	26_8								Trial Courts Administrator's Signature:		
ORGANIZATION CODE:						SIGNATURE DATE:					

TRAVEL PERFORMED BY COMMON CARRIER OR STATE VEHICLE					
THIS SECTION REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETED ONLY WHEN COMMON CARRIER IS BILLED DIRECTLY TO THE STATE AGENCY					
Date	Ticket Number or State Vehicle Number	From	To	Amount	Name of Common Carrier or State Agency Owning Vehicle
STATE OF FLORIDA PURCHASING CARD CHARGES					
THIS SECTION REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETED ONLY WHEN TRAVEL RELATED EXPENSES ARE PAID BY USING THE STATE OF FLORIDA PURCHASING CARD					
Date	Merchant/Vendor	Description of Item Acquired		Amount of Charge	
<b>TOTAL</b>				\$	-
THIS SECTION REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETED ONLY WHEN NON-REIMBURSABLE ITEMS WERE PURCHASED USING THE STATE OF FLORIDA PURCHASING CARD					
Date	Merchant/Vendor	Description of Item Acquired		Amount of Charge	
<b>Total (This amount must appear on the line "Less Non-Reimbursable Items Included on Purchasing Card" on the reverse side of this form.)</b>				\$	-
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS					
Class A travel -- Continuous travel of 24 hours or more away from official headquarters. Class B travel -- Continuous travel of less than 24 hours which involves overnight absence from official headquarters. Class C travel -- Travel for short or day trips where the traveler is not away from his official headquarters overnight.			Breakfast --- when travel begins before 6 a.m. and extends beyond 8 a.m. Lunch ----- when travel begins before 12 Noon and extends beyond 2 p.m. Dinner ----- when travel begins before 6 p.m. and extends beyond 8 p.m. or when travel occurs during night-time hours due to special assignment.		
<p>NOTE: No allowance shall be made for meals when travel is confined to the city or town of official headquarters or immediate vicinity except assignments of official business outside the traveler's regular place of employment if travel expenses are approved and such special approval is noted on the travel voucher. Rate of Per Diem and Meals shall be those prescribed by Section 112.061, Florida Statutes. Non-reimbursable items may not be charged on the State of Florida Purchasing Card. Inadvertent non-reimbursable charges are to be deducted from the travel reimbursement claimed on the reverse side of this form on the line "Less Non-reimbursable Items Included on Purchasing Card" and the above "Non-reimbursable Items" section of "State of Florida Purchasing Card Charges" section above must be completed. Per diem shall be completed at one-fourth of authorized rate for each quarter or fraction thereof. Travel over a period of 24 hours or more will be calculated on the basis of 6-hour cycles, beginning at midnight; less than 24-hours travel will be calculated on the basis of 6-hour cycles, beginning at the hour of departure from official headquarters. Hour of departure and hour of return should be shown for all travel. When claiming per diem, the meal allowance columns should not be used. Claims for actual lodging at single occupancy rate plus meal allowances should be put in the "Per Diem or Actual Lodging Expenses" column and include the appropriate meal allowances in the "Meals for Class A &amp; B Travel" column. Claims for meals allowance involving travel that did not require the traveler to be away from headquarters overnight should be included in the "Class C Meals" column. Vicinity travel must appear in the separate column. When travel is by common carrier and billed directly to the traveler, the amount and description should be included in the "Other Expenses" column. A copy of the ticket or invoice should be attached to this form. If travel is by common carrier and billed directly to the State agency, then the "Travel Performed by Common Carrier or State Vehicle" section above should be completed. If travel is by common carrier and the carrier is paid by the use of the State of Florida Purchasing Card, then the "State of Florida Purchasing Card Charges" section above should be completed. The name of the common carrier should be inserted in the "Map Mileage Claimed" column in these instances. Justification must be provided for use of a noncontract airline (or one offering equal or lesser rates than the contract airline) or rental car (or one having lower net rate) when contract carriers are available. Additionally, justification must be provided for use of a rental car larger than a Class "B" car. If travel is performed by the use of a State-owned vehicle, the word "State" should be inserted in the "Map Mileage Claimed" column on the reverse side of this form, and the above section designated as "Travel Performed by Common Carrier or State Vehicle" should be completed. If lodging is paid by the use of the State of Florida Purchasing Card, the words "Purchasing Card" should be inserted in the "Per Diem or Actual Lodging Expenses" column on the reverse side of this form, and the above section designated as "State of Florida Purchasing Card Charges" should be completed. Incidental travel expenses which may be reimbursed include: (a) reasonable taxi fare; (b) ferry fares and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; (c) storage and parking fees; (d) telephone and telegraph expenses; (e) convention or conference registration fee. If meals are included in the registration fee, per diem should be reduced accordingly. Receipts should be obtained when required. The official Department of Transportation map should be used in computing mileage from point of origin to destination whenever possible. When any State employee is stationed in any city or town for over 30 continuous work days, such city or town shall be deemed to be his official headquarters and he shall not be allowed per diem or subsistence after the period of 30 continuous work days has elapsed, unless extended by the approval of the agency head. If travel is to a conference or convention, the "Statement of Benefits to the State" section must be completed or a copy of the Authorization to Incur Travel Expense, Form DFS-AA-13, must be attached. Additionally, a copy of a agenda and registration receipt must be attached. Any fraudulent claim for mileage, per diem or other travel expense is subject to prosecution as a misdemeanor.</p>					

**Item II. Enclosure II**

**Protocol for Supreme Court Committees, revised December 2013**

# Protocol for Supreme Court Committees

## *Supporting the Mission of Florida's Judicial Branch*

PREFACE .....	2
I. DEFINITIONS .....	2
II. ROLES .....	3
A. The Supreme Court Governs, Committees Recommend, and Staff Support.....	4
B. Overview of the Court Committee Structure.....	5
C. Roles and Expectations .....	6
D. Principles of Committee Service.....	8
E. Committee Operating Procedures .....	8
F. Code of Conduct.....	9
III. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT .....	10
A. Accessible Meeting Sites .....	10
B. Accommodations for Participation in Committee Events.....	10
C. Accessibility of Electronic Committee Information.....	11
D. Alternate Formats of Committee Documents .....	11
IV. PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC RECORDS .....	12
V. SECURITY .....	12
VI. COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS AND PURCHASING AND PROCUREMENT RULES AND PROCEDURES.....	15
VII. STAFF COVERAGE OF AND ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS .....	16
VIII. MEETING MINUTES .....	17
A. Purpose of Meeting Minutes .....	17
B. Elements of Good Minutes .....	17
IX. PROTOCOL FOR COURT COMMITTEES SEEKING TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES.....	17
X. SUBMISSION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS AND PETITIONS .....	19
A. General Guidelines for Submission of Reports .....	19
B. General Guidelines for Submission of Rule Proposals.....	19
C. Submission of Petitions to Amend the Rules.....	20
D. General Guidelines for Submission of Statutory Proposals.....	21
E. Communication Between OSCA Staff and Supreme Court Personnel.....	21
XI. OSCA COMMITTEE REPORT SUMMARY AND TRANSMITTAL FORM.....	22
XII. END OF TERM REPORT .....	24
APPENDIX.....	25

## PREFACE

The Protocol for Supreme Court Committees, first published in 2008, is a compilation and integration of several pre-existing standards and requirements and was developed to provide guidance to supreme court committee members and Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) staff who serve in a support role to court committees. This protocol does not apply to committees staffed by The Florida Bar. These standards and guidelines have been combined into one convenient resource for court committee chairs, members, and OSCA staff to have a reference tool for conducting orderly, effective, efficient meetings and developing timely and appropriate written work product. The protocol is updated as needed by the Deputy State Courts Administrator's Office in coordination with the clerk of the court, the general counsel, the director of the Office of Community and Intergovernmental Relations, and is subject to the review and approval of the state courts administrator and the Florida Supreme Court. This document is the third edition of the protocol.

There are a number of court appointed committees for which OSCA is designated to provide staff support. This protocol includes a table depicting the various court committees and the present committee structure. The protocol also provides definitions and a narrative overview of the court committee structure and responsibilities. It contains additional sections pertaining to the authority of the supreme court and chief justice, and the roles and responsibilities of committee chairs, committee members, and staff who support the committees. The protocol addresses applicable rules and statutes that are pertinent in planning court committee meetings and developing written work (e.g. Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida statutes and court rules dealing with public records). The protocol also deals with scheduling and conducting meetings, assuring adequate security, providing sufficient staff coverage, developing agendas and minutes, conducting effective meetings, and committee requirements for submitting recommendations related to legislative priorities and court rule proposals. Finally, the protocol addresses proper method of submission for various written reports and proposals.

## I. DEFINITIONS

- **Bar Committee Liaison.** A court committee member who is also a member of a Florida Bar rules committee, and who will advise the Florida Bar committee about court committee rules proposals.
- **Committee Report.** A detailed report that summarizes a committee's research, and contains its findings, conclusions, and recommendations with regard to one or more of the tasks or charges assigned to the committee by the chief justice generally corresponding to a two-year cycle. During a committee's term there might be more than one report, depending on the nature and scope of charges. Not always will a committee's work product culminate in a written committee report.
- **End of Term Report.** A succinct high-level summation of a committee's work and accomplishments during its two-year term, along with any suggestions with regard to

- successor committees and future work. An end of term report will not usually be required for single-purpose committees (e.g., Task Force on Management of Cases Involving Complex Litigation), but will be required for committees that are given specific charges by administrative order. An end of term report is not the same thing as a “committee report” directed to a particular charge, or set of charges, or an annual report expressed by rule. If an annual report is required by rule, there is no need to also submit an end of term report (e.g., Florida Courts Technology Commission and Florida Court Education Council).
- **Justice Liaison.** A justice designated by the chief justice to act as a liaison between a court committee and the supreme court, and whose function is to advise the supreme court about the work of the committee.
  - **OSCA Committee Report Summary and Transmittal Form.** A document prepared by OSCA staff to provide the chief justice and the supreme court with a summary of a committee report and recommendations submitted by a Court committee, as well as administrative and fiscal information relevant to the report. This form provides the supreme court with OSCA’s perspective on implementation of recommendations contained within committee reports. The OSCA Report Summary and Transmittal Form is an internal document prepared at the behest of the state courts administrator for submission to the chief justice and the supreme court. The Report Summary and Transmittal Form is OSCA’s work product and is not prepared by the committee or its chair. Completion and submission of this form by OSCA staff to the state courts administrator assists the state courts administrator in ensuring uniform processing of committee recommendations in a timely manner. A Committee Report Summary and Transmittal Form accompanies a committee report, not an end of term report.
  - **Petition.** A supreme court filing proposing a new rule or rule amendment prepared in accordance with guidelines stated in [In Re: Guidelines for Rules Submissions, No. AOSC06-14, corrected \(July 14, 2006\)](#), Part I, Rules Style Guide, and Part IV, Non-Bar Committee Reports/Petitions to Amend Rules.

