

AGENDA

12:00pm Meeting Convenes

Item I. Opening Remarks and Introductions

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

Item II. Housekeeping

A. Minutes of 06/01/2015 meeting

Item III. Issues of Interest

- A. Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS)
- B. FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative
- C. Incorporating Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS
- D. Incorporating Stalking Violence Injunctions (AOSC12-05) into SRS

Item IV. Judicial Workload Study

A. Project Update

Item V. Judicial Management Council (JMC) Performance Workgroup Recommendations #1 (TCP&A Referral)

- A. Background
- B. Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
- C. Final Proposal & Data Collection Specification

Item VI. Next Meeting

- A. November 2015 Conference Call
- B. January-February 2016 In-person Meeting

01:30pm Meeting Adjourns

Call in is available for interested parties:

Dial-in Number: 888-670-3525

Participant Pin: 4952473921#

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

FY 2014-16 Term Membership List

Chair:

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni
County Judge, Charlotte County

Members:

Mr. Fred Buhl
Director/Court Technology Officer, Eighth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable G. Keith Cary
Circuit Judge, Twentieth Judicial Circuit

Ms. Holly Elomina
Trial Court Administrator, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable David H. Foxman
County Court Judge, Volusia County Court

The Honorable Ilona M. Holmes
Circuit Court Judge, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Shelley J. Kravitz
County Court Judge, Miami-Dade County

The Honorable Ellen S. Masters
Circuit Court Judge, Tenth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Paula S. O'Neil, Ph.D.
Clerk of Circuit Court & County Comptroller, Pasco County

Ms. Kathleen R. Pugh
Trial Court Administrator, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Sharon Robertson
Clerk of Court, Okeechobee County

Mr. Philip G. Schlissel
Administrative General Magistrate, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit

Mr. Grant Slayden
Trial Court Administrator, Second Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Scott Stephens
Circuit Judge, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit

The Honorable William F. Stone
Circuit Judge, First Judicial Circuit

Item I. Opening Remarks

I.A. Opening Remarks

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

Item II. Committee Housekeeping

II.A. Minutes of 6/1/2015 Meeting

**Minutes
Court Statistics & Workload Committee Meeting
June 1, 2015
Phone Conference**

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

12:05 pm Meeting convened

All fifteen members were in attendance:

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, The Honorable G. Keith Cary,
The Honorable David H. Foxman, The Honorable Ilona M. Holmes,
The Honorable Shelley J. Kravitz, The Honorable Ellen S. Masters,
The Honorable Scott Stephens, The Honorable William F. Stone,
The Honorable Paula S. O'Neil, Ph.D., The Honorable Sharon Robertson,
Mr. Fred Buhl, Ms. Holly Elomina, Ms. Kathleen R. Pugh,
Mr. Philip G. Schlissel, & Mr. Grant Slayden

Members absent:

None.

OSCA Staff in attendance:

Greg Youchock, P.J. Stockdale, Shelley Kaus, Kimberly Curry, & Arlene Johnson

Item I. Opening Remarks

- A. The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair, welcomed everyone to the phone conference. It was decided the topics presented for informational purposes would be taken up first so the remainder of the meeting would be available for Item III.

Item II. Committee Housekeeping

- A. Minutes from 2/11/2015 Meeting
1. Members voted (unanimously) to approve the minutes from the in-person meeting held in Orlando, Florida.

Item IV. Judicial Workload Study

- A. Project Update

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
August 31, 2015**

1. Staff updated the committee on the progress of this study.
2. The Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) met in February 2015, and approved the methodology presented.
3. The next step will be the time study, which is scheduled from September 28 – October 25, 2015.
4. Members were informed that Judge Alessandroni would be making presentations on the sufficiency of time survey in the coming months.
5. A document of JNAC talking points on the study along with presentation slides prepared by Judge Crown of Collier County were provided for additional information.

Item V. Issues of Interest

A. Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS)

1. Staff advised that the status of the funding for the JDMS project is currently uncertain, as the legislature did not pass the FY2015-2016 state budget during regular legislative session. A special session has been scheduled from June 1 to June 20.
2. A more in-depth project plan for FY2015-2017 is currently being finalized. OSCA staff is also developing an alternative project timeline in the event the funding is not received.
3. Staff also advised that the recommendations of the Judicial Management Council (JMC) Performance Workgroup (to be discussed in Item III) do not conflict with the FY2015-2017 project plan developed for JDMS. Specifically, JMC Recommendations 1 and 4 are congruent with Goal #2 of the JDMS project plan. Accordingly, JDMS is being recommended as the framework in which to initiate the data collection effort in this committee's proposal.

B. FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative

1. The initiative officially ends on June 30, 2015. However, in response to Recommendation 4 of the JMC Performance Workgroup, the supreme court issued AOSC15-9 In re: Continued Case Reporting Requirements for Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Cases on April 1, 2015. This administrative order continues the requirement to report mortgage foreclosure data to the OSCA through June 30, 2016, "or until such time this Court revisits the requirement."
2. The data collection plan used in the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative will apply to the continued reporting for a seamless transition.
3. Staff provided a summary of the successes of this data collection effort, the knowledge gained, and the impact of these lessons learned on the proposed JDMS system. The initiative provided proof of

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
August 31, 2015**

concept for many of the data management ideas identified by this committee in 2011-2013 while researching the collection of case aging statistics required Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2).

- C. Incorporating Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS Reporting
 - 1. OSCA staff will incorporate the case-event definitions into the SRS Manual during the upcoming SRS Manual Revision.
 - 2. A final draft of the SRS Manual is expected by June 2016.
- D. Evaluation of SRS counting methodology for Juvenile Dependency cases
 - 1. At the February 11, 2015 meeting, staff was asked to investigate the impact of changing the dependency unit of count from case filings to children.
 - 2. Staff reported that the review is complete and it was determined that changing the unit of count to children would have a significant impact on SRS statistics and the workload and resource models that depend on them. In particular, this change would require a redesign of the juvenile dependency case weight use as part of the judicial weighted workload model. As the parameters of the Judicial Workload Study are already defined, changing them at this late stage would set the project back beyond its allotted timeline. Additionally, this change would negatively impact the clerks of courts, as it would require significant changes to their case management systems.
 - 3. Staff advised that the number of children may be available from the Florida Dependency Court Information System (FDCIS), and that information from this source could be evaluated for its utility in developing a workload modifier that includes the number of children per case.
 - 4. Members expressed concerns with the current insufficient method of tracking workload in Juvenile Dependency cases and advocated for a way to achieve statistics more representative of the true workload.

Item III. JMC Recommendation #1 (TCP&A Referral)

- A. Judicial Management Council (JMC) Performance Workgroup Recommendations
 - 1. The Judicial Management Council (JMC) approved the recommendations of its Performance Workgroup on February 27, 2015. Of particular concern to this committee are Recommendations 1 and 4.
 - 2. On April 1, 2015, the supreme court addressed these recommendations and charged the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A) with developing a response to Recommendation # 1. The court requested that TCP&A complete an initial recommendation related to this item and submit it for the court's review by June 30, 2015. The final assessment and recommendation is due by October 1, 2015.

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
August 31, 2015**

3. At its April 17, 2015 meeting, the TCP&A's Workgroup on Performance Management referred the matter to the CSWC for further development. Comments from the workgroup to the CSWC were provided to members.
- B. Preliminary Proposal
1. In response to this referral, committee staff prepared a draft proposal, titled Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project Preliminary Proposal. Staff also identified the other areas that should be developed before the final assessment is submitted to the court, as well as future areas recommended for review prior to any expansion of uniform case reporting.
 2. The preliminary proposal recommends several implementation principles, the framework under which reporting should be designed, and the initial data elements necessary to compute the required statistics and performance measures.
 3. The proposal provides guidance on the data format and transmission schedule of the data, and the creation of a data collection plan. It further recommends that the additional elements proposed as candidates for collection by the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup should be evaluated for inclusion in the Trial Court Data Model as appropriate.
 4. Members voted (14 Y to 1 N) to approve the preliminary proposal and to recommend the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability adopt this proposal as the initial response to Recommendation 1 of the Judicial Management Council's Performance Workgroup.

Item VI. Next Meeting

1. A late August or early September phone conference was discussed, as the final proposal (see Item III) will need to be considered before the October 1st due date.
2. Staff will email members regarding their availability.

1:25 pm Meeting Adjourned

Decision Needed:

1. Adopt the meeting minutes from 6/1/2015.

Item III. Issues of Interest

III.A. Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS)

Funding for the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) project was allocated by the Legislature as of July 1, 2015. Funding for the FY 2015-2017 JDMS development cycle includes \$341,679 for 4.0 FTEs and \$175,263 for staff augmentation, software development and licensing and hardware equipment. A revised JDMS project plan is provided as Enclosure 01.

Although the project is just beginning, JDMS staff have been working steadily on a variety of project elements including:

- Goal 1:
 - Hiring 4.0 FTE positions (in-work; expected completion October 2015)
 - A full skills assessment for the project (complete)
 - Developing a comprehensive training program for the new hires (75% complete)
 - Additional training for existing staff (80% complete)
 - Transitioning Data Administration infrastructure to the court's virtual server farm (40% complete)
- Goal 2:
 - Advancing the Uniform Case Reporting Data Collection Specification

Decision Needed:

1. None. For information only.

III.B. FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative

The FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative officially ended on June 30, 2015. However, reporting of the mortgage foreclosure data was continued per AOSC15-9 In re: Continued Case Reporting Requirements for Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Cases. This administrative order continues the requirement to report mortgage foreclosure data to the OSCA through June 30, 2016, "or until such time this Court revisits the requirement."

The last few monthly reports for the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative are still being prepared. Data and amendments are still being received from the timeframe of the initiative (ending June 30, 2015). Reporting of data for the period beginning July 1, 2015 has continued and is displayed on the Foreclosure Dashboard website.

Future work on the Uniform Case Reporting Project (Item V) is expected to absorb the reporting of mortgage foreclosure case data. For the time being, clerks of court are required to adhere to the data collection plan of the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative for continued reporting in FY2015-2016.

Decision Needed:

1. None. For information only.

III.C. Incorporating Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS Reporting

In keeping with the supreme court charge to incorporate the Case-Event Definitional Framework into the Summary Reporting System (SRS), on July 30, 2015, OSCA staff directed a clarification memorandum regarding AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework to the trial court clerks, trial court administrators, and Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers.

The memorandum served as communication and direction regarding AOSC14-20. Its goal was to provide 24 months advance notice to the clerks of court before full reporting under the new framework is expected.

Staff has received feedback from the clerks of courts in response to the memorandum. In attempts to address their concerns and to provide some background on the work completed by the CSWC and TCP&A over the last five years, staff created a detailed chronology (Enclosure 02) of the project that led up to the issuance of this administrative order. A brief summary of the issues of concern to the clerks of court was provided by Clerk Paula O’Neil, and is included as Enclosure 03.

Decision Needed:

1. None. For information only.

III.D. Incorporating Stalking Violence Injunctions (AOSC12-05) into SRS

The 2012 Stalking Injunction legislation pursuant to ch. 2012-153, section 3, Laws of Florida (LOF), created section 784.0485(1), Florida Statutes. This new section 784.0485(1) created “a cause of action for an injunction for protection against stalking or cyber-stalking.” The effective date of the legislation was October 1, 2012.

On July 12, 2012 the supreme court issued opinion SC12-1205: In re: Amendments to the Florida Family Law Rules of Procedure in response to LOF 2012-153. The court’s opinion amends references throughout the Family Law Rules of Procedure from “*injunctions for domestic, repeat, dating and sexual violence*” to read “*injunctions for protection against domestic, repeat, dating, sexual violence and stalking*.” However, the supreme court opinion SC12-1205 did not include a requirement for reporting these injunctions.

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
August 31, 2015**

On October 24, 2012, the Family Law Rules Committee filed a supplemental petition to amend the Family Law Rules of Procedure Form 12.900(H) and the Family Law Cover Sheet Form 12.928 by adding Stalking Injunction as a new case type. On November 14, 2013 the supreme court re-issued opinion SC12-1205: In re: Amendments to the Florida Family Law Rules of Procedure with the amended Family Law Rules of Procedure Form 12.900(H) and the Family Law Cover Sheet Form 12.928.

OSCA staff continued to monitor this issue and was notified that the order had been approved. As a result, an email was sent on June 3, 2015 informing the trial court clerks of the addition of the Stalking Violence case type to the Circuit Family Division of the Summary Reporting System (SRS) retroactive to November 2013. Stalking data is now being collected and will be incorporated into SRS reporting.

Decision Needed:

1. None. For information only.

Enclosure 01

Judicial Data Management Services

Project Plan

V1.1.3 2015/01/05

Judicial Data Management Services

A Component of the
Integrated Trial Court Adjudication System

Project Plan

PJ Stockdale
Court Services

Contents

- 1 Overview 1
 - 1.1 Project Context..... 1
 - 1.2 The Vision of the Judicial Data Management Services Project 1
- 2 Goals and Scope..... 2
 - 2.1 Project Goals for FY 2015-2017 2
 - 2.2 Project Scope for FY 2015-2017 3
- 3. Organization..... 4
 - 3.1 Project Organization..... 4
- 4. Scheduling and Budget 5
 - 4.1 Milestones 5
 - 4.2 Budget 6
 - 4.3 Development Process 7
 - 4.4 Development Environment 8
 - 4.5 Measurements Program..... 8
- 5. Management Plans 8
 - 5.1 Risk Management 8
- 6. Document Revisions 10

1 Overview

1.1 Project Context

Florida's State Courts System has begun the development of an Integrated Trial Court Adjudicatory System, a project that will optimize the ability of judges and case managers to electronically process and manage cases. The project is also designed to assist chief and administrative judges and court managers in the effective management of court operations and resources. The project has two major components: 1) Judicial Viewers¹, which focus on case management services for judges; and 2) Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS), which focuses on state level court activity data and analysis services for court managers and other stakeholders.

1.2 The Vision of the Judicial Data Management Services Project

The JDMS project will develop a computing environment to provide state-level data management services to all elements of the court system. Those services include:

- Data Consolidation and Standardization Services
- Reporting Services
- Processing Services
- Data Warehouse and Analytical Services

Specifically, the JDMS system will benefit judges, court managers and all users of the court system by providing meaningful data and analysis to: 1) improve adjudicatory outcomes through case management and program evaluation, 2) increase operational efficiency through efficient use of shared resources, and 3) support organizational priorities through legislative resource and budgetary requests. JDMS will additionally enhance the ability of the state courts system to provide court-related data to assist policymakers in evaluating policy and budget options.

Initial development will focus on consolidating existing data sources and establishing critical system infrastructure. This approach will keep the project grounded while providing initial successes from which to base future expansion. The real benefit of the JDMS, however, is in its long-term capability to satisfy the courts' and Legislature's information needs. Thus, the JDMS architecture will form the basis of an organizational business intelligence system. Initial development, while focused on today's needs, will reflect that premise. This approach is directly aligned with the court system's strategic goals and is in consonance with public and private sector organizational best practices.

The Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) system provides a long-term vision and cohesive architecture for the direction of organizational data management. The JDMS project will be implemented in a series of small development cycles taken over one or two years. Each development

¹ Judicial Viewers are also known as the Court Application Processing System (CAPS), which provides judges and case managers with basic tools and capabilities to manage and track case activity. This component is largely restricted to the local jurisdictions in which it is deployed.

Judicial Data Management Services Project Plan

cycle will focus on delivering a specific, achievable set of components that provide needed capabilities within the four JDMS service areas. Thus, each cycle will produce a production-ready component that can be used by the court system even if subsequent work on the JDMS project is postponed. This modularized approach will enable the JDMS project to focus on capabilities important to the court system long term while keeping the project relevant to the priorities of today.

