

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 1: Employee Pay - Salary Equity and Flexibility

At the August 11, 2016, meeting, the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) considered filing a FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) for second-year funding to address court staff salary equity, recruitment, and retention issues.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

File a statewide LBR issue in an amount similar to the FY 2016-17 request of \$5,902,588 in second-year funding for court staff salary equity, recruitment, and retention issues. Authorize staff to make adjustments in the amount, as necessary, based on any updated or revised analysis.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 2: Trial Court Technology Funding

Background

In FY 2015-16, the Supreme Court submitted a supplemental legislative budget request (LBR) for \$25,606,097 in non-recurring general revenue and 65 FTE to fund the first year of a multi-year comprehensive strategy for addressing the statewide technology needs of the trial courts. The issue was also filed for FY 2016-17, with minor modifications to the cost estimates, resulting in an LBR of \$25,299,973 and 65 FTE. Neither request was funded.

Current Issue

At their meeting on June 17, 2016, the TCBC directed staff of the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) to develop a proposal for a comprehensive trial court technology LBR for FY 2017-18. Using last year's LBR of \$25,299,973 as a base, OSCA staff worked with the trial courts to update cost estimates for the Court Application Processing Systems (CAPS), digital court reporting and remote court interpreting equipment, and a minimum level of technology to support court functions and accomplish the business capabilities of the *Florida Trial Court Technology Strategic Plan 2015-2019*. That work indicated that revisions to the request were necessitated by factors such as deployment of technology since the LBR was originally developed (e.g., through end of year spending), changes in circuit readiness to deploy technology, and other new or changed circuit needs. In addition, two issues were added to assist circuits with cross-jurisdictional systems for CAPS viewers and digital court reporting, and circuits were given the discretion to request funds to implement intra-circuit remote interpreting systems.

The comprehensive LBR will support trial court technology and will ensure that the trial courts have:

- Hardware and Software to Receive and Manage Documents Electronically
- Functional Digital Court Reporting and Remote Interpreting Equipment
- Staff to Support Court Technology
- Sufficient Bandwidth
- A Minimum Level of Technology Services in Communities Across the State

As in the previous years' LBRs, this request would not be designed to supplant county funding of court technology. It addresses funding gaps and provides a minimum level of technology services in each county. Based on the comprehensive trial court technology strategic plan, the FY 2017-18 LBR groups critical technology needs into three funding solutions:

Solution 1: Secure Case Management and Processing System (CAPS)

This solution includes the Court Application Processing System (CAPS), which provides judges and court staff electronic case file information needed to perform their adjudicatory function.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 2: Trial Court Technology Funding (continued)

Judges and court staff face challenges using multiple systems to access electronic case files in real-time in order to address the specific case processing and resource management needs of the trial courts. Servers in use are well past recommended usable lifespan. Foreclosure funding, which expired June 30, 2015, purchased the initial hardware and software for CAPS in civil divisions, but ongoing maintenance and refresh are needed to protect the initial investment. Further, not all judges and staff have CAPS.

Benefits of Proposed Solution

- Provides consistent access to and availability of data across counties and circuits.
- Provides complete, accurate, real-time information from multiple sources to judges, allowing for improved efficiency in judicial decision-making and reducing file movement between the clerk and court.
- Ensures judges have technology necessary to securely transmit court orders to the clerks of court.
- Builds upon current \$9 million investment in CAPS, funded with resources from the National Mortgage Foreclosure Settlement.
- Provides infrastructure needed to effectively manage court business processes and provides the court system with monitoring tools that allow courts to tailor performance measures and improve case management.

Solution 2: Court Reporting and Court Interpreting

Court Reporting and Court Interpreting updates include technological systems comprising audio/video hardware and software to support service delivery of critical due process court functions. Courts utilize outdated hardware and software to create the official court record, presenting the risk of system failure. Many circuits report that equipment and parts are no longer available and that manufacturers have ended technical support for these models. This mission-critical equipment is in use 365 days a year, sometimes for over 8 hours per day. Spoken and sign language court interpreting services are costly, and the unavailability of qualified interpreters in local courts sometimes results in court delays.

Benefits of Proposed Solution

- Provides continued ability to create the official court record.
- Improves access to court reporting and court interpreting services; allows for more timely access to transcripts and official records.
- Provides access to qualified interpreters remotely over a broader geographical area, using audio/video technology.
- Allows for cost containment in interpreter staff and contractor expenses.
- Creates potential for expansion to utilize this technology platform in expert witness testimony.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 2: Trial Court Technology Funding (continued)

Solution 3: Minimum Level of Technology Services

Support for a minimum level of technology services includes increased bandwidth, core-function technology services, and staff to support a minimum level of technology in all counties and judicial circuits. Technology services vary across counties and circuits based on the county's ability to provide funding for needed services; multi-county circuits have difficulty sharing resources across county boundaries; and many technology initiatives require dedicated staff support. Circuits must often pay costly outside vendors to support audio equipment. Citizens in different counties may not have comparable access to minimum standard core services. Additional bandwidth is needed to accommodate e-filing mandates, increased web-based services, and digital traffic.

Benefits of Proposed Solution

- Ensures citizens receive access to a consistent level of minimum court technology services, regardless of geography.
- Includes state-level technical expertise, upon request, to bridge knowledge gaps in counties of critical need.
- Provides court with dedicated staff to maintain state-owned hardware and software, resulting in cost savings.
- Allows court staff to maintain a skill set that keeps pace with evolving technology and ensures technology investment is fully supported throughout full life cycle.

Options for Consideration

Option 1: Recommend an FY 2017-18 LBR, as reflected in **Attachment A**, provided at the meeting, and authorize OSCA staff to make minor revisions to the cost estimates and add out-year costs as the issue is finalized for presentation to the Supreme Court.

Option 2: Do not file an LBR for FY 2017-18.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

The TCBC approved Option 1 and recommended filing the portions of the technology request related to remote interpreting (highlighted in Attachment A) as a separate comprehensive court interpreting request with additional funding for court interpreting resources and funding to address a base salary increase for interpreters. Removing these items from the technology LBR brings the total request for this issue to approximately \$23,197,581. The TCBC authorized OSCA staff to refine the overall technology request if it is determined that items such as infrastructural needs from Solution III need to be moved into the comprehensive court interpreting LBR.

Trial Court Technology Comprehensive Plan 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request
Trial Court Budget Commission Meeting, August 11, 2016

		FY 2016-17 Legislative Budget Request			FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request			Change From FY 2016-17 LBR
Technology Projects to Support Business Capabilities		General Revenue Recurring	General Revenue Non-Recurring	Total	General Revenue Recurring	General Revenue Non-Recurring	Total	
Solution I: Secure Case Management and Processing System (CAPS Viewers)								
1	Applications Development and Licensing	\$0	\$3,547,818	\$3,547,818	\$0	\$3,801,595	\$3,801,595	\$253,777
2	Support Services - Maintenance	\$1,856,988	\$0	\$1,856,988	\$1,348,397	\$0	\$1,348,397	(\$508,591)
3	Support Services - Hardware Refresh	\$433,333	\$0	\$433,333	\$442,478	\$0	\$442,478	\$9,145
4	Support Services - Enhancement	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$0
5	Support Services - Server Refresh	\$658,614	\$0	\$658,614	\$402,000	\$0	\$402,000	(\$256,614)
6	Support Services - OSCA Cross-Jurisdictional CAPS (2.5 FTE)	NA	NA	NA	\$484,860	\$10,228	\$495,088	\$495,088
Group I Subtotal		\$3,198,935	\$3,547,818	\$6,746,753	\$2,927,735	\$3,811,823	\$6,739,558	(\$7,195)
Solution II: Digital Court Reporting (DCR) and Remote Court Interpreting (RI)								
7	DCR Equipment - Expansion	\$0	\$796,577	\$796,577	\$0	\$1,610,643	\$1,610,643	\$814,066
8	Support Services - DCR Equipment - Refresh / Maintenance	\$2,583,363	\$1,582,402	\$4,165,765	\$3,069,260	\$795,712	\$3,864,972	(\$300,793)
9	Support Services - OSCA Cross-Jurisdictional DCR (2.5 FTE)	NA	NA	NA	\$444,860	\$10,228	\$455,088	\$455,088
10	Court Reporting - OpenCourt*	\$175,000	\$0	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$175,000)
11	RI Equipment - Expansion	\$0	\$2,412,750	\$2,412,750	\$0	\$2,129,233	\$2,129,233	(\$283,517)
12	Support Services - RI Equipment - Refresh / Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$65,262	\$0	\$65,262	\$65,262
13	Support Services for RI - Statewide Call Manager/Scheduler	NA	NA	NA	\$27,840	\$50,000	\$77,840	\$77,840
Group II Subtotal		\$2,758,363	\$4,791,729	\$7,550,092	\$3,607,222	\$4,595,816	\$8,203,038	\$652,946
Solution III: Support for Minimum Level of Technology								
14	Core Function Capabilities	\$4,150,195	\$0	\$4,150,195	\$3,694,429	\$0	\$3,694,429	(\$455,766)
15	Bandwidth	\$1,260,988	\$0	\$1,260,988	\$1,138,856	\$0	\$1,138,856	(\$122,132)
16	Information Resource Management Consultant (20 FTE, 1 per Circuit)	\$2,032,860	\$47,600	\$2,080,460	\$2,046,700	\$47,980	\$2,094,680	\$14,220
17	Information Systems Analysts (45 FTE)	\$3,066,885	\$107,100	\$3,173,985	\$3,094,650	\$107,955	\$3,202,605	\$28,620
18	Training and Education	\$337,500	\$0	\$337,500	\$396,750	\$0	\$396,750	\$59,250
Group III Subtotal		\$10,848,428	\$154,700	\$11,003,128	\$10,371,385	\$155,935	\$10,527,320	(\$475,808)
TOTAL		\$16,805,726	\$8,494,247	\$25,299,973	\$16,906,342	\$8,563,574	\$25,469,916	\$169,943

Note: Highlighted items represent issues that will be filed as part of a comprehensive court interpreting LBR.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 3: Court Interpreting

Since the passage of Revision 7 to Article V of the Florida Constitution, when the responsibility of providing interpreting services shifted from the county to the state, the trial courts have received limited additional funding for court interpreting services. In FY 2006-07, the courts received 4.0 FTE and \$1,049,387 in contractual funds; however, in FY 2008-09, the budget was reduced by 2.0 FTE and \$184,739. In FY 2013-14, the Legislature provided \$100,000 in non-recurring funds for the courts to conduct a remote interpreting pilot project to assess the viability of virtual remote interpreting as a service delivery model.

