
Florida Judicial Workload Assessment

Final Report

June 2024

Brian J. Ostrom, Ph.D.
Rory Monaghan, Ph.D.
Erika Bailey Stevens, M.A.
Breanna Bell, M.C.J.

**Research and Design Group
National Center for State Courts**



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the Florida judges and quasi-judicial officers to this workload assessment. An undertaking of this nature would not have been possible without these judicial officers' dedicated participation in the time study, sufficiency of time survey, Delphi groups, and their valuable feedback throughout the project.

Over the course of this study, we were fortunate to meet regularly with a distinguished advisory committee. The Judicial Needs Assessment Committee, comprised of both circuit judges and county judges from across the state, provided input and perspective in all phases of the project. We extend a special note of thanks to the committee chair, the Honorable Diana Moreland, for her unflagging support and leadership. We would also like to express our appreciation to the Honorable Melissa Distler, President-Elect of the Florida Conference of County Court Judges, for providing canvassing board data.

Florida's Office of the State Courts Administrator served as an invaluable partner in this endeavor. In particular, we thank Andrew Johns and Ronald Draa for their oversight and commitment to ensuring that Florida accurately assesses judicial need. We very much appreciate their knowledge of the Florida court system and their unfailing good spirits throughout the life of the project. Additionally, we are grateful to Eric Maclure, State Courts Administrator, and Tina White, Deputy State Courts Administrator, for their leadership and active involvement throughout the life of the project. We also extend a special note of thanks to Phillip Suber, Victor McKay, David Yunk, and Zackary Baker for their help in navigating the Florida Judicial Branch.

Office of the State Courts Administrator

Mr. Eric Maclure
State Courts Administrator

Mr. Phillip Suber
Senior Court Operations Consultant

Ms. Tina White
Deputy State Courts Administrator

Mr. Victor McKay
Court Operations Consultant

Mr. Andrew Johns
Chief of Court Services

Mr. David Yunk
Court Statistics Consultant

Mr. Ronald Draa
Senior Court Operations Consultant

Mr. Zackary Baker
Court Statistics Consultant

Judicial Needs Assessment Committee

The Honorable Diana Moreland, Circuit Judge
Chief Judge of the 12th Circuit, *Committee Chair*

Circuit Court:

The Honorable William Stone
Circuit Court Judge, 1st Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Jonathan Sjostrom
Circuit Court Judge, 2nd Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Howard Maltz
Circuit Court Judge, 7th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Lisa Munyon
Chief Judge, 9th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable James Yancey
Chief Judge, 10th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Gina Beovides
Circuit Court Judge, 11th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Lourdes Simon
Circuit Court Judge, 11th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Christopher Sabella
Chief Judge, 13th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Brantley Clark
Circuit Court Judge, 14th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Lisa Small
Circuit Court Judge, 15th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Jessica Recksiedler
Circuit Court Judge, 18th Judicial Circuit

The Honorable Charles A. Schwab
Chief Judge, 19th Judicial Circuit

County Court:

The Honorable Jennifer Johnson
County Court Judge, Dixie County

The Honorable Scott Mitchell
County Court Judge, Duval County

The Honorable Tommy Thompson
County Court Judge, Marion County

The Honorable Dorothy Vaccaro
County Court Judge, Pinellas County

The Honorable Susan Miller-Jones
County Court Judge, Alachua County

The Honorable Renee Inman
County Court Judge, Manatee County

The Honorable Frances Perrone
County Court Judge, Hillsborough County

The Honorable Sharon Hamilton
County Court Judge, Monroe County

The Honorable Robert Lee
County Court Judge, Broward County

The Honorable Paul Alessandrone
County Court Judge, Charlotte County

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Executive Summary	5
I. Introduction	8
A. Weighted Caseload and Workload Assessment.....	8
B. 2024 Judicial Workload Assessment	9
II. Case Types and Events.....	10
A. Case Type Categories	10
B. Case-Related Events	13
C. Non-Case-Related Events	13
III. Time Study.....	14
A. Data Collection	14
B. Preliminary Case Weights.....	17
IV. Quality Adjustment.....	20
A. Sufficiency of Time Survey.....	20
B. Delphi Quality Adjustment Groups	22
V. Judicial Need.....	25
A. Judge Year Values	25
B. Adjustments to Judicial Need	27
C. Judicial Need.....	28
D. Secondary Analysis	34
E. Quasi-Judicial Officers	35
VI. Recommendations.....	39
Appendices.....	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform a comprehensive update, extension, and improvement of the existing Florida circuit and county judicial weighted caseload system in line with state-of-the-art workload assessment practices. A clear and objective assessment of court workload is essential to establish the number of judicial officers required to resolve, in a timely manner, all cases coming before the court.

PROJECT DESIGN

To provide oversight and guidance on matters of policy throughout the project, the Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court appointed a 23-member Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) consisting of circuit and county court judges from across the state. JNAC reviewed and ratified the project design, and the findings and recommendations of the NCSC project team.