As can be seen in section 4.1, the FY 2015-2017 JDMS development cycle identifies specific sub-projects within the larger data management service areas of Data Consolidation and Standardization, Data Warehouse and Analytics and Reporting. Each of the sub-projects, while not providing the full functionality expected for that service, will provide a level of production-grade capability within that service. The timing of the JDMS development cycles will coincide with state funding cycles and be flexible enough to ensure that the project remains relevant to the evolving needs of the court system.

Specific projects will be chosen for each development cycle depending on the needs of the court system at that point. Legislative budget requests will be structured to provide a consistent level of resources and material necessary over the development cycle. This structure will facilitate short-term project planning within the larger design framework of the JDMS system.

2 Goals and Scope

2.1 Project Goals for FY 2015-2017

The inaugural development cycle of the long-term JDMS project is set for the FY 2015-2017 period. It will address critical personnel and systems architecture elements necessary to support the incremental expansion of existing data management projects, such as mortgage foreclosure data collection, and to prepare for the development of more substantial data management capabilities.

The goals for this development cycle of the JDMS project are:

1. Establish a solid data management foundation capable of supporting court activity data management at the state level through the addition of new staff and support elements and the enhancement of existing infrastructure;
2. Expand case inventory and case aging statistics from the foreclosure case type to all case types; and
3. Identify projects and plans for the FY 2017-2018 development cycle.

This phase of the JDMS project will take two years to complete. While the current LBR request is focused on the 2015-2016 fiscal year only, several operational factors dictate a longer development period for this initial project cycle.

Primary among these factors is the critical need to hire, train and integrate four new staff. Depending on availability of necessary skills, hiring and integration may take several months and will impose significant workload on current staff. The need to upgrade existing data collection systems is also a factor. The project should not sacrifice existing data management capability.

2.2 Project Scope for FY 2015-2017

The scope of the sub-projects in this two-year cycle will focus on identifying and deploying the tools, processes and infrastructure necessary to accomplish the goals of this development cycle and to sustain the JDMS project long term. It is expected that several critical modernizations will be completed in the FY 2015-2016 period, including improvements to the data tracking and system logging subsystems, as well as enhancements to development and production server environments (Milestone 01). To ensure the JDMS project continues to move forward long term, this period will also include essential project management and planning tasks (Milestone 00).

Goal 1: Work will primarily focus on enhancing and extending existing data management subsystems including the Uniform Data Reporting (UDR) System and the Uniform Traffic Citation (UTC) System to make these older systems compatible with the JDMS system design and to take advantage of newer, more efficient technologies. Enhancements to the UDR system will result in more detailed data on the use of constitutionally mandated due process elements, which will enable the court system to more effectively manage these costly resources. Enhancements to the UTC system will include upgrades to make that system compatible with the Trial Court Data Model,² which will improve the courts' ability to monitor traffic fine data for budget management and resource allocation. Additional modernizations will improve usability for both systems, which will increase the courts' ability to more readily respond to public data requests and to prepare legislative analysis.

Goal 2: Additional work will focus on expanding the current FY 2013-2014 Foreclosure Initiative data collection project from foreclosure cases³ to all case types under the Summary Reporting System (SRS). This expansion will improve the accuracy and reliability of the SRS statistics which form the basis for the Supreme Court's constitutionally mandated Annual Certification of Judgeships, workload and performance statistics, resource budgeting formulas, legislative analysis and public data requests.

Goal 3: Work will also include the evaluation and prioritization of needed capabilities in preparation for subsequent project cycles. This will include a comparative review of web-reporting frameworks and other tools related to the visual display of performance metrics and data and identification of "Next Step" sub-projects for the FY 2017-2018 development cycle based on evolving organizational priorities. Short- and long-term planning is a core competency of the JDMS project. Such planning will enable the project to focus on delivering specific capabilities on a timely schedule at minimal cost.

Court organization is a dynamic environment with several critical priorities pending at this time. As discussed in section 4.3, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) strives to maintain a development environment adaptable enough to handle change while still advancing the organization's goal.

² The Trial Court Data Model is a data element framework that identifies the essential information and data relationships necessary to advance a case through the adjudication process. The model was developed as part of the [Trial Court Integrated Management Project](#). (See Appendix C of the linked document.)

³ The FY 2013-2014 Foreclosure Initiative is a data driven case management effort to reduce the backlog of foreclosure cases in Florida. The Initiative defined a minimal set of data elements within the foreclosure case type that enabled the computation of meaningful statistics to guide backlog reduction efforts at both the local and state level.

3. Organization

3.1 Project Organization

The project team and management structure may be modified depending on funding and FTE.

Table 1 JDMS Project Team (Tentative)

Role	Description	Name/Title*
Committee Sponsor	Provides judicial oversight of the JDMS project.	Court Statistics and Workload Committee
Executive Sponsor	Provides executive support for the JDMS project including establishment and coordination of scope for sub-projects and liaison with the Supreme Court and associated judicial commissions.	Patricia (PK) Jameson, State Courts Administrator
Executive Liaison	Provides executive support and assistance for JDMS development.	Blan Teagle, Deputy State Courts Administrator; Eric Maclure, Deputy State Courts Administrator
Technology Support	Provides all technology support for the JDMS project.	Alan Neubauer, State Courts Technology Officer
Business Sponsor	Represents cross organizational elements of JDMS project such as policy, best practice and strategic elements.	Gregory Youchock, Chief of Court Services
Project Manager	Manages the JDMS business case and project team.	PJ Stockdale, Data Administration Supervisor
Software Support	Provides all software support for the JDMS project.	TBD
Data Management Services	Provides data management support including data dictionary preparation and maintenance, data model validation and meta-data integration.	TBD

4. Scheduling and Budget

4.1 Milestones

Milestone	Description	Planned Tasks (not inclusive or expository)	Duration
00 Planning and Preparation	Tasks and sub-projects associated with planning and executing and closing the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring, training and integration of new staff • Purchase of hardware and software • Standardization of tools and development methods • FY 2016-17 sub-project planning 	Jul 2015 - Jun 2016
01 Data Management Foundation	Tasks and sub-projects necessary to develop a solid data management foundation capable of supporting court activity data management at the state level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a generalized data exchange service • Development of a generalized automated logging system • Development of a generalized data tracking system • Expansion of the Trial Court Data Model physical data base and associated programming interface • Enhancements to computer server environment • Modernization of existing data collection systems 	Oct 2015 - Jun 2016 Jul 2016 - Jun 2017
02 Development Cycle Planning	Tasks and sub-projects necessary to identify projects and plans for the next JDMS development cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comparative review of web reporting frameworks and other tools related to the visual display of performance metrics and data • Identification of “Next Step” projects based on developing organizational priorities • Preparation of cost estimates and budget requests 	Jan 2016 - Jun 2016

Judicial Data Management Services Project Plan

Milestone	Description	Planned Tasks (not inclusive or expository)	Duration
03 Expansion of case inventory and aging statistics	Tasks and sub-projects necessary to expand case age activity reporting from the mortgage foreclosure case type to all SRS case types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of case type implementation sequence • Software review of existing system for scalability • Preparation of appropriate documentation and directives • Implementation coordination with clerks of court and circuit court administration • Planning and execution of staff augmentation contract • Education and training for field staff 	Jul 2015 - Jun 2016 Jul 2016 - Jun 2017

4.2 Budget

Budget estimates for FY 2016-2017 are somewhat variable. While the JDMS project is designed to result in a significant expansion of services and capabilities in the second year of development, the extent of that expansion depends on available resources in FY 2015-2016. Modifications to the FY 2016-2017 cost estimates will be made as the project progresses.

Requirement	LBR Category	FY 2015-16 LBR	FY 2016-17 LBR (Estimated)
Personnel			
4.0 Staff FTE (note 1) (Data Management Development and Support) (2) Court Statistics Consultant (1) Senior Court Analyst II (1) Senior Court Analyst I		(R) \$341,679	\$0
Contract Services (note 2)	100777	(NR) \$140,000	(NR) \$70,000
Software/Licenses (note 3, 6)			
Perl Licenses	040000	(NR) \$2,178	(R) \$1,888
Microsoft SQL Server	060000	(NR) \$1,880	\$0
Microsoft Remote Access License	060000	\$0	(NR) \$7,000
SAS Analytics Pro (5 User) (note 4)	100777	(NR) \$26,915	(R) \$7,600

Judicial Data Management Services Project Plan

Requirement	LBR Category	FY 2015-16 LBR	FY 2016-17 LBR (Estimated)
Equipment/Hardware (note 3, 6)			
Workstations/Monitors (note 5)	060000	(NR) \$4,290	\$0
Blade Server and Storage	060000		(NR) \$9,120
Total Non-Recurring		\$175,263	\$86,120
Total Recurring		\$341,679	\$9,488

Notes:

1. Requested FTEs will perform a variety of data management and development duties as necessary for the JDMS project. Costs are reported on FY 2015-2016 LBR and include expenses and human resource services amounts and initial training costs for reach position.
2. Contract services are computed at \$125.00 per hour as per (Information Technology (IT) Consulting Services 973-561-10-1) and include SQL software development, ETL services and validation.
3. Software and hardware estimates include a one-time non-recurring expenditure to purchase followed by, and where required by the vendor, a recurring maintenance or upgrade fee in the second year following purchase.
4. Verified SAS contract costs (35F-0170K) as of July 18, 2014. SAS Analytics Pro software package includes both the base components of SAS applicable to data management and the analytical components. Due to SAS licensing structure, it is not possible to separately purchase the analytical component package without also purchasing the base data management components. Therefore, it is more cost effective to purchase the full analytical package at one time rather than purchasing the base components separately and then, later, repurchasing the analytic packages paying for the base components twice.
5. Workstation purchase includes units for use by contractors in addition to staff personnel.
6. As project priorities are solidified, it may be necessary to shift the order of software purchases. For example, it may be necessary to fund the Microsoft Remote Access licensing element in FY 2015-16 and the Microsoft SQL Server licensing element in FY 2016-2017.

4.3 Development Process

The Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) project will use a variation of the Agile Scrum development methodology. Scrum is a management framework for completing complex projects using one or more cross functional teams including developers, business analysts, domain experts, etc. This methodology establishes a fixed set of business goals (milestones) and time frames but leaves the scheduling of the specific tasks necessary to achieve those goals to the development team. The team accomplishes tasks as a series of short, two or three week, “sprints” that focus on the needs of the project and the operational needs of the end user at a particular point in time. This methodology allows the development teams to be responsive to the needs of the end user of the system and fosters an environment where emergent opportunities can be quickly capitalized on and the occasional dead end minimized. This methodology is well suited to the dynamic court environment and has been employed successfully during past data management projects.

4.4 Development Environment

The Judicial Data Management Services system project will use open source tools and applications to the maximum extent possible and where appropriate. This will help minimize project costs. It will also allow the project to take advantage of several related case management projects currently in work within the Eighth, Fifteenth and Seventeenth Judicial Circuits, all built upon open source platforms.

The OSCA’s Data Administration unit supports the following development environments for use in this project: Perl or Python for application programming, Microsoft PowerShell and Unix tools for command scripting and control, Microsoft SQL Server and T-SQL for data base services and the commercial SAS data processing package for analysis and modeling. Additional software for project management (Redmine) and source control (git) will also be used.

4.5 Measurements Program

Specific metrics to determine success are under review and will be incorporated when finalized and approved.

5. Management Plans

The respective management plans including risk, communication, quality, configuration and change are under development and will be incorporated in fact, or by reference, as each one is completed and approved.

5.1 Risk Management

Without proper planning, information technology projects can be subject to a number of risks, such as scope creep or unrealistic short-term expectations. This project plan attempts to guard against those inherent risks by adopting mitigation strategies as described in the table below.

Risk	Mitigation Strategy
Unrealistic short term expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning extensively with sponsors and stakeholders to reach agreement on the scope for each development cycle • Set reasonable and achievable goals for each development cycle based on available resources, skills and manpower • Develop a reasonable Change Management Plan to ensure project remains responsive to evolving needs of the court system • Employ an enterprise data management strategy that supports agile development

Judicial Data Management Services Project Plan

Risk	Mitigation Strategy
The necessary additional skilled personnel are not available or allocated appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly define the scope of the each development cycle within the context of the long term JDMS vision so that staffing needs are understood • Develop a succession plan to ensure needed skills are available as staff leave or advance in the organization • Use staff augmentation contracts where appropriate
Inadequate allocation of resources (hardware, software, funding)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly define the scope of each development cycle within the context of available resources • Establish a development environment that encourages the use of open source and inexpensive tools to minimize costs wherever practical • Encourage technical solutions that use the lowest-level technology that advances project goals efficiently and effectively with available resources
Overall JDMS project loses focus due to long development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly define the long-term vision of court data management (Court Data Management Framework) • Establish a comprehensive communications plan to keep stakeholders focused • Ensure project produces a steady stream of usable results
Short-term development cycle diverted to sub-projects not planned for (project creep)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish comprehensive development cycle plans with agreement and commitment of sponsors and stakeholders to support plan schedule • Frequent meetings with stakeholder commissions to demonstrate progress
Short-term development cycle required to do more than planned (scope creep)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a clear and specific project plan with meaningful outcomes • Establish a comprehensive Communications Plan to ensure buy in and support from project sponsors and commission stakeholders • Establish a strong Change Management Plan that helps maintain project focus while remaining responsive to evolving needs
Additional data sources cannot be developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage an organizational approach to data management • Clearly define data needs of the court (i.e., Trial Court Data Model, performance indicators) • Encourage a project governance structure that promotes the inclusion of organizational data into local projects
Field level systems do not evolve to capture necessary court activity data or to provide that data to JDMS in an efficient manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage an organizational approach to data management • Clearly define data needs of the court (i.e., Trial Court Data Model, performance indicators) • Work with Florida Courts Technology Commission to ensure local data system specifications include the capacity to programmatically transmit data to JDMS.

6. Document Revisions

Revision	Date	Responsible Primary
1.0.0	2014/12/10	PJ Stockdale
1.0.4	2014/12/15	PJ Stockdale
1.1.2	2014/12/18	PJ Stockdale
1.1.3	2015/01/05	PJ Stockdale

Enclosure 02

**Background and Chronology of
AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework**

Background and Chronology of AO14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework

Executive Summary

The Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A) through its Court Statistics & Workload Committee (CSWC) developed the definitions and case statuses that became known as the Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework adopted by the supreme court on March 26, 2014.

September 2010 – Project commences:

- Projects such as the 2010 Divisional Case Count Report, FY 2010-2011 Foreclosure and Economic Recovery Initiative project, and the Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions Project convinced the court committees of the need to develop clear definitions for critical case events such as filing, disposition, reopen and reclosure. Consequently, the CSWC undertook a project to establish clear definitions for several critical case events.

Legislative Session 2012 – Further necessity:

- Statutory changes to ch. 28.241(1)(b) and 34.041(2), F.S. complicated reporting for the court system and required the establishment of clear and unambiguous definitions of post-judgment events. These statutory changes were initiated by the clerks of court, through their association.

May 2012-June 2012 – Comment Period:

- A draft set of definitions and accompanying guidelines were provided for comments and suggestions to chief judges, trial court administrators, and clerks of court.

May 2013 – Recommendations made to the supreme court:

- The TCP&A recommends to the supreme court the final “Case-Event Definitional Framework”, including comments, for use in trial court activity reporting statewide.