On March 27, 2014, the Supreme Court issued an opinion in SC13-304 amending the rules for certification and regulation of court interpreters. In response to concerns expressed during the FY 2014-15 allocation process regarding additional funding needed to comply with the requirements of the opinion, the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) directed OSCA staff to examine options for requesting additional funding through a legislative budget request (LBR) and to also consider additional workload needs. Based on circuit requests from the FY 2014-15 allocation process and extrapolating to a statewide need, the TCBC approved an LBR of \$1,367,126 (\$1,233,292 contractual funds; \$133,834 salary dollars) in recurring funds for FY 2015-16. The Legislature appropriated \$750,000 in recurring contractual dollars, partially funding this request for FY 2015-16. In FY 2016-17, the judicial branch filed an LBR for the remaining unfunded portion of the initial request in the amount of \$483,292, which was not funded.

Current Issue

The trial courts continue to experience the effect of market-driven factors leading to difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified court interpreters and increasing contractual costs. The courts have experienced vacancies in court interpreting positions as a result of retirements and resignations. These positions often remain vacant for long periods due to the inability to find qualified applicants and compete with higher paying salaries for similar positions and skill sets. Due to these staff shortages, many circuits have had to rely on contract interpreting services whose rates can be significantly higher than typical FTE costs. At their June 17, 2016, meeting, the TCBC directed the FMC to provide recommendations for determining court interpreting needs for consideration in the FY 2017-18 LBR. OSCA staff developed two options for the FMC's and TCBC's consideration.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 3: Court Interpreting (continued)

	LBR
Option 1 – Percent Increase in Population Growth	\$1,150,600
Option 2 – Percent Increase in Expenditures	\$1,608,230

In addition to requesting funding to obtain certified court interpreters, the courts will continue to seek ways to maximize resources through the use of technology and the expansion of virtual remote interpreting services based on the success of the pilot. It is anticipated resources related to remote interpreting will be included in the judicial branch FY 2017-18 legislative budget request.

Option 1 (see **Attachment A**) utilizes the current funding methodology in which FY 2017-18 need is projected using FY 2015-16 estimated costs and applying a 6.5% statewide growth rate to each circuit. The estimated growth rate is based on the statistics of "People who speak English at home less than very well" in Florida, which was taken from the 2000 and 2010 Census. The growth rate is derived by first estimating the annual statewide population growth from 2000 to 2010, then multiplying by 2 in order to obtain an estimated statewide growth from 2015 to 2017.

Option 2 (see **Attachment B**) projects the FY 2017-18 need by applying the average growth rate in contractual expenditures over the last three years to estimated FY 2015-16 expenditures. The average growth rate is multiplied by 2 in order to obtain an estimated statewide growth rate from 2015 to 2017.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve *Option 2* and direct OSCA staff to work with the circuits to determine the specific type of funding (contractual or FTE) needed.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

Approved *Option 2* and directed OSCA staff to work with the circuits to determine the specific type of funding (contractual or FTE) needed. In addition, the TCBC recommended filing both the above issue, requests for additional funding to support remote interpreting services as developed within the Comprehensive Trial Court Technology LBR, and the court interpreting component of the second half of the employee pay issue (Court Base Salary Increase and Compression Adjustment) for recruitment, retention, and equity, as a separate legislative issue (see the below chart).

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 3: Court Interpreting (continued)

OSCA staff may adjust final LBR amounts to support infrastructural needs, also developed within the Comprehensive Trial Court Technology LBR, for the implementation of remote interpreting services.

	Recurring	Non- Recurring	Total
Remote Interpreting Equipment – Expansion	\$0	\$2,129,233	\$2,129,233
Remote Interpreting Support Services – Refresh and Maintenance	\$65,262	\$0	\$65,262
Remote Interpreting Support Services – Statewide Call Center and Scheduler	\$27,840	\$50,000	\$77,840
Court Interpreting Resources (FTE/Contractual Split TBD)	\$1,608,230	\$0	\$1,608,230
Court Interpreting Base Salary Increase and Compression Adjustment - Last Year	\$391,944	\$0	\$391,944
Total	\$2,093,276	\$2,179,233	\$4,272,509

Trial Court Budget Commission

August 11, 2016, Meeting

Court Interpreting

FY 2017-18 Proposed LBR - Option 1 Current Methodology

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
		FY 2016-17 Allotment¹ (CC 131, CC 267, and CC 730)				
Circuit	FTE	Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses	Beginning Contractual Allotment	Total Budget	FY 2015-16 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ²	FY 2017-18 Estimated Total Need Based on 6.5% Growth Rate ³
1	0	\$0	\$46,798	\$46,798	\$48,137	\$51,266
2	0	\$0	\$35,484	\$35,484	\$21,194	\$22,571
3	0	\$0	\$42,422	\$42,422	\$24,136	\$25,705
4	0	\$0	\$311,496	\$311,496	\$287,963	\$306,681
5	5	\$299,332	\$76,885	\$376,217	\$78,412	\$402,297
6	2	\$127,716	\$286,192	\$413,908	\$278,051	\$432,142
7	3	\$180,241	\$76,745	\$256,986	\$85,311	\$282,813
8	1	\$59,400	\$45,026	\$104,426	\$47,061	\$113,381
9	10	\$605,242	\$160,748	\$765,990	\$174,935	\$830,888
10	6	\$403,421	\$87,434	\$490,855	\$77,333	\$512,003
11	52	\$3,208,365	\$317,693	\$3,526,058	\$531,164	\$4,198,477
12	0	\$0	\$383,858	\$383,858	\$372,790	\$397,021
13	10	\$590,540	\$148,420	\$738,960	\$149,151	\$787,771
14	0	\$0	\$40,560	\$40,560	\$37,617	\$40,062
15	13	\$841,195	\$140,498	\$981,693	\$166,996	\$1,073,723
16	2	\$130,360	\$18,842	\$149,202	\$18,332	\$158,357
17	16.0	\$958,981	\$154,993	\$1,113,974	\$147,511	\$1,178,414
18	1	\$59,438	\$39,618	\$99,056	\$36,061	\$101,706
19	2	\$136,702	\$530,679	\$667,381	\$489,128	\$666,509
20	7	\$424,402	\$463,311	\$887,713	\$516,302	\$1,001,850
Total	130.0	\$8,025,335	\$3,407,702	\$11,433,037	\$3,587,583	\$12,583,637
FY 2017-18 Proposed LBR Using Current Methodology⁴						\$1,150,600

¹ FY 2016-17 Allotment include CC 131 (Court Interpreting), CC 267 (Cost Recovery), and CC 730 (Cost Sharing).

² FY 2015-16 Estimated Contractual Expenditures are based on actual expenditure data from July 2015 to June 2016 and include an estimate for certified forwards.

³ FY 2017-18 Estimated Total Need applies an estimated 6.5% statewide growth rate to the sum of each circuit's FY 2011/12 Allotment - Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses and FY 2015-16 Estimated Contractual Expenditures. The estimated growth rate is based on the statistics "People who speak English at home less than very well" in Florida provided in the 2000 and 2010 Census. The growth rate is derived by first estimating the annual statewide growth from 2000 to 2010 and then multiplying by 2 in order to obtain an estimated statewide growth from 2015 to 2017. Circuit 11 estimated FY 2017-18 expenditures were adjusted to reflect increased monthly expenditures beginning December 2015.