The workload assessment was conducted in two phases:

1. A *time study* in which all circuit and county court judges, senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers were asked to record all case-related and non-case-related work over a four-week period. The time study provides an empirical description of the amount of time judges and judicial officers currently devote to processing each case type, as well as the division of the workday between case-related and non-case-related activities. About 99 percent of all expected judicial officers participated in the time study, including both full time and part time positions.
2. A *quality adjustment* process to ensure that the final weighted caseload models for circuit court and county court judges incorporate sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing. The quality adjustment process included:
 - a statewide *sufficiency of time survey* asking judges about the amount of time currently available to perform various case-related and non-case-related tasks; and
 - a structured quality review of the case weights by a set of Delphi groups comprising experienced judges from across the state of Florida.

RESULTS

Applying the final weighted caseload model to current case filings shows a need for a total of 663 circuit court judges and 371 county court judges in the state of Florida. This represents an increase of 55 circuit court judgeships and an increase of 29 county court judgeships in comparison with current allocations.¹

RECOMMENDATIONS

The updated weighted caseload model developed during this workload assessment provides an empirically grounded basis for analyzing judicial workload in each of Florida's trial courts. The following

¹ The 55 additional circuit court judgeships and 29 county court judgeships are in addition to the number of judges that will be statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024 (608 circuit court judges and 342 county court judges).

recommendations are intended to ensure the effective use of the weighted caseload model for the purpose of judicial certification and to preserve the model's integrity and utility over time.

Recommendation 1

The revised weighted caseload model clearly shows the changing character of judicial workload in Florida. When applied, the new case weights adopted by the JNAC provide an accurate means to determine the number of judges needed in each circuit and county court. Currently, application of the revised case weights demonstrates that the existing number of judges in some jurisdictions is insufficient to effectively resolve the cases coming before the court. It is recommended that the Florida Supreme Court annually use the weighted caseload model as a primary consideration in certifying judicial need to the Florida Legislature.

Recommendation 2

Over time, the integrity of any weighted caseload model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, rules of court, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies (e.g., recent legislative changes to pretrial detention statutes and recent Florida Supreme Court rules changes governing civil case management). The certification procedures outlined in the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration call for the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability to review the weighted caseload model “and consider adjustments no less than every five years.”² NCSC recommends that each review incorporate a time study to capture empirically any changes in the amount of judicial work associated with cases of various types, as well as a Delphi quality adjustment process to ensure sufficient time for quality performance. JNAC members recommended that future studies should more closely examine the role of interpreters in the courtroom and consider further case-type distinctions. In particular for county courts, separating domestic violence misdemeanors from non-domestic violence misdemeanors and creating a separate case weight for insurance cases may improve the overall accuracy of county court case weights. NCSC also recommends establishing a practice under which the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability meets, as warranted, to review new legislation, changes to rules of court, or other contextual factors that impact the judicial case weights. The present study considerably enhances the potential for keeping the case weights current. Through a regular review process, targeted adjustments can be made to the case weights at the case level to respond to new court rules, legislative mandates, and improved case processing strategies.

Recommendation 3

No weighted caseload model can fully quantify the impact of all jurisdiction-specific factors on judicial workload. Whenever the weighted caseload model suggests a change to the number of judges allocated to a particular court, NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System continue to conduct a secondary analysis of the impact of the factors enumerated in Rule 2.240(b)(1)(B) of the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration on judicial workload in the affected court.

² FLA. R. GEN. PRAC. & JUD. ADMIN. 2.240(b)(1)(C).

Recommendation 4

As Florida continues to expand its use of different types of problem-solving courts, such programs will have an increasing impact on judicial workloads. An improvement in the present study, as compared to the 2016 study, was the development of individual case weights for additional problem-solving courts. However, there are current limitations in tracking the case counts for some of these problem-solving courts (e.g., the ability to classify cases within the appropriate tier of trial court for felony and misdemeanor cases is limited). NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System invest additional resources in collecting and tracking data for problem-solving courts to improve the ability to accurately calculate case weights.

Recommendation 5

The availability of support personnel, especially case managers and staff attorneys, has a profound impact on judges' ability to perform their work efficiently and effectively. During the course of this study, judges indicated that these positions, particularly case managers, are not used uniformly across the state. To assist funding authorities in allocating resources, NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System conduct a staffing workload assessment to expand the use of weighted caseload throughout all court staff positions.

Recommendation 6

The current workload assessment documents the important contribution made by quasi-judicial officers to the efficient and effective resolution of cases in circuit and county courts. NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the various roles and uses of quasi-judicial officers (e.g., magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers) across the state. A targeted evaluation would provide a deeper understanding of the current availability of quasi-judicial resources, the specific functions that quasi-judicial officers perform, and the impact that their work has on the need for county court and circuit court judges. The study would also assist in identifying variations among counties and circuits in the availability and use of quasi-judicial officers and facilitate the review and enhancement of current standards for allocating quasi-judicial officers on the basis of workload – thereby contributing to the equitable distribution of resources.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform a comprehensive study of the workload for Florida circuit and county judicial officers. A *weighted caseload* study provides a clear and objective method to determine the need for judges, magistrates, and hearing officers in both circuit and county courts. Unlike methods of judicial resource allocation that are based on population or raw, unweighted caseloads, the weighted caseload method is grounded in the understanding that different case types vary in complexity and therefore in the amount of judicial work they require. For example, the typical professional malpractice case requires more judge time than the typical automobile tort. Thus, the weighted caseload model explicitly incorporates the differences in judicial workload associated with different types of cases, producing a more accurate and nuanced profile of the need for judges in each court.