June 2013 – Framework utilized in Foreclosure Initiative reporting:

- AOSC13-28 In re: Final Report and Recommendations of the Foreclosure Initiative Workgroup issued by the supreme court. This order incorporated the Case-Event Definitional Framework in the reporting requirements of the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative.

October 2013 – Orders established to help court communicate case status to clerks of court:

- In response to clerks’ challenges in identifying cases in INACTIVE status, the supreme court issued AOSC 13-51 In re: Case Status Reporting Requirements for Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Cases, which provided additional assistance to clerks of court regarding the reporting of case status as defined in the Case-Event Definitional Framework.

March 26, 2014 – Administrative Order issued by supreme court:

- The supreme court issued AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework, establishing the framework essential for correct reporting of case activity in the trial courts.

Fall 2014 – Incorporation into the Summary Reporting System (SRS):

- OSCA staff evaluated the incorporation of the framework into the SRS, and delayed its implementation to coincide with a planned SRS manual revision. A draft of the completed revisions to the manual is expected by December of 2016.

July 30, 2015 – Summary Reporting System (SRS) Clarification Memo 15-01:

- This memorandum served as communication and direction regarding AO14-20, giving 24 months advance notice to the clerks of court before full reporting under the new framework is expected.

Detailed Timeline

On March 26, 2014 the supreme court issued AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework, which established specific definitions for critical events within a case essential for correct reporting of case activity in the trial courts. This framework includes unambiguous definitions for filing, disposition, reopen and reclosure events and provides for the reporting of case status actions within these events. Together, these definitions provide a framework for reporting case activity necessary to support uniform case reporting as per section 25.075, F.S., Rules 2.245, 2.250 and 2.225(a)(2) of the Florida Rules of Judicial Administration and data collection under the Trial Court Data Model.

The State Courts Administrator was specifically directed with taking “...*the appropriate action to implement this Framework as an intrinsic element of new trial court case activity data management projects, ..., and to retrofit, as necessary and practical, existing trial court data collection systems ... in a reasonable time frame commensurate with available resources and the expected benefits of such actions.*” As an ongoing action, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) will be evaluating existing case activity data collection systems and developing plans for controlled implementation.

Background

The definitions established by this supreme court administrative order were the end result of a project that began in the fall of 2010. At this time, several events occurred that convinced the court system that there was a need to more accurately track case activity for workload and inventory purposes under the Summary Reporting System (SRS). Some of these events included statutory changes to the reopen filing fee that necessitated a more precise definition of the reopen event, the legislatively mandated Divisional Case Count report and the FY2010-2011 Foreclosure and Economic Recovery Initiative.

At the same time, the Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions (TIMS) project had begun. The final report from of the TIMS project advanced a comprehensive data model to track trial court activity. The uniqueness of the data reported and tracked within the model required clear and unambiguous definitions for all relevant case events such as case initiation (filing), case disposition and reopen. Additionally, some of the performance measures considered as part of the TIMS project required a clear definition of case closure and of case status, such as active or inactive.

Consequently, the Court Statistics & Workload Committee (CSWC) undertook a project to establish clear definitions for several critical case events. The CSWC determined that there was no “quick fix” to the issue of not having clear definitions and processes in place to close reopen cases for SRS purposes. The committee noted that there are legislative and fiscal issues involved, and that any solution would require modification to both clerks’ and courts’ data collection apparatus.

Clerk Representation on CSWC

Many of the data and reporting issues that the CSWC is concerned with involve both the clerks of court and court administration. In November 2010, the CSWC voted to include two clerks of court as members to provide this important perspective. The Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A) concurred and on March 2, 2011, The Honorable Sharon Robertson, Okeechobee County Clerk of the Circuit Court and The Honorable Don W. Howard, Okaloosa County Clerk of the Circuit Court were officially appointed to the Court Statistics and Workload Committee.

For the FY2012-2014 committee term, Clerk Howard was replaced by The Honorable Barbara T. Scott, Clerk of Court in Charlotte County. Clerk Scott resigned from the committee after one term and was replaced by The Honorable Paula S. O’Neil, Ph.D., Clerk of Circuit Court from Pasco County for the FY2014-2016 term. Clerk Robertson is currently serving her third term on the CSWC.

To further encourage the cooperation between the clerks of court and the work of this committee, the CSWC has routinely provided the clerks association, the FCCC, with notices of this committee’s scheduled meetings and with meeting materials. Meeting materials and meeting minutes are also available to the public on the Court Statistics & Workload Committee’s webpage (<http://www.flcourts.org/administration-funding/performance-accountability/statistics-workload.stml>).

Timeline

The development of the definitions and associated case statuses, which later became the Case-Event Definitional Framework is shown in the timeline below. As the project was under the jurisdiction of the TCP&A and CSWC, the timeline is provided in two-year committee terms.

FY 2010-2012 Term

September 2010 – May 2012:

- The CSWC adopted a working definition for the disposition of reopened cases to support the FY 2010-2011 Foreclosure and Economic Recovery Initiative project. In particular, this project identified a clear need to track when post-judgement events are closed, as a significant amount of judicial workload is represented by these events.
- Projects such as the 2010 Divisional Case Count Report and the Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions Project convinced the CSWC of the need to develop clear definitions for critical case events such as filing, disposition, reopen and reclosure.
- Amendments to ch. 28.241(1)(b) and 34.041(2), F.S. were passed in the 2012 Legislative Session that, while not specifically defining when a case was reopened, did provide direction on when a “reopen” fee could be assessed. These amendments, while providing the clerks of court with some guidance on charging post-judgment fees, further complicated reporting for the court system and required the establishment of clear and unambiguous definitions of post-judgement events. These statutory changes were initiated by the clerks of court, through their association.
- As the court committed to court activity monitoring, the CSWC included definitions for case status in order to support requirements such as those in Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2).

May 2012-June 2012:

- A final set of definitions and accompanying guidelines were provided for comments and suggestions to chief judges, trial court administrators, and clerks of court.
- Several clerks expressed caution as to the potential impact of these definitions and believed that significant system changes would be required in order to report case status information.
- The CSWC expressed sensitivity to the issue of clerk system changes, and adopted a strategy of engagement all interested parties before implementing a new data collection requirement.

FY 2012-2014 Term

February - May 2013:

- Comments provided during the 2012 outreach were incorporated into the final definitions (now formally referred to as the Case-Event Definitional Framework) were presented to the Commission on Trial Court Performance & Accountability (TCP&A). The commission voted

unanimously to recommend supreme court adoption of the framework for use in trial court activity reporting statewide.

June 21, 2013:

- The supreme court issued AOSC13-28 In re: Final Report and Recommendations of the Foreclosure Initiative Workgroup, which incorporated the Case-Event Definitional Framework in the reporting requirements of the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative.

July 2013 – January 2014:

- Representatives from the FCCC met with OSCA staff to discuss many clerks' limitations on reporting cases in inactive status (as per the Case-Event Definitional Framework) and seek a resolution to the issue.
- In response, the supreme court issued AOSC 13-51 In re: Case Status Reporting Requirements for Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Cases, which provided additional assistance to clerks of court regarding the reporting of case status as defined in the Case-Event Definitional Framework.
- An advisory bulletin was sent out by the FCCC regarding "CCIS Foreclosure Report Case Status" (Advisory Bulletin No. SC 14-016). The bulletin provides information to counties regarding AOSC 13-51 and clarified the use of the INACTIVE status.

March 26, 2014:

- The supreme court issued AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework, establishing that these definitions for critical events within a case (the framework) are essential for correct reporting of case activity in the trial courts.

FY 2014-2016 Term

Fall 2014:

- The CSWC directed OSCA staff to evaluate the Summary Reporting System (SRS) to see what approach would be most beneficial in implementing the case-event definitions into SRS.
- Evaluation included both the changes to operational procedure and the cost to the courts and clerks of court to modify case maintenance and data management systems.
- To reduce impact to clerk systems, the incorporation of the Case-Event Definitional Framework into the SRS was scheduled to coincide with a planned SRS Manual revision. Doing so delayed the implementation of the framework and gave the clerks of court even more time to initiate systems changes as compared to the previously recommended 18-month timeline.

May 2015:

- The OSCA begins the process of the SRS Manual revision. A draft of the completed revisions is expected to be ready by December of 2016.

July 30, 2015:

- Summary Reporting System (SRS) Clarification Memo 15-01 is sent to all trial court clerks of circuit court, trial court administrators, and the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FCCC). This memorandum served as communication and direction regarding the AO14-20. Its goal was to provide 24 months advance notice to the clerks of court before full reporting under the new framework is expected.

Enclosure 03

AOSC14-20 In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework

Impact Statement

AOSC14-20 Impact

Prior SRS reporting requirements were count oriented. AOSC14-20 creates event and status-oriented reporting requirements. AOSC13-51 required a local AO to be created to provide explicit direction for designating the status of foreclosure cases as *active* or *inactive*. In response, the Sixth Judicial Circuit Chief Judge signed local AO2013-081 to establish the use of *active* and *inactive* case types for mortgage foreclosures, including defining activities for each status.

AOSC14-20 establishes eight key events and six statuses in which a case can be placed, as the case progresses from initiation to resolution.

Reportable Events/Statuses			
Historic SRS Case Counts	AOSC13-51 Established Case Status Mortgage Foreclosure Only	AOSC14-20	
		Case Statuses	Key Events
Number of Filings (Defendants, Counts, Cases, or Petitions) Dispositions Reopen	Open Open Inactive Closed Reopen Reopen Inactive Reclosed	Open Active Open Inactive Closed Reopen Active Reopen Inactive Reclosed	Filing Event Open Case Disposition Event Closed Case Reopen Event Reopened Case Reclosure Event Reclosed Case

The requirements established in AOSC14-20 are a fundamental change in how the case status information is captured and reported by Clerks & Comptrollers. As an example, the new requirements call for a case to be moved from *inactive* status to *active* status before it can be *closed* or *reclosed*. Therefore, multiple steps or entries would be required by deputy clerks when processing certain pleadings. Another example is that AOSC14-20 would require Clerks & Comptrollers to track post-judgment actions individually. When all post-judgment actions are resolved, the statuses would need to be updated to *reclosed*. Training on these new requirements would be extensive.

Implementing the changes required in AOSC14-20 would require significant resources of time and money.

- There is no funding for mandated changes. Costs would be incurred for system updates. Annual budget cuts have been experienced with no foreseeable relief in the future.
- Vendor-initiated system updates would be needed to capture new key events and statuses.
 - Code table configuration and programming requirements would be needed, depending on the case management system.
- Clerk-initiated system updates would be needed to capture new key events and statuses.
 - Code table configuration and maintenance would be necessary.
 - Code mapping for reportable key events and statuses would be needed (e.g., docket codes to capture key events or case statuses).
- Comprehensive training workshops would be needed for new reporting requirements.
- Quality assurance report development would be needed to ensure accuracy and compliance.
- The July 1, 2017, implementation requirement recommends, "...Incorporating these definitions into local procedures as soon as possible."

Item IV. Judicial Workload Study

IV.A. Project Update

The Supreme Court of Florida has tasked the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) with updating the trial court judicial case weights used to evaluate judicial workload. The OSCA has 15 years of direct experience evaluating judicial workload beginning with the 1999 Delphi Workload Assessment followed by the 2006-07 Judicial Resource Study (JRS). In the fall of 2014, the OSCA signed a contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform the Judicial Workload Study. The NCSC were the consultants on the two previous studies.

As Chair of the Supreme Court's Court Statistics and Workload Committee, Judge Alessandroni is the lead judicial officer on this effort. Staff support is being provided by the OSCA.

A summary of the study is provided in Enclosure 04. A copy of the NCSC presentation to the FL Conference of Circuit Judges and FL Conference of County Judges is provided in Enclosure 05.

Decision Needed:

1. None. For information only.

Enclosure 04

**Judicial Workload Study Update
August 2015**

Judicial Workload Study Update

- In the fall of 2014, the OSCA contracts with National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to conduct a Judicial Workload Study.
- The study is being chaired by Judge Paul Alessandrone, County Judge, Charlotte County and Chair of the Supreme Court's Court Statistics and Workload Committee of the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability.
- In February 2015, the OSCA conducted a meeting of 41 judges in Orlando. Every judicial circuit had one county and one circuit judge represented. This committee is known as the Judicial Needs Advisory Committee (JNAC) and is providing executive direction to the project. A representative from OPPAGA attended the entire meeting.
- In July/August 2015 presentations are made by Judge Alessandrone and NCSC staff to plenary sessions of the county and circuit judges conferences re: the overall methodology and the time study.
- Beginning on September 28 through October 25, a time study of all trial court judges, senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers and civil traffic infraction hearing officers will be conducted. Case event data will be uploaded each night to the NCSC's servers in Williamsburg, VA.
- In early December 2015, site visits to two small, two medium, two large and one extra-large circuit will be conducted by the NCSC. Judge Alessandrone will be attending several of the site visits. OSCA staff will visit the 1st and 14th circuits to interview the judges to ensure panhandle representation.
- In February 2016, a meeting of subject matter expert judges (approximately 84) will be convened to review the preliminary case weights developed via the time study. The major divisions under review are circuit criminal, circuit civil, county criminal, county civil, family, juvenile, and probate.
- In the spring of 2015 (March/April) the JNAC will reconvene to review/adjust/approve the final case weights.
- In April/May of 2016, the NCSC will submit the final report to the Supreme Court of Florida.
- Assuming the Supreme Court accepts the case weights, they can then use in their certification opinion which is typically issued in the late fall of 2016.

Enclosure 05

NCSC Presentation to Judges Conference

July/August 2015

A large silhouette of the state of Florida is centered on the page. Inside the white space of the silhouette, there is a black and white landscape scene featuring a body of water, a rocky shore, and some trees or vegetation.

2015 Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Judge Paul Alessandroni

Matthew Kleiman Ph.D.

National Center for State Courts

Florida Conference of Circuit Court Judges

August 3, 2015

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment Objective

- The Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) comprises 41 judges – a county and circuit court judge from each circuit, plus the chair
- JNAC is an advisory committee to the judicial workload assessment being conducted by the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) and National Center for State Courts (NCSC)

The purpose of this presentation is to introduce the study and respectfully encourage full participation for the benefit of the entire branch.

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment Historical Overview

- 1998 – Legislature required that requests for additional judgeships must be supported by Delphi-based caseload weighting system
- 1999 – OSCA and NCSC measured judicial workload using a time study during which nearly 120 judges tracked their time spent on different types of cases
- 2006 – the case weights were updated without time study

Since 1999, the Supreme Court has determined and certified the need for additional judges according to the case weighting system

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

A weighted caseload system determines whether new judges are needed based not just on the number of cases filed, but also—very importantly—on how much time it takes for judges to handle different types of cases based on the complexity of those cases.

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment Historical Overview

Between 2001 and 2006 the Legislature funded

159 new judgeships

based on the case weights established by 1999 time study

- The 2006 update did **not** include a time study
- Not a single judgeship has been funded since 2006

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Benefits of Participation

We have the opportunity to participate in a new time study!

- provide accurate, verifiable data to enhance credibility of Supreme Court's annual certification need to Legislature
- document full range of workload activity facing judges
- capture data on impact of specialty courts
- assess impact of E-filing/paperless courts

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Benefits of Participation

Goal: 100% judicial participation to

- ensure accuracy of new case weights
- enhance validity of time study
- send positive message about our commitment to accurately quantifying judicial workload
- support judicial pay issues
- capture workload nuances by county and circuit, including division assignment, geography, travel, etc.