⁴ FY 2017-18 Proposed LBR Using Current Methodology is the difference between FY 2017-18 Estimated Total Need and FY 2016-17 Total Budget.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
Court Interpreting
FMC and TCBC Recommendation:
Proposed FY 2017-18 LBR - Option 2

Circuit	FY 2013-14 Expenditures	FY 2014-15 Expenditures	FY 2015-16 Estimated Expenditures¹	FY 2017-18 Estimated Expenditures
1	\$33,691	\$41,245	\$48,137	\$66,008
2	\$36,770	\$37,671	\$21,194	\$29,062
3	\$44,832	\$44,584	\$24,136	\$33,097
4	\$252,370	\$250,788	\$287,963	\$394,872
5	\$104,686	\$145,607	\$78,412	\$107,523
6	\$199,876	\$280,116	\$278,051	\$381,279
7	\$73,713	\$65,207	\$85,311	\$116,984
8	\$33,878	\$40,543	\$47,061	\$64,532
9	\$98,531	\$159,537	\$174,935	\$239,881
10	\$65,379	\$77,671	\$77,333	\$106,043
11 ²	\$228,157	\$258,042	\$531,164	\$1,004,673
12	\$313,591	\$304,968	\$372,790	\$511,191
13	\$131,576	\$156,427	\$149,151	\$204,524
14	\$33,321	\$38,041	\$37,617	\$51,583
15	\$83,088	\$131,713	\$166,996	\$228,994
16	\$16,822	\$19,234	\$18,332	\$25,137
17	\$119,644	\$142,831	\$147,511	\$202,276
18	\$25,650	\$44,486	\$36,061	\$49,448
19	\$391,374	\$444,108	\$489,128	\$670,720
20	\$329,474	\$357,673	\$516,302	\$707,983
Total	\$2,616,423	\$3,040,492	\$3,587,583	\$5,195,813
Percent Change		16.2%	18.0%	
Average Increase		17.1%		

Proposed LBR Request	\$1,608,230
-----------------------------	--------------------

¹ FY 2015-16 Estimated Expenditures are based on July 2015 through June 2016 data and include an estimate for certified forward expenditures.

² Circuit 11 estimated FY 2017-18 expenditures were adjusted to reflect increased monthly expenditures beginning December 2015.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 4: Case Management

Background

Case managers provide early and continuous intervention through the life of a case that leads to timely disposition. Specifically, case managers perform intake, screening, evaluation, monitoring, tracking, coordinating, scheduling, and referral activities. In FY 2015-16, a legislative budget request (LBR) was filed for 92.0 FTE case managers, which was partially funded during the 2015 Special Session when the Legislature appropriated \$2.0 million to the trial courts for this issue resulting in approximately 38.0 FTE. Additionally, as part of the state courts system's FY 2016-17 LBR, 52.5 FTE case managers were requested but not funded. Based on feedback from circuits, there still exists a need for additional case managers in order to provide an adequate level of services throughout the state.

In December 2015, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) released a report that discusses staffing formulas used for case managers and staff attorneys and recommends refining the approach to staffing need projections in these areas. The report states the current methodology of requesting 1 case manager for every 5,500 filings "was not a meaningful number for evaluating the need for case managers." Further, the report notes, "case managers were usually assigned to divisions, such as a family court, where they help litigants unrepresented by attorneys, or to specialty courts where they monitor the participants' compliance with obligations like drug testing and family counseling between court appearances. The need for case managers appears to be more dependent upon how they are used in each circuit."

As a remedy, the report states "in some circuits, adding additional case managers may be useful for improving the efficient disposition of cases, and could lead to more timely case closure. In circuits with drug treatment courts, veterans' courts, and mental health courts, case managers may have more of an effect on participant outcomes than on case timeliness, as they guide participants through treatment steps and frequent court appearances. Thus, the [Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC)] could consider revisiting the case manager staffing formula to develop a more refined approach taking into account the specific types of cases and types of courts where the case managers would be best used."

Current Issue

At the June 17, 2016, meeting, the TCBC directed staff to examine the need and cost for additional case managers in the trial courts as part of the FY 2017-18 LBR. OSCA staff have prepared three options for the TCBC's consideration.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 4: Case Management (continued)

	FTE	LBR
Option 1 – 1:5,500 Filings Ratio (3 Year Maximum)	60.5	\$3,731,096
Option 2 – 1:5,500 Filings Ratio (3 Year Average)	24.0	\$1,480,104
Option 3 – Proposed Ratio by Court Division	50.0	\$3,083,550

Option 1 – 1:5,500 Filings Ratio Using Three-Year Maximum Filings

The official needs assessment funding methodology for the case management element is based on a ratio of 1.0 FTE case manager for every 5,500 projected filings, with a floor of 8.0 FTE. Option 1 applies the same formula but uses maximum filings from FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15, with the exception of civil traffic infraction filings and excluding any negative net need. This option uses existing FTE in the Case Management (CC 122) and Drug Court (CC 217) cost centers, based on FY 2016-17 allocations (see **Attachment B**). Based on this methodology, an additional 60.5 FTE are needed. The positions would be funded at the Court Program Specialist II level, totaling \$3,731,096. (See **Attachment A**.)

Option 2 – 1:5,500 Filings Ratio Using Three-Year Average Filings

Option 2 applies the same formula as in the official needs assessment funding methodology but uses an average of filings from FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15, with the exception of civil traffic infraction filings and excluding any negative net need. This option uses existing FTE in the Case Management (CC 122) and Drug Court (CC 217) cost centers, based on FY 2016-17 allocations (see **Attachment B**). Based on this methodology, an additional 24.0 FTE are needed. The positions would be funded at the Court Program Specialist II level, totaling \$1,480,104. (See **Attachment A**.)

Option 3 – FTE Need Based on Proposed Ratio by Court Division

Option 3 applies a ratio of case management FTE per judge by division of court in order to provide more directed support in the divisions where it is most needed. This option uses the number of judges by division, which were self-reported on the Judicial Needs Application by judicial FTE as of July 1, 2015. The number of existing case management FTE by division is based on information reported by the circuits as of July 2016 (see **Attachment C**). Based on this methodology, an additional 50.0 FTE are needed. The positions would be funded at the Court Program Specialist II level, for a total cost of \$3,083,550. (See **Attachment D**.)

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 4: Case Management (continued)

Please note, if additional resources are appropriated, circuit allotments will be determined during the FY 2017-18 allocation process. Allotments may be determined using a methodology different than that used in developing the LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve Option 3.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

The TCBC approved Option 3.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request
Case Management**

Circuit	FY 2016-17 FTE ¹	Option 1: Maximum Filings Using 1:5,500 Filings Ratio ²			Option 2: Average Filings Using 1:5,500 Filings Ratio ²		
		Three-Year Maximum Filings ³	Total Need (Rounded to whole FTE)	Net Need FTE ⁵	Three-Year Average Filings ⁴	Total Need (Rounded to whole FTE)	Net Need FTE ⁵
1	14.0	74,497	14.0	0.0	68,382	12.0	0.0
2	6.0	42,041	8.0	2.0	37,937	8.0	2.0
3	7.0	19,472	8.0	1.0	17,497	8.0	1.0
4	22.0	125,243	23.0	1.0	114,763	21.0	0.0
5	12.0	88,986	16.0	4.0	79,028	14.0	2.0
6	24.0	148,559	27.0	3.0	135,337	25.0	1.0
7	17.5	99,100	18.0	0.5	90,017	16.0	0.0
8	7.0	41,673	8.0	1.0	36,968	8.0	1.0
9	21.0	164,745	30.0	9.0	148,564	27.0	6.0
10	12.5	85,034	15.0	2.5	72,831	13.0	0.5
11	50.0	313,496	57.0	7.0	281,375	51.0	1.0
12	11.0	72,587	13.0	2.0	65,680	12.0	1.0
13	23.0	165,535	30.0	7.0	147,074	27.0	4.0
14	8.0	38,171	8.0	0.0	34,643	8.0	0.0
15	22.0	158,077	29.0	7.0	127,897	23.0	1.0
16	8.0	10,985	8.0	0.0	9,490	8.0	0.0
17	34.0	221,624	40.0	6.0	194,934	35.0	1.0
18	14.5	94,054	17.0	2.5	83,865	15.0	0.5
19	9.0	59,016	11.0	2.0	53,299	10.0	1.0
20	18.0	115,426	21.0	3.0	101,778	19.0	1.0
Total	340.5	2,138,321	401.0	60.5	1,901,358	360.0	24.0

¹ Includes case management FTE in cost centers 122 (Case Management) and 217 (Drug Court).

² Based on current funding methodology of a 1:5,500 filings ratio and a floor of 8.0 FTE

³ Three-year maximum filings based on fiscal years 2012-13 to 2014-15 and does not include civil traffic infraction filings.

⁴ Three-year average filings based on fiscal years 2012-13 to 2014-15 and does not include civil traffic infraction filings.