A. WEIGHTED CASELOAD AND WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT

1. The Weighted Caseload Model

The weighted caseload method calculates judicial need based on each court's total workload. A weighted caseload model consists of three elements:

1. *Case filings*, or the number of new cases of each type opened each year;
2. *Case weights*, which represent the average amount of judge or judicial officer time required to handle cases of each type over the life of the case; and
3. The *year value*, or the amount of time each judge or judicial officer has available for case-related work in one year.

Total annual workload is calculated by multiplying the annual filings for each case type by the corresponding case weight, then summing the workload across all case types. Each court's workload is then divided by the year value to determine the total number of full-time equivalent judges and/or judicial officers needed to handle the workload.

2. Review of Previous Weighted Caseload Studies in Florida

The Florida Constitution provides that “[t]he supreme court shall establish by rule uniform criteria” for determining the need for judges in each of Florida’s judicial circuits, including both circuit and county court judges, and that the Supreme Court shall certify the need for increases and/or decreases in the number of judges in each circuit to the legislature.³ Prior to 1999, the Supreme Court of Florida relied primarily on caseload standards based on the total number of case filings in certifying the need for trial court judges. In a 1997 review of the methodology, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) determined that the filings-based judicial certification process was insufficient for determining judge need and recommended developing a weighted caseload model instead.

³ FLA. CONST. art. V, § 9.

The resulting 1998 judicial certification bill required the Florida Supreme Court to develop a Delphi-based weighted caseload model, and OSCA contracted with NCSC to conduct a judicial workload assessment consisting of two parts. First, a preliminary model was developed through a Delphi process, which uses structured group discussions to determine expert consensus around a question which is difficult to measure. This model was subsequently validated and updated based on the results of a two-month time study empirically measuring the current judicial officer workload. A key recommendation of the 1999 study was that OSCA should “conduct a systematic update of the case weights approximately every five years” to ensure that the weighted caseload model accurately reflects changes in legislation, case law, court rules, technology, and legal practice.⁴

Following the recommendation from the 1999 study, a 2007 study used the Delphi method to update the existing case weights and included a time study to establish weighted caseload models for child support hearing officers and general magistrates. Although initially charged with developing case weights for traffic hearing officers as well, the workgroup ultimately recommended against implementing a weighted caseload model for traffic hearing officers at that time, “due to inconsistencies among circuits in how traffic hearing officers are utilized and due to accuracy issues related to traffic filing data.”⁵

Another update to the judicial workload model occurred in 2016. This more comprehensive assessment centered around a time study in which all circuit and county court judges, senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers participated. The study also included a quality adjustment process comprising site visits, Delphi groups, and a sufficiency of time survey. The use of a time study as the foundation of the case weights was consistent with the 1999 Delphi Policy Committee’s determination that a time study is the most accurate method of determining the average amount of judicial time per case across all filings within a particular case type.

B. 2024 JUDICIAL WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT

In keeping with the recommendation from the 1999 study, the current study represents a systematic and comprehensive assessment of the Florida weighted caseload system to review and update the caseload model. Since the previous weighted caseload study, changes in legislation, case law, and technology have had a substantial impact on the work of circuit and county judicial officers, necessitating an update of the case weights.

In 2023, OSCA contracted with NCSC to conduct the current evaluation of the weighted caseload model for circuit and county court judges and judicial officers, including senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers. This report describes the methodology and results for the Florida Judicial Workload Assessment, conducted between June 2022 and May 2024.

⁴ BRIAN J. OSTROM ET AL., *NAT’L CTR. FOR STATE COURTS, FLORIDA DELPHI-BASED WEIGHTED CASELOAD PROJECT: FINAL REPORT 11-14* (Jan. 2000), at 76-77.

⁵ COMM’N ON TRIAL CT. PERFORMANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY, *SUP. CT. OF FLA., JUDICIAL RESOURCE STUDY FINAL REPORT 7* (2007), at 66.

1. Judicial Needs Assessment Committee

To provide oversight and guidance on matters of policy throughout the project, the Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court appointed a 23-member Judicial Needs Assessment Committee consisting of circuit and county court judges from across the state. The committee met several times over the course of the project and was responsible for:

- Advising the project team on the selection of case types and the definitions of case-related and non-case-related events to be used during the time study;
- Reviewing and endorsing the results of the time study and the quality adjustment process; and
- Making policy decisions as to the content of the model, including the number of case-related working days in the year and the division of the workday between case-related and non-case-related work.