## II. ROLES

Committees are the mechanism established by the supreme court for developing consensus on appropriate judicial branch policies affecting the administration of justice. While the state courts system is administered by the chief justice and the Florida Supreme Court, the policy development strategy of the judicial branch is, in many respects, very collegial. Due to the nature of the judicial branch, the development and implementation of policies and procedures for the trial and appellate courts involve a complex, and sometimes lengthy, process.

Some committees – such as the Trial Court Budget Commission, District Courts of Appeal (DCA) Budget Commission, and Judicial Management Council – are established

by the Rules of Judicial Administration. Others – Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee and Committees on Standard Jury Instructions – were established as a result of a supreme court opinion. And, by way of another example, while the Florida Court Education Council was initially established by administrative order, when the Florida Legislature established the Court Education Trust Fund in 1982 it conferred on the council specific statutory duties for administering the trust fund. Additional committees may be appointed when a specific issue or concern is brought to the supreme court’s attention, or when the supreme court desires to evaluate and improve the court system’s performance in a particular area.

Court committees make a vital contribution to the function of the judicial branch. The topics they deal with include judicial education, the emergence of new technologies and how they affect the judicial system, budget development and administration, and rules governing mediators and arbitrators, just to name a few. Serving on or staffing a court committee is a rewarding and important responsibility. These guidelines inform chairs, members, and staff about the unique aspects of their roles with regard to court committees.

#### **A. The Supreme Court Governs, Committees Recommend, and Staff Support**

- **Governance:** The chief justice is the chief administrative officer of the judicial branch. The Florida Supreme Court establishes policy for the branch and is responsible for the establishment of committees, designation of committee membership, identification of committee charges, and adoption of committee recommendations relating to policy and administration of the branch.
- **Policy Recommendations:** Committees are the mechanism established by the supreme court for developing consensus on appropriate judicial branch policies affecting the administration of justice. Committees allow the branch to take advantage of the rich intellectual, social, and experiential diversity of judges, practitioners, court staff, and topical experts. Committees are advisory in nature, and make recommendations for consideration by the supreme court. Court committees have no authority to become involved in issues beyond the scope of the applicable rule or administrative order, absent requesting and receiving approval in advance from the supreme court. Except for those that are established by rule and those that provide operational or regulatory oversight, committees will generally serve for a limited time frame to complete specific assignments.
- **Support:** Staff provides logistical, research, data collection and analysis, and other support to committees in performing the tasks assigned in the administrative order.

## B. Overview of the Court Committee Structure

The current court committee structure involves five committee types: Council, Commissions, Division Steering Committees, Work Groups/Task Forces, and Other. A description of the committee types follows.

- **Council:** In accordance with the Rules of Judicial Administration, the Judicial Management Council of Florida is responsible for crisis planning; evaluating information on branch performance and effectiveness; long-range planning; recommending coordination of work by court committees; and other issues referred by the supreme court. Council membership includes internal and external representation.
- **Commissions:** Commissions address operational and policy matters that span the divisions and/or levels of the court. Membership of court commissions primarily consists of judicial officers and court personnel. Examples of state courts system commissions include:
  - DCA and Trial Court Budget Commissions
  - Commissions on DCA and Trial Court Performance and Accountability
  - Florida Court Education Council
  - Florida Courts Technology Commission
  - Committee on Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules and Policy
- **Division Steering Committees:** The work of steering committees is specific to particular court divisions. Steering committees may develop an aspirational vision of the ideal court division; recommend models, standards, and best practices; and conduct court improvement initiatives. They may also address the impact on their topical assignment area of new legislation, case law, federal guidelines, and other changes. Examples of division steering committees include:
  - Steering Committee on Families and Children in the Court
  - Criminal Court Steering Committee
- **Work Groups/Task Forces:** Work groups and task forces are ad hoc groups appointed for a specific period of time to address a specific issue or narrow topic. They conduct studies, prepare reports, and take other appropriate action as directed by the chief justice. Examples include:
  - Task Force on Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues in the Court
  - Standing Committee on Fairness and Diversity
  - Task Force on Judicial Branch Planning
- **Other.** This group encompasses other committees required by supreme court opinion, statutory provisions, or other requirements and are delegated some decision making authority by the supreme court. Examples include:

- Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee
- Mediation Ethics Advisory Committee, Mediator Qualifications Board, and Mediation Training Review Board

### C. Roles and Expectations

- **Chief Justice.** The Florida Supreme Court establishes court committees as necessary to accomplish the objectives established in the judicial branch strategic plan. The chief justice, after consultation with the supreme court, appoints the chair and members, sets the terms, and designates the tasks assigned to a committee. If a committee needs clarification on the scope of its role or charges, or requires guidance on a contemplated course of action, those matters should be directed to the chief justice or to the justice liaison if one is appointed.
- **Administrative Order.** Unless they are specified in statute or rule, a court committee's authority and responsibilities will be set forth in an administrative order. The administrative order provides the committee with a foundation and common understanding of the purpose, goals, objectives, and time lines for the committee's work. If a committee believes that, based on their knowledge and expertise its members should address issues or tasks outside the scope of the administrative order, the chair should seek the advice of the professional staff assigned to the committee to determine whether to submit a written request to the chief justice for direction.

The standard elements that should usually be included in an administrative order appointing a court committee are:

- Authority/Mission/Purpose of the Committee
- Responsibilities/Tasks/Charges
- Membership
- Member Terms
- Expiration Date, if applicable
- Rules of Court: a committee has no authority to recommend rule amendments unless there is an explicit authorization in the administrative order; additionally, the order will provide direction on requirements for liaising with the appropriate Florida Bar rules committee(s) and directions as to the process for submission to the supreme court.
- Statutory Proposals: a committee has no authority to recommend statutory amendments unless there is an explicit authorization in the administrative order.
- Mandatory Judicial Education: a requirement that, if a committee intends to recommend mandatory judicial education, the committee must liaison with the Florida Court Education Council in developing that recommendation.

- Recommendations that Impact the Court Budget: a requirement that, if a committee makes a recommendation that impacts court funding, the committee must liaison with the applicable budget commission(s).
- Recommendations that Impact Court Technology: a requirement that, if a committee makes a recommendation that impacts court technology, the committee must liaison with the Florida Courts Technology Commission.
- To conserve court system resources, committees are encouraged to limit in-person meetings and use options such as conference calls, videoconferences, and other electronic meeting options when appropriate.
- **Justice Liaison.** Many court commissions and committees are assigned a supreme court liaison, who is one of the active justices. The liaison serves as the primary communication link between the committee and the supreme court. A liaison may be assigned to a specific committee for any of a variety of reasons; knowledge and expertise in a particular subject area, interest in the topical area, and distribution of workload are among the factors considered by the chief justice in making liaison assignments. The liaison is expected to monitor the work of the committee and inform the supreme court about those committee activities that may require subsequent supreme court action. The liaison shall be given notice of and materials for all committee activities, but is not expected to routinely participate in the committee's activities. The justice liaison's monitoring function may be fulfilled through review of minutes, meetings and/or telephone conversations with the committee chair and staff, or attendance at all or part of a court committee's meetings. A justice liaison is not a member and does not vote. The liaison should not be present during and will not participate in committee deliberations on rule proposals or other matters that may come before the supreme court in an adjudicatory capacity. In some instances, a court committee will be chaired by a justice, in which case there will not be a separate justice liaison appointed.
- **Chair.** The committee chair calls meetings, establishes the agenda, presides at each meeting, and makes work assignments. The chair oversees the accountability of any subcommittees and, if necessary, appoints or removes members or chairs of subcommittees. The chair also works closely with staff to establish a meeting schedule, develop meeting agendas and materials, and submit an end of term report to the chief justice. During meetings, the chair facilitates the discussion and typically does not advocate for or against a proposal while in the chair position. If the chair is a justice, there is no justice liaison. If the chair is a justice, and the committee begins deliberation on matters that may come before the court in its adjudicatory capacity, the chair shall appoint the vice-chair, or other designee, to preside and shall not attend that portion of a committee meeting.
- **Committee Members.** The supreme court attempts to ensure knowledgeable, balanced, and diverse representation on committees. Members who are appointed to represent a specific group or organization are expected to effectuate two-way

communication between the committee and that organization. Court committees face tremendous challenges. Members are expected to take an active part in the activities and work assignments of the committee and to follow the appropriate committee policies and protocols. Full participation by each and every member is a critical component of success; therefore, members are expected to make exceptional effort to attend meetings. Nevertheless, there will be occasions when members cannot attend a meeting; members should advise the chair of those instances in advance. Court committee members are carefully selected for their specialized knowledge, and thus should not send a representative to committee functions. Should a member choose to do so, however, the representative will be allowed to observe and take notes, but will not be allowed to participate in deliberations or vote. Members who become unable to fulfill their commitment to the committee are expected to resign so that a replacement can be appointed, thereby minimizing the negative impact on the group and its ability to fulfill tasks.

- **Bar Committee Liaison.** The purpose of liaisons is to promote communication between supreme court committees whose recommendations may include changes to court rules and Florida Bar committees that advise the supreme court about specific bodies of court rules on a continuing basis.
- **Staff.** Staff support for court committees is primarily provided through the state courts administrator, who designates subordinate staff with the appropriate expertise and within available resources to perform these functions on his or her behalf. Staff work closely with the chair and committee members in developing and implementing activities designed to meet the mandates established by rule or administrative order. Staff is accountable to the state courts administrator for proper management of funds and work products within the province of the committee. Staff also works to ensure that the committee is in compliance with applicable state and federal laws, regulations, and guidelines. Generally, a lead staff member will be assigned primary responsibility for each committee or committee project.

#### **D. Principles of Committee Service**

- **Duty of Care** requires committee members to use reasonable care and good judgment in making decisions on behalf of the interests of the judicial branch.
- **Duty of Loyalty** requires committee members to be faithful to the committee and judicial branch, avoiding conflicts of interest.
- **Duty of Adherence** requires committee members to comply with governing documents (i.e., administrative orders, meeting rules, court policies, etc.).

#### **E. Committee Operating Procedures**

Committee operating procedures are a tool that can be used to help ensure that court committees stay on task and on time. And, while many committee chairs

elect to work through consensus building, when consensus cannot be reached the chair may find it helpful to utilize formal voting procedures. For more details, see Roberts Rules of Order available online at [www.robertsrules.com](http://www.robertsrules.com).

- An **Agenda** is issued to ensure that important business is covered.
- **Motions** are proposals for action.
- A **Second** is required for the motion to be discussed.
- **Amendments** may be made to most motions if they improve the intent or clarify the original motion.
- **Tabling** lays the motion aside.
- **Calling the Question** refers to ending the discussion and voting on the motion.
- **Minutes** should record the time and location of the meeting, participants, and the outcomes of the motions.
- **Voting** is the official action after discussion to adopt, kill, or table the motion.
- **Quorum** is a majority of committee members or the required number as set forth in the meeting rules in order to conduct business.

#### **F. Code of Conduct**

- Respect the chair.
- Bring a calendar to meetings.
- Travel arrangements should permit members to arrive on time and participate in the full meeting.
- Use of cell phones, PDAs, laptops, tablets, and other electronic devices during a meeting is limited to official meeting business (viewing meeting materials, taking notes).
- Read and prepare for meetings.
- Bring needed files, paper, and pen.
- Follow the agenda.
- Listen more than you speak.
- Speak when you have an essential point.

