



**COURT STATISTICS AND WORKLOAD COMMITTEE  
ORLANDO, FL  
FEBRUARY 2015**

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

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

## AGENDA

### 09:00am Meeting Convenes

#### Item I. Opening Remarks and Introductions

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

#### Item II. Housekeeping

- A. Minutes of 10/15/2014 meeting
- B. Travel Reimbursement Instructions

#### Item III. Issues of Interest

- A. Uniform Data Reporting – Court Interpreter Hourly Report (Closeout)
- B. Plan to incorporate Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS Reporting
- C. FY 2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative
- D. Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS)
- E. Performance Measures Required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2)

### 12:00pm – 1:00pm Lunch

#### Item IV. Judicial Workload Study

- A. Project Summary and Update

#### Item V. Next Meeting

- A. Phone conference May or June 2015

### 03:00pm Meeting Adjourns

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

---

**Chair:**

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni  
County Judge, Charlotte County  
350 East Marion Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Punta Gorda, Florida 33950  
Phone: 941.505.4826  
Fax: 941.505.4825  
Email: [palessandroni@ca.cjis20.org](mailto:palessandroni@ca.cjis20.org)  
JA: Patricia Twardzik  
Email: [patriciat@ca.cjis20.org](mailto:patriciat@ca.cjis20.org)

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

**Members:**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

The Honorable Paula S. O'Neil, Ph.D.  
Clerk of Circuit Court & County Comptroller  
Pasco County  
7530 Little Road, Suite 106  
New Port Richey, FL 34654  
Phone: 727.847.8199  
Fax: 727.847.8121  
Email: [poneil@pascoclerk.com](mailto:poneil@pascoclerk.com)  
Administrative Assistant: Laurie Ansgore  
Email: [lansorge@pascoclerk.com](mailto:lansorge@pascoclerk.com)

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

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

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

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

The Honorable Scott Stephens  
Circuit Judge, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit  
800 E. Twiggs Street, Room 420  
Tampa, Florida 33602  
Phone: 813.272.6879  
Email: [stephenss@fljud13.org](mailto:stephenss@fljud13.org)  
JA: Ann Mynatt  
Email: [mynattea@fljud13.org](mailto:mynattea@fljud13.org)

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

---

The Honorable William F. Stone  
Circuit Judge, First Judicial Circuit  
Okaloosa County Courthouse Annex Extension  
1940 Lewis Turner Boulevard  
Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547  
Phone: 850.609.5414  
Fax: 850.651.7467  
Email: [judge.stone@flcourts1.gov](mailto:judge.stone@flcourts1.gov)  
JA: Frannie Natalie  
Email: [frannie.natalie@flcourts1.gov](mailto:frannie.natalie@flcourts1.gov)

**OSCA Staff:**

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

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

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

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

**Item I.        Opening Remarks**

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair

## **Item II. Committee Housekeeping**

### **II.A. Minutes of 10/15/2014 Meeting**

#### **Minutes Court Statistics & Workload Committee Meeting October 15, 2014 Phone Conference**

**The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, Chair**

**12:02 pm Meeting convened**

Twelve of the fifteen members were in attendance:

The Honorable Paul Alessandroni, The Honorable G. Keith Cary,  
The Honorable David H. Foxman, 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. Kathleen R. Pugh, Mr. Philip G. Schlissel, &  
Mr. Grant Slayden

Members absent:

The Honorable Ilona M. Holmes, The Honorable Shelley J. Kravitz, &  
Ms. Holly Elomina

OSCA Staff in attendance:

Greg Youchock, P.J. Stockdale, Shelley Kaus, Kimberly Curry, &  
Blan Teagle

Other parties in attendance:

Ms. Susan Wilson

### **Item I. Opening Remarks and Introductions**

- A. The chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the FY2014-16 term of the Court Statistics and Workload Committee.
- B. The chair welcomed the committee's three new members: The Honorable Scott Stephens, Circuit Judge from the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, The Honorable William F. Stone, Circuit Judge from the First Judicial Circuit, and The Honorable Paula O'Neil, Clerk of Circuit Court from Pasco County.
- C. Staff gave a brief history of the Court Statistics and Workload Committee (CSWC).