2. Methodology

The workload assessment was conducted in two phases:

1. A *time study* in which all circuit and county court judges, senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers recorded all case-related and non-case-related work over a four-week period. The time study provides an empirical description of the amount of time currently devoted to processing each case type, as well as the division of the workday between case-related and non-case-related activities.
2. A *quality adjustment* process to ensure that the final weighted caseload models incorporated sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing. The quality adjustment process included a court wide sufficiency of time survey asking all Florida judicial officers about the amount of time currently available to perform various case-related and non-case-related tasks and a series of six case-specific focus groups, referred to as Delphi adjustment sessions.

II. CASE TYPES AND EVENTS

A. CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

During its first meeting, JNAC defined the case type categories to be used as the basis for the weighted caseload model. The committee established two sets of case type categories, one for circuit court and one for county court, which satisfied the following requirements:

- The case type categories are both mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, meaning that any given case falls into one, and only one, case type category;
- Categories are legally and logically distinct;
- There are meaningful differences among categories in the amount of judicial work required to process the average case;
- There are a sufficient number of case filings within the category to develop a valid case weight; and

- Filings for the case type category or its component case types are tracked consistently and reliably in the Summary Reporting System (SRS) and audited by OSCA or tracked through another case management system.

Using the case type categories from the prior studies as a starting point, JNAC agreed upon 36 case type categories for circuit court and 15 case type categories for county court (Exhibit 1). Case types were based upon case types used in the 2016 study but were expanded to include additional information. A number of changes were made to the circuit court case types. For clarity, JNAC altered the names of some of the previous case types; for example, *serious crimes against persons* and *less serious crimes against persons* were revised to *non-capital homicide and sex crimes* and *other crimes against persons*, respectively. A few new case types were also added to the circuit court case types: *insurance*, *Bar referee/discipline*, and *risk protection orders*.

For both circuit and county court, JNAC expanded the problem-solving court options to include five case types: *adult drug court*, *DUI drug court*, *mental health court*, *veterans court*, and *other problem-solving courts*. For the circuit court, they also added three categories for juvenile problem-solving courts: *juvenile delinquency drug court*, *juvenile dependency drug court*, and *juvenile dependency early childhood court*.

Finally, notable changes for the county court case types also included dividing *misdemeanors* and *ordinance violations* into two separate categories and adding *foreclosure and other real property* as a separate case type. The committee further specified that *other county civil* should include only non-monetary matters.

In addition to the listed case types, circuit court judicial officers were able to indicate when they were working on county court case types and vice versa. For family (domestic relations and juvenile) case types, judicial officers were also asked to indicate whether the case they were working on was reopened. For civil case types, they were asked to report whether they were working on a complex civil case. Additional details regarding case types are available in Appendix A (circuit court) and Appendix B (county court).

Exhibit 1: Case Type Categories

Circuit Court	County Court
Capital Murder	Misdemeanors
Non-Capital Homicide and Sex Crimes	Ordinance Violations
Other Crimes Against Persons	Non-DUI Criminal Traffic
Crimes Against Property	DUI
Drug Offenses (excluding Problem-Solving Courts)	Adult Drug Court
Adult Drug Court	DUI Drug Court
DUI Drug Court	Mental Health Court
Mental Health Court	Veterans Court
Veterans Court	Other Problem-Solving Courts
Other Problem-Solving Courts	Small Claims
Professional Malpractice and Product Liability	County Civil
Auto and Other Negligence	Foreclosure and Other Real Property
Contract and Indebtedness	Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)
Foreclosure and Other Real Property	Evictions
Insurance	Civil Traffic Infractions
Business Disputes	Circuit Court Case Types
Other Circuit Civil	
Jimmy Ryce	
Appeals	
Bar Referee/Discipline	
Simplified Dissolution	
Dissolution	
Child Support	
Order for Protection Against Violence	
Paternity	
Other Domestic Relations	
Juvenile Delinquency	
Juvenile Delinquency Drug Court	
Juvenile Dependency	
Juvenile Dependency Drug Court	
Juvenile Dependency Early Childhood Court	
Probate	
Trusts	
Commitment Acts	
Guardianship	
Risk Protection Orders	
County Court Case Types	

B. CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK

To describe case-related work in more detail, JNAC defined separate case-related event categories that cover the complete life cycle of each case. Case-related events include all activities directly associated with the resolution of individual cases, from pre-filing activity (e.g., review of search warrants) through post-disposition matters (e.g., probation violations). JNAC defined four case-related event categories for both circuit and county court (Exhibit 2). Detailed definitions of the case-related event categories appear in Appendix A (circuit court) and Appendix B (county court).