- Respect the rules of order.
- Leave personal and political agendas at the door.
- Actions of the committee belong to the committee; exhibit respect for your fellow committee members by supporting committee actions publicly when appearing in an official capacity as a representative of the committee. When presenting conflicting positions from those taken by the committee or voicing a minority view, members must stipulate that those positions are not those of the committee but of the individual or as a member of another organization.

### **III. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**

[The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 \(ADA\)](#) is a federal civil rights law enacted by Congress to ensure that qualified individuals with disabilities are afforded the same opportunities that are available to persons without disabilities. [Title I of the ADA](#) requires state courts to provide reasonable accommodations for qualified judges and court employees with disabilities. [Title II of the ADA](#) applies to state and local government entities – including state courts – and requires them to remove communication barriers and afford accessibility for all their services, programs, and activities.

#### **A. Accessible Meeting Sites**

All committee-sponsored meetings and activities should be held in locations that are physically accessible. Committee chairs and staff should take reasonable and necessary steps, prior to any meeting, to ensure that hotels, public buildings, and/or other proposed meeting sites comply with the [ADA Standards for Accessible Design](#).

#### **B. Accommodations for Participation in Committee Events**

The state courts system will attempt to provide auxiliary aids and services for qualified individuals with disabilities who have an interest in participating in court committee activities. Announcements of committee meetings, training sessions, and other activities should include information about the availability of auxiliary aids and services, upon request and with advance notice. Sample ADA notice language for committee-sponsored meetings, teleconferences, videoconferences, and other events follows:

Persons with disabilities who need an accommodation to participate in [insert the name of the event] should contact [insert name, address, phone number, and email address of the appropriate staff member] as far in advance as possible but preferably at least five working days before the date of

the scheduled event. Persons using a TDD may contact [insert appropriate staff member's name] through the Florida Relay Service, 711.

Examples of auxiliary aids or services that the state courts system may need to provide for qualified individuals with disabilities who participate in court committee meetings or events include:

- Assistive listening devices
- Qualified sign language interpreters and oral interpreters
- Real-time transcription services
- Accessible formats such as large print, Braille, on disk, or audio tapes
- Qualified readers

### **C. Accessibility of Electronic Committee Information**

The [Americans with Disabilities Act](#) prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, and Florida law requires the judicial branch to adhere to the Section 508 standards. The Florida Accessible Electronic and Information Technology Act<sup>1</sup> requires that all three branches of state government make their electronic information and data accessible. The law provides that state entities shall develop, procure, maintain, and use accessible electronic information and information technology acquired on or after July 1, 2006, that conform to Section 508 standards. The Florida act became effective July 1, 2006, and applies prospectively to software applications and operating systems, web-based Intranet and Internet information and applications, telecommunications products, video and multimedia products, self-contained closed products, and desktop and portable computers.

Committee reports must be designed so that they are accessible to persons who use assistive technology. Committee websites must also be accessible. And, if a court committee provides information in multimedia formats — streaming media, CD-ROMs, etc. — this information must be accessible: videos should include captioning and video descriptions and a text transcript should be available and assistive technology should be able to navigate the multimedia application without using a mouse.

### **D. Alternate Formats of Committee Documents**

In addition to the electronic accessibility requirements discussed in paragraph C above, upon request by a qualified individual with a disability, committee work

---

<sup>1</sup> [Sections 282.601–282.606, Fla. Stat.](#)

products must be provided in alternate formats such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or on disk. Sample language that should be included on committee reports and similar work products follows:

***Alternate Formats***

Upon request by a qualified individual with a disability, this document will be made available in alternate formats.

To order this document in an alternate format, please contact [insert name, address, phone number, and email address of the appropriate staff person].

#### **IV. PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC RECORDS**

Committee meeting video and audio records and minutes are public records, unless matters that are confidential pursuant to statute or rule are discussed. Committee records must be maintained in accordance with the judicial branch administrative records retention schedule. When recordings are used to assist in the preparation of the official record, recordings become superseded by the minutes and may be discarded once written minutes are prepared. Committee members should be advised prior to the beginning of the meeting that it will be recorded. Drafts of committee reports and other work products are public records that must be provided upon request and dissemination should be coordinated by the chair, in consultation with the OSCA's General Counsel's Office. Committee members should not on their own initiative disseminate copies of a committee report before it has been formally submitted to and reviewed by the supreme court.

The public meeting and notice requirements of [Chapter 286, Florida Statutes](#), do not apply to judicial branch events. Nevertheless, most meetings of official supreme court-appointed committees, judicial conferences, and other official court events should be presumed to be generally accessible by the public. Instances in which an event would *not* be accessible to members of the public, upon request, include:

- Florida Supreme Court conferences.
- Meetings when confidential or sensitive issues will be discussed (i.e., executive sessions, emergency preparedness planning, etc.).
- Meetings of judicial officers and/or court staff that comprise informal work groups or where preliminary discussions on matters will occur.

#### **V. SECURITY**

Because of security concerns, advance notice of court committee meetings and judicial conferences is not normally provided to the public, except by invitation. Accordingly, staff should refrain from posting on the Florida Courts Internet site or other venue accessible to the public any calendars, notices, agendas, or other documents disclosing

the date and location of court meetings; such information may, however, be posted on the Intranet site.

In some instances — such as public hearings — the state courts system is specifically seeking the public’s participation or input on court-related matters, and information about the event must be published in advance. Additionally, some official court committees — such as the Trial Court Budget Commission — have adopted procedures requiring that meeting notices be posted on the Florida Courts Internet site in advance, so that interested persons are provided with a reasonable opportunity to be heard on agenda items under consideration by the Commission. In those and similar circumstances, staff should utilize the criteria in these guidelines to ensure that appropriate security precautions are implemented.

If staff receives an inquiry from a reporter or other member of the public about the location of a committee meeting, judicial conference, or other court event, staff should advise that such information is not generally provided to the public in order to ensure the safety of judicial officers and staff. If possible, respond to the caller’s questions about the substance of a meeting without disclosing the location, which often satisfies his or her informational needs. Because of security concerns, do not offer to provide calendars, agendas, meeting notices, or other documents that disclose the date and location of court meetings. These documents should be provided only if the individual submits a formal public records request, in which case the normal public records request protocol must be followed. If information is requested in a manner that raises security concerns, staff should take prudent security precautions as described in these guidelines.

Upon request from staff of a governmental or justice system entity (e.g., The Florida Bar, Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), The Florida Legislature, Attorney General’s Office), information about upcoming meetings should be readily provided. However, one should mention to them that in order to ensure the safety of event participants, meeting details are not generally provided to the public. Please request their assistance in helping maintain the security of the event by not widely distributing the information that is being provided.

Primary staff assigned to the project, in consultation with his or her manager(s) and committee chairs, is responsible for determining the appropriate security precautions for a particular event, based on these guidelines.

It is not always necessary to provide security coverage at ordinary court committee meetings. However, if one or more of the following elements are present, staff should consult with the appropriate security personnel (for those described below) in order to determine whether security coverage might be appropriate at meetings and events involving judges and court staff:

- The event will be held at a location other than a courthouse or other location in which adequate security is already provided.

- The event is a public hearing or other highly visible event. That is, the event has been publicized in the media or on the Florida Courts Internet site, or a large number of people have been notified of the event.
- The event includes discussion of a highly controversial topic.
- The event includes public figures or dignitaries such as the governor, cabinet members, legislators, justices, or others.
- There is some credible intelligence indicating a potential threat to the judicial branch or any of its officials or staff.

Furthermore, if committee members express concern about security or if unusual inquiries are received about the meeting, the chair and staff should consider moving the meeting to a courthouse or other secure location or arranging adequate security coverage.

If the committee chair and staff determined that it would be prudent to have security coverage at a court-sponsored event that is located in Tallahassee, staff should coordinate the security arrangements through the Supreme Court Marshal's Office. A written request should be submitted to the supreme court marshal, and a written confirmation that the arrangements have been made should be requested. If the event is located outside the Tallahassee area, staff should initiate a request for security arrangements through the appropriate Trial Court Administrator's Office or DCA Marshal's Office, which will coordinate security coverage with the local law enforcement, as appropriate in their area. The following information should be provided to them:

- The date, time, and location of the meeting, along with a list of anticipated attendees.
- Other information about the meeting site such as the distance between the various meeting rooms, whether it is a gated/restricted-entrance facility, etc.

For events that will be convened at a courthouse, staff should contact the appropriate marshal or trial court administrator, in advance, to notify them of the meeting and any specific security needs, including attendance of dignitaries, any known threats, and other security concerns such as recent controversial court decisions, controversial meeting topics, etc.

Security coverage is provided at all major judicial education programs. Accordingly, it is not usually necessary for committee staff to make separate security arrangements for each meeting held in conjunction with judicial education programs. However, committee staff should provide advance notice to the appropriate program coordinator (as indicated below) about the meeting and any specific security needs, including attendance of dignitaries, known threats, recent controversial court decisions, controversial meeting topics, etc.:

- Appellate Education Programs: conference manager
- Circuit Judges Annual Education Programs: conference manager
- County Judges Annual Education Programs: conference manager
- Florida Judicial College, College of Advanced Judicial Studies, and other court education programs: the appropriate program coordinator in the OSCA Court Education Office

Whenever the chief justice or an associate justice will participate in a court-related event outside of a courthouse, staff should consult with the Supreme Court Marshal's Office regarding any security arrangements that office deems to be necessary.

It costs approximately \$25–\$35 per hour to cover the cost of each sworn law enforcement officer. Committee staff should provide for security costs in project budget plans. Please note that resources have not been allocated to the Supreme Court Marshal's Office for the provision of security at off-site meetings; nevertheless, that office will make every effort to provide or make arrangements for security coverage at Tallahassee court events.

Whether or not it is necessary for security coverage, there are other steps one can take to improve security at court-sponsored meetings and events:

- *Name Tags.* Provide the participants with name tags that are visibly discernable from other persons who may be in the same location. Do not use titles (such as judge, state attorney, etc.) on name tags.
- *Marquee Announcements.* When posting a meeting at a hotel or other location, avoid using terms like “court,” “judicial,” “judge,” or other words that indicate the likely meeting participants. For example, instead of the Florida Courts Technology Commission, one might say Technology Commission. Or instead of posting a notice about the Trial Court Budget Commission, one might use the initials TCBC. OSCA is another acronym familiar to judges and court staff but anonymous to those outside the court system, and could be used on marquee announcements.