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Benefits of Participation

It is in the long-term best interest of our entire branch to participate in this time study

Accurate data is needed for valid workload measurement

With 100% participation, the results will be more persuasive in advocating for needed judicial resources

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

This workload assessment will comprehensively review, update, and extend the Florida judicial weighted caseload system to bring it in line with state-of-the art practices and reflect recent developments in statutory and case law that impact judicial workload.

Overall Question

- How many judicial officers are needed to provide efficient, effective, and equitable case resolution for the citizens of Florida?

NCSC Experience With Workload Assessment

The screenshot shows the NCSC website's 'Workload Assessment' page. The header includes the NCSC logo and tagline 'Trusted Leadership. Proven Solutions. Better Courts.' along with a search bar and a 'MY CENTER LOGIN' section. The navigation menu includes 'INFORMATION & RESOURCES', 'SERVICES & EXPERTS', 'EDUCATION & CAREERS', 'CONFERENCES & EVENTS', and 'COMPANION SITES'. The main content area is titled 'Workload assessment' and features a sidebar with 'AREA OF EXPERTISE' categories such as Appellate Justice, Caseflow & Workflow management, Children & Families, Civil justice, Court Statistics, Elders, Emergency planning & Security, Facilities planning, Jury management, Language access, Organizational management, Performance measurement, Problem solving courts, Sentencing & Probation, Technology, and Workload assessment. The main text describes the NCSC's role in workload assessment and includes a list of services: providing empirical support for budget requests, assessing resource equity, and managing resource distribution. A 'PEOPLE WHO VIEWED THIS PAGE ALSO VIEWED' section lists 'Browse Topics A-Z', 'Court Community Jobs', 'Publications & Library', and 'High Performance Courts'. An 'NCSC CONTACT' section lists Shannon Roth. Below the text is a map of the United States with a legend indicating that states where workload assessments have been completed are shown in blue. The legend includes American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands. The map shows that assessments have been completed in states including WA, OR, CA, NV, UT, AZ, NM, TX, MT, ND, SD, NE, KS, MN, IA, MO, WI, MI, IN, OH, PA, NY, VT, ME, NH, MA, RI, CT, NJ, DE, MD, DC, VA, WV, KY, TN, MS, AL, GA, SC, NC, and FL.

• Judges

California, Florida, Maryland, Minnesota, Virginia, Michigan, North Carolina, Texas, Wisconsin

• Court Support Staff

California, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon

• Public Defenders

Virginia, Maryland, New Mexico

• Prosecutors

North Carolina

• International

Bulgaria, Canada, Kosovo, Serbia, West Bank

Weighted Caseload: An Introduction

Calculating Resource Need

Three elements needed to calculate judicial need

- Accurate and valid filing counts
- Case weights
- Judge year value

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

Case Type A
Case Type B
Case Type C

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

	Number of new filed cases
Case Type A	1,000
Case Type B	3,000
Case Type C	200
	4,200

Filings

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

	Number of new filed cases	*	Time (mins)
Case Type A	1,000	*	300
Case Type B	3,000	*	50
Case Type C	200	*	125
	4,200		

Case
Weights

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

	Number of new filed cases	*	Time (mins)	=	Workload (mins)
Case Type A	1,000	*	300	=	300,000
Case Type B	3,000	*	50	=	150,000
Case Type C	200	*	125	=	25,000
	4,200				475,000

Workload

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

Total Workload (mins)
475,000

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

Total Workload (mins)	÷	Judge Year Value (mins)
475,000	÷	77,400

How much time is available in a year to handle cases?

Judge Day

Separated into two parts:

- *Case-related matters*: Time spent handling cases, both on-bench and off-bench
- *Non-case-related matters*: Time spent on judicial functions not directly related to individual cases

Non-Case-Related Events

- Non-case-related administration
- General legal research
- Judicial education and training
- Committee, other meetings and related work
- Community activities and public outreach
- Work related travel time
- Vacation, sick leave, and holidays

Current Florida Judge Year

Total Days per Year			365
Minus			
Weekends	-		104
Holidays	-		11
Vacation	-		20
Sick Days	-		5
Judicial Education/Committees	-		10
<hr/>			
Total Working Days per Year	=		215

Judge Years (in days) in Selected States

<u>State</u>	<u>Judge Year</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Judge Year</u>
Arkansas	226	Florida	215
Missouri	224	Michigan	215
Delaware	222	Minnesota	215
New York	221	New Mexico	214
Colorado	220	Washington	214
Georgia	220	Connecticut	213
Oregon	220	Nebraska	211
Maine	219	Utah	211
New Hampshire	219	Louisiana	209
Hawaii	218	Wisconsin	209
South Dakota	216	North Dakota	205
Virginia	216	Alabama	200
California	215		
		25-state average	215 days

Current Florida Judge Day

- The standard judge day reflects judge time actually spent on case related matters.
- The current standard judge day is:
 - 6 hours for circuit judges in urban jurisdictions
 - 5.5 hours for circuit judges in rural jurisdictions
 - 5.5 hours for all county judges

Calculating Available Judge Time

Standard Judge Day

Each judge day was derived by beginning with an average 8.5 hour work day and then subtracting:

- 1 hour for lunch

Circuit

- 1.5 hours of administrative time for judges in urban jurisdictions
- 2 hours of administrative time for judges in rural jurisdictions (includes requisite travel time from one court location to another)

Judge Year Value: Circuit Judges, Urban

215 days x 6 hours/day x 60 minutes = 77,400 minutes

→ Each FTE judge has 77,400 minutes
per year for case-related work

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

Total Workload (mins)	÷	Judge Year Value (mins)
475,000	÷	77,400

How much time is available in a year to handle cases?

$$215 \text{ days} \times 6 \text{ hours/day} \times 60 \text{ minutes} = 77,400 \text{ minutes}$$

Calculating Resource Need

An Example

Total Workload (mins)	÷	Judge Year Value (mins)	=	Implied Judge Need
475,000	÷	77,400	=	6.1

Overview of Judicial Workload Assessment

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

Time
Study

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Formation of Judicial Needs Assessment Committee

- Provide project guidance and oversight
- Initial Planning Meeting
 - Define case types
 - Review judge day and year values
 - Establish scope and method of time study data collection (e.g., participation, sampling strategy, duration)

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Time Study (September 28 – October 25, 2015)

- Benchmark of current practice
 - 4 weeks
- Event-based analysis
- Accurate measure of average time per case
- Case weights describe “what is”

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Time Study (September 28 – October 25, 2015)

- Statewide participation
 - Circuit and County Court judges
 - Senior judges
 - Magistrates
 - Hearing officers

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Time Study (September 28 – October 25, 2015)

- Record all work
 - Case-related work
 - On-bench
 - Off-bench
 - Non-case-related work
 - After-hours work

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice “What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Quality Adjustment “What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

NCSC
National Center for State Courts

FLORIDA JUDICIAL WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT | COUNTY COURT JUDGES | TIME STUDY TRAINING

What time should I track?

During the time study, you will be asked to record **all of your time spent on work-related activities.** This includes all on-bench work, as well as off-bench preparation related to cases. It also includes all judicial work that is not related to specific cases before the court, such as administrative work and travel. Finally, it includes after-hours work, including on-call work and other work that you do at home or in the office during evening and weekend hours.

ON BENCH	✓
OFF BENCH	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE	✓
TRAVEL	✓
AFTER-HOURS WORK	✓
ON-CALL WORK	✓
WEEKEND WORK	✓



During the time study, you will track all of your work-related activities. For each activity, you will record the amount of time you spent.



MAIN MENU



RESOURCES

Introduction

◀ BACK NEXT ▶

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Circuit Court Case Types

Criminal

1. Capital Murder
2. Serious Crimes Against Persons
3. Less Serious Crimes Against Persons
4. Crimes Against Property
5. Drug Offenses
6. Felony Drug Court
7. Other Problem-Solving Courts

Civil

8. Professional Malpractice and Product Liability
9. Auto and Other Negligence
10. Contracts and Indebtedness
11. Real Property
12. Business Disputes
13. Other Circuit Civil
14. Jimmy Ryce

15. Criminal and Civil Appeals

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

**Time
Study**

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Circuit Court Case Types (continued)

Family

16. Simplified Dissolution
17. Dissolution
18. Child Support
19. Orders for Protection Against Violence
20. Paternity
21. Other Domestic Relations
22. Juvenile Delinquency
23. Juvenile Dependency

Probate

24. Probate
25. Trust
26. Commitment Acts
27. Guardianship

Quality Adjustment Process

“What is” → “What should be”

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

Time
Study

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

**Sufficiency
Survey**

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Sufficiency Survey

- Web-based survey
- Input from judges statewide
- *“Identify activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice”*
- Used by Delphi groups to identify tradeoffs, bottlenecks, or areas of perceived resource constraints

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice “What is”

JNAC

Time
Study

Quality Adjustment “What should be”

**Sufficiency
Survey**

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Pretrial/pre-disposition activities

Thinking of a typical case on your docket, please check up to 3 activities for which you believe the quality of justice would be improved if you had more time.

- consider motions and conduct pretrial hearings
- conduct case management conferences
- conduct settlement conferences
- conduct scheduling conferences
- review the case file (including reports from probation, mediators, and evaluators)
- prepare and issue orders
- explain orders and rulings
- ensure parties feel that their questions/concerns are addressed
- address questions or concerns from self-represented litigants

For the activities you selected above, please provide additional detail on what you would do differently if more time was available.

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice “What is”

JNAC

Time
Study

Quality Adjustment “What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

Delphi
Adjustments

Site Visits

- Series of focus groups at 3 to 5 courts -- meet with judges who handle different types of cases
- Urban and rural; single- and multi-county jurisdictions
- Obtain information on the way that cases are currently handled
- Identify proven efficient and effective case processing policies and strategies
- Help identify challenges or bottlenecks to effective case processing

Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Current Practice
“What is”

JNAC

Time
Study

Quality Adjustment
“What should be”

Sufficiency
Survey

Site Visits

**Delphi
Adjustments**

Quality Adjustment Sessions (Delphi)

Structured method for assessing reasonableness of case weights

- Gather expert opinion on key case-related activities
- Think explicitly about how specific types of cases are handled
- Discuss how much time should be spent
 - Provide specific rationales for adjustments
 - Consensus-based approach

	Number of new filed cases	*	Time (mins)	=	Workload (mins)
Case Type A	1,000	*	300	=	300,000
Case Type B	3,000	*	50	=	150,000
Case Type C	200	*	125	=	25,000
	4,200				475,000
			<i>Year Value</i>	÷	77,400
			<i>FTE</i>		6.1

	Number of new filed cases	*	Time (mins)	=	Workload (mins)
Case Type A	1,000	*	300	=	300,000
Case Type B	3,000	*	50 60	=	180,000
Case Type C	200	*	125	=	25,000
	4,200				505,000
			<i>Year Value</i>	÷	77,400
			<i>FTE</i>		6.5

Time Study
September 28 – October 25

Item V. Judicial Management Council (JMC) Performance Workgroup Recommendations #1 (TCP&A Referral)

V.A. Background

This data collection project was initiated by the Judicial Management Council's (JMC) Performance Workgroup in February 2015. In their final report, the Workgroup recommended that the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A)

“...propose clerk collection and reporting requirements that address: the collection of specific data elements, transmission of that data in a prescribed format, and directs those transmissions to occur in a timely manner to enhance performance reporting.”

At its April 17, 2015 meeting, the TCP&A's Workgroup on Performance Management referred the matter to the Court Statistics and Workload Committee (CSWC) for further development.

A preliminary proposal, Response to Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup Recommendation One: Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project Preliminary Proposal was prepared by the CSWC and approved by the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability on June 5, 2015.

V.B. Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project

The Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project identifies specific case events that will form the foundation of court case activity reporting. One goal of this data collection project is to consolidate several existing case activity reporting requirements in to a single, consistent reporting framework. State-level reporting is defined under the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) data management framework and complies with the data structure requirements of the Trial Court Data Model. As per the JMC Performance Workgroup recommendation, this data collection specification identifies specific events and associated data elements to be reported, details of the transmission of those events in a prescribed format and establishes a meaningful timeframe necessary to enhance performance reporting.

The Commission on Trial Court Performance & Accountability, through its Court Statistics and Workload Committee, has emphasized that data quality is of fundamental importance to the value of the information collected. The JDMS framework also defines quality as one of the four essential structural elements of a uniform court management system. Accordingly, the UCR project specification includes design elements to enhance the quality of data captured within the data collection specification.

Concurrently, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) should also implement a specific auditing process to validate the data collected via this specification. However, it is

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
Phone Conference
August 31, 2015**

recognized that auditing data after receipt at the state level is the least effective mechanism for quality improvement. Those entities closest to the source of the data record, clerks of court and circuit court staff, are encouraged to implement more efficient system level quality and auditing capabilities within their case maintenance and case application processing systems.

The CSWC is cognizant of the potential impact this data collection specification may have on clerks of court, court administration and other justice partners and encourages all partners to seek solutions that maximize deployment and minimize costs. The CSWC also notes that the UCR Project is the consequence of a long series of data management initiatives that began with the Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions (TIMS) Project advancing through the Case-Event Definitional Framework and into the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) Framework. These projects are essential to the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts. The CSWC believes in the engagement of all stakeholders and will continue to work with all partners to implement these mission critical projects in a responsible and sustainable way.

V.C. Final Proposal & Data Collection Specification

In its referral to TCP&A, the supreme court, directed that a final proposal implementing the JMC Performance Workgroup recommendations be submitted to the supreme court by October 1, 2015. Together, the Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project Final Proposal (Enclosure 06) and the Data Collection Specification (Enclosure 07) are advanced to satisfy that request.

The particulars of the final proposal have not changed significantly from the preliminary proposal advanced by the CSWC in June 2015. Staff has included an implementation schedule that attempts to balance the court's need for case activity and judicial workload data with the impact of such reporting on clerks of court and other data providers. The Final Proposal (Enclosure 06) is provided with track changes enabled so that members may quickly see the differences between the Preliminary and Final Proposals. Track changes will be removed when the proposal is advanced to TCP&A for final approval. Highlights of the enclosed proposal are listed below. The chief recommendations are:

- All new data collection efforts, including the Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Proposal, be developed in accordance with the JDMS framework and principles.
- Data elements and performance measures considered for this proposal should be developed from the Trial Court Data Model (TCDM) approved as part of the 2010-2012 Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions (TIMS) project.
- New data collection and reporting requirements be specified using a phased approach as a series of small, manageable data collection projects that focus on essential case and performance management needs.
- The supreme court charge OSCA with development and execution of the UCR Project data collection specification and delegate execution and management operations to the OSCA under Fl. R. Jud. Admin 2.245(a).

**Commission on Trial Court
Performance & Accountability
Court Statistics & Workload Committee
Phone Conference
August 31, 2015**

- The current twelve-element data collection effort presently part of the Foreclosure Initiative reporting requirements be expanded to encompass all divisions of court.
- An additional five data elements should be added to the twelve elements currently collected for a total of seventeen elements.
- Additional elements proposed as candidates for collection by the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup should be evaluated for inclusion in the Trial Court Data Model (TCDM) as appropriate.
- The UCR Project data collection specification adopt the most effective data format and transmission schedule sufficient to report and maintain the seventeen elements in this proposal consistent with the JDMS Framework architecture.
- The OSCA should update this data collection specification to comport, as appropriate, with the Data Exchange Standards currently being developed by the Florida Court Technology Commissions Data Exchange Workgroup as that standard is finalized.
- State-level case activity data in this proposal be submitted from the clerks of court to the OSCA on a daily basis, at a minimum.
- The supreme court issue an administrative order adopting a data collection plan detailing a timely and achievable implementation schedule for this data collection proposal to include transmission format, transmission frequencies and quality/correction mechanisms.
- The UCR Project Data Collection Specification include intrinsic design elements to enhance the quality of data captured.
- The OSCA implements a specific auditing process to validate the data collected in this proposal.