⁵ Net need does not include circuits with a negative need.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
 Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2016-17

Circuit	Case Management - CC 122			Drug Court - CC217	Post-Adjudicatory Drug Court - CC 753	Veterans Court - CC 377		Mental Health Diversion Program - CC 378	Juvenile Drug Court
	FTE	OPS 030000	Contracted Services 100777	FTE	FTE	Recurring Veterans Court 103770	Nonrecurring Veterans Court 103770	Nonrecurring Contracted Services 100777	Contracted Services (Non-Recurring)
1	12.0			1.0	1.0	\$300,000			
2	6.0					\$125,000		\$200,000	
3	6.0			1.0					
4	21.0		\$924	1.0		\$350,000	\$112,032		
5	11.0	\$21,313		1.0	1.0				
6	24.0	\$14,600			2.0	\$300,000	\$300,000		
7	15.5			2.0	1.0				
8	7.0					\$150,000			
9	19.0			2.0	2.0	\$200,000			
10	12.5				2.0				
11	48.0			2.0				\$250,000	
12	9.0			2.0			\$300,000		
13	22.0		\$86,400	1.0	3.0		\$150,000		
14	7.0			1.0					
15	21.0			1.0					
16	6.0			2.0					
17	33.0			1.0	2.0				
18	12.5			2.0			\$150,000		\$260,000
19	7.0			2.0					
20	18.0						\$105,000		
Total	317.5	\$35,913	\$87,324	22.0	14.0	\$1,425,000	\$1,117,032	\$450,000	\$260,000

**Trial Court Budget Commission
 August 11, 2016, Meeting
 FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request
 Case Management FTE by Court Division¹**

Circuit	Circuit Criminal	Circuit Civil	County Criminal	County Civil	Family					Juvenile	Probate / Guar.	Other / General	Drug Court ²	Veterans Court CC 377	Mental Health Diversion CC 378	Total
					Pro Se	DV/ DR	UFC	Other/ Unsp.	Total Family							
1					5.50	3.50	2.00		11.00			1.00	2.00	4.00		18.00
2					3.50				3.50			2.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	8.00
3		2.00			3.25	1.00		0.25	4.50				0.50			7.00
4		1.00				3.00		14.00	17.00			3.00	1.00	2.00		24.00
5	1.00	3.50				7.50		1.00	8.50	0.75	0.25					14.00
6		4.00					5.00	12.00	17.00			3.00	6.00	2.00		32.00
7	2.00	1.50						9.00	9.00	2.00	1.00		3.00			18.50
8	2.00							5.00	5.00					0.30		7.30
9	1.00	1.00				3.00		11.00	14.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.00		25.00
10	1.00	1.00			4.00	0.50	4.00	1.00	9.50		1.00		2.00			14.50
11	7.00	4.00	1.00			8.00	1.00	13.00	22.00	6.00	6.00	2.00	2.00		2.00	52.00
12						3.00	3.00		6.00		2.00	1.00	2.00			11.00
13					9.00	2.00			11.00	7.00	2.00	2.00	4.00			26.00
14	1.75	0.75						4.25	4.25			0.25	1.00			8.00
15	1.00	4.00		1.00				7.00	7.00	6.00	3.00					22.00
16		1.50				2.00		2.00	4.00		0.50		2.00			8.00
17	1.00	4.00				5.00	4.00	8.00	17.00	8.00	2.00		4.00			36.00
18	1.00	5.00						3.00	3.00	1.00	2.50		2.00			14.50
19		0.75					0.50	4.00	4.50		1.75	1.00	2.00			10.00
20		5.00						13.00	13.00					1.00		19.00
Total:	18.75	39.00	1.00	1.00	25.25	38.50	19.50	107.50	190.75	31.75	23.00	16.25	38.00	12.30	3.00	374.80
Percent:	5.0%	10.4%	0.3%	0.3%	6.7%	10.3%	5.2%	28.7%	50.9%	8.5%	6.1%	4.3%	10.1%	3.3%	0.8%	100.0%

¹ As reported by circuits. Includes FTE in all court divisions as well as OPS and contractual case management services.

² Includes Post-Adjudicatory Drug Court

Trial Court Budget Commission

August 11, 2016, Meeting

FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

FMC Recommendation - Option 3: Case Management FTE Need Based on Proposed Ratio by Division

Circuit	Circuit Criminal 1:3 Ratio				Circuit Civil 1:3 Ratio				Family		Juvenile 1:2 Ratio				Probate/Guardianship 1:3 Ratio				Grand Total Net Need FTE
	Judicial FTE ¹	Case Manager FTE ²	Total Need	Net Need FTE	Judicial FTE ³	Case Manager FTE ⁴	Total Need FTE	Net Need FTE	Judicial FTE ⁵	Case Manager FTE ⁶	Judicial FTE ⁷	Case Manager FTE ⁸	Total Need FTE	Net Need FTE	Judicial FTE	Case Manager FTE	Total Need FTE	Net Need FTE	
1	7.6	6.0	2.5	0.0	4.9	0.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	11.0	4.6	0.0	2.3	2.0	1.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	4.0
2	5.9	2.5	2.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	1.4	1.0	3.2	3.5	1.5	0.0	0.8	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.0	2.0
3	2.7	0.5	0.9	0.0	1.5	2.0	0.5	0.0	1.5	4.5	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
4	10.8	3.0	3.6	1.0	9.1	1.0	3.0	2.0	8.4	17.0	3.6	0.0	1.8	2.0	1.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.0
5	9.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	8.0	3.5	2.7	0.0	9.7	8.5	2.3	0.8	1.2	0.0	2.0	0.3	0.7	0.0	2.0
6	14.0	8.0	4.7	0.0	11.0	4.0	3.7	0.0	16.0	17.0	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.0
7	8.5	5.0	2.8	0.0	6.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.4	1.0	0.8	0.0	1.0
8	4.0	2.3	1.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.9	1.0	4.2	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	2.0
9	16.0	7.0	5.3	0.0	10.0	1.0	3.3	2.0	8.0	14.0	7.0	1.0	3.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.0	5.0
10	9.2	3.0	3.1	0.0	6.8	1.0	2.3	1.0	6.5	9.5	3.7	0.0	1.9	2.0	1.3	1.0	0.4	0.0	3.0
11	25.2	11.0	8.4	0.0	24.4	4.0	8.1	4.0	14.7	22.0	8.6	6.0	4.3	0.0	3.8	6.0	1.3	0.0	4.0
12	6.7	2.0	2.2	0.0	5.2	0.0	1.7	2.0	5.3	6.0	2.1	0.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	2.0	0.4	0.0	3.0
13	11.3	4.0	3.8	0.0	15.4	0.0	5.1	5.0	8.6	11.0	7.0	7.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.3	0.0	5.0
14	4.0	2.8	1.3	0.0	2.5	0.8	0.8	0.0	3.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
15	8.9	1.0	3.0	2.0	11.5	4.0	3.8	0.0	5.7	7.0	4.8	6.0	2.4	0.0	3.1	3.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
16	0.9	2.0	0.3	0.0	1.2	1.5	0.4	0.0	1.2	4.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0
17	19.0	5.0	6.3	1.0	16.5	4.0	5.5	2.0	11.0	17.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	0.8	0.0	3.0
18	9.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.8	5.0	1.9	0.0	6.7	3.0	3.6	1.0	1.8	1.0	0.8	2.5	0.3	0.0	1.0
19	6.1	2.0	2.0	0.0	5.1	0.8	1.7	1.0	4.2	4.5	2.6	0.0	1.3	1.0	0.8	1.8	0.3	0.0	2.0
20	8.0	1.0	2.7	2.0	9.1	5.0	3.0	0.0	8.0	13.0	3.5	0.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	0.0	0.6	1.0	5.0
Total	186.6	72.1	62.2	8.0	160.7	39.0	53.6	24.0	137.1	190.8	69.4	31.8	34.7	16.0	29.6	23.0	9.9	2.0	50.0
Percent	0.3	0.2			0.3	0.1			0.2	0.5	0.1	0.1			0.0	0.1			

¹ Includes Circuit Criminal division judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

² Includes case management FTE as reported by circuits in Circuit Criminal, Drug Court (CC 217 and CC 753), Veterans Court (CC 377), and Mental Health Diversion Court (CC 378).

³ Includes Circuit Civil division judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁴ Includes case management FTE as reported by circuits in the Civil division including Foreclosure case managers.

⁵ Includes Family Division judges in the Domestic Relations and Other categories as self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁶ Includes case management FTE as reported by circuits in the Family division including Domestic Violence, Domestic Relations, Unified Family Court, Pro Se litigant support, and Other or Unspecified Family case managers.

⁷ Includes Delinquency and Dependency judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁸ Includes case management FTE as reported by circuits in Juvenile, Dependency, Delinquency, and Juvenile Specialty or Drug courts.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 5: Staff Attorneys

Background

As part of the FY 2010-11 and FY 2012-13 legislative budget requests (LBRs), the State Courts System (SCS) requested additional trial court staff attorney resources using a methodology based on a ratio of one staff attorney for every two existing judges (staff attorneys for new judges are considered during the certification process).

In recognition of the economic downturn experienced across the state, coupled with anticipated increases in workload associated with legislation regarding the often complex and legally significant matters related to a sentence of death, the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) began using a more targeted approach for requesting additional staff attorney resources. In the FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 LBRs, the TCBC limited requesting additional staff attorney resources to post-conviction matters related to sentences of death. The approved methodology is based on 10 years of cumulative capital murder conviction data, the official judicial Delphi case weight for Capital Murder cases, and a ratio of staff attorney workload associated with these cases to the FTE equivalent of judicial workload. None of these requested resources have been funded. The trial courts have not received funding for additional staff attorney resources since FY 2006-07.

The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), in their December 2015 report, suggested “the circuit courts may have a need for additional staff attorneys, but the magnitude of that need is not clearly defined with data. The numbers of death penalty cases, complex civil cases, and post-conviction motions are more relevant measures of need than the ratio of attorneys to judges. A ratio of one staff attorney for two judges may not be sufficient for criminal court judges but for other divisions, a lower ratio may be sufficient.” In response to the OPPAGA report, the TCBC directed staff of the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) to develop alternative legislative budget request funding formulas for staff attorneys for consideration at the July 2016 Funding Methodology Committee (FMC) meeting.