## **VI. COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS AND PURCHASING AND PROCUREMENT RULES AND PROCEDURES**

When planning and conducting court committee meetings and events, staff and members must comport with all applicable ethical requirements, including:

- [Code of Judicial Conduct \(see especially Canons 2, 3, and 5\)](#)
- [Section 112.313, Florida Statutes](#)

- [State Courts System Purchasing Directives](#)
- [Florida Supreme Court Confidentiality Policy](#)
- [Florida Supreme Court Internet Use Policy](#)
- [Supreme Court and OSCA Vendor Gift Policy](#)

## VII. STAFF COVERAGE OF AND ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The responsibility for determining who attends committee meetings rests with the lead staff member assigned to the project. Individuals whose presence is critical to the meeting will be notified by the lead staff member. Others who may be interested in attending a meeting should ask the lead staff in advance. Some of the factors that may be considered in determining the staff who should attend a committee meeting or event include:

- ***Role at committee meeting.*** The primary purpose for staff attendance at committee meetings is to provide staff support for the committee, including the presentation of research/information, the recording of minutes, provision of background, and, if requested, recommending policy options. Staff may also appear at committee meetings to report on the activities of another committee or initiative, or to speak to legislative or budgetary issues.
- ***Costs.*** Travel is expensive and should be managed wisely. Attendance at meetings should be carefully considered. In general, each person who attends a committee meeting should contribute to the meeting.
- ***Committee comfort.*** Committees often operate best when they are able to discuss issues candidly. During some deliberative stages of committee work, the presence of too many staff persons may inhibit frank discussions. This is less of a concern when the committee is in an information-gathering stage, or when committee members are receiving or making formal presentations.
- ***Subject matter related to current or future staff work.*** Staff who do not provide direct support to a committee often have job responsibilities that are closely related to or will be affected by the work of a committee. Additionally, those who do not provide direct support to the committee may have responsibility for implementing recommendations of the committee, and it would be beneficial for them to observe the discussion firsthand.
- ***Professional development.*** Some committee meetings or events present unique and/or cost-effective training opportunities.

- **Other factors.** If resources and time permit, there may be other legitimate purposes for attending committee meetings, particularly if they are held either in Tallahassee or in a city where staff have other business (e.g., Florida Bar meetings and judicial conferences).

## **VIII. MEETING MINUTES**

### **A. Purpose of Meeting Minutes**

- To establish a record for decisions that are made and those items that require follow-up.
- To avoid reopening and reworking issues that have already been decided.
- To remind members about actions that have been taken and to serve as a catalyst for next step(s).

### **B. Elements of Good Minutes**

- A record of who was in attendance at the meeting.
- The date, time, duration, location, starting and ending time of the meeting, as well as the date, time and place of the next meeting.
- A record of who is responsible for what and by when.
- An indication of the disposition of each item. Minutes usually reflect decisions and agreed-upon actions rather than a detailed account of the discussions.

## **IX. PROTOCOL FOR COURT COMMITTEES SEEKING TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

A court committee cannot propose a statutory change unless it has express authority to do so. If a court committee has received no explicit authority to propose a statutory change, but becomes aware that a change is needed, the committee may: (1) contact the chief justice by letter seeking guidance; or (2) include a general recommendation for a statutory change in the committee's report.

When a committee has been given specific authority to propose statutory changes, the following protocol must be followed:

- When a potential legislative issue is on the agenda for discussion by a court committee, the state courts administrator and the director of the Office of Community and Intergovernmental Relations (OCIR) should be notified in advance and invited to participate in the meeting.

- If a court committee anticipates legislative activity on an issue, the committee should complete a Legislative Issue Information Sheet and return the form to OCIR by mid-summer, consistent with the annual legislative policy development schedule released by OCIR through e-mail and on the Intranet each year. If draft bill language is available, it should be attached to the form.
- OCIR is authorized to and responsible for communicating with representatives of the district courts, circuit courts, county courts, The Florida Bar, and/or others, as appropriate, in regard to potential legislative issues.
- Proposed legislative issues, along with comments developed with the representatives mentioned above, will be compiled by OCIR and presented to the state courts administrator.
- The state courts administrator, assisted by OCIR, will present potential legislative issues to the supreme court, in the fall, preceding the legislative session each year. Those issues will then be considered by the supreme court and, if approved, will be included in the proposed Judicial Branch Legislative Agenda, and that document will be available for use by all judges and court staff who have been designated to assist in advancing the issues.
- As necessary, the state courts administrator and OCIR in cooperation with the committee recommending the legislative issue or other designated persons as appropriate, will secure sponsors for approved legislation.
- The committee recommending the legislative issue shall designate a member of the committee to serve as a liaison to the state courts administrator, OCIR, and the legislature on the issue; to address and make decisions on behalf of the committee on matters, including but not limited to amendments, which may arise on the legislation; and, as necessary, to meet with legislators and legislative staff or appear before legislative committees on the issue.
- The unit of the Office of the State Courts Administrator providing staff support to the court committee shall designate a staff person to serve as a liaison to the state courts administrator and OCIR on the legislative issue; to provide technical assistance to the committee and OCIR on matters, including but not limited to amendments, which may arise on the legislation; and, as necessary, to attend meetings with legislators and legislative staff or meetings of legislative committees on the issue.
- The Judicial Branch Legislative Agenda will be periodically updated and made available to judges and court staff on the Intranet.
- Notice of any meetings between court committee members/staff and legislators/legislative staff should be provided via e-mail to OCIR in advance when possible or as soon after the meeting as is practicable.
- Information about proposed amendments to language in a bill or a draft bill should be provided to OCIR as soon as it becomes available.

- If the issue becomes law, committee staff shall, no later than August 1, provide OCIR with pertinent implementation deadlines, any reporting requirements, any requirements to develop rule changes, and any other information necessary to fully implement the law.

## **X. SUBMISSION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

### **A. General Guidelines for Submission of Reports**

- Committee reports will be submitted to the chief justice through the state courts administrator. If the committee also is proposing rule changes, the report shall advise the supreme court that a separate rules petition has been prepared and will be filed with the Florida Supreme Court Clerk's Office. If a committee has been authorized to recommend statutory amendments, those proposals should be outlined in a committee's report and not submitted via a petition.
- Staff should provide the committee report to the state courts administrator, along with an OSCA Committee Report Summary and Transmittal Form prepared by staff. As with other work products, management reviews of a committee report, including review by the designated deputy state courts administrator where appropriate, should be obtained prior to submission to the state courts administrator. Staff should build in lead time to ensure adequate time for review. The state courts administrator will provide the report, along with the completed OSCA Committee Report Summary and Transmittal Form, to the chief justice with copies to the other justices, the clerk of court, the director of the Central Staff Office, and the director of the Public Information Office, as appropriate. Committee chairs, members, and staff should not submit reports directly to the chief justice, as that may result in confusion, delays, an inability to implement a recommendation, or other obstacles.
- Courtesy copies of reports should be provided to any entities affected by the report, as directed by the state courts administrator.
- Committee reports should be posted on the Florida Courts Internet site (unless there is a specific directive to do otherwise); given to the Supreme Court Library; and sent to the State Library/Archives pursuant to statutory requirement.
- If the chief justice or supreme court determines that action is required to respond to or implement recommendations contained in the report, the chief justice or supreme court will take such action and notify staff.

### **B. General Guidelines for Submission of Rule Proposals**

- The only acceptable method for submission of rule proposals is by a formal petition filed with the supreme court. Rule proposals submitted as part of a committee report will not be accepted.

- A court committee must have express authority to draft and submit rule changes directly to the supreme court, either by rule, through a charge contained in the administrative order establishing or continuing the committee or through a letter issued to the committee by the clerk of court.
- If a court committee has received no express authority to propose a rule change, but becomes aware that a change is needed, the committee may: (1) contact the justice liaison by letter so that the supreme court may refer the matter to the appropriate Florida Bar rules committee or supreme court committee; (2) contact the appropriate Florida Bar committee liaison about the matter; or (3) include a general recommendation for the rule change in the committee's report.
- If a court committee has authority to propose rule changes to the supreme court but is required to liaison with a Florida Bar rules committee, the committee must forward its rule proposal to the Florida Bar rules committee for review and remarks prior to submitting the proposal via petition to the supreme court. The committee liaison should explain rule proposals to the Florida Bar rules committee. The committee may include remarks from the Florida Bar rules committee in its petition to the supreme court. Official comment from the Florida Bar committee may be submitted directly to the supreme court during the appropriate comment period, but should not be included as part of the court committee's petition.
- If a rule proposal drafted by a court committee relates to a "non-referral" rule identified in [rule 2.140\(g\), Florida Rules of Judicial Administration](#), the committee need not coordinate with The Florida Bar Rules of Judicial Administration Committee. Proposals relating to non-referral rules may be submitted by the Office of the State Courts Administrator or a court committee, provided the committee has express authority to draft and propose rules, by petition filed with the Florida Supreme Court Clerk's Office. If a committee does not have authority to propose rules, it may include a recommendation for a rule or rule change, along with its administrative recommendations, in a report to the supreme court submitted through the state courts administrator.

### **C. Submission of Petitions to Amend the Rules**

- Petitions to amend the rules must be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Rules Submissions, as enumerated in [AOSC06-14](#). Rule petitions should be filed with the Florida Supreme Court Clerk's Office in electronic form only, by using the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal (<https://www.myflcourtagency.com>). Petitions to amend the rules and all attachments must be filed in Microsoft Word format. [In Re: Electronic Filing in the Supreme Court of Florida via the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal, No. AOSC13-7 \(February 18, 2013\)](#).
- Before filing a petition to amend the rules with the clerk of court, committee staff should notify the state courts administrator.

## **D. General Guidelines for Submission of Statutory Proposals**

- Court committees may not recommend statutory amendments absent express authority to do so. Such authority is usually conveyed via rule or administrative order.
- On behalf of the committee, staff must forward statutory proposals to the state courts administrator and the director of the Office of Community and Intergovernmental Relations for submission to the supreme court. Statutory proposals approved by the chief justice and supreme court may be included within the judicial branch agenda for the next legislative session. Only those statutory proposals approved by the supreme court shall be considered part of the branch legislative agenda.
- Unless the supreme court has affirmatively supported or has no objection to pursuit of a statutory issue as part of the approved judicial branch legislative agenda, committee members may not communicate with legislators or legislative staff on behalf of the committee, the supreme court, or the judicial branch in regard to the statutory issue. This provision is not intended to apply to committee members expressing their personal views who affirmatively state that they are not speaking on behalf of the committee, the supreme court, or the judicial branch. See [rule 2.205\(a\)\(1\)\(B\), Florida Rules of Judicial Administration](#).
- For further information see Section IX. Protocol for Court Committees Seeking to Recommend Legislative Issues.

## **E. Communication Between OSCA Staff and Supreme Court Personnel**

- Administrative Matters
  - Justices and supreme court staff may consult with OSCA staff about committee reports and other work products that are before the chief justice or supreme court in their administrative capacity.
  - OSCA staff should not relay to committee members the content of discussions with the supreme court or supreme court staff relating to administrative orders, committee reports or work products, or other administrative matters pending before the chief justice or supreme court, unless requested to do so by the chief justice or supreme court.
- Rule Proposals and Petitions to Amend Rules
  - OSCA staff may consult with the Central Staff Office about technical matters concerning committee rule proposals or petitions to amend rules before a petition is filed with the supreme court.
  - OSCA staff may relay to committee members the content of pre-filing discussions with supreme court staff about technical matters concerning rule proposals or petitions to amend rules.