Decision Needed:

1. Approve the enclosed final data collection proposal (Encl 06), referred to as the Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project.
2. Approve the enclosed Uniform Case Reporting Project Data Collection Specification (Encl 07) for use in satisfying the requirements outlined in the UCR Project.
3. Recommend that the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability adopt this proposal and data collection specification as final response to Recommendation 1 of the Judicial Management Council's Performance Workgroup.

Enclosure 06

**Response to Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup
Recommendation One**

Uniform Case Reporting Project

Final Proposal

Response to Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup Recommendation One Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project

Final Proposal

Deleted: Preliminary

Direction

On April 1, 2015 the supreme court charged the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A) with developing a response to Recommendation 1 of the Judicial Management Council's (JMC) Performance Workgroup Recommendations, approved by the Judicial Management Council on February 27, 2015. This recommendation reads as follows:

Recommendation 1 - The JMC Performance Workgroup recommends that the supreme court charge the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability to propose clerk collection and reporting requirements that address: the collection of specific data elements, transmission of that data in a prescribed format, and directs those transmissions to occur in a timely manner to enhance performance reporting.

The supreme court's referral letter to TCP&A specified that the assessment and recommendations should build upon and be consistent with other work in this area, in particular the 2010 Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions (TIMS) Project. It also directed the inclusion of a draft of the proposed vehicle to require the reporting requirements (new court rule of procedure, amended court rule of procedure, administrative order, or similar authoritative mechanism). It further requested that when developing recommendations, TCP&A consider continuation of the requirements delineated in AOSC13-28 and AOSC13-51, both relating to the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative reporting requirements. Coordination with the JMC Performance Workgroup is expected as these recommendations are undertaken.

The supreme court requested that TCP&A complete an initial recommendation related to this item and submit it for the court's review by June 30, 2015. The final assessment and recommendation should be submitted by October 1, 2015.

At its April 17, 2015 meeting, the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup referred the matter to the Court Statistics and Workload Committee (CSWC) for further development.

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project

This proposed data reporting project addresses the supreme court charge to "...propose clerk collection and reporting requirements ...". It takes its name from s. 25.075, Florida Statutes directing the supreme court to develop a uniform case reporting system. While summary counts of cases have been collected under this statute for almost forty years, the court has not fully captured the underlying case detail that would provide essential organizational court and case management information. Given the complexity and cost of establishing new data reporting systems, this proposal advances seventeen data elements focused on basic court and case

activity. These elements will provide valuable court activity information and serve as a foundation for future court and case management projects.

Reporting Framework

The CSWC has reviewed the Trial Court Data Model (TCDM) as presented in Appendix C of the 2010-2012 Trial Court Integrated Management Solutions (TIMS) Project report. The data elements and relationships defined in the TCDM of court activity. The TCDM already incorporates the data elements included in this proposal as well as many others that would be valuable to court managers in the long term. The CSWC suggests that the Performance Management Workgroup review the TCDM and prioritize the implementation of elements within the model by identifying associated organizational value for these elements. This prioritization will help guide additional system development planning.

Following the completion of the 2010-2012 TIMS Project, the supreme court approved the Integrated Trial Court Adjudication System (ITCAS) project as a next step to court management. The ITCAS project is designed to provide case and court management tools and capabilities to both judges and state level managers. The state-level data management component is called the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) system. The JDMS system represents a state-level implementation of the Trial Court Data Management Framework architecture as presented in Appendix M of the TIMS report.

The focus of JDMS is on state-level court activity data and analysis services for court managers and other stakeholders. The JDMS project will develop an integrated computing environment to provide state-level data management services to all elements of the court system as appropriate.

In a recent letter to the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers Association, the supreme court emphasized the use of the JDMS system as the primary mechanism to produce "... state-level, court activity data and analysis services." Accordingly, CSWC recommends that all new data collection efforts, including the Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project, be developed in accordance with the JDMS framework and principles. This framework is structured to provide the data receipt, processing, storage, and computational capability necessary for this proposed data collection project.

Project Implementation Principles

The CSWC recognizes that effective and meaningful data collection is not without cost. The committee is sensitive to the potential impact of additional data collection on the clerks of court and court administration staff who will ultimately be responsible for collecting and reporting that data to the OSCA. The TCDM defines over 475 data elements describing essential court activity. While it is expected that court data management systems will evolve to capture all of this information, it is not expected that all of this information be captured at one time. To attempt to do so would prove prohibitively expensive and would overwhelm the data management capacity of county, circuit and state alike. On the other hand, the CSWC is also cognizant of the critical need for essential court and case management data.

Therefore, the CSWC recommends that new data collection and reporting requirements be specified using a phased approach as a series of small, manageable data collection projects that

focus on essential case and performance measurement needs. This will enable county, circuit and state staff to expand their data management systems following sound development practices, while providing a consistent and expanding stream of meaningful management data. This recommendation is consistent with the data management philosophy outlined in the TIMS report and with court data management principles set forth in AOSC09-30, In Re: Standards for Electronic Access to the Courts, Section 6.

Deleted: 8

AOSC13-28 pertaining to the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative charged the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) with developing a detailed data collection plan for the Initiative. The supreme court further charged OSCA with administration and maintenance of this plan. The CSWC recommends that the supreme court similarly charge OSCA with development and execution of the proposed UCR Project data collection plan and delegate execution and management operations to the OSCA under Fl. R. Jud. Admin 2.245(a).

Initial Data Elements

In response to Recommendation 4 of the JMC Performance Workgroup report, the supreme court recently issued AOSC15-9, In Re: Continued Case Reporting Requirements for Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Cases, which extends the data collection program established for the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative for the period of one year beyond June 30, 2015. The report cited the valuable information captured by this data collection program and its significant contributions to the reduction of foreclosure backlog in the courts. Additionally, it is noted that the twelve elements collected in this Initiative have broad applicability across all case types. Consequently, building upon and consistent with this highly successful Initiative, CSWC recommends that this twelve element data collection effort be expanded to encompass all divisions of court. Additionally, the data elements currently collected as part of this effort should be expanded from a total of twelve to a total of seventeen elements. These seventeen elements are instrumental in calculating basic macro level performance indicators for the court and in satisfying requirements of a variety of existing administrative orders, rules of court, and statutes. They are available in existing case maintenance systems, but have not previously been accessible to the courts in a readily usable form. This proposal would bring these elements together in a consistent format and provide a solid case data foundation for further work by the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup.

The three case aging statistics measures computable from these proposed data elements are:

- Clearance Rate
- Average Time to Disposition
- Average Age of Pending Caseload

Additional case statistics and case inventory reports are possible from the full seventeen element set. Below is a chart containing the proposed data elements pertaining to all divisions of court, a description of the element, and the reporting requirement(s) each element will satisfy. The twelve elements collected in the Foreclosure Initiative are listed first, and the five new elements are shaded in gray.

Table 1: Uniform Case Reporting Initial Data Elements

Data Element	Description	Reporting Requirement(s) Satisfied:
Report Date	Effective date of the information contained in the case record.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Uniform Case Number (UCN)	Standard UCN as required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245(b).	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Date Case Initiated/Reopened	The document stamp state (physical or electronic) that the case is brought before the court either through a filing event or reopen event.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
SRS Case Type	Six-digit Case Type as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Divisional Assignment	Division within the local jurisdiction to which the case is assigned.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Judge Assigned	Name of judge or team assigned primary responsibility for the case as of the Report Date.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Judicial Officer Referred (if applicable)	Name of the judicial officer (magistrate or designee) assigned primary responsibility for the case under the oversight of the Judge Assigned as of the Report Date.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)

Table 1: Uniform Case Reporting Initial Data Elements

Data Element	Description	Reporting Requirement(s) Satisfied:
Case Status	Status of the case as of the Report Date. Valid values are “ACTIVE”, “INACTIVE”, “CLOSED”, “REOPEN ACTIVE”, “REOPEN INACTIVE”, and “RECLOSED”.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Closure Date	Date the case was closed for court action because of a disposition event or reclosed for court action because of a reclosure event.	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
SRS Disposition Category	Six-digit Disposition Category as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Case aging statistics as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) Pending caseload report as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b)
Reason for Status Change	Numerical code to categorize the reason a case changed from Active to Inactive status or from Inactive back to Active status as of the Report Date.	Inactive Status Analysis as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOSC13-28 Final Report and Recommendations of the Foreclosure Initiative Workgroup • AOSC13-51 Case Status Reporting Requirements • FY2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative Data Collection Plan
Description of Status Change	A free text description of the Reason for Status Change when a code signifying “other” is used.	Inactive Status Analysis as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOSC13-28 Final Report and Recommendations of the Foreclosure Initiative Workgroup • AOSC13-51 Case Status Reporting Requirements • FY2013-14 Foreclosure Initiative Data Collection Plan

Table 1: Uniform Case Reporting Initial Data Elements

Data Element	Description	Reporting Requirement(s) Satisfied:
Complex Civil Litigation	A flag to denote whether the case has been designated as Complex Civil Litigation per Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.201.	Complex Civil Litigation reporting as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.201
SRS Case Type at Disposition	Six-digit Case Type as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Computing SRS as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 25.075, F.S. • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245
Reopen SRS Case Type	Six-digit Case Type as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Computing SRS as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 25.075, F.S. • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245
Reclosure SRS Case Type	Six-digit Case Type as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Computing SRS as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 25.075, F.S. • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245
Reclosure SRS Disposition Category	Six-digit Disposition Category as defined by the Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002).	Computing SRS as required by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 25.075, F.S. • Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245

Reporting requirements satisfied by these elements

The five new elements and twelve currently reported elements proposed for this data collection project will satisfy and standardize several existing reporting requirements. The court system is presently unable to calculate the case aging statistics for the associated performance measures required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) from the data reported by the clerks of court. In its FY2012-2014 term, this committee evaluated the minimum data elements and frequency of reporting necessary to calculate these statistics. The committee is basing its current recommendation on both this evaluation and the subsequent FY2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative, which included the same performance measures and case age calculations.

The pending caseload report required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b) is submitted quarterly by the clerks of court, in what is understood to be a manual, labor-intensive process for most. These reports are not submitted to the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) in a format or timeframe that provides much value to the courts. The transmission of case activity records should supplant the former quarterly reporting processes, relieving the clerks of court of this workload requirement, significantly reducing the time in which statistics are ready for use by the court, and increasing the accuracy of this dataset.

Complex Civil Litigation reporting as required by Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.201 is submitted on spreadsheets to the OSCA on a quarterly basis. Inclusion of this single data element will eliminate an entire reporting process that is presently separate from all other reporting to the state. The transmission of case activity records should supplant the former quarterly reporting processes, relieving the clerks of court of this workload requirement, significantly reducing the time in which statistics are ready for use by the court, and increasing the accuracy of this dataset.

For the past 39 years, clerks of court submit monthly summary counts of case filings and dispositions to the Summary Reporting System (SRS), required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245, which is part of the Uniform Case Reporting System required by Section 25.075, Florida Statutes. Collection of the elements to satisfy the aforementioned reporting requirements will provide most of the information needed to simultaneously calculate several of the SRS statistics. The inclusion of four more data elements in these case records will allow the OSCA to calculate all of the SRS statistics. Over time, the transmission of case-level records should supplant the former monthly reporting and associated amendment processes, relieving the clerks of court of this workload requirement, significantly reducing the time in which statistics are ready for use by the court, and increasing the accuracy of this extremely dynamic dataset.

The CSWC is cognizant of the importance of maintaining existing data collection programs during the transition to UCR Proposal reporting. The CSWC supports the assertion in AOSC09-30, Section 6, “It should be noted that the existing reporting mechanisms that this data collection proposal is intended to absorb cannot and should not be abandoned prematurely. Every effort should be made to consolidate data collection and reporting mechanisms during the development process, clerks of court, circuit court administration and other reporting entities should expect to continue data collection and reporting under the appropriate guidelines until directed otherwise by the courts” and believes it should be followed in this project.

Deleted: 8

Transmission and format of data

As discussed in AOSC09-30, the streamlining of the numerous and varied reporting mechanisms should be pursued whenever possible. Collection of these seventeen data elements for case-level data within all divisions of court will replace an assortment of paper forms depicting summary counts that must be hand-keyed into a database by OSCA staff, electronic spreadsheets, and pdf reports containing lists of cases serving a singular purpose. Much of this variability in reporting arises from the many different case maintenance system in use by clerks of court and from the independent character of each of these reporting requirements. The TIMS project asserted that these system differences were basic to the effective operation of the courts in each jurisdiction while allowing that a certain degree of standardization is necessary. In light of these differences, the CSWC recommends that the UCR Project data collection plan adopt the most effective data format and transmission schedule sufficient to report and maintain the seventeen elements in this proposal consistent with the JDMS Framework. It is further recommended that the OSCA update this data collection plan to comport, as appropriate, with the Data Exchange Standards currently being developed by the Florida Court Technology Commissions Data Exchange Workgroup as that standard is finalized.

Frequency of data transmission

The case event data included in the UCR project should be transmitted to the state level on a daily basis at a minimum. With an eye to the future evolution of court data management, it is important to keep in mind that the ideal transmission of case event data is at the moment when change occurs as this results in the most accurate and reliable data generated as close to the source and at the lowest level possible. This principle, referred to as event-push, is axiomatic within data management and underlies most mobile and web based applications. Both the JDMS framework and the Data Exchange standards propose capability for this sort of immediate transfer. However, the CSWC recognizes the difficulty within current field data management systems in providing this level of granularity to the state level. The UCR Data Collection Specification should accommodate this reality with the understanding that over the next three years, clerk and other case data source systems should evolve to provide UCR data.as it changes.

Deleted: T

Previous research by this committee on the reporting of case age statistics determined that daily submission represented a reasonable balance between the courts need for up-to-date information and the effort required to provide that information. The FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative demonstrated that this time frame is achievable by most clerks of court. Staff to this initiative also noted significant improvements to data quality among those counties submitting daily.

Deleted: Consequently, the CSWC recommends that state-level case-level records, such as those proposed for the UCR Project, should be submitted from the clerks of court to the OSCA on a daily basis, at a minimum.

Order/Rule establishing new reporting requirements

Similar to the process followed by the supreme court for the FY2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative, the CSWC recommends that the supreme court issue an administrative order adopting a data collection plan detailing a timely and achievable implementation schedule for this data collection proposal to include transmission format, transmission frequencies and quality/correction mechanisms. The OSCA should be charged with compiling this plan and for its subsequent administration and update as required. The initial plan should be forwarded to TCP&A via CSWC for approval and subsequent submission to the supreme court along with a proposed administrative order.

Once the UCR Project is underway, the associated rules of court as identified in Table 1 should be evaluated and amended as appropriate to reflect the new data collection methodology. A proposed order and an analysis of rule changes will be provided with the October report.