Exhibit 2: Case-Specific Judicial Work, Circuit and County Court

Pre-Disposition/Uncontested Disposition
Bench Trial/Contested Disposition/Summary Judgment
Jury Trial
Post-Judgment/Post-Disposition

C. NON-CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK

Time spent on work not related to a particular case before the court, such as court management, committee meetings, travel, and judicial education, is also an essential part of the judicial workday. To compile a detailed profile of judicial officers' non-case-related activities and provide an empirical basis for the construction of the judge day and year values, JNAC defined nine non-case-related event categories for both circuit and county court (Exhibit 3), retaining the non-case-related event categories used in the previous study. To simplify the task of completing the time study forms and aid in validation of the time study data, vacation and other leave, lunch and breaks, and time spent filling out time study forms were included as non-case-related events. Appendix A (circuit court) and Appendix B (county court) provide details for each non-case-related event category.

Exhibit 3: Non-Case-Specific Judicial Work, Circuit and County Court

Non-Case-Related Administration
General Legal Research
Judicial Education and Training
Committee Meetings, Other Meetings, and Related Work
Community Activities and Public Outreach
Work-Related Travel
Time Study Data Reporting and Entry

Leave & Breaks Activities

Vacation, Sick Leave, and Holidays
Lunch and Breaks

III. TIME STUDY

The time study phase of the workload assessment measured current practice—the amount of time judges and quasi-judicial officers currently spend on cases of each type and on non-case-related work. For a period of four weeks, all Florida circuit and county court judges and quasi-judicial officers were asked to track all their working time by case type and event. Separately, OSCA provided counts of filings by case type category and court location. NCSC used the time study and filings data to calculate the average number of minutes currently spent resolving cases within each case type category (preliminary case weights).

A. DATA COLLECTION

1. Time Study

During a four-week period running from September 18 through October 15, 2023, all circuit and county court judges, senior judges, magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers throughout the state of Florida were asked to track all of their working time by case type category and case-related event (for case-related activities) or by non-case-related event (for non-case-related activities). Judges and judicial officers were asked to record their time in five-minute increments using an online time tracking tool. Participants were instructed to record all their working time, including time spent handling cases on and off the bench, non-case-related work, and any after-hours or weekend work. Circuit and county court judges were asked to record all other time devoted to hearing cases in the other court level—for example, time spent by county court judges assisting with circuit court cases.

To maximize data quality, all time study participants were asked to view a live or recorded webinar training module explaining how to categorize and record their time. Project staff also provided an overview of the workload assessment process, including the time study requirements. In addition to the training modules, judges and judicial officers were provided with web-based reference materials, and NCSC staff were available to answer questions via an online help desk connected with the time tracking tool. To verify accuracy and completeness of the time study data, the time tracking tool allowed time study participants to record and edit their own data and permitted real-time monitoring of participation rates.

Across the state, 586 circuit court judges (99.7 percent) and 321 county court judges (98 percent) participated in the time study, along with 53 senior judges, 121 magistrates, and 122 hearing officers. All together, about 99 percent of all expected judicial officers participated in the time study, including both full time and part time positions. These extremely high participation rates ensured sufficient data to develop an accurate and reliable profile of current practice in Florida’s circuit and county courts. Exhibit 4 shows the participation rate by position.

Exhibit 4: Time Study Participation Rate

	Circuit Judges	County Judges	Senior Judges	Magistrates (full-time)	Magistrates (part-time)	Hearing Officers (full-time)	Hearing Officers (part-time)	Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers
Participants	586	321	53	112	9	37	6	80
Total	588	328	186	114	9	38	6	108
Participation Rate	100%	98%	28%	98%	100%	97%	100%	74%

2. Caseload Data

To translate the time study data into the average amount of time expended on each type of case (preliminary case weights), it was first necessary to determine how many individual cases are filed in each category on an annual basis. OSCA provided filings⁶ data for fiscal years 2020-2021 through 2022-2023.⁷ The caseload data for all three years were then averaged to provide an annual count of filings within each case type category. The use of an annual average rather than the caseload data for one particular year minimizes the potential for any temporary fluctuations in caseloads to influence the case weights.

Exhibits 5 and 6 show the annual and average filings for each case type category for circuit court and county court, respectively.⁸ JNAC and OSCA made two important decisions regarding the filings data. First, due to a change in legislation that caused many attorneys to file auto and other negligence cases at a higher rate, the 2023 filings for auto and other negligence are about three times higher than 2021 and 2022. JNAC decided that this change was an aberration and not part of a filing trend. As a result, the auto and other negligence filing count uses a two-year average from 2021 and 2022. Second, both county and circuit judges recorded time during the time study for adult drug court and DUI drug court case types. However, these case types are almost exclusively filed with OSCA as circuit court cases, and OSCA's filing totals for these case types in county court are artificially low. As such, the filing totals shown for adult drug court and DUI drug court have been combined and are identical for county court and circuit court.

⁶ Civil and Criminal Appeals are tracked as reopened cases, not as new filings.

⁷ Problem-solving court data was provided by calendar year.

⁸ Filings data were not available for Other Problem-Solving Courts cases, so a case weight was not created for this case type in either circuit court or county court.