## **Item II. Committee Housekeeping**

- A. Minutes from 4/10/2014 Meeting
  - 1. Members voted (unanimously) to approve the minutes from the last meeting of the FY2012-14 term, which was a phone conference held on 4/10/2014.
- B. Committee Charges
  - 1. Staff presented the charges included in Supreme Court Administrative Order, AOSC14-40, IN RE: COMMISSION ON TRIAL COURT PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY, that are relevant to the CSWC. Staff discussed what the committee has been directed to work on during the FY2014-16 term.
- C. Committee Protocol and Procedures
  - 1. Members were provided with a copy of the Protocol for Supreme Court Committees, most recently revised in December of 2013.
  - 2. Staff presented three operational strategies that the CSWC has successfully utilized in the past for addressing committee tasks.
  - 3. Members voted (unanimously) to adopt the use of these three proposed strategies for committee tasks in the FY 2014-16 term.

## **Item III. Judicial Workload Study**

- A. Project Summary and Review
  - 1. Staff provided an overview of this study, which 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.
  - 2. The major methodological steps identified by the NCSC were laid out, including the timeframe for completion. Staff informed members of the estimated cost associated with a study of this magnitude, as well as the fact that the Trial Court Budget Commission appropriated funding at its June 20, 2014 meeting.
  - 3. Staff announced that the committee's chair, Judge Paul Alessandrone, would be directly involved in this effort. The 40-member Judicial Needs Assessment Committee is planned to be comprised of one circuit judge and one county judge from each circuit.
  - 4. It was noted that a final determination as to when the study will begin is pending, but it is anticipated that it will commence in early 2015. Staff advised they are awaiting final approval from the supreme court before a contract can be executed with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC).

5. Members involved in the original time study inquired as to some specifics of this forthcoming study. Staff and members discussed several variables to account for in a study and shared some observations and insights.
6. Staff advised that the NCSC will be integral consultants to the judges and staff participating in the study, and they will be consulted on the methodology employed and subsequent analysis.

#### **Item IV. Issues of Interest**

- A. Plan to incorporate Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS Reporting
  1. Staff updated members on the OSCA's progress regarding the supreme court charge to incorporate the Case-Event Definitional Framework into existing development projects. Staff explained the OSCA developed a physical data model that implemented case-event elements of the Trial Court Data Model, including database tables and supporting software code as part of the 2014 Criminal Transaction System Modernization project.
  2. Staff advised that in addition to upgrading the data collected via the Offender Based Transaction System (OBTS), this implementation is general in nature and will be usable by any subsequent data projects that involve case-event reporting.
- B. Uniform Data Reporting - Court Interpreter Hourly Reporting
  1. Staff reported that the OSCA has begun collecting court interpreting events and hours as part of a program being administered by the TCP&A. Currently, TCP&A is conducting a pilot program on the use of Shared Remote Interpreting Resources, which includes the reporting of both events and hours.
  2. In order to reduce the reporting burden on circuit court administrations, staff advised that the reporting of court interpreting events and hours via the Uniform Data Reporting (UDR) system has been suspended. UDR statistics for court interpreting events and hours are being computed from data provided under the Shared Remote Interpreting pilot project. Once this project is complete, reporting will resume under the previously existing UDR reporting mechanism.
- C. FY2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative
  1. Staff gave an update on the Foreclosure Initiative, which at the time was in its sixteenth month.
  2. Staff announced that the preceding three months showed a remarkable improvement in the quality of the data as OSCA staff had been working diligently with the clerks of court to increase the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the data. Since September, 51 of the 67 counties report their data on a weekly basis at a minimum, with 43 of them submitting daily reports of the activity that occurs on mortgage foreclosure cases. A

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Orlando, FL  
February 2015**

second vast improvement was reported: 42 counties have reported inactivity to the initiative to date, which is a requirement of the initiative that was initially not met by a large number of counties. Lastly, analysis of SRS to Foreclosure Initiative filings produced remarkably similar results, and in some instances the Foreclosure Initiative filings appear to be more accurate.