Current Issue

At their June 17, 2016, meeting, the TCBC directed the FMC to provide recommendations for determining staff attorney needs for consideration in the FY 2017-18 LBR. OSCA staff have developed three options for the FMC’s and TCBC’s consideration. The suggested methodologies have been updated to reflect the new judicial case weights and minutes proposed in the 2015 Florida Judicial Workload Assessment Final Report developed by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC).

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 5: Staff Attorneys (continued)

	FTE	LBR
Option 1 – Ratio of 1 Staff Attorney for every 2 Judges	105.0	\$7,766,010
Option 2 – Targeted for Death Penalty Workload	42.0	\$3,106,404
Option 3 – Targeted Ratio by Court Division	39.5	\$2,921,499

Options for Consideration

Option 1: Recommend filing an LBR based on the current methodology using a ratio of 1 staff attorney for every 2 existing judges for a request of 105.0 FTE staff attorney positions totaling \$7,766,010. (See Attachment A.)

Option 2: Recommend filing an LBR based on a targeted approach for death penalty staff attorneys for a request of 42.0 FTE staff attorney positions totaling \$3,106,404. (See Attachment B.)

Option 3: Recommend filing an LBR based on proposed ratios of staff attorney support per judge by division of court for a request of 39.5 FTE staff attorney positions totaling \$2,921,499. (See Attachment C.)

Option 4: Do not file an LBR for Staff Attorney FTE at this time.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve Option 3.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

The TCBC approved Option 3.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
Trial Court Staff Attorneys
Proposed FY 2017-18 LBR - Option 1**

A	B	C	D	E	F
			Funding Methodology		
Circuit	Number of Circuit Court Judges	FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Allotment ¹	Trial Court Staff Attorney Total Need ² (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Trial Court Staff Attorney Net Need ³ (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Proposed FY 2017-18 LBR ⁴
1	24	9	12	3	3
2 ⁶	16	8	9	1	1
3	7	3	4	1	1
4	35	13.5	18	5	5
5	31	10	16	6	6
6	45	15	23	8	8
7	27	8.5	14	6	6
8	13	6	7	1	1
9	43	14	22	8	8
10	28	10	14	4	4
11	80	25	40	15	15
12 ⁶	21	7	12	5	5
13	45	16	23	7	7
14	11	6	6	0	0
15	35	11.5	18	7	7
16	4	1	2	1	1
17	58	17	29	12	12
18	26	9	13	4	4
19	19	5	10	5	5
20	31	10	16	6	6
Total	599	204.5	308	105	105

¹ FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Allotment includes positions in CC 258 and CC 257 (post conviction).

² Trial Court Staff Attorney Total Need is based on the current funding methodology ratio of 1 Staff Attorney to every 2 circuit court judges, rounded to the nearest whole FTE.

³ Trial Court Staff Attorney net need is the difference between Trial Court Staff Attorney total need and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE allotment.

⁴ Proposed FY 2017-18 LBR is based on Trial Court Staff Attorney net need.

⁵ RIF FTE includes reductions as a result of HB 7009 and the FY 2008-09 Reduction in Force.

⁶ The 2nd Circuit includes 1.0 FTE prison petition Staff Attorney in their FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Allotment and Trial Court Staff Attorney Total Need. The 12th Circuit includes 1.0 FTE Jimmy Ryce Staff Attorney in their FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Allotment and Trial Court Staff Attorney Total Need.

Note: Resources associated with new judges are addressed in the certification process.

Trial Court Budget Commission

August 11, 2016, Meeting

Proposed FY 2017-18 Staff Attorney LBR - Option 2

Death Penalty Staff Attorneys Only (Based on 10 Years of Cumulative Convictions)

A	B	C	D	E	F
Capital Murder Delphi Case Weight (in Minutes)				3,273	
Circuit	10 Year Cumulative Capital Murder Convictions ¹	Weighted Judicial Workload (in Minutes) Associated with Capital Murder Convictions Based on 10 Years of Cumulative Convictions	Available Minutes Per Judge	Estimated Number of Capital Murder Judges (Unrounded)	FTE Need based on 2:1 Ratio (Rounded to the Nearest 0.5 FTE)
1	104	340,392	77,400	4.4	2.0
2	57	186,561	77,400	2.4	1.0
3	30	98,190	77,400	1.3	0.5
4	184	602,232	77,400	7.8	4.0
5	69	225,837	77,400	2.9	1.5
6	166	543,318	77,400	7.0	3.5
7	86	281,478	77,400	3.6	2.0
8	26	85,098	77,400	1.1	0.5
9	212	693,876	77,400	9.0	4.5
10	75	245,475	77,400	3.2	1.5
11	158	517,134	77,400	6.7	3.5
12	64	209,472	77,400	2.7	1.5
13	109	356,757	77,400	4.6	2.5
14	35	114,555	77,400	1.5	0.5
15	172	562,956	77,400	7.3	3.5
16	5	16,365	77,400	0.2	0.5
17	161	526,953	77,400	6.8	3.5
18	137	448,401	77,400	5.8	3.0
19	63	206,199	77,400	2.7	1.5
20	38	124,374	77,400	1.6	1.0
Total	1,951	6,385,623		82.5	42.0

¹ The 10 Year Cumulative Capital Murder Convictions include data from FY 2005-06 through FY 2014-15. FY 2014-15 includes annualized dispositions for Hillsborough County based on data from July 2014 through December 2014.

Note: The Summary Reporting System statistics provided above were extracted from a dynamic data base and may be amended by the Clerk of Court.

Trial Court Budget Commission August 11, 2016, Meeting FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

FMC Recommendation - Staff Attorney FTE Need Based on Proposed Ratio by Division - Option 3

Circuit	Circuit Criminal 2:1 Ratio		Circuit Civil 2.5:1 Ratio		Family 3:1 Ratio		Probate/Guardianship 2.5:1 Ratio		Total Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Need	FY 2016-17 Trial Court Staff Attorney Allocations	Trial Court Staff Attorney FTE Net Need ⁵
	Judicial FTE ¹	Staff Attorney FTE Need	Judicial FTE ²	Staff Attorney FTE Need	Judicial FTE ³	Staff Attorney FTE Need	Judicial FTE ⁴	Staff Attorney FTE NEED			
1	7.60	3.80	4.90	1.96	9.85	3.28	1.25	0.50	9.54	9	1.00
2	5.85	2.93	4.20	1.68	4.69	1.56	0.66	0.26	6.43	8	0.00
3	2.68	1.34	1.54	0.62	1.97	0.66	0.46	0.18	2.80	3	0.00
4	10.75	5.38	9.05	3.62	12.00	4.00	1.30	0.52	13.52	13.5	0.50
5	9.00	4.50	8.00	3.20	12.00	4.00	2.00	0.80	12.50	10	3.00
6	14.00	7.00	11.00	4.40	16.75	5.58	2.50	1.00	17.98	15	3.00
7	8.50	4.25	6.00	2.40	10.00	3.33	2.40	0.96	10.94	8.5	2.50
8	4.00	2.00	2.70	1.08	5.15	1.72	0.35	0.14	4.94	6	0.00
9	16.00	8.00	10.00	4.00	15.00	5.00	1.00	0.40	17.40	14	3.00
10	9.20	4.60	6.80	2.72	10.15	3.38	1.25	0.50	11.20	10	1.00
11	25.20	12.60	24.36	9.74	23.30	7.77	3.75	1.50	31.61	25	7.00
12	6.70	3.35	5.20	2.08	7.40	2.47	1.20	0.48	8.38	7	1.00
13	11.25	5.63	15.40	6.16	15.60	5.20	1.00	0.40	17.39	16	1.00
14	4.00	2.00	2.50	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.40	4.40	6	0.00
15	8.90	4.45	11.50	4.60	10.50	3.50	3.10	1.24	13.79	11.5	2.50
16	0.90	0.45	1.15	0.46	1.50	0.50	0.40	0.16	1.57	1	1.00
17	19.00	9.50	16.50	6.60	19.00	6.33	2.50	1.00	23.43	17	6.00
18	9.00	4.50	5.75	2.30	10.30	3.43	0.80	0.32	10.55	9	2.00
19	6.10	3.05	5.08	2.03	6.78	2.26	0.75	0.30	7.64	5	3.00
20	8.00	4.00	9.10	3.64	11.50	3.83	1.90	0.76	12.23	10	2.00
Total	186.6	93.3	160.7	64.3	206.4	68.8	29.6	11.8	238.2	204.5	39.50
Percent	31.2%		26.8%		34.5%		4.9%				

¹ Includes Circuit Criminal division judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

² Includes Circuit Civil division judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

³ Includes Family Division judges (Domestic Relations, Delinquency, Dependency, and Other) self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁴ Includes Probate division judges self-reported by FTE as part of the Judicial Needs Application as of July 1, 2015. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁵ Rounded to the .50 FTE level and does include negative net need values.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 6: Court Reporting

Background

For the FY 2010-11 legislative budget request (LBR) process, the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) approved a funding methodology for determining court reporting needs based on a ceiling applied to all recurring dollars (excluding equipment and maintenance expenditures) for each circuit. An LBR, based on the ceiling model, was filed for FY 2010-11; however, the request was not funded. The trial courts have not received additional court reporting resources since FY 2007-08.