- Communications between supreme court personnel and OSCA staff should cease once a petition to amend rules is filed with the supreme court.

## **XI. OSCA COMMITTEE REPORT SUMMARY AND TRANSMITTAL FORM**

The purpose of the OSCA Committee Report Summary and Transmittal Form is to provide the chief justice and the supreme court with administrative and fiscal information with regard to reports submitted by court committees, and to provide the court with OSCA's input and perspective on implementation of recommendations contained within those reports. Completion of this form is not a committee work product. Completion of this form helps ensure uniform processing of committee recommendations in a timely manner. Failure to follow the appropriate procedures may result in delays, an inability to implement a recommendation, or other obstacles.

### **I. Background Information**

- A. Name of Committee [name]
- B. Title of Project or Report [title]
- C. Date of Committee's Last Meeting [date]
- D. Supreme Court Liaison [name of justice]
- E. Chair [name of chair]
- F. Staff Contact(s) [name of primary staff]

### **II. Committee Recommendations Requiring Action by the Chief Justice and/or Supreme Court**

- A. Brief Summary of Report and/or Recommendations.

[Insert a brief summary of the report and its key recommendations. This summary may be no more than a few sentences or paragraphs and should not be any longer than one page.]

- B. Supreme Court Action(s) Requested by the Committee.

[Insert a concise description of the specific action requested of the supreme court. Examples include: adoption of a policy; endorsement of best practices; change in a professional fee; etc.]

C. Proposed Implementation Step(s).

[Briefly state a strategy for implementing the action set forth in item II.B., above. For example: issuance of a memorandum to chief judges; referral of a proposed rule amendment to a Florida Bar rules committee; issuance of an administrative order; etc.]

D. Time Frame.

[If applicable, identify any factors that impact on the need for expedited implementation of the committee’s recommendation; e.g. rule must be adopted to implement legislation that becomes effective on a certain date.]

E. Rules of Court Procedure.

[Are any amendments to rules of court procedure being proposed? If so, please briefly describe the proposed rule and the committee’s interaction with the applicable Florida Bar rules committee]

F. Referral to Other Court Committee(s).

[Should the court, as a matter of sound decision making and/or as a policy or budget concern, consider referring one or more recommendations to another court committee, Florida Bar committee, or other entity for comment or further review?]

III. Anticipated Judicial and Fiscal Impact

[This section cannot be left blank. Provide as much information as possible about the fiscal and workload impact of the committee’s recommendations on the court system. If exact dollar amounts cannot be determined but there will be an impact, indicate that the fiscal amount has not yet been determined but do not state not applicable.]

	Amount	Amount	Amount
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
FISCAL IMPACT ON COURTS:	(FY 13-14)	(FY 14-15)	(FY 15-16)

Non-recurring Effects:

Recurring Effects:

Long-Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

Total Revenues and Expenditures:

**FISCAL IMPACT ON OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES:**

[Describe the anticipated fiscal impact on other governmental entities such as the clerks of court, state attorneys, public defenders, guardian ad litem program, law enforcement, executive branch entities, etc.]

**DIRECT FISCAL IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:**

[Describe the anticipated fiscal impact on the private sector such as attorneys, businesses, court-related service providers, etc.]

**OTHER WORKLOAD AND FISCAL COMMENTS:**

[Please use this space to note any other workload or fiscal comments that are relevant to the committee's report.]

**XII. END OF TERM REPORT**

An end of term report is a succinct summation of a committee's work and accomplishments during the two-year term of the chief justice who appointed the committee and provided it with its charges. An end of term report will not usually be required for single-purpose committees (e.g., the Task Force on Management of Cases Involving Complex Litigation), but will be required for committees that are given specific charges by administrative order. An end of term report is not the same thing as a "committee report" directed to a particular charge, or set of charges, or an annual report expressed by rule. If an annual report is required by rule, there is no need to also submit an end of term report (e.g., Florida Courts Technology Commission and Florida Court Education Council).

The end of term report is prepared by the committee chair with assistance of staff and is provided via the state courts administrator to the chief justice and the supreme court. As with other work products, appropriate management reviews of end of term reports, including review by the designated deputy state courts administrator where appropriate, should be obtained prior to submission to the state courts administrator. The end of term report provides a concise overview of committee work accomplished and serves as a status report that: (1) reviews the charges and tasks contained in the administrative order appointing the committee; (2) describes charge-related tasks undertaken and completed during the outgoing chief justice's administration; (3) identifies the status of any pending initiatives; (4) provides a progress report and explanation for any charges not met or fully addressed; and (5) identifies for the incoming chief justice any committee recommendations regarding reappointment, appointment of a successor committee, or referral to a separate committee, and may include suggested enumerated charges for the incoming chief justice to consider including in future administrative orders.

The end of term report may reference and briefly summarize content of in-depth final reports and recommendations or rules petitions developed in the course of fulfilling the committee's previous charges; however, the more detailed reports or petitions are not to be restated, reargued, or comprehensively reviewed.

## APPENDIX:

### Overview of Supreme Court Appointed Committees Staffed by the Office of the State Courts Administrator

Committee	Authority	Purpose and Current Charges (where applicable)	Establish Date	Chair	Justice Liaison	Lead Staff
<p><b>COUNCILS:</b> Councils are responsible for addressing judicial administration issues that have statewide impact, affect multiple levels of the court system, or affect multiple constituencies in the court community. Council membership includes internal and external representation.</p>						
Judicial Management Council	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225	Serves as a focused advisory body to assist the chief justice and supreme court in identifying trends, potential crisis situations, and the means to address them.	1950s; Reestablished in 2012	Polston	N/A	OSCA: Teagle
<p><b>COMMISSIONS:</b> Commissions address high-level policy issues that span the divisions and/or levels of the court. Membership of court commissions primarily consists of judicial officers and court personnel.</p>						
DCA Budget Commission	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.235	Oversees the preparation and implementation of the district court component of the judicial branch budget. The Commission is directly responsible for recommending budgeting and funding policies and procedures for the district court budgets, so that the funding requirements of each of the intermediate appellate courts can be adequately addressed while promoting statewide operational consistency.	2001	Lawson, effective July 1, 2013	Polston	OSCA: Wilson
Trial Court Budget Commission	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.230	Oversees the preparation and implementation of the trial court component of the judicial branch budget. The Commission is directly responsible for recommending budgeting and funding policies and procedures for the trial court budget, in order to support a trial court system that will effectively carry out the administration of justice.	2000	Steinbeck	Perry	OSCA: Goodner
Commission on DCA Performance & Accountability	Administrative order. See also s. 19, Art. III, Fla. Const.; Ch. 216, Fla. Stat.	<p>Proposes policies and procedures on matters related to the efficient and effective functioning of Florida's district courts through the development of comprehensive resource management, performance measurement, and accountability programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor statewide performance indicators, recommend improvements in case processing practices, and report to the Supreme Court on the efficiency, effectiveness, and timeliness of DCA case processing (particularly dependency, TPR, and postconviction cases).</li> <li>▪ Review DCA case management info and ensure establishment of uniform data definitions and reporting procedures. Work with ACTC regarding any revisions to the DCA case management system that may impact the definitions and/or reporting of district DCA data.</li> <li>▪ Provide input to DCABC on budget and funding issues pertaining to DCA operations and performance.</li> <li>▪ Propose responses to any statutory requirements and requests by executive and legislative branches related to DCA performance and accountability.</li> </ul>	2002; Prior to that was a JMC committee	Van Nortwick	Quince	OSCA: Geraci

Committee	Authority	Purpose and Current Charges (where applicable)	Establish Date	Chair	Justice Liaison	Lead Staff
Commission on Trial Court Performance & Accountability	Administrative order. See also s. 19, Art. III, Fla. Const.; Ch. 216, Fla. Stat.	<p>Proposes policies and procedures on matters related to the efficient and effective functioning of Florida’s trial courts, through the development of comprehensive performance measurement, resource management, and accountability programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify information that needs to be accessed and tracked in order to move cases efficiently and effectively through the trial court process. Identify key caseload and workload information needed at the circuit and statewide reporting levels essential for performance monitoring and resource management. Establish uniform data definitions, guidelines, and standards for data collection and reporting necessary to produce consistent, automated trial court case management statewide.</li> <li>▪ Address policy issues to maintain the integrity of the Summary Reporting System, the Weighted Caseload Model, the Uniform Data Reporting System, and other trial court data collection efforts. Provide direction for addressing special data collection needs requested by the legislature or others and guidance in the development of standardized reporting systems for the trial courts. Provide policy guidance related to data collection and analysis pertaining to trial court activity, workload, supplemental resources, and performance measures.</li> <li>▪ Continue development of standards of operation and best practices for the major elements of the trial courts, with focus on expert witness services.</li> <li>▪ Provide assistance to trial courts with regard to implementation of standards of operation and best practices approved by the Supreme Court.</li> <li>▪ Propose responses to any statutory requirements and requests by executive and legislative branches related to trial court performance and accountability.</li> </ul>	2002; Prior to that was a JMC committee	Terrell	Labarga	OSCA: Harris
Florida Courts Technology Commission - Appellate Court Technology Committee	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.236	Oversees, manages, and directs the development and use of technology within the judicial branch under the direction of the Florida Supreme Court, as specified in Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.236.	1995; Reestablished by rule in 2010	Munyon	Pariante	OSCA: Neubauer
Florida Court Education Council	Administrative order. See also s. 25.384, Fla. Stat.	<p>Provides oversight of the development and maintenance of a comprehensive educational program for Florida judges and certain court support personnel. The Council’s responsibilities include making budgetary, programmatic, and policy recommendations to the Supreme Court regarding continuing education for Florida judges and certain court professionals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Administer the Court Education Trust Fund to provide education and training for judges and Florida court personnel.</li> <li>▪ Develop publications to enhance the competence of the judiciary and court support personnel.</li> <li>▪ Develop distance learning events and methodologies in order to support the education and training of Florida court personnel</li> </ul>	1978	Labarga	N/A	OSCA: Martin