3. Staff advised that the result of the increase in data submission frequency, completeness, and accuracy is a significant reduction in the amount of time in which calculated statistics can be considered reliable and ready for publication. In particular, the daily submission, combined with the ability to capture case activity as it occurs instead of querying data after the fact, has resulted in a tremendous leap forward in the quality of the Foreclosure Initiative data. Staff reminded members that this event-push model was a recommendation from the TIMS report and Trial Court Data Model that this committee was instrumental in developing.

D. Performance Measures Required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2)

1. Staff updated members that the measures required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2) are also included as elements under several related projects, such as the TCP&A's High Performing Courts, the Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup, and the OSCA's Judicial Data Management Services; and as such, additional work on these measures has been placed on hold in order to give these encompassing projects an opportunity to complete their respective planning. Staff advises that care should be taken to ensure that the final performance measurement effort as required by rule will meet the needs of all stakeholders involved.
2. Staff will continue to monitor the advancement of these projects as they involve the CSWC.

### **Item V. Next Meeting**

1. Staff announced an in-person meeting was being planned for late January or early February of 2015. Plans to coordinate the in-person meeting to coincide with the first meeting of the Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (for the Judicial Workload Study) were being considered. Therefore, staff is awaiting scheduling of this anticipated meeting.
2. Members were alerted to look out for future emails regarding both the date and location of the CSWC in-person meeting.

**1:27 pm Meeting Adjourned**

**Decision Needed:**

1. Adopt the meeting minutes from 10/15/2014.

**II.B. Travel Reimbursement**

Travel information and reimbursement forms were included in the separate Travel Packet emailed out to all members. Please contact any staff member if you need another copy of this packet.

**Committee Action Needed:**

1. Please fax or mail a completed form with all reimbursable receipts to:

OSCA – Court Services  
ATTN: Penni Griffith  
Florida Supreme Court Building  
500 S. Duval Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
Ph: 850-487-0749  
Fax: 850-414-1342

## **Item III. Issues of Interest**

### **III.A. Uniform Data Reporting - Court Interpreter Hourly Reporting**

Supreme Court Administrative Order AOSC11-45 IN RE: COURT INTERPRETING SERVICES IN FLORIDA'S TRIAL COURTS adopts a set of recommendations on standards of operation and best practices. The order directs TCP&A and CSWC to modify court interpreting statistics collected in the Uniform Data Reporting (UDR) system to capture the number of court interpreting hours (in quarter hour segments), by proceeding type and language, in addition to the number of events. These statistics should also be modified in order to be consistent with amendments to s. 29.004, Florida Statutes.

TCP&A wrapped up its a pilot program on the use of Shared Remote Interpreting Resources in January 2015. Transactional reporting of these event has ended. Court Interpreter events and hours will return to summary reporting via the UDR web-based data entry application beginning with the February 2015 reporting period. The amended Court Interpreter events and hours data entry form is provided as Enclosure 01 for your information. This modified form has been submitted to the OSCA IT Governance Board for inclusion into the OSCA project planning cycle. Staff will monitor this implementation. This completes the implementation of court interpreting hour reporting as required by AOSC11-45.

#### **Decision Needed:**

1. None. For information only.

### **III.B. Plan to incorporate Case-Event Definitional Framework (AOSC14-20) into SRS Reporting**

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.

In keeping with the supreme court charge to incorporate the Case-Event Definitional Framework into existing development projects, the Office of The State Courts Administrator (OSCA) staff as directed by the Court Statistics and Workload committee has evaluated the Summary Reporting System (SRS) to see what approach would be most beneficial in implementing the case-event definitions into SRS.

During evaluation, staff has determined that it is appropriate to implement the Case-Event Definitional Framework into SRS reporting. Although the review is not yet complete, staff has determined that the changes necessary to incorporate the definitional framework will fall into three categories based on the potential impact of the change on SRS reporting. Impact, in this

context, includes both the changes to operational procedure and the cost to the courts and clerks of court to modify systems.