Current Issue

At their June 17, 2016, meeting, the TCBC directed the FMC to provide recommendations for determining court reporting needs for consideration in the FY 2017-18 LBR. OSCA staff have developed two options for the FMC's and TCBC's consideration.

	LBR
Option 1 – Funding Ceiling Methodology	\$1,315,372
Option 2 – Unit Cost Model	\$1,347,244

The first option (see **Attachment A**) utilizes the current funding methodology in which a funding ceiling is applied to each circuit's FY 2016-17 total budget. The ceiling is calculated using FY 2015-16 UDR data and a standard statewide cost of \$50 per steno/real-time hour, \$25 per digital/analog hour, \$7 per transcript page, and \$25 per media copy. A 10% non-direct services modifier devoted to overhead/coordination is applied. The proposed FY 2017-18 LBR amount is the difference between the FY 2016-17 funding ceiling and FY 2016-17 total budget, excluding negative values.

The second option (see **Attachment B**) uses a unit cost model, using three-year average relevant filings for years FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14, and FY 2014-15. With this methodology, unit costs are calculated for small, medium, and large circuits, based on current budget allotment, minus the estimated shared costs for providing services under the court reporting cost sharing arrangement and projected cost recovery revenue. The additional funding need is based on the amount of funding needed to bring five underfunded circuits up to the minimum unit cost.

Under both options, the amount of funding identified is not yet specified for contractual or FTEs/salary dollars. The type of resources would need to be determined from circuit input prior to submitting the LBR.

A third option is to not file an LBR.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 6: Court Reporting (continued)

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve *Option 1* and direct OSCA staff to work with the circuits to determine the specific type of funding (contractual or FTE) needed.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

Do not file an LBR.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
Court Reporting - Option 1
FY 2016-17 Funding Ceiling Table

A	B	C	D	E	F
FY 2015-16					
Estimated Hours, Pages, and Media¹					
Circuit	Steno/ Real-time Hours (\$50)	Digital/ Analog Hours (\$25)	Transcript Pages (\$7)	Media Copies (\$25)	FY 2016-17 Funding Ceiling ²
1	3,457	9,312	81,288	866	\$1,095,948
2	3,731	9,394	79,551	539	\$1,090,905
3	502	4,669	20,120	247	\$317,724
4	26,447	14,251	9,669	619	\$1,937,961
5	544	22,667	5,233	1,779	\$742,479
6	3,768	29,159	182,925	673	\$2,436,143
7	3,335	18,552	16,238	1,694	\$865,223
8	1,187	9,449	40,952	692	\$659,493
9	6,464	33,880	168,423	1,291	\$2,619,580
10	4,667	17,868	83,059	1,183	\$1,420,142
11	17,568	55,652	14,313	1,032	\$2,635,260
12	3,562	28,983	25,439	1,269	\$1,223,720
13	5,235	38,203	160,957	1,772	\$2,626,606
14	1,035	4,631	14,890	687	\$317,823
15	1,013	24,973	133,704	2,500	\$1,840,743
16	415	2,580	2,438	207	\$118,240
17	20,883	37,244	53,811	1,372	\$2,624,850
18	338	32,828	2,113	1,783	\$986,663
19	230	15,955	6,687	2,801	\$579,930
20	2,967	20,275	1,042	2,140	\$787,621
Total	107,348	430,525	1,102,852	25,146	\$26,927,054

¹ FY 2015-16 estimated hours, pages, and media are based on annualized data reported from July 2015 to May 2016.

² FY 2016-17 funding ceiling for direct services was calculated by summing \$50 multiplied by steno/real-time hours, \$25 multiplied by digital/analog hours, \$7 per transcript page, and \$25 per media copy. In addition, a Non-Direct Services Modifier of 10% was applied. The funding ceiling does not determine the allotment or LBR for maintenance.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
Court Reporting - Option 1
FY 2017-18 Proposed LBR Using Current Methodology

A	B	C	D	F	G	H
FY 2016-17 Budget Allotment¹ (CC 129, CC 267, CC 729)						
Circuit	FTE (CC 129, CC267, CC 729)	Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses (CC 129, CC 267, CC 729)	Adjusted Beginning Contractual Allotment - (CC 129)	Total Budget	FY 2016-17 Funding Ceiling	FMC Recommendation: FY 2017-18 Proposed LBR Using Current Methodology ²
1	22	\$1,482,848	\$18,091	\$1,500,939	\$1,095,948	\$0
2	15	\$1,033,054	\$10,495	\$1,043,549	\$1,090,905	\$47,356
3	6	\$367,601	\$2,041	\$369,642	\$317,724	\$0
4	1	\$83,019	\$1,314,551	\$1,397,570	\$1,937,961	\$540,391
5	16	\$884,682	\$35,125	\$919,807	\$742,479	\$0
6	39	\$2,208,166	\$447,039	\$2,655,205	\$2,436,143	\$0
7	14	\$836,612	\$117,850	\$954,462	\$865,223	\$0
8	16	\$976,143	\$33,816	\$1,009,959	\$659,493	\$0
9	45	\$2,974,380	\$29,749	\$3,004,129	\$2,619,580	\$0
10	14	\$771,694	\$396,075	\$1,167,769	\$1,420,142	\$252,373
11	4	\$211,990	\$2,064,350	\$2,276,340	\$2,635,260	\$358,920
12	18	\$1,203,287	\$20,509	\$1,223,796	\$1,223,720	\$0
13	14	\$1,196,598	\$1,238,065	\$2,434,663	\$2,626,606	\$191,943
14	7	\$503,551	\$8,521	\$512,072	\$317,823	\$0
15	23.75	\$1,375,941	\$261,095	\$1,637,036	\$1,840,743	\$203,707
16	5	\$322,253	\$13,740	\$335,993	\$118,240	\$0
17	31	\$1,692,012	\$676,997	\$2,369,009	\$2,624,850	\$255,841
18	12	\$722,735	\$151,064	\$873,799	\$986,663	\$112,864
19	13	\$705,502	\$61,137	\$766,639	\$579,930	\$0
20	15	\$786,455	\$252,246	\$1,038,701	\$787,621	\$0
Total	330.75	\$20,338,523	\$7,152,555	\$27,491,078	\$26,927,054	\$1,315,372

¹ FY 2016-17 budget allotment includes CC 129, CC 267, and CC 729 (cost sharing). Beginning Contractual Allotments were adjusted to subtract maintenance costs based on FY 2015-16 maintenance expenditures.

² FY 2017-18 proposed LBR using current methodology is the difference between FY 2016-17 funding ceiling and FY 2016-17 total budget, excluding negative values.

Trial Court Budget Commission

August 11, 2016, Meeting

Court Reporting - Option 2

Based on Unit Cost Using Three-Year Average Relevant Filings

Circuit	FTE (CC 129, CC 267, and CC 729)	FY 2016-17 Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses (CC 129, CC 267, and CC 729)	FY 2016-17 Beginning Contractual Allotment (CC 129, CC 267)	FY 2016-17 Total Budget Allotment ¹	FY 2016-17 Adjusted Budget ²	Three-Year Average Filings (FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15) ³	Unit Cost	Proposed Minimum Unit Cost	Estimated Court Costs based on Minimum Unit Cost	Additional Need
Small										
2	15	\$996,745	\$66,315	\$1,063,060	\$825,881	21,676	\$38.10	-	-	-
3	6	\$349,921	\$21,626	\$371,547	\$303,851	10,979	\$27.68	-	-	-
8	16	\$929,585	\$79,960	\$1,009,545	\$859,771	24,419	\$35.21	-	-	-
14	7	\$484,486	\$27,689	\$512,175	\$425,525	23,352	\$18.22	\$27.68	\$646,393	\$220,867
16	5	\$312,037	\$44,994	\$357,031	\$287,656	5,936	\$48.46	-	-	-
Medium										
1	22	\$1,410,746	\$118,040	\$1,528,786	\$1,112,342	44,715	\$24.88	-	-	-
5	16	\$865,482	\$207,172	\$1,072,654	\$994,943	42,828	\$23.23	-	-	-
7	14	\$789,255	\$158,138	\$947,393	\$840,291	57,538	\$14.60	\$18.64	\$1,072,508	\$232,217
10	14	\$758,413	\$452,675	\$1,211,088	\$841,988	45,163	\$18.64	-	-	-
12	18	\$1,142,308	\$88,162	\$1,230,470	\$1,140,306	37,407	\$30.48	-	-	-
18	12	\$685,309	\$197,683	\$882,992	\$833,235	49,713	\$16.76	\$18.64	\$926,650	\$93,415
19	13	\$657,252	\$127,405	\$784,657	\$739,193	30,847	\$23.96	-	-	-
Large										
4	1	\$81,733	\$1,404,029	\$1,485,762	\$1,484,077	65,530	\$22.65	-	-	-
6	39	\$2,140,465	\$657,391	\$2,797,856	\$2,419,732	77,600	\$31.18	-	-	-
9	46	\$2,886,135	\$161,786	\$3,047,921	\$2,742,257	79,554	\$34.47	-	-	-
11	4	\$211,990	\$2,101,831	\$2,313,821	\$2,208,402	132,560	\$16.66	\$21.97	\$2,912,351	\$703,948
13	14	\$1,150,076	\$1,350,190	\$2,500,266	\$2,096,645	82,529	\$25.40	-	-	-
15	23.75	\$1,331,529	\$365,532	\$1,697,061	\$1,350,718	65,886	\$20.50	\$21.97	\$1,447,515	\$96,797
17	31	\$1,633,012	\$847,375	\$2,480,387	\$2,105,172	81,948	\$25.69	-	-	-
20	15	\$781,205	\$534,341	\$1,315,546	\$1,284,723	58,488	\$21.97	-	-	-
Total LBR Request									\$1,347,244	

¹ Total budget allotment was calculated by summing Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses and beginning contractual allotments for CC 129 (Court Reporting), CC 729 (Cost Sharing), and CC 267 (Cost Recovery).