Implementation Schedule

As noted previously the committee is sensitive to the potential impact of additional data collection on the clerks of court, court administration staff and OSCA staff. A headlong rush to obtain case event data, however valuable, would quickly overwhelm available staff resources resulting in an inefficient collection process, poor quality data and a frustrating user experience for all concerned. The following implementation schedule is provided to balance the need for court case event data while ensuring that staff and other resources are available to handle this reporting requirement. The CSWC expects that advances in technology and case management refresh cycles may offer opportunities to advance this data collection more quickly than proposed. The CSWC recommends that the OSCA and reporting entities look for specific

Formatted: Normal

opportunities to advance this process and that the Time Frame column be interpreted to mean “as soon as possible but no later than”

<u>Division</u>	<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Circuit Civil</u>	<u>Jan 2016 – Jun 2016</u>	<u>10 volunteer</u>	<u>Clerks have already been reporting data on foreclosure cases since July 2013. These are a subset of circuit civil cases</u>
	<u>Jul 2016 – Jun 2017</u>	<u>Remaining 57 counties in groups of 20</u>	
<u>Family (including juvenile)</u>	<u>Jul 2017 – Jul 2018</u>	<u>67 counties in groups of 20</u>	
<u>Probate & County Civil</u>	<u>Jul 2018 – Jun 2019</u>	<u>67 counties in groups of 20</u>	
<u>Circuit Criminal & County Criminal</u>	<u>Jul 2019 – Jun 2020</u>	<u>67 counties in groups of 20</u>	<u>The majority of clerks report criminal data electronically via the OBTS system. However, this data collection vehicle does not include some of the elements captured in this UCR proposal</u>
<u>Involuntary Civil Commitment of Violent Sexual Predators</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>The cases are not covered under the current UCR project plan. Additional research is needed to determine how these cases can best be reported.</u>

Formatted: Centered
Formatted Table

Formatted: Normal

Quality

The TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup has emphasized that data quality is of fundamental importance to the value of the information collected. AOSC09-30 defines quality as one of the four essential concepts for a uniform case management system. The court system at all levels should work constantly to improve quality as a consequence of the process by which data is generated and not an effect imposed after the data is collected. Consistent with AOSC09-30, the CSWC recommends that the UCR Project Data Collection Plan include intrinsic design elements to enhance the quality of data captured.

For example, increasing the frequency of transmission to at least daily will improve quality by providing reports closer in time to the actual event. This will also enable more opportunity for timely correction of data. Setting the condition that a change record should be generated

whenever one of the elements in a dataset should change provides similar benefits. While this results in larger data files being exchanged between partners, it ensures that the daily transmission of data contains all of the relevant case activity events leading to more accurate and timely case activity data. The number of data elements is another example of quality design. The small number of elements in this reporting requirement makes it easier to generate the data record when any of the data elements change.

In addition, the CSWC recommends that the OSCA implement a specific auditing process to validate the data collected in this proposal. However, the CSWC also recognizes that auditing data after receipt at the state level is the least effective mechanism for quality improvement and encourages those entities closest to the data record, clerks of court and circuit court staff, to implement more efficient system level quality and auditing capabilities within their case maintenance and case application processing systems.

Long Term Roadmap

The Uniform Case Reporting Project Preliminary Proposal aims to answer the charge of the Supreme Court by doing three things:

- Advance a standard, repeatable process for satisfying court data needs;
- Identify a targeted and manageable set of activity measures and data elements with a defined value for the courts; and
- Incorporate data quality and process improvement as structural components of our court operations.

The CSWC readily acknowledges that the court system will need to develop additional activity measures and process improvement programs that will require more enhanced data collection and reporting. This work has already begun. For example, at its April meeting, the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup identified several elements as candidates for future consideration such as number of hearings, monetary assessments, uniform docket codes and flags to denote pro se parties, specialty courts and incomplete service.

The CSWC recommends that the TCP&A Performance Management Workgroup continue its work in identifying performance and process measures, using the Trial Court Data Model as a guide for its deliberations, and that the workgroup builds on the experience of this data collection project to advance another set of requirements following this one. In this way, the UCR project proposal can serve as a template for similar projects in the future.

Next Steps

In keeping with the idea that court data management should be advanced through a series of short, targeted projects, the CSWC suggests the following next steps for consideration after the final report to the supreme court in October 2015:

1. A comprehensive rule review to consolidate the various reporting requirements satisfied by the UCR Proposal.

2. A complete evaluation of the Trial Court Data Model to identify the next set of elements to be implemented. This set should consist of approximately ten data elements and should be considered in relation to the organizational and management value they provide.
3. Identification of data sources and supporting infrastructure necessary to collect the proposed data elements.

Enclosure 07

**Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification**

Florida Office of the State Courts Administrator

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification

V1.0.1 2015/08/27

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project.....	1
Implementation Framework.....	2
Case Events.....	2
Accuracy and Reliability.....	2
Data Sources	2
Consolidation of Existing Reporting	3
Reporting of Case Events.....	3
Table 1. Types of Events	3
Reporting Format	6
Submission Schedule	7
Data Fields Describing Case Events	7
Table 2. Description of Data Fields	7
Determination of Active/Inactive Status.....	10
Table 3. Reasons for Inactivity and Associated Reporting Codes.....	11
Uniform Case Reporting Project and the Summary Reporting System.....	12
Reporting Exceptions.....	13
Appendix A. Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework	14
Appendix B. SRS Case Types and SRS Disposition Category Codes.....	18
Table 4. SRS Case Types to Case Type Codes.....	18
Table 5. SRS Disposition Categories and Disposition Category Codes.....	18

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page ii

Appendix C. Example Data File 19

Appendix D. Sample Orders Directing Change of Status 28

Document Revisions

Revision	Date	Responsible Primary
1.0.0	2015/08/25	PJ Stockdale
1.0.1	2015/08/27	PJ Stockdale

Significant Changes

Introduction

This document outlines the proposed data collection specification necessary to track and monitor the case activity end events necessary for several existing case-related reporting requirements. This data collection project was initiated by the Judicial Management Council's (JMC) Performance Workgroup in February 2015. In their final report, the Workgroup recommended that the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability

“...propose clerk collection and reporting requirements that address: the collection of specific data elements, transmission of that data in a prescribed format, and directs those transmissions to occur in a timely manner to enhance performance reporting.”

A preliminary proposal Response to Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup Recommendation One: Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project Preliminary Proposal was prepared by the Court Statistics and Workload Committee (CSWC) and approved by the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability on June 5, 2015. This specification implements that proposal.

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project

The Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project identifies specific case events that will form the foundation of court case activity reporting. One goal of this data collection project is to consolidate several existing case activity reporting requirements in to a single, consistent reporting framework. State-level reporting is defined under the Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) data management framework and complies with the data structure requirements of the Trial Court Data Model. As per the JMC Performance Workgroup recommendation, this data collection specification identifies specific events and associated data elements to be reported, details of the transmission of those events in a prescribed format and establishes a meaningful timeframe necessary to enhance performance reporting.

The Commission on Trial Court Performance & Accountability, through its Court Statistics and Workload Committee, has emphasized that data quality is of fundamental importance to the value of the information collected. The JDMS framework also defines quality as one of the four essential structural elements of a uniform court management system. Accordingly, the UCR project specification includes design elements to enhance the quality of data captured within the data collection specification.

Concurrently, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) should also implement a specific auditing process to validate the data collected via this specification. However, it is

recognized that auditing data after receipt at the state level is the least effective mechanism for quality improvement. Those entities closest to the source of the data record, clerks of court and circuit court staff, are encouraged to implement more efficient system level quality and auditing capabilities within their case maintenance and case application processing systems.

Implementation Framework

Case Events

The data captured by this data collection specification tracks significant events related to case initiation, closure and post-judgment activity along with associated changes in case status. The specification also tracks case assignment events including judge, division, Summary Reporting System (SRS) case type and disposition category and Complex Civil Litigation designation. Case event and associated status are defined in [AOSC14-20 In Re: Case Event Definitional Framework](#).

Accuracy and Reliability

The Judicial Data Management Services framework and the underlying Trial Court Data Model emphasize an event driven model of data management. In this framework, data concerning an event is generated at the moment the event occurs. Data records are small and targeted to capture the details of just the event. This targeted methodology minimizes the logic necessary to extract data from active case management systems and improves quality by generating timely data as close to the source and at the lowest level possible.

Although this specification assumes that event records will be generated as the event occurs, it is understood that the technology to transmit those records as the event occurs is not currently available. Therefore, it is expected that multiple event records will be aggregated into a single file for submission to the OSCA no less than once per day.

Data Sources

The clerks of court, as custodians of the court record, are ultimately responsible for providing the data necessary under the Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) project specification. However, it is recognized that clerks of court and circuit court administration have many potential sources of this case activity data, such as the clerk's own case maintenance system, the circuit judicial viewer systems as they are deployed and the state level Comprehensive Case Information System (CCIS). Within the constraints of established reporting requirements, this plan should not be construed to limit the ability of clerks of court to develop this data in the manner most suited to their operations. Clerks of court, in coordination with circuit administration, vendors and other data providers, may arrange to provide the necessary data from any source provided that the

source is capable of meeting the reporting requirements contained herein and of providing data of sufficient quality to satisfy the reporting need.

Consolidation of Existing Reporting

As noted, a long term goal of this reporting specification is the consolidation of several existing case activity reporting mechanisms, including case inventory statistics of Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2), Pending Caseload statistics required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b), Complex Civil Litigation reporting required by Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.201 and, ultimately, Summary Reporting System reporting as required by Section 25.075, Florida Statutes and Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245.

However, until the transition to reporting under the UCR Specification is complete and the OSCA certifies the resultant data as suitable for use to satisfy a particular reporting requirement, clerks of court, circuit court administration and other reporting entities must continue data collection and reporting under applicable rules and guidelines until directed otherwise by the courts. The ability to submit data via this specification is not sufficient to stop reporting as required by the aforementioned rules and statute. Explicit notification is required.

Reporting of Case Events

The following significant events in the life of a case require reporting under this specification. The reporting structure contained in this specification is designed to facilitate the reporting of case events as they occur. Reportable events are listed in Table 1 below, along with the fields appropriate for each event type. Please refer to the section titled Submission Schedule for additional information on the submission of these records.

Table 1. Types of Events

Case Event Type	Fields Contained in Event Record
Case Initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to CASE INITIATION) • Event Date (date of case initiation) • UCN • SRS Case Type at filing • Divisional Assignment • Judge Assigned • Judicial Officer Referred (if applicable) • Case Status (set to ACTIVE or INACTIVE) • Complex Civil Litigation Indicator

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 4

Case Event Type	Fields Contained in Event Record
Case Closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to CASE CLOSURE) • Event Date (disposition date) • UCN • SRS Case Type at disposition • Case Status (set to CLOSED) • SRS Disposition Category <p>Optional fields if different than last report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divisional Assignment • Judge Assigned • Judicial Officer Referred • Complex Civil Litigation Indicator
Change Event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to CHANGE EVENT) • Event Date (date the change occurred) • UCN <p>Any and all fields that changed on the Event Date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Status (ACTIVE, INACTIVE, REOPEN ACTIVE, or REOPEN INACTIVE) • Reason for Status Change (if Case Status Changed) • Description of Status Change (if OTH or OTHDISP) • SRS Case Type (if changed) • Divisional Assignment (if changed) • Judge Assigned (if changed) • Judicial Officer Referred (if changed) • Complex Civil Litigation Indicator (if changed)
Reopen Initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to REOPEN INITIATION) • Event Date (date of event reopening the case) • UCN • SRS Case Type at Reopen • Divisional Assignment • Judge Assigned • Judicial Officer Referred (if applicable) • Case Status (set to REOPEN ACTIVE) • Complex Civil Litigation Indicator

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 5

Case Event Type	Fields Contained in Event Record
Case Reclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to CASE RECLOSURE) • Event Date (reclosure date) • UCN • SRS Case Type at reclosure • Case Status (set to RECLOSED) <p>Optional fields if also changed on the Event Date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divisional Assignment • Judge Assigned • Judicial Officer Referred • Complex Civil Litigation Indicator
Undo Record Action (See note 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to UNDO RECORD) • Event Date (event date of record identified for removal from the system) • UCN
Delete Case Action (See note 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to DELETE CASE) • Event Date (date the entire case has been identified for deletion) • UCN
Delete All Post-Judgement Action (See note 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Date/Time • Event Type (set to DELETE REOPEN) • Event Date (date the entire block of post-judgement activity on the case has been identified for deletion) • UCN

Notes:

1. Corrections to case activity data records reported in error may be submitted in one of two methods. A Case Initiation, Case Closure, Reopen Initiation, or Case Reclosure record may simply be re-submitted with the same event date as the previous record containing the correct information. Please note that all fields required in the record must be included in this re-submission. Additionally, if a Change Event record is identified to have been submitted in error, it may be corrected with an “UNDO RECORD” action. An Undo record will initiate a process to remove the specific record associated with the same Event Date. This may be done preceding a second Change Event record with the correct case activity information.
2. A “DELETE CASE” record will initiate the deletion procedure and remove all records previously reported for a UCN including all post-judgment actions. This process is expected to be used

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project Data Collection Specification Page 6

infrequently, and caution should be taken when employing it. Most corrections can be accomplished by the Undo procedure. If a UCN should not have been reported to the UCR Project, all records can be deleted with this single action.

3. Similar to the delete case action, a “DELETE REOPEN” will initiate the deletion procedure and remove all post-judgement activity previously reported for a UCN. This process is expected to be used infrequently, and caution should be taken when employing it. Most corrections can be accomplished by the Undo procedure. If a series of post-judgement events for a UCN should not have been reported to the UCR Project, all post-judgement records can be deleted with this single action. All activity reported for the initial phase of the case (from initiation to closure) will remain in the database.

A canonical reference workflow for reporting under this specification might be as follows. Applicable documents are reported to the clerk of court and a case is initiated. At the point of initiation, a “case initiation” event record is generated. The case is initially assigned to Division 1A, Judge Stilton. The event record is output to a data file pending transmission to the OSCA. A few hours later, the case is reassigned to Division 2, Magistrate Hanson. A “change event” record is generated noting the change in division and assignment to the magistrate and this record is output to the pending data file. Meanwhile, an order disposing of case number 15-0456CA is received. A “closure” event record is generated and output to the pending data file. At a specified time (at least daily), all output to the pending event file are put on hold and the event file is transmitted to the OSCA. The hold is then released and all outstanding event records are written to a new event record file to be uploaded at the next scheduled upload time.

It is understood that every clerk system is unique in its own way. It is not expected that clerks of court will implement the reference workflow described above exactly. There are other, equivalent workflows that may be more appropriate to a particular system. However, the workflow described will guarantee that the data reported satisfies the reporting requirements of this specification. Clerks of court are encouraged to implement a functionally equivalent workflow as appropriate to their operations.

Under this architecture, the last valid record submitted will be considered authoritative.

Reporting Format

The reporting format for this specification is XML, which is well suited to the submission of a one or more variable length data records detailing the facts of different events. A single submission under this specification should consist of all events that have occurred since the last report. Examples of XML event records as outlined in Table 1 are provided in Appendix C.

The applicable event XML schema (xsd) documents will be published on the OSCA website at: _____(TBD)_____. Please refer to the website for the most up-to-date schemas for each event type.

Submission Schedule

A file containing all event records that have occurred since the last report transmitted must be submitted daily, by 11:59pm EST.

Data Fields Describing Case Events

The following fields from the Trial Court Data Model (TCDM) have been identified as the minimum necessary to support the reporting of case events in the UCR Project Specification. Table 2 is provided for informational purposes only. Please refer to the current XML schemas for each event type to obtain the formatting requirements of the data fields named below.

Table 2. Description of Data Fields

Field Name	Description
Report Date/Time	The effective date and time the information in the event record is valid. Allows for multiple event records to be reported in the same file. The last valid record submitted will be considered authoritative.
Event Type	Indicates the type of event reported in the record. Please refer to the XML schemas for Event Type codes.