#### Minor

Minor changes would have the least significant impact on the reporting of SRS statistics. Changes of this type may involve simple language changes or a new way of looking at an event but would not materially affect the reporting of that event. An example of this would be a change in the current language that is used for SRS in cases referred to mediation or arbitration. Currently the SRS manual reads “Do not report cases disposed when referred to mediation or arbitration.” Once the language change is incorporated, it will read “Report cases *inactive* when referred to mediation or arbitration.” Therefore, the recommendation would be to incorporate the language change during the next SRS manual revision.

#### Medium

Medium changes will have some impact on SRS statistics or may require changes to local operating procedures. However, the benefits accruing from improved statistics outweigh the costs of implementing the change. Changes in this category will have to be evaluated on a case by case basis to determine if the anticipated change will have an overall positive or negative impact to the quality of SRS reporting. One example is the Mortgage Foreclosure cases. Currently the SRS manual states that when a suggestion of bankruptcy is filed, the case is reported as closed for SRS purposes. Once the Case-Event definitions are incorporated, this type of cases will no longer be counted as disposed when a bankruptcy is filed. This will initially cause a decrease in the number of dispositions being reported, but would help improve the overall accuracy of the data. Staff recommends a technical memorandum to the clerks be issued for this type of change.

#### Major

Major changes would have a significant impact to SRS reporting or may involve disruptive changes to local operating procedures. With the incorporation of the Case-Event Definitional Framework, those anticipated to be major changes will likely do more harm than good to SRS statistics. An example of this would be with Juvenile Dependency cases. Currently when there are multiple children on a case and there has been a decision made regarding the first child, the case is closed so that it does not show up as pending on a judge’s docket. Cases with matters involving multiple children can often take years until every motion with each child is resolved. With the incorporation of the Case-Event definitions, this would be a change to the practice of closing a case when matters with the first child are resolved, but instead, these type of cases would be placed in an *Inactive* status. This will cause a significant decrease in the number of dispositions reported. Staff recommends that changes not be incorporated into SRS reporting at this time. Additional analysis will be needed to determine how best to implement changes in these areas while minimizing the expected costs.

Currently, the OSCA staff is in the planning stage of an SRS manual revision to begin in the upcoming months. Staff will develop a change-category matrix identifying necessary reporting changes and outlining an appropriate implementation strategy. This strategy will consider the expansion of transactional reporting, which may resolve some major issues as a product of this shift in reporting. Staff will continue to monitor this issue in attempts to avoid making changes to the SRS manual that may soon become obsolete.

**Decision Needed:**

1. Adopt the proposed strategy for implementing the Case-Event Definitional Framework into SRS reporting.

**III.C. FY 2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative**

The FY 2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative ends on June 30, 2015. As noted before, data collection for this initiative has been marked with some very promising results. Over the course of the initiative, OSCA staff has been working diligently with the clerks of court to increase the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the data, as well as with circuit administration to verify the accuracy of the statistics and correct any discrepancies noted by users of the Foreclosure Dashboard website. Currently 54 of the 67 counties report their data on a weekly basis at a minimum, with 45 of them submitting daily reports of the activity that occurs on mortgage foreclosure cases. The reporting of inactivity (case statuses of “Inactive” and “Reopen Inactive”) was something many counties initially struggled to provide when the initiative began in July 2013. Currently, 45 of the 67 counties have reported inactivity to the initiative and staff is working with the remaining counties to be able to achieve full compliance with the Data Collection Plan. Lastly, analysis of foreclosure filings reported to the Foreclosure Initiative and summary totals reported through the separate SRS system produced remarkably similar results. In some instances, the Foreclosure Initiative filings appear to be more accurate and have the ability to be updated often and with ease.

The result of the increase in data submission frequency, completeness, and accuracy has significantly reduced the amount of time in which calculated statistics can be considered reliable and ready for publication. In particular, the daily submission, combined with the ability to capture case activity as it occurs instead of querying data after the fact, has resulted in a tremendous leap forward in the quality of the Foreclosure Initiative data. This event-push model was a recommendation from the TIMS report and Trial Court Data Model and was validated during this committee’s work on case age statistics in 2012 that was adopted on February 1, 2013.