Exhibit 5: Annual Circuit Court Case Filings by Case Type

Case Type	FY 2020-2021	FY 2021-2022	FY 2022-2023	3-Year Avg.
Capital Murder	466	370	414	417
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	4,696	4,740	4,997	4,811
Other Crimes Against Persons	31,707	31,135	32,364	31,735
Crimes Against Property	64,877	66,233	69,070	66,727
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	47,071	46,574	49,244	47,630
Adult Drug Court	1,940	2,733	2,406	2,360
DUI Drug Court	85	106	146	112
Mental Health Court	762	897	820	826
Veterans Court	587	770	756	704
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	3,357	3,185	3,617	3,386
Auto and Other Negligence	49,879	46,432	131,843	48,156
Contract and Indebtedness	56,937	38,635	35,769	43,780
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	18,630	26,020	30,393	25,014
Insurance	25,961	13,480	14,861	18,101
Business Disputes	4,814	4,552	4,979	4,782
Other Circuit Civil	14,052	14,230	15,188	14,490
ICCSVP (Jimmy Ryce)	72	62	51	62
Appeals	442	219	208	290
Bar Referee/Discipline	78	89	51	73
Simplified Dissolution	11,293	11,115	11,210	11,206
Dissolution	78,257	74,837	72,820	75,305
Child Support	11,369	9,761	10,612	10,581
Orders for Protection Against Violence	74,972	79,669	80,152	78,264
Paternity	13,798	14,712	13,929	14,146
Other Domestic Relations	20,390	22,566	22,803	21,920
Juv. Delinquency	19,354	21,083	25,571	22,003
Juv. Delinquency Drug Court	162	180	197	180
Juv. Dependency	11,600	10,280	9,680	10,520
Juv. Dependency Drug Court	192	206	224	207
Juv. Dep. Early Childhood Court	150	159	178	162
Probate	75,725	83,459	79,307	79,497
Trusts	781	705	714	733
Commitment Acts	67,100	67,958	61,553	65,537
Guardianship	8,731	9,020	9,398	9,050
Risk Protection Orders	4,004	4,558	7,149	5,237
TOTAL	724,291	710,730	802,674	745,898

Exhibit 6: Annual County Court Case Filings by Case Type

Case Type	FY 2020-2021	FY 2021-2022	FY 2022-2023	3-Year Avg.
Misdemeanors	198,147	200,416	206,452	201,672
Ordinance Violations	24,040	28,049	34,069	28,719
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	175,336	182,996	193,666	183,999
DUI	24,628	23,899	22,104	23,544
Adult Drug Court	1,940	2,733	2,406	2,360
DUI Drug Court	85	106	146	112
Mental Health Court	144	710	875	576
Small Claims	647,248	559,041	725,090	643,793
County Civil	106,606	91,246	94,244	97,365
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	3,143	4,015	5,029	4,062
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	10,152	12,995	13,254	12,134
Evictions	92,124	113,155	154,557	119,945
Civil Traffic Infractions	1,095,423	1,354,999	1,388,480	1,279,634
TOTAL	2,379,016	2,574,360	2,840,372	2,597,916

B. PRELIMINARY CASE WEIGHTS

Following the four-week data collection period, the time study data and filings data were used to calculate preliminary case weights for circuit and county court judges. A preliminary case weight represents the average amount of time judges currently spend processing a case of a particular type, from pre-filing activity to all post-judgment matters. The use of separate case weights for each case type category allows for the fact that cases of varying levels of complexity require different amounts of time for effective resolution.

To calculate each preliminary case weight, the time recorded in the case type category by all judges was weighted to the equivalent of one year’s worth of time. The total annual time for the case type was then divided by the average annual filings to yield the average amount of hands-on time judges currently spend on each case. Exhibits 7 and 8, respectively, show the calculation of the preliminary case weight for each circuit and county court case type category, as well as the existing case weights from 2016.

The bottom panel of Exhibit 9 contains the preliminary case weights for circuit and county problem solving courts. Adult drug court and DUI drug court case weights were calculated by combining the time study minutes from the circuit and county court and dividing by the combined 3-year average filings. Separate case weights were calculated for mental health court at the circuit and county levels. Veterans court only operates at a circuit level, so only circuit court has a case weight calculated.

Exhibit 7: Circuit Court Preliminary Case Weights

Case Types	Time Study Minutes	÷	3-year Average Annual Filings	=	Case Weight	2016 Case Weight
Capital Murder	1,323,810		417		3,177	3,273
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	2,957,955		4,811		615	1,130
Other Crimes Against Persons	5,052,173		31,735		159	91
Crimes Against Property	2,604,006		66,727		39	37
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	2,323,651		47,630		49	61
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	929,000		3,386		274	474
Auto & Other Negligence	3,902,097		48,156		81	97
Contract and Indebtedness	1,678,230		43,780		38	50
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	1,556,756		25,014		62	20
Insurance	1,651,402		18,101		91	
Business Disputes	1,594,866		4,782		334	229
Other Circuit Civil	2,320,246		14,490		160	92
Jimmy Ryce	39,442		62		640	686
Appeals	152,074		290		525	275
Bar Referee/Discipline	122,435		73		1,685	
Simplified Dissolution	202,377		11,206		18	23
Dissolution	6,997,308		75,305		93	79
Child Support	279,888		10,581		26	16
Order for Protection Against Violence	2,509,132		78,264		32	16
Paternity	1,899,210		14,146		134	79
Other Domestic Relations	967,503		21,920		44	44
Juv. Delinquency	1,560,499		22,003		71	47
Juv. Delinquency Drug Court	34,921		180		194	
Juv. Dependency	3,164,334		10,520		301	271
Juv. Dependency Drug Court	39,296		207		190	
Juv. Dep. Early Childhood Court	78,692		162		485	
Probate	1,820,061		79,497		23	18
Trusts	175,762		733		240	116
Commitment Acts	176,986		65,537		3	6
Guardianship	837,459		9,050		93	101
Risk Protection Orders	207,180		5,237		40	
Total	50,197,353		717,954			