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 8

Field Name	Description
Event Date	<p>The date on which the event occurred.</p> <p>For Case Initiation and Reopen Initiations, this is the document stamp date (physical or electronic) that the case is brought before the court through a filing event or a reopen event, respectively.</p> <p>For Case Closure and Case Reclosures, this is the date that the case was closed for court action because of a disposition event or reclosed for court action because of a reclosure event. Please see AOSC14-20 for additional clarification.</p> <p>For Change Event records, this is the date the change occurred or was recorded.</p> <p>For Undo Record actions, this date should match the Event Date of the previously-submitted record now identified for removal.</p> <p>For Delete Case and Delete Reopen actions, this is the date the entire block of activity has been flagged for deletion.</p>
Uniform Case Number (UCN)	Standard UCN to identify and update case status data as required by Fl. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245(b).
SRS Case Type	As defined by Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002). See Appendix B Table 4 for the appropriate category codes. Please note that any record requiring this field must include the current SRS Case Type. i.e., the case's SRS Type at the time of disposition, reopen, and reclosure. Additionally, this field may be reported at any point in time during the life of a case if the SRS Case Type changes through a Change Event.
Divisional Assignment	<p>The division within the local jurisdiction to which the case is assigned. Since divisional assignments are specific to circuits and courts, clerks of court and court administration should ensure that this field is used consistently throughout the local jurisdiction.</p> <p>If the divisional assignments are associated with a team assignment, please report the team name in the Judge Assigned field.</p>

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 9

Field Name	Description
Judge Assigned	<p>Name of judge or senior judge or the team assigned primary responsibility for the case as of date of report. Names should be reported as last name, followed by comma, followed by a space, followed by the first name, followed by a space, and then an optional suffix such as SR, III, etc. Hyphens and all other punctuation should be dropped. Paired names should be run together. For ex., Judge John Allers-Smith Sr. should be reported as “ALLERSSMITH, JOHN SR”</p> <p>If no judge or team has been assigned responsibility for the case as of the date of the report although one is expected soon, use the value “NOJUDGEASSIGNED”. However, this value is considered a temporary assignment and the case will have to be permanently assigned as appropriate.</p> <p>For those jurisdictions using the team concept, please report a name for the team so that the appropriate group can be identified in all computations.</p>
Judicial Officer Referred (if applicable)	<p>Name of the judicial officer (magistrate or designee) assigned primary responsibility for the case under the oversight of the “Judge Assigned” as of date of report. All cases are assigned to a judge, senior judge for disposition. However, these cases may be referred to a magistrates or other specially designated officer for resolution. Effective program evaluation requires that the name of both the primary judge and referred judicial officer be known. Names should be reported as described for Judge Assigned. For those jurisdictions applying the team approach or for those cases not involving an assisting general magistrate or senior judge, this field may be left blank.</p>
Case Status	<p>The status of the case as of the Event Date. Valid values are ACTIVE, INACTIVE, CLOSED, REOPEN ACTIVE, REOPEN INACTIVE, RECLOSED.</p> <p>See Appendix A for a description of these statuses as defined by the Case-Event Definitional Framework.</p>

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 10

Field Name	Description
SRS Disposition Category	As defined by Summary Reporting System (SRS) Manual (Jan 2002). See Appendix B Table 5 for the appropriate category codes. Required in the reporting of Case Closure events. Not applicable to Reclosure events.
Reason for Status Change	Code to categorize the reason a case changed from ACTIVE to INACTIVE status or from INACTIVE back to ACTIVE status as of the Report Date. Must be included on all records reporting a Case Status change with either of these two values. Permissible values are listed in Table 3. Additionally, the sample orders in Appendix D provides the reasons and associated reporting codes.
Description of Status Change	A free text description of the Reason for Status Change when a code signifying “other” is used. Required when the codes of “OTH” or “OTHDISP” is contained in the Reason for Status Change field.
Complex Civil Litigation Indicator	A flag to denote whether the case has been designated as Complex Civil Litigation per Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.201. A one-character value of “Y” denotes the case has been designated as such. This indicator is required on Case Initiation records and may be included on Change Event, Case Closure, Reopen Initiation, and Case Reclosure events if the value of this field is different than the previous record for the UCN submitted.

Determination of Active/Inactive Status

The determination of case status is a challenging issue within the courts. Yet, it is an essential element for case management since, by definition, case status identifies those open cases on which the court can proceed and those on which it cannot. The definitions of ACTIVE and INACTIVE cases were established in [AOSC14-20 In Re: Case Event Definitional Framework](#). Accurate reporting of case status is important to ensure that court resources are dedicated to the cases that need attention the most. In recognition of this importance, chief judges and clerks of court should establish a mechanism, by local administrative order, whereby cases known to the circuit to change status from ACTIVE to INACTIVE or INACTIVE to ACTIVE can be communicated to the clerk of courts who can report that status to the OSCA as indicated in this document and to the circuit judges who can act on this information.

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 11

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. Additionally, the local administrative order should include directions to both parties to notify the clerk of courts as soon as an event occurs that would change the status of a case such as when a bankruptcy is filed or an agreement is reached. Sample orders are provided as Appendix D and may serve as a template if desired.

There are currently six recognized reasons that may move a case from ACTIVE to INACTIVE status or, conversely, from INACTIVE to ACTIVE status listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Reasons for Inactivity and Associated Reporting Codes

Reason	Codes		Description
	Active to Inactive	Inactive to Active	
A stay of bankruptcy	BKST	BKSTLFT	
Resolution of case requires resolution of a related case	CPRC	CPCSDISP	
On-going settlement negotiations or agreement by both parties	BWAP	BWAPDISP	
Case is on hold pending appeal.	AP	APDISP	
A hold is placed on case due to Department of Justice or Attorney General review.	DOJAG	DOJAGDISP	

**Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 12**

Reason	Codes		Description
	Active to Inactive	Inactive to Active	
When directed by the presiding judge consistent with the definitions of an inactive case (AOSC14-20).	OTH	OTHDISP	A free text description of the cause must be provided when reporting a status change for either of these two reasons.

A status change will occur as of the document stamp date of the document directing the status change. A case transitions from INACTIVE to ACTIVE when any event occurs that enables the court to take further action on the case. Thus, the filing of a motion or the scheduling of a hearing or case conference requesting the court to take further action would be examples of events that move a case from INACTIVE to ACTIVE status regardless of the existence of the circumstances noted above unless that requested action must also be on hold until the reason for inactivity is resolved.

Uniform Case Reporting Project and the Summary Reporting System

Reporting under the UCR Project Data Collection Specification reporting occurs within the larger context of the Summary Reporting System (SRS), which is the primary mechanism for reporting judicial workload information to the OSCA under s. 25.075, F.S. The challenge in this data collection project is to provide the more detailed reporting mechanism necessary to successfully accomplish project goals while remaining consistent with SRS requirements and purpose.

It is one goal of the Uniform Case Reporting project to consolidate case inventory and judicial workload reporting. However, the existing reporting requirements as provided in rule, order and statute remain the official mandate and cannot be abandoned prematurely. Clerks of court, court administration and other reporting entities should expect to continue all data collection and reporting as required under the appropriate statute, rule, order or guideline until directed otherwise by the court. The transition to UCR reporting is dependent on the quality of the data received and the efforts of data sources to provide that data as required by this specification. Every effort will be made to consolidate reporting as quickly as possible.

Reporting Exceptions

In circumstances where the instructions for reporting under the UCR Project Data Collection Specification conflict with reporting instructions under SRS, please follow the instructions listed in this document when reporting data via this specification. SRS instructions should be followed when reporting under those guidelines. Please contact OSCA staff if additional clarification is needed.

Appendix A. Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework

This framework provides a clear and unambiguous description of certain key events in adjudication of a case and provides a foundational structure for recording and tracking case activity within the trial courts. The framework is not all inclusive of every important event in the life of a case and is intended to be expanded as the informational needs of the court system evolve.

- **Filing event**: A filing event occurs when an action is brought before the court as the result of a petition, pleading, complaint or any other recordable¹ action sufficient to begin a case. This definition would include an arrest or summons or other action charging an individual with a crime, as well as the filing of any other document or action recorded with the court authorized to initiate a case. The initiation of a case by whatever means is referred to as a filing event.
- **Open case**: A case that has one or more issues outstanding that require active resolution by the court.
- **Disposition event**: A disposition event has occurred when a case is closed for court activity as a result of judicial decision, order or other recordable action that provides resolution, by the court, on the issues raised by and subsequent to the filing event.
- **Closed case**: A case that has had all issues raised by and subsequent to the filing event resolved and no further action of the court is required.
- **Reopen event**: A reopen event occurs when a motion, pleading or other recordable action occurs on a case that requires additional court activity after a disposition event has closed the case for court activity. Note that a reopen event involves at least one action and that additional post-judgment actions may occur before the case is reclosed.
- **Reopened case**: A case that has one or more post-judgment actions outstanding that require active resolution by the court.
- **Reclosure event**: A reclosure event occurs when the last (or only) post-judgment action has been resolved by judicial decision, order or other recordable action, thereby completing court proceedings on the issues raised by and since the reopen event occurred.
- **Reclosed case**: A reopened case that has had all post-judgment actions resolved and no further action of the court is required.

¹ Recordable, in this guideline, means those happenings relating to court activity that would appear on a court docket or otherwise require the making of an historical record by the clerk of courts in their official capacity.

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 15

With the addition of these definitions, there are six statuses in which a case can be placed as the case moves from initiation to resolution:

- **Active** - A case is considered in an active status when the court is engaged in activity directly related to the resolution of the specific matters and issues associated with the case. This status applies to open cases in the period between a filing and disposition event.
- **Inactive** - A case is considered in an inactive status when court activity on that case is suspended pending resolution of an issue external to the court or that does not directly involve the court in resolving that issue; for example, awaiting the results of an appeal or the disposition of a related case. A case placed in an inactive status is not closed and does not need to be reopened when the case returns to active status, regardless of the length of time involved. This status applies to open cases in the period between a filing and disposition event.
- **Closed** - A case is considered to be closed, or disposed, (that is, in a closed status) for court activity on the date of the judicial decision, order or other recordable action that provides resolution to the last (or all) of the matters brought before the court as a consequence of the filing event that initiated the case. The court, then, has no further action to take on the case. This status identifies a previously open case that has been resolved by the courts and applies to the period between the disposition event and the first reopen event.
- **Reopened Active** - A case will be considered to be in a reopened status (either active or inactive), from the date that the first post-judgment motion/pleading is filed or other action occurs that reopens a case for court activity (i.e. the reopen event) until the date of the last judicial decision/order resolving all overlapping court proceedings (i.e. the reopen closure event). Each period in which a case is reported as in a reopened status may involve one or more overlapping post-judgment actions. A case is considered to be in a reopened active status when one or more post-judgment actions are pending and the court is actively engaged in their resolution. This status identifies a reopened case and applies to the period between the initiating reopen event and the final reclosure event as described.
- **Reopened Inactive** - A case is considered to be in a reopened inactive status if the activity on all outstanding post-judgment actions is held in abeyance pending resolution of some issue external to the court or that does not directly involve the court in resolving that issue. In this circumstance, the court is not actively working to resolve the matter(s). This status identifies a reopened case and applies to the period between the initiating reopen event and the final reclosure event as described.

- **Reclosed** - A case that has had one or more post-judgment actions will be considered reclosed, or re-disposed, (that is, in a reclosed status) for court activity on the date of the judicial decision, order or other recordable action that provides resolution to the last (or all) of the matters brought before the court since the reopen event occurred. The court, then, has no further action to take on the case. This status identifies a previously reopened case with additional matters that has been resolved by the courts and applies to the period between the reclosure event and the next reopen event.

Additional Guidelines

For consistency in reporting, an event or status change is said to occur as of the date the order is signed, the clerk document date/time stamp or the electronic date/time stamp associated with the action as appropriate.

Recordable, in this guideline, means those happenings relating to court activity that would appear on a court docket or otherwise require the making of an historical record by the clerk of courts in their official capacity.

The definition of the closure events (disposition and reopen) denote that the court has no further action to take on a case. This definition of closure does not indicate the clerk of courts has completed all of their required activity with regards to the case, only that the court has rendered judgment on the matters of the case and will take no further action on the case (excluding planned review or scheduled future action).

Note also that a case status cannot be reported as a closure (closed or reclosed) while the case remains in an inactive status. The act of closing a case for whatever reason is indicative of significant activity on the case. Therefore, an inactive case that is being closed for any reason including administratively, should be transitioned to the appropriate active status (active or reopened active) first, then followed by the corresponding closure status.

Upon initiation, an open case is considered to be in an active status. If, at some point in the adjudication process, the case can no longer be actively advanced, the case may be moved to inactive status. Once work can begin again on the case, it is returned to active status. This cycle may be repeated any number of times throughout the life of the case until the final disposition event where the case is moved to closed status. At this point, the case is no longer considered open.

From the date of disposition, subsequent filings or other recordable actions (post-judgment) will indicate that the case has been reopened. A case reopen event represents a block of time in which one or more overlapping post-judgment actions, such as motions, petitions, or reviews, are

being actively addressed by the court. When the last post-judgment action in that block is resolved, the case reopen event is closed and the case is moved to reclosed status.

When considered as a block of one or more post-judgment actions, a reopen event moves a previously closed case into a reopened active status. This starts a case reopen block for tracking purposes. A subsequent, overlapping post-judgment action for a case already in reopened active status would not change the case's status. It simply becomes another matter to be resolved by the court for this case reopen block. It is possible that activity on the case may stop due to circumstances out of the court's control. In this instance, the case remains reopened but the status would change to reopened inactive. Subsequent activity on the matters by the court would change the status back to reopened active, where it would remain until returned to reopen inactive status or reclosed.

Each post-judgment action (from reopen event to reclosure event) should be tracked individually. This ensures the necessary granularity within the framework. Different data collection systems may require these actions to be reported in different ways depending on the purpose of that data collection. For example, reporting for case age statistics may require that each post-judgment action be reported as they occur. Reporting for judicial workload (e.g., Summary Reporting System), may consider case reopen blocks (from case reopen event to case reclosed event) and not the individual post-judgment actions that make up the block. This flexibility in the framework is necessary to reconcile reporting within existing data collection systems and to ensure consistent reporting for the future.

Example

A motion to reopen a case previously disposed is filed on June 15. The case is placed in a reopened active status and a case reopen event block begins. On June 20, a second motion for modification is filed. This post-judgment action while tracked separately, is part of the existing case reopen event block. On June 23, the first motion is disposed. The case remains in a reopened active status because the second motion has not been resolved. On July 3, the second motion is resolved and the case is placed in a reclosed status. Although there are two post-judgment actions, there is only one case reopen block. If third motion is filed subsequent to July 3, say on July 15, the case would then be returned to reopened active status, pending resolution of that reopen event and a second case reopen block would begin.

Appendix B. SRS Case Types and SRS Disposition Category Codes

Please use the numerical codes contained in Table 4 for SRS Case Types and the codes contained in Table 5 for SRS Disposition Categories.

Note: Code tables currently in preparation. The specification will be updated to include 6-digit codes for each SRS Case Type and each SRS Disposition Category.