**Decision Needed:**

1. None. For information only.

### **III.D. Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS)**

The Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) project has advanced in the past quarter. The supreme court has adopted the JDMS project as a legislative priority and a draft project plan has been proposed and approved. This plan (Enclosure 02) was submitted to the Legislature as part of the FY 2015-2016 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) package.

In summary, the Judicial Data Management Services concept proposes a state-level framework for data management within the court system. This framework, by design, will be applicable at all levels of the court. However in this phase, it is targeted to the state level and will focus on organizational data management capabilities.

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 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. To ensure the JDMS project continues to move forward long term, this period will also include essential project management and planning tasks.

**Commission on Trial Court  
Performance & Accountability  
Court Statistics & Workload Committee  
Orlando, FL  
February 2015**

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 framework design and to take advantage of newer, more efficient technologies. Additional modernizations will improve usability for both systems, which will increase the court's 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 cases<sup>1</sup> 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.

Each of these goals has an essential role in the evolution of the JDMS framework and is relevant to the work of the CSWC. Enhancements (goal 1) to the UDR system will prepare the system to capture 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,<sup>2</sup> which will improve the court's ability to monitor traffic fine data for budget management and resource allocation.

The set of data elements collected via the FY 2013-15 Foreclosure Initiative (goal 2) is necessary and sufficient for the computation of the case inventory and case aging statistics required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2). Consequently, if we were to expand that data collection from mortgage foreclosures to other SRS case types, we would extend that computational capability also. As a secondary effect, the data collection is also sufficient to compute pending caseload

---

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2013-2015 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 mortgage foreclosure case type that enabled the computation of meaningful statistics to guide backlog reduction efforts at both the local and state levels.

<sup>2</sup> 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.)

report as required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.250(b), which would eliminate the need for clerks of court to submit these reports on paper as is the current practice.

The inclusion of four additional elements to the current twelve elements collected would enable the OSCA to compute SRS statistics directly from the detailed case data for most divisions and case types as required by s. 25.075, F.S. and Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.245. The additional fields required are 1) SRS case type at disposition 2) SRS case type upon reopen, 3) SRS case type upon reclosure, and 4) SRS disposition category at reclosure. This information is readily available on the civil and family cover sheets required by rule and should be readily available from clerks of court. Because of the unique structure of juvenile SRS statistics, reporting within these case types will require the most adaptation. However, once the necessary adaptations are identified, the detailed case event reporting would be sufficient to address the reporting issues currently blocking the application of the Case-Event Definitional Framework to juvenile reporting.

One natural extension of the Foreclosure data collection effort is the mechanism by which this data and the computed performance indicators are presented to judges and court administration. Dashboards are one aspect of this visual display of data (goal 3). This provides the opportunity for active data validation and correction. For example, a judge notices a case on his active inventory that he or she knows is closed. The judge could click a button to notify JDMS that the case is closed. JDMS could then, through the use of data exchanges, determine the actual closure information and update the information in the trial court data model directly, or at a minimum, initiate the necessary corrective action from the clerk of court.

**Decision Needed:**

1. None. For information only.

**III.E. Performance Measures Required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.225(a)(2)**

As noted in our April 10, 2014 meeting, the CSWC has completed the initial evaluation of reporting needs under this rule and established pilot reporting through the FY 2013-2015 Foreclosure Initiative. These measures are included as an element under several related projects such as the TCP&A's High Performing Courts, the Judicial Management Council Performance Workgroup and the OSCA's Judicial Data Management Services. Care should be taken to ensure that the final performance measurement effort as required by rule will meet the needs of all stakeholders involved. Additional work on these measures is on hold in order to give these encompassing projects an opportunity to complete their respective planning. Staff will continue to monitor the advancement of these projects, as they involve this committee.