² FY 2016-17 Adjusted Budget is based on the FY 2016-17 Total Budget Allotment minus the shared costs for providing services under the court reporting cost sharing arrangement, and FY 2016-17 projected cost recovery revenue.

³ Case filings include felony, misdemeanors, worthless checks, municipal ordinance, county ordinance, criminal traffic, DUI, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, guardianship, Baker and Substance Abuse Act, and Involuntary Civil Commitment.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 7: General Magistrate

Background

The State Courts System has relied on funding formulas to define what is reasonable and necessary to fund the elements of the court system in order to ensure adequate and equitable funding for all circuits. The funding methodology approved for the General Magistrates element is based on a case weighted methodology for general magistrates and a ratio of one administrative support position per magistrate. If the funding methodology indicated a need for 0.5 FTE, the number was rounded up. Current FTE numbers were subtracted from the whole numbers identified by the funding methodology to obtain additional FTE need. This methodology does not expand on the use of these resources within the judicial system to divisions where general magistrates are not used statewide.

In November 2014, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) entered into a contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to evaluate judicial workload in Florida. Funding for the workload study was provided by the TCBC. In June 2015, the Supreme Court decided to include quasi-judicial officers such as senior judges, general magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers as part of the workload study. The NCSC draft report assessing the workload of judicial and quasi-judicial officers was received in May 2016. In June 2016, the Supreme Court approved the updated case weights from the NCSC report (see new weights in **Hearing Officer and General Magistrates Comparison of 2007 and 2016 Case Weights**).

The new workload study documents the important contribution made by general magistrates in the efficient and effective resolution of cases. However, the study recognizes the variations across counties and circuits in the availability and current use of general magistrates based on the time study results. The new weights developed in the 2016 workload study did not account for additional need in order to expand resources to other divisions. The case weights represent workload that incorporates sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing of the cases that are handled by the existing resources available in the trial courts.

In previous years, the maximum total and net needs were calculated based on three years of forecasted filings developed as part of the process for certification of need for new judges. New case types were incorporated in the workload study, and three years of forecasted filings for those case types are not available. In order to be comparable with the process used in previous years, the general magistrates' case weights are applied to the maximum number of actual filings over a three-year period, rather than forecasted filings, to determine the maximum total and net need by circuit.

The trial courts have not received additional general magistrate resources since the initial funding in FY 2004-05, during Revision 7 to Article V. Additionally, general magistrates and

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue7: General Magistrate (continued)

their support staff were reduced by 23.75 FTE in 2008. The last request submitted by the Court for general magistrate resources was for the FY 2012-13 LBR. This request was submitted by the trial courts as an attempt to improve efficiencies in the management of the trial courts' workload in absence of additional judicial resources, but was not funded. Finally, the trial courts have not received additional judicial resources since FY 2007-08.

Current Issue

At the June 17, 2016, meeting, the TCBC directed staff to examine the need and cost for additional general magistrates in the trial courts as part of the FY 2017-18 LBR. OSCA staff have prepared four options for the FMC's and TCBC's consideration.

	FTE	LBR
Option 1 – Need based on maximum filings over 3 years	54.5	\$4,506,088
Option 2 – Need based on average filings over 3 years	33.5	\$2,671,806
Option 3 – Divisional need based on maximum filings over 3 years	68.0	\$5,656,240
Option 4 – Divisional need based on average filings over 3 years	48.0	\$3,879,922

Total and net need for general magistrates and administrative support are reflected in the following four attachments. In **Attachment A**, the total need is based on the maximum number of filings over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 for non-capital murder, sexual offense, felony drug court, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, Substance Abuse Act, and other social cases. The total need is calculated in two steps. The first step estimates general magistrate workload by multiplying filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, general magistrate total need is calculated by dividing the estimated general magistrate workload by the total time available for case related work. Additionally, administrative support need is calculated to achieve the 1:1 ratio of general magistrates to support staff.

In **Attachment B**, the total need is calculated similarly to Attachment A, but is based on the average number of filing over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15, for the same case types.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

Fiscal Year 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

Issue 7: General Magistrate (continued)

In **Attachment C**, the total need is calculated similarly to Attachment A, but is divided across the division of circuit court in comparing maximum total need to actual general magistrate assignment. As noted above in the Background section, this option does not represent an expansion in the use of general magistrates to new divisions.

In **Attachment D**, the total need is calculated similarly to Attachment B, but is divided across the division of circuit court in comparing average total need to actual general magistrate assignment. As noted above in the Background section, this option does not represent an expansion in the use of general magistrates to new divisions.

Options for Consideration

Option 1: File an LBR for the General Magistrate element (22.0 Magistrate FTEs; 32.5 Administrative Support FTEs; for a total of \$4,506,088) based on the official methodology, using the maximum actual filings over three fiscal years.

Option 2: File an LBR for the General Magistrate element (12.0 Magistrate FTEs; 21.5 Administrative Support FTEs; for a total of \$2,671,806) based on the official methodology, using the average actual filings over three fiscal years.

Option 3: File an LBR for the General Magistrate element (28.0 Magistrate FTEs; 40.0 Administrative Support FTEs; for a total of \$5,656,240) based on divisional need, using the maximum actual filings over three fiscal years.

Option 4: File an LBR for the General Magistrate element (18.0 Magistrate FTEs; 30.0 Administrative Support FTEs; for a total of \$3,879,922) based on divisional need, using the average actual filings over three fiscal years.

Option 5: Do not file an LBR for the General Magistrate element.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve Option 4.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation

The TCBC approved Option 5.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
General Magistrates
Background Statistics - Option 1**

A	B	C	D	E	F
	FY 2016-17 Allotment		Total Need		
Circuit	General Magistrate FTE Allotment	Administrative Support FTE Allotment	Total Need ¹	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Administrative Support Maximum Total Need ² (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)
1	3.5	3.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
2	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.0
3	1.0	0.0	1.4	1.0	1.0
4	7.0	6.0	7.1	7.0	7.0
5	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
6	7.25	7.0	7.3	7.0	7.0
7 ⁴	3.5	4.0	5.4	5.0	5.0
8	2.0	1.0	2.4	2.0	2.0
9	6.0	4.0	8.5	9.0	9.0
10	4.0	3.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
11	11.0	11.0	16.7	17.0	17.0
12	4.0	3.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
13	7.0	7.0	8.3	8.0	8.0
14	2.0	1.0	2.1	2.0	2.0
15	7.0	6.0	7.1	7.0	7.0
16	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.0
17	9.0	8.5	11.5	12.0	12.0
18	4.0	3.0	5.4	5.0	5.0
19	3.0	3.0	3.7	4.0	4.0
20	5.0	5.0	6.7	7.0	7.0
Total	93.25	82.5	116.5	116.0	116.0

¹ Total need reflects the maximum General Magistrate FTE total need over a three-year period. The total need is based on the maximum number of filings over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 for non-capital murder, sexual offense, felony drug court, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, UIFSA, other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, Substance Abuse Act, and other social. The total need was calculated in two steps. The first step estimated General Magistrate workload by multiplying filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, General Magistrate total need was calculated by dividing the estimated General Magistrate workload by the total time available for case related work.

² Administrative Support maximum total need assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrate.

³ Circuit 7 FY 2015-16 allotment has 0.5 FTE more Administrative Support FTE than General Magistrate FTE but is not considered in excess of the 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrates due to their total need.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016 Meeting**

**General Magistrates - Option 1
FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request**

A	B	C	D	E
	Net Need¹		FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request - Option 1	
Circuit	General Magistrate Net Need	Administrative Support Net Need	General Magistrate FTE	Administrative Support FTE
1	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.0
2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
4	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
6	-0.25	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.0
8	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
9	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
10	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
11	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
12	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
13	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
14	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
15	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
16 ²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.5
18	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
19	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
20	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Total	21.75	32.5	22.0	32.5

¹ Net Need is the difference between total need and FY 2016-17 FTE allotment.

² Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
General Magistrates
Background Statistics - Option 2**

A	B	C	D	E	F
	FY 2015-16 Allotment		Total Need		
Circuit	General Magistrate FTE Allotment	Administrative Support FTE Allotment	Total Need ¹	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Administrative Support Average Total Need ² (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)
1	3.5	3.0	4.3	4.0	4.0
2	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
3	1.0	0.0	1.2	1.0	1.0
4	7.0	6.0	6.4	6.0	6.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	5.0
6	7.25	7.0	6.8	7.0	7.0
7 ⁴	3.5	4.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
8	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
9	6.0	4.0	7.9	8.0	8.0
10	4.0	3.0	4.4	4.0	4.0
11	11.0	11.0	14.8	15.0	15.0
12	4.0	3.0	3.8	4.0	4.0
13	7.0	7.0	7.9	8.0	8.0
14	2.0	1.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
15	7.0	6.0	6.5	7.0	7.0
16	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0
17	9.0	8.5	10.1	10.0	10.0
18	4.0	3.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
19	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
20	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Total	93.25	82.5	105.2	105.0	105.0

¹ Total need reflects the average General Magistrate FTE total need over a three-year period. The total need is based on the average number of filings over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 for non-capital murder, sexual offense, felony drug court, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, UIFSA, other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, Substance Abuse Act, and other social. The total need was calculated in two steps. The first step estimated General Magistrate workload by multiplying filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, General Magistrate total need was calculated by dividing the estimated General Magistrate workload by the total time available for case related work.