Table 4. SRS Case Types to Case Type Codes

SRS Case Type	Code

Table 5. SRS Disposition Categories and Disposition Category Codes

SRS Disposition Category	Code

Appendix C. Example Data File

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 20

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">

<!--
  An example of a submission file capturing several case events as required
  by the UCR Project Data Collection Specification.
-->
<dataPackage type="UCR01" version="0.1.0">

  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      The pkgAuditBlock captures the metadata related to the actual submission
      of data. It includes information on the entity who is originating the
      data transfer(pkgOrigination), the entity intended to receive the
      the data (pkgDestination) and and to optionally identify the primary
      data custodian (pkgCustodian) of the data being submitted. This field
      required only when the entity originating the data transfer is not
      designated as the primary record custodian. For example, when a 3rd party
      is supplying data for a clerk of court who is designated the primary
      record custodian.
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <pkgAuditBlock>
    <pkgOrigination>
      <!-- a unique identifier for this request -->
      <pkgUUID version="4">af083c07-719b-47d2-bdab-135bac7f8d3b</pkgUUID>

      <!-- entity identifiers for the originating entity including name,
      the entity system initiating the request, an email or other
      contact info for the receiving system to respond to

      In this example, the entity originating the submission is the
      primary record custodian
-->
    <pkgFromAgency>
      <AgencyName>County 83</AgencyName>
      <AgencySystem>Harconen CMS 3.45</AgencySystem>
      <AgencyReplyTo>helpdesk@flcounty.org</AgencyReplyTo>
      <!-- other agency identifiers? -->
    </pkgFromAgency>

    <pkgDateTime>2014-08-22T23:59:20-05:00</pkgDateTime>

    <!--
    entity identifiers for the entity from which data is being
    submitted including name, the entity system the data is inteded
    for and an optional email or other contact information
-->
    <pkgToAgency>
      <AgencyName>OSCA</AgencyName>
      <AgencySystem>JDMS</AgencySystem>
      <AgencyReplyTo>UCRhelp@flcourts.org</AgencyReplyTo>
    </pkgToAgency>
  </xs:annotation>
</dataPackage>
</xs:schema>
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project

Data Collection Specification

Page 21

entity identifiers for the primary record custodian of the data being submitted. This field is mandatory if the data is being submitted by a 3rd party on behalf of the primary record custodian. The field, if needed, should include

In this example, the entity originating the submission is the primary record custodian so this field is not required

```
<pkgPrimaryCustodian>
  <AgencyName></AgencyName>
  <AgencySystem></AgencySystem>
  <AgencyReplyTo></AgencyReplyTo>
</pkgPrimaryCustodian>
-->
</pkgOrigination>
</pkgAuditBlock>

<xs:annotation>
  <xs:documentation>
    The package data block captures metadata about the data being transferred.
    Since the data exchange can transfer data for a variety of specifications,
    it is necessary to clearly identify the data being submitted and the
    submission specification the data is being submitted under. This additional
    information will allow for the possibility of multiply submission version
    and is provided to allow data custodians some flexibility in upgrading
    systems to newer versions of the specification.
  </xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>

<pkgDataBlock>
  <PackageName>UCR Package 01</PackageName>
  <PackageID>67d71a22-608f-436d-9613-8775afb47405</PackageID>
  <PackageContent type="ucr">XML</PackageContent>
  <PackageComplete>Y</PackageComplete>
  <PackageData>
    <reportPeriodFrom>2015-08-21T11:59:00-05:00</reportPeriodFrom>
    <!--
      This example documents the reporting of a filing event
      The following elements comprise reporting for this event
      reportDateTime ( required)
      eventType ( required)
      caseUCN (required)
      eventDate (required)
      caseSRSType (required)
      caseDivisionAssigned (required)
      caseJudgeAssigned (required)
      caseJudicialOfficerAssigned (conditional - if assigned)
      caseStatus (required)
      caseComplexCivil (conditional - circuit civil cases only)
    -->
  </PackageData>
</pkgDataBlock>
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T09:23:45-05-00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Filing</eventType>
  <caseUCN>302014CA003452AXXXMP</caseUCN>
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 22

```
<eventDate>2014-12-24</eventDate>
<caseSRSType>346011</caseSRSType>
<caseDivisionAssigned>Foreclosure</caseDivisionAssigned>
<caseJudgeAssigned>
  <jofcLastName>Allers-Smith</jofcLastName>
  <jofcFirstName>John</jofcFirstName>
  <jofcMiddleInit>J </jofcMiddleInit>
  <jofcSuffix>SR</jofcSuffix>
</caseJudgeAssigned>
<caseStatus>ACTIVE</caseStatus>
<caseComplexCivil>N</caseComplexCivil>
</dataEvent>
<!--
```

```
  This example documents the reporting of a closure event.
  reportDateTime ( required)
  eventDate (required)
  eventType ( required)
  caseUCN (required)
  caseSRSType (required)
  caseSRSDispositionCategory (required)
  caseDivisionAssigned (required)
  caseJudgeAssigned (required)
  caseJudicialOfficerAssigned (conditional - if assigned)
  caseStatus (required)
-->
```

```
<dataEvent>
<reportDateTime>2015-08-21T09:23:52-05:00</reportDateTime>
<eventType>Closure</eventType>
<caseUCN>342012CA002238AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
<eventDate>2013-07-13</eventDate>
<caseSRSType>346013</caseSRSType>
<caseSRSDispositionCategory>362200</caseSRSDispositionCategory>
<caseDivisionAssigned>Mortgage</caseDivisionAssigned>
<caseJudgeAssigned>
  <jofcLastName>Johnson</jofcLastName>
  <jofcFirstName>Sara</jofcFirstName>
</caseJudgeAssigned>
<caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
  <jofcLastName>Toms</jofcLastName>
  <jofcFirstName>Greg</jofcFirstName>
</caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
<caseStatus>CLOSED</caseStatus>
</dataEvent>
<!--
```

```
  This example documents the reporting of a post judgement initiation event.
  reportDateTime ( required)
  eventDate (required)
  eventType ( required)
  caseUCN (required)
  caseSRSType (required)
  caseSRSPostJudgeType (required)
  caseDivisionAssigned (required)
  caseJudgeAssigned (required)
  caseJudicialOfficerAssigned (conditional - if assigned)
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 23

```
        caseStatus (required)
        caseComplexCivil (conditional - circuit civil cases only)
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T09:27:04-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Post-Judgement Initiation</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003245AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-11</eventDate>
  <caseSRSType>346011</caseSRSType>
  <caseSRSPostJudgeType>346007</caseSRSPostJudgeType>
  <caseDivisionAssigned>DIVISION I</caseDivisionAssigned>
  <caseJudgeAssigned>
    <jofcLastName>Smith</jofcLastName>
    <jofcFirstName>John Paul</jofcFirstName>
  </caseJudgeAssigned>
  <caseStatus>REOPEN ACTIVE</caseStatus>
  <caseComplexCivil>Y</caseComplexCivil>
</dataEvent>
```

!--> This example documents the reporting of a post judgement closure event.

```
        reportDateTime ( required)
        eventDate (required)
        eventType ( required)
        caseUCN (required)
        caseSRSPostJudgeType (required)
        caseDivisionAssigned (required)
        caseJudgeAssigned (required)
        caseJudicialOfficerAssigned (conditional - if assigned)
        caseStatus (required)
-->
```

```
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T10:22:34-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Post-Judgement Closure</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003245AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseSRSType>346013</caseSRSType>
  <caseDivisionAssigned>DIVISION I</caseDivisionAssigned>
  <caseJudgeAssigned>
    <jofcLastName>Smith</jofcLastName>
    <jofcFirstName>John Paul</jofcFirstName>
  </caseJudgeAssigned>
  <caseStatus>REOPEN CLOSED</caseStatus>
</dataEvent>
```

!--> This example documents the reporting of a change in case status including

the

```
        reportDateTime ( required)
        eventDate (required)
        eventType ( required)
        caseUCN (required)
        caseStatus (required)
        caseReasonForStatusChange (required)
        caseReasonForStatusChangeComment (conditional - required if Reason in
```

OTHER category)

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 24

```
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T12:06:35-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003245AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseStatus>INACTIVE</caseStatus>
  <caseReasonForStatusChange>OTH</caseReasonForStatusChange>
  <caseReasonForStatusChangeComment>Judge ordered case
inactive</caseReasonForStatusChangeComment>
</dataEvent>
```

```
<!--
Change records may be submitted for all fields except record identifying
fields. Changing of one field value is considered one transaction.
However, multiple field changes may be included in one dataEvent element.
The fields that can be changed within a Change dataEvent element are
  caseSRSType
  caseSRSDispositionCategory
  caseDivisionAssigned
  caseJudgeAssigned
  caseJudicialOfficerAssigned
  caseStatus
  caseComplexCivil
  caseSRSPostJudgeType
```

```
The following fields cannot be altered using the Change type of a
dataEvent element
  reportDateTime ( required)
  eventDate (required)
  eventType ( required)
  caseUCN (required)
-->
```

```
<!--
This example documents the reporting of a change in case status involving
  reportDateTime ( required)
  eventDate (required)
  eventType ( required)
  caseUCN (required)
  caseStatus (required)
-->
```

```
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T14:07:35-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003245AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseStatus>INACTIVE</caseStatus>
</dataEvent>
```

```
<!--
This example documents the reporting of a change to the SRS case type
  reportDateTime ( required)
  eventDate (required)
  eventType ( required)
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 25

```
    caseUCN (required)
    caseSRSType (required)
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T14:08:24-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003246AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseSRSType>346013</caseSRSType>
</dataEvent>
<!--
This example documents the reporting of a change to the Divisional
```

Assignment

```
    reportDateTime ( required)
    eventDate (required)
    eventType ( required)
    caseUCN (required)
    caseDivisionAssigned (required)
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T14:08:58-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003247AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseDivisionAssigned>DIVISION I</caseDivisionAssigned>
</dataEvent>
<!--
This example documents the reporting of a change to the Judge Assigned
    reportDateTime ( required)
    eventDate (required)
    eventType ( required)
    caseUCN (required)
    caseJudgeAssigned (required)
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-21T14:13:42-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA003245AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-21</eventDate>
  <caseJudgeAssigned>
    <jofcLastName>Allers-Smith</jofcLastName>
    <jofcFirstName>John</jofcFirstName>
    <jofcMiddleInit>J </jofcMiddleInit>
    <jofcSuffix>SR</jofcSuffix>
  </caseJudgeAssigned>
</dataEvent>
<!--
This example documents the reporting of a change to several fields at one
```

time

```
    reportDateTime ( required)
    eventDate (required)
    eventType ( required)
    caseUCN (required)
    caseSRSType
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 26

```
        caseComplexCivil
        caseSRSPostJudgeType
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-22T16:28:03-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA009359AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-22</eventDate>
  <caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
    <jofcLastName>Toms</jofcLastName>
    <jofcFirstName>Greg</jofcFirstName>
  </caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
  <caseComplexCivil>Y</caseComplexCivil>
  <caseSRSPostJudgeType>474005</caseSRSPostJudgeType>
</dataEvent>
```

```
<!--
  This example documents the reporting of a change to several fields at one
```

time

```
        reportDateTime ( required)
        eventDate (required)
        eventType ( required)
        caseUCN (required)
        caseSRSType
        caseComplexCivil
        caseSRSPostJudgeType
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-22T16:32:24-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>Change</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342012CA058722AXXXXXX</caseUCN>
  <eventDate>2015-08-22</eventDate>
  <caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
    <jofcLastName>Toms</jofcLastName>
    <jofcFirstName>Greg</jofcFirstName>
  </caseJudicialOfficerReferred>
  <caseComplexCivil>Y</caseComplexCivil>
  <caseSRSPostJudgeType>474005</caseSRSPostJudgeType>
</dataEvent>
```

```
<!--
  This is an example of a record that will remove a case from the system.
  ALL record of the case will be removed including any events, judge
  post judgment actions etc.
```

assignments

```
-->
<dataEvent>
  <reportDateTime>2015-08-22T16:31:30-05:00</reportDateTime>
  <eventType>DELETE CASE</eventType>
  <caseUCN>342014CF94232AXXXAX</caseUCN>
</dataEvent>
```

```
<!--
```

Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 27

This is an example of a record that remove a single reopen event (from first post-judgment motion to last) from a case. Other reopen event will remain associated with case

-->

<dataEvent>

 <reportDateTime>2015-08-22</reportDateTime>

 <eventType>DELETE REOPEN</eventType>

 <caseUCN>342014CF93232AXXXAX</caseUCN>

</dataEvent>

 <reportPeriodThru>2015-08-22T11:58:59-05:00</reportPeriodThru>

 </PackageData>

</pkgDataBlock>

</dataPackage >

</xs:schema>

Appendix D. Sample Orders Directing Change of Status

The enclosed documents provide sample orders directing the change of status for a case, including the reason for the status change. Please refer to the section “Determination of Active/Inactive Status” in this data collection specification for a full discussion.

**Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 29**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
_____ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN
AND FOR _____ COUNTY,
FLORIDA

Plaintiff

CIRCUIT CIVIL DIVISION

vs.

Defendant

UNIFORM CASE NO.: _____

ORDER PLACING CASE ON INACTIVE STATUS DUE TO:

This case came before the Court, and the Court has been advised that the Plaintiff/Defendant have/has moved to place the case on INACTIVE status due to:

- Bankruptcy stay, Case No. _____ [BKST]
 - Case pending resolution of another case, Case No. _____ [CPRC]
 - Written agreement of the parties [BWAP]
 - Appeal pending [AP]
 - Motion to stay or abate due to Department of Justice/Attorney General settlement [DOJ/AG]

 - Other (a reason must be provided in writing by the presiding judge or designee) [OTH]
- _____

The Clerk of Court is therefore directed to remove this case from the **ACTIVE** status, and designate it as an **INACTIVE** case category based on the reason checked above. The parties must return the case to active status by motion, with notice to all parties, within 30 days of the termination of grounds for inactive status, and seeking an order of court returning it to active status.

DONE and ORDERED in _____ County, Florida, this ____ day of _____ 20____.

Presiding Judge or Magistrate

cc: Service List

**Uniform Case Reporting (UCR) Project
Data Collection Specification
Page 30**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
_____ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN
AND FOR _____ COUNTY,
FLORIDA

Plaintiff

CIRCUIT CIVIL DIVISION

vs.

Defendant

UNIFORM CASE NO.: _____

ORDER RETURNING CASE TO ACTIVE STATUS DUE TO:

This case came before the Court, and the Court has been advised that the Plaintiff/Defendant have/has moved to place the case on ACTIVE status due to:

- Plaintiff/defendant stipulates that the bankruptcy stay has been lifted, Case No. _____ [BKST LFT]
 - Plaintiff/defendant stipulates that related case has been disposed, Case No. _____ [CPCS DISP]
 - By written agreement of the parties [BWAP]
 - Plaintiff/defendant stipulates that pending appeal has been disposed [AP DISP]
 - Plaintiff/defendant stipulates that Department of Justice/Attorney General review is complete [DOJ/AG DISP]
 - Other (a reason must be provided in writing by the presiding judge or designee) [OTH DISP]
- _____

The Clerk of Court is therefore directed to remove this case from the **INACTIVE** status, and designate it as an **ACTIVE** case based on the reasons checked above. The parties must return the case to active status by motion, with notice to all parties, within 30 days of the termination of grounds for inactive status, and seeking an order of court returning it to active status.

DONE and ORDERED in _____ County, Florida, this ____ day of _____ 20____.

Presiding Judge or Magistrate

cc: Service List

Item VI. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the FY 2014-16 term will be a phone conference, likely held during lunch time.

It is anticipated this phone conference will be held in November. Staff will email possible dates to members to request your availability and preference.

The next in-person meeting is planned for late January or early February. Staff will email possible dates to members to request your availability and preference.

Committee Action Needed:

1. Please reply to the forthcoming email with your availability for the proposed meeting dates.