Exhibit 8: County Court Preliminary Case Weights

Case Types	Time Study Minutes	÷	3-year Average Annual Filings	=	Case Weight	2016 Case Weight
Misdemeanors	5,622,462		201,672		28	16
Ordinance Violations	252,792		28,719		9	
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	1,930,795		183,999		10	8
DUI	2,087,990		23,544		89	71
Small Claims	4,066,039		643,793		6	16
County Civil	4,174,242		97,365		43	29
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	146,463		4,062		36	
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	215,352		12,134		18	21
Evictions	2,157,642		119,945		18	10
Civil Traffic Infractions	747,070		1,279,634		0.58	0.22
Total	21,768,052		2,595,493			

Exhibit 9: Preliminary Problem-Solving Court Case Weights, Circuit and County Court

Case Types	Time Study Minutes	÷	3-year Average Annual Filings	=	Case Weight	2016 Case Weight
Combined						
Adult Drug Court	734,562		2,360		311	112/134*
DUI Drug Court	38,922		112		346	
Circuit Court						
Mental Health Court	264,243		826		320	
Veterans Court	207,431		704		295	
County Court						
Mental Health Court	160,649		576		279	

**First number indicates circuit court case weight; second number indicates county court case weight.*

IV. QUALITY ADJUSTMENT

The preliminary case weights generated during the time study measure the amount of time Florida’s circuit and county court judges *currently* spend handling various types of cases, but do not necessarily indicate whether this is the amount of time judges *should* spend handling cases. To provide a qualitative assessment of whether current practice allows adequate time for quality performance, judges across the state completed a web-based sufficiency of time survey. Informed by the survey results and their own expertise, six expert panels of experienced judges recommended changes to the preliminary case weights to allow sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing. The recommended adjustments were reviewed and finalized by JNAC.

A. SUFFICIENCY OF TIME SURVEY

To provide a statewide perspective on any areas of concern related to current practice, all circuit and county court judges were asked to complete a Web-based sufficiency of time survey in October of 2023. Survey participants were asked to rate the extent to which they had sufficient time to handle each case type on a scale from 1 (*almost never*) to 5 (*almost always*). In addition, participants who felt they did not have enough time for their case-related work were asked to identify the specific case type where they felt the issue was most pressing. Participants were then asked to select the case-related activities, if any, for which additional time would improve the quality of justice for that case type.

The survey also included questions about the sufficiency of time for general workload and non-case-related activities (e.g., judicial education and training, public outreach, committee work) and space for judges to comment freely on their workload. Finally, the survey asked judges to estimate the amount of time they spent serving on the county canvassing board.

The survey was completed by 879 (64 percent) judicial officers. Demographic data indicating participant positions, circuits, and number of years working for the Florida courts are included in Appendix C. Results were disaggregated first by circuit versus county court, then by broad case type categories (circuit criminal, circuit civil, circuit family, circuit juvenile, circuit probate, county criminal, and county civil). Appendix D presents the survey results in more detail.

Overall, only 46 percent of the survey participants agreed that they had sufficient time, on a regular basis, to get their work done. However, the percentage varied by position, with circuit judges (41 percent), county judges (39 percent) and general magistrates (37 percent) reporting the lowest levels of agreement that they had sufficient time for their general workload.

When asked to select a case type area in which the issue of insufficient time is most pressing, participants completing the circuit court survey most often selected *family law* (26 percent), while those completing the county court survey most frequently chose *civil* (36 percent). After selecting a broader case type area, participants were asked to select a specific case type which caused “*the greatest concern of not having sufficient time*” for their case-related work. For circuit court, *non-capital homicide and sex crimes*, *business disputes*, *insurance*, *dissolution*, and *juvenile dependency* were the most frequently selected case types. For county court, *misdemeanors*, *DUI*, and *county civil* were most often chosen.

Participants were also asked to review a list of case-related activities for the broad case type category they selected and to select activities for which they believed more time would improve the quality of justice. Appendix E indicates the details for each case-specific activity by case type for the most frequently selected case types. When asked about non-case-specific activities for which they needed additional time, survey respondents frequently indicated they needed more time for training and for reading professional journals and appellate opinions. Survey responses for non-case-related activities are summarized in Appendix F.