Committee	Authority	Purpose and Current Charges (where applicable)	Establish Date	Chair	Justice Liaison	Lead Staff
Committee on ADR Rules and Policy	Administrative order.	Pursuant to Chapter 44, Florida Statutes, the Supreme Court is required to establish rules of practice and procedure for court-ordered mediation, court-ordered non-binding arbitration, voluntary trial resolution, and court-connected voluntary binding arbitration. Pursuant to section 44.106, Florida Statutes, the Supreme Court is required to establish standards for training for court-appointed mediators and arbitrators. Those two functions have been combined under the umbrella of the Committee on Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules and Policy.	Created in 2003 by merging two committees that were established in 1988	Palmer	Quince	OSCA: Fleischer
<b>STEERING COMMITTEES:</b> Steering committees represent the interests of their respective court divisions. They develop an aspirational vision of the ideal court division; recommend models, standards, and best practices; and conduct court improvement initiatives. Steering committees also address the impact on their topical assignment area of new legislation, case law, federal guidelines, and other changes.						
Steering Committee on Families and Children in the Court	Administrative order.	<p>The goal of the family court initiative is to establish a fully integrated, comprehensive approach to handling all cases involving children and families. The Steering Committee works to encourage and facilitate improvements in efficiency and effectiveness of family court operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop and encourage implementation of promising practices to help ensure that children involved in dependency and delinquency court cases stay in school and are less likely to be arrested, suspended, or expelled.</li> <li>▪ Provide input to DJJ as it addresses statutory amendments to Ch., 985, Fla. Stat.</li> <li>▪ Subject to available resources, provide an education program for family court judges and staff that addresses promising unified family court practices and strategies for unified family court implementation.</li> <li>▪ Assist the multi-disciplinary panel that must be established by OSCA to guide the federally prescribed efforts of the Dependency Court Improvement Grant.</li> <li>▪ Examine the necessity to amend the judicial notice provisions within Ch. 741 and ss. 90.403 and 90.202, Fla. Stat. If amendments are deemed necessary, propose specific language to the Court for consideration of inclusion in its legislative agenda.</li> </ul>	1994 Combined, or superceded, two or more former court committees	Pariente	N/A	OSCA: Patterson
Criminal Court Steering Committee - Subcommittee on Capital Postconviction Proceedings	Administrative order.	<p>Develops consistent and expedited recommendations to the Supreme Court regarding changes required by legislative enactments, judicial decisions, or other events or circumstances involving criminal law matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommend, if necessary, proposed changes to the uniform orders of supervision that are prepared and disseminated by DOC, in consultation with OSCA.</li> <li>▪ Recommend, if necessary, proposed statutory and/or rule changes related to the involuntary commitment of sexually violent predators in light of <i>Morel v. Wilkins</i>, 37 Fla. L. Weekly S161 (Fla. March 8, 2012).</li> <li>▪ Recommend, if necessary, proposed statutory and/or rule changes to post-conviction matters, including forms, in light of the Court’s opinion in SC11-1679 (In Re: Amendments to the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure – Post-Conviction Rules).</li> </ul>	2002; Merged up to five predecessor committees	Emas	Labarga	OSCA: Schneider

Committee	Authority	Purpose and Current Charges (where applicable)	Establish Date	Chair	Justice Liaison	Lead Staff
<p><b>WORK GROUPS/TASK FORCES:</b> Work groups and task forces are ad hoc groups appointed for a specific period of time to address a specific issue or narrow topic. They conduct studies, prepare reports, and take other appropriate action as directed by the Supreme Court.</p>						
Unified Committee on Judicial Compensation	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.244	Serves as the court system’s mechanism for addressing and advancing judicial compensation and benefits issues. The committee develops and recommends to the supreme court judicial pay and benefits priorities, and advocates for judicial pay and benefits issues approved by the court for inclusion in the annual judicial branch LBR.	Established in 2005 and codified in rule in 2012	Polston	N/A	OSCA: Goodner
Task Force on Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues in the Courts	Administrative order.	<p>Addresses the needs of individuals with serious mental illnesses and substance abuse issues who become involved in the justice system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Address statutory and rule changes relating to the confidentiality of treatment records and behavior health evaluations.</li> <li>▪ Continue to promote the recommendations outlined in the Transforming Florida's Mental Health System report.</li> <li>▪ Provide guidance to OSCA relating to the post-adjudication drug court expansion project.</li> <li>▪ Develop a resource guide for judges and court staff in assisting veterans with mental health and substance abuse disorders who become involved in the criminal justice system.</li> <li>▪ Examine how to best target resources and programs that serve individuals with mental health and substance abuse disorders.</li> <li>▪ Develop recommendations to ensure that judges handling cases involving individuals with substance abuse and mental health disorders receive appropriate and timely education and training.</li> </ul>	2010; It is the success to drug court task force	Leifman	Quince	OSCA: Patterson
Standing Committee on Fairness and Diversity	Administrative order.	<p>Helps advance the State Courts System’s efforts to eliminate from court operations bias that is based on race, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, financial status, or any characteristic that is without legal relevance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify and explore strategies that chief judges could use to promote and encourage diversity in the administration of justice.</li> <li>▪ Work with the FCEC to identify and recommend resources necessary to ensure that all judges and court staff have the opportunity to participate in a fairness and diversity education program.</li> <li>▪ Build partnerships and collaborations with The Florida Bar Commission on Professionalism, local bar associations, community organizations, and Florida law schools for the purpose of advancing fairness and diversity initiatives within the legal profession.</li> <li>▪ Develop recommendations relating to the reassessment of perceptions of disparate treatment in the Florida court system.</li> </ul>	2004; It is the successor to Fairness, Gender Bias, and Racial & Ethnic Bias Com’s	Bernstein	Perry	OSCA: Samuel
<p><b>OTHER COMMITTEES:</b> This group encompasses other committees required by Court opinion, statutory provisions, or other requirements and that should, by reason of their regulatory or other responsibilities, operate more independently from Court oversight.</p>						

Committee	Authority	Purpose and Current Charges (where applicable)	Establish Date	Chair	Justice Liaison	Lead Staff
Committee on Standard Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases	327 So. 2d 6	Makes recommendations to the Court regarding changes that are required in jury instructions in criminal cases. These changes will be in response to legislative enactments, judicial decisions, or other events or circumstances that affect the presentation of cases to trial juries. The Committee is also charged with reviewing the standard instructions for errors and inaccuracies and recommending to the Court amendments and revisions in the instructions that would be beneficial to the administration of justice.	1976	Bulone	Labarga	OSCA: <sup>1</sup> Schneider
Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee	327 So. 2d 5	Renders written advisory opinions to inquiring judges concerning the propriety of contemplated judicial and nonjudicial conduct.	1976	Arias, effective July 1, 2013	Canady	OSCA: Goodlett
Mediation Qualifications Board	Fla. R. Cert. Mediators 10.730	Responsible for accepting grievances against certified mediators; determining probable cause with regard to grievances filed against certified mediators; conducting hearings in relation to grievance proceedings, if necessary; and sanctioning certified mediators, if appropriate.	1992	N/A	N/A	OSCA: Fleischer
Mediation Training Review Board	Administrative order	Responsible for reviewing complaints filed against certified mediation training programs.	1995	Vacant	N/A	OSCA: Fleischer
Mediator Ethics Advisory Committee	Fla. R. Cert. Mediators 10.900(a)	Provides written advisory opinions to mediators concerning interpretations of the rules and guidance on standards of conduct.	1994 as Mediator Qualifications Advisory Panel; renamed in 2000	Greenfield-Mandler	N/A	OSCA: Fleischer
Court Interpreter Certification Board	Fla. R. Cert. Court Interp 14.110	Assists the Supreme Court of Florida in overseeing the certification and regulation of court interpreters as set forth in Rules 14.100 through 14.460.	2006	Davis, effective July 1, 2013	Canady	OSCA: Bell
Judicial Branch Records Management Committee	Administrative order. See also 973 So. 2d 437 (Fla. 2008)	Records retention issues in the judicial branch have become increasingly complex in recent years, requiring a new level of oversight and attention. In 2008, the Supreme Court approved the creation of a comprehensive judicial branch records management and retention program. The Committee was subsequently established to oversee that records management and retention program.	2008	Thomas	Pariente	OSCA: Hall
Local Rule Advisory Committee	Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.140(h)	Makes recommendations to the Court concerning local rules and administrative orders submitted pursuant to Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.215(e).	1979 (?)	Silvernail	Quince	OSCA: <sup>2</sup> Schneider

Prepared by the Office of the State Courts Administrator  
December 11, 2013

<sup>1</sup> The committee was originally staffed by The Florida Bar. Staff responsibilities were transferred to OSCA effective January 1, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> Staff responsibilities for the committee were assigned to OSCA in 2010. Prior to that time, there was no official staff support provided to the committee; former 1<sup>st</sup> DCA Judge Marguerite Davis, who previously chaired the committee, fulfilled the staff functions.

## **Item III. Judicial Workload Model (Case Weight) Review**

### **Background**

The last official updates to the Judicial Weighted Workload Model case weights occurred in 2006 and 2007. That effort is commonly referred to as the Judicial Resource Study (JRS)<sup>1</sup>. The JRS also attempted to measure or assign weights (i.e., times) to those portions of cases handled by supplemental hearing officers such as magistrates. Case weights are influenced by legislative mandates, court rules, court initiatives, technology, evolving case precedent, case complexity, and the availability of supporting resources. The original Delphi study<sup>2</sup> completed in 2000 recommended that the case weights be updated every five years.

Even though Florida's court system has not received additional judgeships since 2006, the case weights that form the cornerstone of the Judicial Weighted Workload Model should be reviewed and updated regularly to ensure the continued applicability of the model. Based upon experience in working with the workload model since 2000 and in the interest of making efficient use of staff resources, the CSWC at its February 1, 2013 meeting directed OSCA staff to: 1) recalculate event proportions used to generate case weights for all case types; and 2) develop an adjustment modifier for the County Criminal and Misdemeanor Traffic division. This strategy will make certain that the workload model remains an accurate and viable mechanism for determining the need for additional trial court judges.

At the request of the supreme court, the County Criminal and Misdemeanor Traffic adjustment modifier was provided to the Chief Judges and Trial Court Administrators in August 2013 for review. The impact of the modifier on net judicial need, along with the comments made by circuits, was provided to the supreme court in October 2013 as part of their deliberations for the Annual Certification of Judgeships. This was the same information provided to this committee at the October 11, 2013 meeting. The revised case weights based on recalculated event proportions (action item 1) were not presented to the court as these weights had not yet been vetted through this committee.

After consideration of the County Criminal and Misdemeanor Traffic modifier, the comments of the Chief Judges and Trial Court Administrators, changes in case law and court process since the 2007 JRS, and the length of time since the original time study in 2000, the supreme court has elected to revise all case weights used within the Judicial Weighted Workload Model to better align those weights with the actualities of the current day.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Judicial Resource Study Final Report](#), Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability, July 2007

<sup>2</sup> [Florida Delphi-based Weighted Caseload Project Final Report](#), National Center for State Courts, January 2000

### **III.A. Full Case Weight Study**

#### **Governance**

It is anticipated that the Court Statistics and Workload Committee will be the body overseeing this effort. OSCA staff will conduct the study at the committee's direction. As with previous efforts, the OSCA may contract with the National Center for State Courts to assist with the methodology and statistical analysis. This study is expected to begin with the FY 2014-16 committee term.

#### **Time Study Anticipated**

As with the original 1999 Delphi, a judicial time study is anticipated. To ensure statewide applicability, all twenty circuits will need to participate. Since it has been more than ten years since the original case weight study, it is recommended that a time study be conducted to ensure that the weighted workload model accurately captures the changes to procedure and process that have occurred since 2000. One month of judicial time will be recorded. Judges will be required to keep daily time sheets and submit the data nightly. Staff is exploring the availability of a web-based time sheet application. The sample size (i.e., number of judges) for this effort may be around 300-350, statewide. As with previous studies, the key ingredient of the time study is the recording of events. The entire process may take 12 -18 months.