² Administrative Support average total need assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrate.

³ Circuit 7 FY 2015-16 allotment has 0.5 FTE more Administrative Support FTE than General Magistrate FTE but is not considered in excess of the 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrates due to their total need.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting**

**General Magistrates - Option 2
FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request**

A	B	C	D	E
	Net Need¹		FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request - Option 2	
Circuit	General Magistrate Net Need	Administrative Support Net Need	General Magistrate FTE	Administrative Support FTE
1	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0
2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
4	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6	-0.25	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.0
8	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
9	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
10	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
11	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
12	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
13	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
14	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
15	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
16 ²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.5
18	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total	10.75	21.5	12.0	21.5

¹ Net Need is the difference between total need and FY 2016-17 FTE allotment.

² Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

Trial Court Budget Commission August 11, 2016, Meeting General Magistrates Background Statistics - Option 3 (Maximum Filings)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	Circuit Criminal		Circuit Civil		Family Court		Probate		Mental Health and Guardianship	
Circuit	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Unrounded) ¹
1	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.19	2.50	3.95	0.00	0.03	0.50	0.58
2	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.15	2.00	1.62	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.39
3	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.10	0.33	1.16	0.17	0.01	0.17	0.11
4	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.38	6.80	5.86	0.00	0.04	0.20	0.77
5	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.55	4.70	4.64	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.69
6	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.51	5.25	5.74	0.00	0.06	2.25	0.92
7	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.30	3.50	4.44	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.61
8	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.09	1.30	1.93	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.37
9	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.60	4.25	6.99	0.00	0.04	0.75	0.81
10	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.22	2.95	4.09	0.00	0.03	0.25	0.59
11	0.00	0.04	1.00	1.18	10.00	13.82	0.00	0.07	1.00	1.63
12	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.23	2.90	3.22	0.00	0.04	0.10	0.70
13	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.42	4.50	6.92	0.00	0.03	2.00	0.94
14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.50	1.77	0.00	0.01	0.50	0.19
15	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.56	5.80	5.79	0.00	0.06	1.20	0.69
16 ³	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.03	0.20	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02
17	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.87	6.00	9.12	2.00	0.06	1.00	1.37
18	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.32	3.60	4.45	0.00	0.04	0.40	0.61
19	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.24	2.78	3.02	0.00	0.03	0.23	0.39
20	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.50	3.85	5.42	0.00	0.06	0.40	0.74
Total	0.00	0.33	4.88	7.53	74.71	94.71	2.27	0.73	11.16	13.15

¹ Total need reflects the maximum General Magistrate FTE total need over a three-year period. The total need is based on the maximum number of filings over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 for non-capital murder, sexual offense, felony drug court, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, UIFSA, other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, Substance Abuse Act, and other social. The total need was calculated in two steps. The first step estimated General Magistrate workload by multiplying filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, General Magistrate total need was calculated by dividing the estimated General Magistrate workload by the total time available for case related work.

² Total current general magistrate FTE assignments may not be exact due to rounding. In addition, assignments were self reported by FTE equivalent as of July 1, 2015. Current assignments do not include 0.20 FTE assigned to Other County Civil.

³ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
General Magistrates - Option 3
FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request

A	B	C	D	E
	Circuit Civil	Family Court	Mental Health and Guardianship	Total
Circuit	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹
1	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
4	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
6	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
7	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
8	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
9	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0
10	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
11	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
12	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
13	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
16 ³	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
18	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Total	3.0	20.0	5.00	28.0

F	G	H
---	---	---

FY 2016-17 Administrative Support FTE	FY 2017-18 Administrative Support FTE Need ²	FY 2017-18 Proposed Administrative Support LBR ²
3.0	5.0	2.0
2.0	2.0	0.0
0.0	2.0	2.0
6.0	8.0	2.0
5.0	6.0	1.0
7.0	8.5	2.0
4.0	5.5	2.0
1.0	2.5	2.0
4.0	9.0	5.0
3.0	4.2	1.0
11.0	17.0	6.0
3.0	5.0	2.0
7.0	8.5	2.0
1.0	2.0	1.0
6.0	8.0	2.0
0.0	0.4	0.0
8.5	13.0	5.0
3.0	5.0	2.0
3.0	3.0	0.0
5.0	6.5	1.0
82.5	121.0	40.0

¹ Proposed General Magistrate LBR is the difference between total need and General Magistrate FTE assignments.

² FY 2017-18 Administrative Support FTE need is based on a 1:1 ratio to General Magistrates. FY 2017-18 Proposed Administrative Support LBR is based on the FY 2017-18 FTE need minus FY 2016-17 Administrative Support FTE.

³ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

Trial Court Budget Commission August 11, 2016, Meeting General Magistrates Background Statistics - Option 4 (Average Filings)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	Circuit Criminal		Circuit Civil		Family Court		Probate		Mental Health and Guardianship	
Circuit	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Unrounded) ¹	General Magistrate FTE Assignments	General Magistrate Average Total Need (Unrounded) ¹
1	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.15	2.50	3.60	0.00	0.03	0.50	0.55
2	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.12	2.00	1.48	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.38
3	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.06	0.33	1.03	0.17	0.01	0.17	0.10
4	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.28	6.80	5.35	0.00	0.03	0.20	0.69
5	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.38	4.70	4.39	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.65
6	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.37	5.25	5.51	0.00	0.06	2.25	0.83
7	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.21	3.50	4.03	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.57
8	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.06	1.30	1.67	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.29
9	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.44	4.25	6.69	0.00	0.03	0.75	0.72
10	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.16	2.95	3.64	0.00	0.03	0.25	0.56
11	0.00	0.04	1.00	0.87	10.00	12.29	0.00	0.06	1.00	1.57
12	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.17	2.90	2.95	0.00	0.04	0.10	0.66
13	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.32	4.50	6.61	0.00	0.03	2.00	0.88
14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	1.50	1.63	0.00	0.01	0.50	0.17
15	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.42	5.80	5.38	0.00	0.06	1.20	0.67
16 ³	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.03	0.20	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02
17	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.66	6.00	8.20	2.00	0.05	1.00	1.13
18	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.22	3.60	3.98	0.00	0.03	0.40	0.59
19	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.17	2.78	2.72	0.00	0.03	0.23	0.37
20	0.00	0.01	0.20	0.32	3.85	4.97	0.00	0.06	0.40	0.68
Total	0.00	0.3	4.88	5.47	74.71	86.69	2.27	0.70	11.16	12.08

¹ Total need reflects the average General Magistrate FTE total need over a three-year period. The total need is based on the average number of filings over fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 for non-capital murder, sexual offense, felony drug court, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, UIFSA, other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, TPR, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, Substance Abuse Act, and other social. The total need was calculated in two steps. The first step estimated General Magistrate workload by multiplying filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, General Magistrate total need was calculated by dividing the estimated General Magistrate workload by the total time available for case related work.

² Total current general magistrate FTE assignments may not be exact due to rounding. In addition, assignments were self reported by FTE equivalent as of July 1, 2015. Current assignments do not include 0.20 FTE assigned to Other County Civil.

³ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

Trial Court Budget Commission
August 11, 2016, Meeting
General Magistrates - Option 4 (Average Filings)
FY 2017-18 Proposed Legislative Budget Request

A	B	C	D	E
	Circuit Civil	Family Court	Mental Health and Guardianship	FMC Recommendation
Circuit	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹	Proposed General Magistrate LBR (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE) ¹
1	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
10	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
11	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0
12	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
13	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16 ³	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Total	1.0	13.0	4.00	18.0

F	G	H
		FMC Recommendation
FY 2016-17 Administrative Support FTE	FY 2017-18 Administrative Support FTE Need ²	FY 2017-18 Proposed Administrative Support LBR ²
3.0	5.0	2.0
2.0	2.0	0.0
0.0	2.0	2.0
6.0	7.0	1.0
5.0	6.0	1.0
7.0	7.5	1.0
4.0	5.5	2.0
1.0	1.5	1.0
4.0	8.0	4.0
3.0	4.2	1.0
11.0	15.0	4.0
3.0	5.0	2.0
7.0	8.5	2.0
1.0	2.0	1.0
6.0	7.0	1.0
0.0	0.0	0.0
8.5	12.0	4.0
3.0	4.0	1.0
3.0	3.0	0.0
5.0	5.5	0.0
82.5	110.7	30.0

¹ Proposed General Magistrate LBR is the difference between total need and General Magistrate FTE assignments.

² FY 2017-18 Administrative Support FTE need is based on a 1:1 ratio to General Magistrates. FY 2017-18 Proposed Administrative Support LBR is based on the FY 2017-18 FTE need minus FY 2016-17 Administrative Support FTE.

³ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.