**Decision Needed:**

1. None. For information only.

**Enclosure 01**

**Uniform Data Reporting  
Court Interpreting Hourly Reporting**

Circuit

Month

Calendar Year

### Uniform Data Reporting for Court Interpreting Circuit 1

Last Updated : 05/31/2014 10:00 am

***Note:** The purpose of this data is to identify the number of interpreter events, hours, and translation pages. This data is not designed to identify how the service was provided (employee or contract) or correspond to employees' time sheets or to contractors' invoices, as the reality of providing these services can include scheduling and coverage requirements, travel time and waiting time. For additional instructions [click here](#) .*

Type of Proceeding	Number of Events and Hours								Translation Pages
	Spanish		Haitian-Creole		Other		Sigr		
	Events	Hours	Events	Hours	Events	Hours	Events	Hours	
Circuit Criminal									
County Criminal									
Family Court - Dependency/CINS/FINS									
Family Court -Delinquency									
Baker/Marchman/Guardianship									
Domestic Violence Injunctions									
General Magistrate/Child Support Enforcement Hearing									
Officer for Family Court - All Other or Title IV-D									
Other Case Types									
<b>Total</b>									
									<input type="button" value="Update Data"/>

*(In order to review totals and transmit data, please select the Submit Data or Update Data button.)*

**Enclosure 02**

**Judicial Data Management Services**

**Project Plan**

**v. 1.1.2**

# **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 Viewers<sup>1</sup>, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Viewers, also known as Court Application Processing System (CAPS) 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,<sup>2</sup> 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 cases<sup>3</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](#).

<sup>3</sup> 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"> <li>• Hiring, training and integration of new staff</li> <li>• Purchase of hardware and software</li> <li>• Standardization of tools and development methods</li> <li>• FY 2016-17 sub-project planning</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• Implementation of a generalized data exchange service</li> <li>• Development of a generalized automated logging system</li> <li>• Development of a generalized data tracking system</li> <li>• Expansion of the Trial Court Data Model physical data base and associated programming interface</li> <li>• Enhancements to computer server environment</li> <li>• Modernization of existing data collection systems.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• A comparative review of web reporting frameworks and other tools related to the visual display of performance metrics and data.</li> <li>• Identification of “Next Step” projects based on developing organizational priorities</li> <li>• Preparation of cost estimates and budget requests</li> </ul>	Jan 2016 - Jun 2016

## Judicial Data Management Services Project Plan

Milestone	Description	Planned Tasks (not inclusive or expository)	Duration
03  Production Data Subsystem	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"> <li>• Determination of case type implementation sequence</li> <li>• Software review of existing system for scalability</li> <li>• Preparation of appropriate documentation and directives</li> <li>• Implementation coordination with clerks of court and circuit court administration</li> <li>• Planning and execution of staff augmentation contract</li> <li>• Education and training for field staff</li> </ul>	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)
<b>Personnel</b>			
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
<b>Software/Licenses (note 3, 6)</b>			
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)
<b>Equipment/Hardware</b> (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.

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

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

## **6. Document Revisions**

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Responsible Primary</b>
1.0.0	2014/12/10	PJ Stockdale
1.0.4	2014/12/15	PJ Stockdale
1.1.2	2014/12/18	PJ Stockdale

## **Item IV. Judicial Workload Study**

### **IV.A. Project Summary and 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 2006-2007 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 workload studies.

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

#### Major Methodological Steps:

Appoint and convene a forty member Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (executive committee) comprised of one county and one circuit judge for each circuit (February 12-13, 2015);

Attend county and circuit judges conferences to orient judges re: time study (July/August 2015);

NCSC will develop web-based/video training for the circuits re: time study (August 2015);

Conduct a one month web-based judicial time study of all trial court judges (Sep. 2015);

Administer a web-based *Sufficiency of Time* survey for all trial court judges (fall 2015);

Conduct site visits to a stratified sample of small, medium, large and extra-large circuits, meeting with the chief judge, administrative judges and trial court administrators (fall 2015);

Convene a group of approximately 120 judges by court division to assess the proposed revised weights (winter 2016); and

Reconvene the Judicial Needs Assessment Committee to review and approve of the final proposed case weights (January/February 2016).

A final report documenting the entire Judicial Workload Study by the NCSC is due to the supreme court in the late spring of 2016.

#### **Decision Needed:**

1. None. For information only.

## **Item V. 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 May or June. 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.