#### **Trainings**

OSCA staff anticipates conducting in-person, videoconferencing and webinar-type trainings for judges and judicial assistants. As with the Foreclosure Initiative, staff may also develop recorded trainings that participants can access at will.

#### **Law and Statute Review since 2006**

The OSCA continues to receive judicial feedback that although filings are dropping, cases are taking longer. Circuit and county court judges indicate that statutory requirements passed by the legislature over the last several years result in more frequent and longer hearings and other judicial requirements that are causing cases to take longer. A list of these requirements and confirmation by the judges will be necessary heading into the next Delphi review process.

#### **Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

### **III.B. Results of Event Proportion Recalculation**

As discussed in the February 1 and October 11, 2013 meeting materials, the individual case weights used to calculate judicial workload can be decomposed into a set of smaller events that contribute time spent on those specific events to the “average” case weight in varying proportions. Thus, in the weighted workload model, it is possible to fine tune the case weight for changes in the time to process events, such as case conferences or jury trials, or for changes in the proportion of occurrence of those events. While it is not currently practical to track event times or, for some case types, event proportions through existing case management systems, the Summary Reporting System does provide the capability to track changes to event proportions for most case types. Please see the October 11, 2013 meeting materials for a more complete discussion.

The event proportions change over time in response to many factors (i.e., case precedent, availability of supporting resources, etc.). Updating event proportions using current data will bring them in line with current practices. Staff recalculated each event proportion based on the most recent three years of Summary Reporting System (SRS) statistics (fiscal years 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12) using weighted average with weights of 0.1, 0.3, and 0.6. The use of three years worth of data helped to control for normal year-to-year variations in event occurrence. As noted, detailed data needed to recalculate event proportions is not available for each case type. Where appropriate, the event proportion estimates identified by the Judge Forum Groups as part of the 2007 JRS Study were retained.

Lastly, each case weight was recomputed using the recalculated event proportions. A side-by-side comparison of the 2007 case weights and the recomputed 2013 case weights is presented in Figure 1. Also presented is a comparison of the FY 2014-15 change in judicial need for circuit court and county court based on the 2007 case weights and the recomputed preliminary 2013 case weights. The results show that the recalculated event proportions increased the statewide FY 2014-15 circuit court judicial need by 4.2 FTE (from -5.1 FTE to -0.9 FTE). In county court, the judicial need increased by 3.7 FTE (from 25.2 FTE to 28.9 FTE).

#### **Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

**Figure 1:  
Comparison of 2007 Case Weights and Recomputed 2013 Case Weights**

<b>Division</b>		<b>2007 Case Weights</b>	<b>Recomputed 2013 Case Weights</b>	<b>Number Change</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	
Circuit Criminal	Capital Murder	2,151	2,341	190	8.8%	
	Serious Crimes Against Persons	275	291	16	5.8%	
	Less Serious Crimes Against Persons	76	74	-2	-2.6%	
	Crimes Against Property	57	61	4	7.0%	
	Drug Offenses	57	60	3	5.3%	
	Drug Offenses Involving Drug Court	108	108	0	0.0%	
Family Court	Simplified Dissolution	14	19	5	35.7%	
	Ordinary Dissolution	61	59	-2	-3.3%	
	Child Support	24	25	1	4.2%	
	Domestic Violence	25	26	1	4.0%	
	Other Domestic Relations	26	26	0	0.0%	
	Juvenile Delinquency	48	48	0	0.0%	
	Juvenile Dependency	242	242	0	0.0%	
	Parental Notice of Abortion	125	125	0	0.0%	
Circuit Civil	Professional Malpractice & Product Liability	230	232	2	0.9%	
	Auto & Other Negligence	91	81	-10	-11.0%	
	Contracts & Real Property	44	51	7	15.9%	
	Other Circuit Civil	64	64	0	0.0%	
	Jimmy Ryce Act	1,013	1,139	0	0.0%	
Probate	Probate & Mental Health	31	30	-1	-3.2%	
	Guardianship & Trust	62	61	-1	-1.6%	
<b>FY 2014-15 Circuit Court</b>		<b>Change in Judicial Need</b>	<b>-5.1</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>82.4%</b>
County Criminal	Misdemeanor & Criminal Traffic	16	17	1	6.3%	
	Municipal & County Ordinance	4	4	0	0.0%	
	DUI	32	34	2	6.3%	
County Civil	Small Claims (up to \$5,000)	17	17	0	0.0%	
	County Civil (\$5,001 - \$15,000)	31	31	0	0.0%	
	Other County Civil	16	16	0	0.0%	
	Evictions	7	6	-1	-14.3%	
	Civil Traffic Infractions	1.41	1.41	0	0.0%	
<b>FY 2014-15 County Court</b>		<b>Change in Judicial Need</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>14.7%</b>

### **III.C. Results of Misdemeanor and Criminal Traffic Modifier**

In 2012, the supreme court directed the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) to review the predicted judicial need arising from the use of the county court case weights adopted by the 2007 Judicial Resource Study Workgroup. Specifically, the court requested the OSCA evaluate and propose an alternative methodology for determining the need for county court judges in large counties (i.e., Duval, Pinellas, Orange, Miami-Dade, Hillsborough, Palm Beach, Broward, and Lee).

During the initial review of the county court case weights, staff found that some large counties have routinely requested much less than what their predicted county court criminal need indicated. In fact, for the past 10 years some counties have requested less than 30 percent of their predicted county court judicial need. Staff presumes this may be due to courthouse space limitations, state attorney and public defender staff reductions, availability of general magistrates and hearing officers, and the case weights within the county criminal division.

The Judicial Weighted Workload Model provides for the incorporation of need modifiers to capture the fine-grained characteristics that may vary significantly from circuit to circuit. As the most authoritative source of case and time data available, a review of the actual responses to the 2007 Judicial Resource Study (JRS) case weight survey from large counties was conducted.

The focus of this analysis was first to determine whether the county criminal division event times reported by large counties through the 2007 JRS case weight survey were consistently lower than the state average. As a reminder, the 2007 JRS case weight survey was divided by division of court, case type, and event type, and participating judges were asked to estimate the actual time spent handling each type of case and type of event in their circuit.

To determine whether a difference exists between the large counties' event time responses and the state average, staff extracted data from the 2007 survey. In this survey, participating judges were asked for their estimates by circuit only. Therefore, to ensure accuracy in this analysis, staff excluded large counties within multi-county circuits and large counties containing outlier data. Ultimately, the survey responses from Miami-Dade and Hillsborough Counties were identified and used to represent all large counties.

The analysis found that large counties' average event time responses were in fact lower than the state average, creating an overestimate of the actual workload in large counties. With this in mind, staff proposes new county criminal division case weights for large counties based on the data extracted from the 2007 survey. The following table (Figure 2) displays the current case weights and proposed new large counties' case weights for each county criminal case type. The current case weights will remain for small and medium counties.

**Figure 2:**  
**Comparison of Current County Criminal Division Case Weights and  
Proposed Large Counties Case Weight**

<b>Type of Case</b>	<b>Current Case Weight (in minutes)</b>	<b>Proposed Large Counties Case Weight (in minutes)</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Misdemeanor and Criminal Traffic	16	12	-4
Municipal and County Ordinance	4	3	-1
DUI	32	28	-4

**Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

## **Item IV. Performance Measures Required by Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2)**

### **IV.A. Project Review**

In Supreme Court Order SC11-1347 IN RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF JUDICIAL BRANCH GOVERNANCE STUDY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS — AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION, the supreme court revised Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) to charge the Judicial Management Council with:

“identifying and evaluating information that would assist in improving the performance and effectiveness of the judicial branch (for example, information including, but not limited to, internal operations for cash flow and budget performance, and statistical information by court and type of cases for (i) number of cases filed, (ii) aged inventory of cases — the number and age of cases pending, (iii) time to disposition — the percentage of cases disposed or otherwise resolved within established time frames, and (iv) clearance rates — the number of outgoing cases as a percentage of the number of incoming cases).”

At its February 1, 2013 meeting, the CSWC took two specific actions to address this rule requirement: the CSWC 1) adopted a standard methodology for computing the above referenced case age statistics and 2) adopted four action steps to determine the best approach to implement case age reporting. The CSWC also advanced the Case-Event Framework through TCP&A to the supreme court to provide the necessary definitional framework for these measures.

### **IV.B. Progress on CSWC Recommendations**

In a case of parallel evolution, the performance indicators calculated for the FY2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative are exactly those required by Rule 2.225(a)(2). Since the Foreclosure Initiative represents a real world implementation of the data collection standards needed to compute case age statistics, the CSWC decided to incorporate the lessons learned from this project as a guide to the larger data collection for Rule 2.225. To date, staff believes that this initiative has served as an excellent pilot project that later can be expanded to all case types.

The four actions steps recommended by the CSWC are:

1. The OSCA open a dialog with various clerks of court, including our members on the CSWC, and the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers to establish a practical plan for the collection of necessary data that minimizes both disruption and cost. Based on our experience, staff believes an implementation period of eighteen months to be reasonable for a project of this type. With time for planning, we could set a target date of October 2014 to coincide with the start of many county fiscal years. This should allow both the OSCA and the clerks of court sufficient time to modify their systems as needed. This

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

time frame is consistent with the proposed timeframe for implementing requirements for changes to SRS reopen/reclosure reporting.

**Update:** In May 2013, OSCA staff began discussions with the FCCC concerning the requirement of case age reporting. The advent of the FY2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative, and its associated funding, channeled subsequent discussions into the activities necessary to report case age statistics for this initiative. However, staff has consistently stressed the expectation that this reporting would be expanded to other divisions of court when the Foreclosure Initiative was completed. The data elements identified in this initiative are those required for accurate reporting of case age statistics, and the reporting requirements were defined to support expansion to other divisions of court.

OSCA staff has held several discussions with the FCCC on the reporting of supplemental resource officers (senior judges and magistrates) who assist with foreclosure cases and case status. Staff has also had discussions on the frequency of reporting including the changes necessary to capture the requisite data in the clerks' nightly uploads to the Comprehensive Case Information System (CCIS).

2. Because of their overall value to the evaluation of court operations, staff recommends that all four data elements be included in this round of modifications. It will be easier and less costly to incorporate one extra change that is closely related to the data already being modified than to attempt to make the change at a later date.

**Update:** As discussed previously, the OSCA currently captures, under section 25.075, F.S. and Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245, all but three pieces of data necessary to compute these statistics. We do not capture 1) date of status change, 2) type of status change, and 3) reclosure date. A fourth datum, 4) reason for status change, while not strictly necessary, has been proposed to provide valuable case management and program evaluation information. The collection of "reason for status change" would be consistent with the reporting intent of Fl. R. Civ. P. 1.201 on Complex Civil Litigation and Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b) on time standards.

The Foreclosure Initiative did not originally include the reason for case status change as part of the data collected. However, subsequent work to improve case status reporting supports the assertion that this information is important to meaningful case management and program evaluation. AOSC13-51, IN RE: CASE STATUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE CASES, directed each circuit to "...implement an effective communications mechanism by which the courts and clerks are notified of case status changes in a timely manner."

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

The order further refers to the Foreclosure Initiative Data Collection Plan for details. The current Data Collection Plan (version 1.3.2) includes the following direction: “While it is left to individual jurisdictions to develop the mechanism that best fits its operations, the mechanism should generate a record of, at a minimum, the uniform case number of the case, the date of the order initiating the status change, the case number of any related case (if appropriate) and the reason for the status change including a fixed code to facilitate electronic tracking within the court system” and provides a table of codes identifying the six reasons that foreclosure cases may be reported as inactive/active. The Data Collection Plan lays additional groundwork for expansion by including the statement, “However, status change reason codes are an integral part of case age reporting as envisioned by Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) which will include all case types. It is expected that these reason codes will be included in the data provided to the judicial viewers as they are implemented and to the state level as applicable. Clerks of court and court administration should plan to achieve this reporting capability no later than January 31, 2015.”

3. The OSCA should continue to monitor the ITCAS project and its components for opportunities to develop these and other performance measures from these systems. Additionally, the OSCA should request changes as necessary to the appropriate development teams of these projects that would facilitate the collection of data necessary for these measures.

**Update:** OSCA staff continues to monitor closely the ITCAS project and, in particular, the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) component thereof. Staff has been working with the Florida Courts Technology Commission’s TIMS subcommittee to incorporate state-level electronic reporting capabilities within the judicial viewers, which will provide additional opportunities to capture a variety of case activity data from these systems.

At the state level, the first subproject recommended for the JDMS component is to build or extend the data capture, computation and reporting infrastructure for case age reporting pioneered for the Foreclosure Initiative. This project would gradually expand reporting from foreclosure case types to all civil case types. Additional discussions with OSCA staff and the FCCC would be necessary to determine an implementation schedule for the remaining court divisions.

4. As it is not possible to obtain sufficient real-world data to evaluate the usefulness of the case age measures without case status data, staff recommends that the OSCA conduct a

series of simulations to ascertain the conditions and constraints under which case age measures may be used and interpreted given the current limitations of the data.

**Update:** Work on the simulation study was deferred so that staff could work on developing the data collection infrastructure for the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative. However, the initiative has provided most of the real world experience and data that was lacking when the CSWC made its initial recommendation for a study to determine the conditions and constraints of case age reporting. Lessons learned from the Foreclosure Initiative include:

- a. The reporting requirements of Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) and 2.250(b) are duplicative and somewhat inconsistent.
  - i. The data necessary to support rule 2.225(a)(2) is more comprehensive and timely than the data necessary to satisfy rule 2.250(b). If we include the Reason for Status Change field as discussed in item 2 above, then the data for 2.225(a)(2) is a complete superset of that required for 2.250(b).
  - ii. The current quarterly reporting requirement as specified by Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b) is not sufficient to provide meaningful case age reporting statistics at either the state or local level.
  - iii. Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b) may need to be amended to ensure consistency.
- b. Monthly reporting is the minimum time frame for useful statistics at the state level (that is, for statewide program management). However, monthly reporting is not sufficient to provide useful statistics to circuit judges and staff for direct management of their caseloads or programs.
- c. Weekly reporting is the minimum time scale necessary to provide useful statistics to circuit judges and staff. Weekly reporting is a viable time scale for many clerks of court to meet; although, due to legacy system issues, some clerks would not, in the short term, be able to provide data weekly.
- d. Daily reporting is the optimal time frame for reporting as this provides the most up-to-date information available within the limits of the clerks and court data collection systems.

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Tampa, FL  
January 2014**

- i. Many clerks have found that daily reporting for the Foreclosure Initiative to be simpler, more accurate and less work than weekly or monthly reporting. Reporting on a weekly or monthly basis requires the clerks to create a snapshot of their dynamic case maintenance systems for the specific reporting period. Whereas, daily reporting allowed the clerk to simply report only those changes to foreclosure cases posted in the last day.
  - ii. As a function of operations, not all clerks would report each day. However, lags of a few days (up to a week) will not materially affect the accuracy of the case age statistics.
  - iii. One practical option would be to establish a more dynamic point in time reporting mechanism as the standard, so that clerks would report, for example, at least twice per month with all data since the previous report. This point in time approach is consistent with modern data management practices and is proposed as a development standard within the JDMS framework.
  - iv. Changes in reporting requirements prove to be challenging once a reporting mechanism is already established. Rather than requiring less frequent reporting initially with the expectation of increasing the frequency in the future, or asking for fewer elements initially and increasing the number of fields reported in the future, having the clerks set up the desired reporting parameters and frequency from the start may be less of an overall burden.
- e. Tracking of opened and reopened case status (ACTIVE/INACTIVE/CLOSED) remains an important element of case management. Case managers and judges have identified thousands of foreclosure cases that are listed as pending for court activity that should be classified as either INACTIVE or CLOSED (or RECLOSED). Repeatedly reviewing these cases to determine status represents a significant drain on limited court time that could be better spent adjudicating ACTIVE cases.
  - f. Reason for Status Change should be considered an integral element of case age reporting. Process evaluation is an essential element of the TCP&A's High Performance Court Initiative, and this field provides important information necessary to address process improvement in these areas.

#### **IV.C. Example of Case Age Data Collection**

As discussed, the FY2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative represents a real world implementation of the data collection standards needed to compute case age statistics, and the example of this single division of court is a good way to understand how the larger data collection for Rule 2.225 could be implemented for other divisions of court. Though not a requirement of this rule, the Foreclosure Performance Indicators Dashboard website is a great visual representation of the data collected, the statistics calculated, and the real-world application of how these indicators would “assist in improving the performance and effectiveness of the judicial branch” as ordered in Rule 2.225.

#### **Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

## **Item V. Status Reports**

### **V.A. Judicial Data Management Services**

The OSCA through its FY 2014-15 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) has requested funding (salary dollars) for four FTE to assist with the management and administration of the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) project. This request will begin to be vetted by legislative and gubernatorial staff during the pre-legislative session committee hearing process. The OSCA is optimistic that the salary dollars will be forthcoming as this issue builds upon work established via the TIMS project, the advent and application of the judicial viewers throughout the state, and the important case and data management strides made during the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative.

### **V.B. FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative**

Florida's State Courts System is now in the seventh month of the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative. Since July 2013, great strides have been made in the trial courts including the hiring of case managers, magistrates, and senior judges. The clerks of court also received significant funding (6.7 million) as part of this initiative to support the judiciary. It is our understanding that many clerks have hired additional staff and some used portions of the money to improve their case management and reporting technology. The OSCA received limited funding for technology and staff augmentation. As part of the initiative, the OSCA contracted with the Unisys Corporation to develop a Foreclosure Performance Indicators Dashboard website. The clerks of court are submitting foreclosure data displayed on the website. The website is also designed to assist judges and case managers with managing foreclosure cases. OSCA staff has identified several initiative issues that it will focus its attention on during the next few months, including:

- a transition from monthly to weekly reporting of initiative data;
- the proper identification of active versus inactive cases (case status);
- the referral to a magistrate or senior judge (reporting requirement);
- time to disposition;
- age of pending caseload;
- the use of actual initiative data rather than estimated SRS data to evaluate and communicate the progress of the program to judges, justices, the legislature and the governor's office.

### **V.C. Uniform Data Reporting - Court Interpreters Data Collection**

Due to the workload associated with the FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative, the modification to the UDR system has temporarily been put on hold. As discussed at our June 21, 2013 meeting, Supreme Court Administrative Order AOSC11-45 IN RE: COURT INTERPRETING SERVICES IN FLORIDA'S TRIAL COURTS adopts a set of recommendations on standards of operation and best practices.

Recommendation VIII of AOSC11-45 directs TCP&A and CSWC to modify court interpreting statistics collected in the Uniform Data Reporting (UDR) system to capture the number of court interpreting hours (in quarter hour segments), by proceeding type and language, in addition to the number of events. These statistics should also be modified in order to be consistent with amendments to s. 29.004, Florida Statutes.

On May 31, staff initiated a survey of all OSCA units and Trial Court Administrators to help identify possible changes that may be necessary to the UDR system for court interpreting reporting.

### **V.D. Statutory and Rule Changes to Stalking Violence Reporting**

On July 12, 2012 the supreme court issued opinion SC12-1205 {Amendments to the Florida Family Law Rules of Procedure} in response to Laws of Florida (LOF) 2012-153. The court's opinion SC12-1205 amends references throughout the Family Law Rules of Procedure from "*injunctions for domestic, repeat, dating and sexual violence*" to now read "*injunctions for protection against domestic, repeat, dating, sexual violence and stalking.*" The court's opinion SC12-1205 did not state whether the clerks of court should report data from the petitions for injunction against stalking.

Since our October, 2013 meeting, no further activity has occurred. Staff will continue to monitor this matter for any change.

### **V.E. Case Event Framework**

The Case-Event definitions adopted by the CSWC on February 1, 2013 were approved by the TCP&A and have been forwarded to the supreme court for adoption statewide. At this time, we are still waiting for a response from the court as to whether these definitions will be adopted.

### **Decision Needed:**

1. None: For information only

## **Item VI. End of FY 2012-14 Term**

The end of the FY 2012-14 term for the CSWC is June 30, 2014. There are a few housekeeping actions required to close out this term and prepare for the FY 2014-16 term.

### **VI.A. End of Term Report**

The CSWC contributes a summation of our work and accomplishments during the two-year term to be included in the End of Term Report for the Trial Court Performance and Accountability Commission (TCP&A). Staff will have a draft completed for member review via email in March or April of 2014.

### **VI.B. Supreme Court Reauthorization**

Staff will be working on TCP&A reauthorization, which includes CSWC direction. If any member would like to submit ideas for projects or issues to be taken up in the next term, please contact staff. A list of project ideas will be compiled and circulated to all members for approval via email.

### **VI.C. Next Term CSWC Membership**

The membership for the FY 2014-16 term must be designated by June 30, 2014. Current members are encouraged to remain on the committee for the next term, as several of our ongoing projects will be carried through and completed in the next term. Please contact staff as soon as possible if you are unable to continue serving on the committee.

### **Committee Action Needed:**

1. Please contact Shelley Kaus ([kauss@flcourts.org](mailto:kauss@flcourts.org)) as soon as possible if you are unable to serve on the committee for the FY 2014-16 term.
2. Email ideas for future projects or issues to PJ Stockdale ([stockdap@flcourts.org](mailto:stockdap@flcourts.org)) no later than February 28, 2014.

## **Item VII. Next Meeting**

The final meeting of the FY 2012-14 term will be a phone conference, likely held during lunch time.

Possible dates have been identified as the following:

- Monday, May 5<sup>th</sup>
- Wednesday, May 7<sup>th</sup>
- Monday, May 12<sup>th</sup>
- Monday, May 19<sup>th</sup>

### **Committee Action Needed:**

1. Please email availability to Shelley Kaus at [kauss@flcourts.org](mailto:kauss@flcourts.org) no later than February 28, 2014.