Comments from the survey respondents provided additional information about where judges feel pressed for time. Both circuit and county judges emphasized the challenges around effective case management due to a high volume of cases and lack of time and resources to address those challenges. In particular, they highlighted the limitations of outdated court technology and a lack of case managers, interpreters, and other vital support staff. The high turnover rate increases the time required to train new staff. A shortage of public defenders and attorneys moves cases inefficiently through the system. Across case types, judges indicated a greater need for time spent with pro se litigants for explanation and clarification of court procedures. In addition, they frequently cited the need for additional time for trials and hearings, particularly for complex case types. Judges also reported insufficient time for community outreach, conducting legal research, case preparation, and writing orders. The following comments are a representative sample of typical responses:

“Handling cases involving pro se litigants is very challenging. We often do not have sufficient time to slow down to be able to address the complexities that come with these types of cases.”

“There is so much to read, write, and research (within the case file and review of the law, etc...) to prepare for and complete hearings/meet job requirements. There is not enough time within the workday to do all that is done.”

“Our dockets are unusually large, and we do not have any case managers or staff who assist with case management.”

Within the comments, judges also provided greater detail about particular case types that require more time. For circuit criminal cases, trials, hearings, and jury selection require considerable time, and there are concerns around finding enough docket time for trials and hearings, particularly for jury trials. Additional time is needed for 3.850 cases, as these are usually more complex and time-consuming. Meanwhile, judges who selected circuit civil as the most pressing case type category expressed the need for additional time for summary judgment, in part due to the enactment of a new summary judgment rule. In circuit family cases, by far the greatest area of concern was dissolution cases. Several judges noted that contested divorce cases and cases involving multiple children are particularly complex and require additional time to ensure all issues are addressed.

Comments for the county court indicated that for criminal cases, judges would like to conduct longer hearings for criminal cases, to ensure that victims and defendants in these cases are heard and to better explain processes and rulings, especially for self-represented parties. In addition, county court judges emphasized that they do not have the benefit of court counsel, so they would like more time for case law research and trial preparation. Similarly, judges who selected county civil case types reported that they do not have law clerks, staff attorneys, or case managers to assist with case management in an area with high

case volume. They also highlighted that PIP/insurance cases can be time-consuming and that more administrative time is needed to address the volume of mail.

B. DELPHI QUALITY ADJUSTMENT GROUPS

In April 2024, Delphi panels of circuit and county court judges were convened to identify case types and activities where additional time was required to enhance performance and to recommend corresponding adjustments to the preliminary case weights. Panels consisted of five to nine judges selected from a representative variety of large and small judicial circuits across the state.

Each of the six groups focused on a particular subset of case types: circuit criminal, circuit civil/probate, family court, juvenile, county criminal, and county civil. At the beginning of each Delphi session, NCSC provided group members with the preliminary case weights and the sufficiency of time survey results. Using a variant on the Delphi method—a structured, iterative process for decision-making by a panel of experts—each group was then asked to:

1. Review each preliminary case weight by case type and event and identify specific case types and activities where additional time would allow for more effective case processing, as well as areas where efficiency might be gained;
2. Within particular case types, recommend adjustments to the time allotted to specific case-related functions;
3. Provide an explicit rationale to support any proposed increase or reduction in judicial time; and
4. Review and revise the recommended adjustments until a consensus was reached that all adjustments were necessary and reasonable.

Across all Delphi groups, judges reported that many case types are more complex than during the previous study and that cases with pro se litigants or interpreters require more time to process. Judges on the panels identified particular case types where cases have increased in complexity. For example, in juvenile dependency cases there are increasing rates of children diagnosed with special needs, such as drug dependency or autism. Professional malpractice cases have also grown more complex since the 2016 study, as they involve a greater number of parties and attorneys. Additionally, the county criminal panel strongly recommended separating domestic violence misdemeanor from non-domestic violence misdemeanor in future studies, as domestic violence cases are more complex and require additional time. Judges across the Delphi groups indicated that more time is needed for case management in general, although certain case types are affected more than others. In particular, the circuit civil and probate group indicated that a new case management order from the Supreme Court in 2021 requires orders for every case.

The Delphi groups also indicated several new statutes affecting the amount of time required for case processing. Following the time study, a new statute was effective in January 2024 which will require additional pretrial detention hearings for circuit criminal cases. Similarly, new requirements for reviewing coercive control are expected to increase the amount of time required for case processing for orders for protection against violence. For non-DUI criminal traffic, a new regulation passed since the end of the time study requires 10 days of jail time for driving with non-valid licenses, which is expected to result in a greater number of trials. Although no additional change was recommended for the case weights, judges

in the circuit criminal Delphi group noted that a new law on capital punishment for sex offenses has had no major impact so far but may eventually require extra time for 12-person jury selection.

In some cases, the time study data resulted in case weights which decreased compared to the 2016 case weights. Judges on the panel were able to provide context for some of these differences. The circuit criminal Delphi panel indicated that the decrease in the non-capital homicide and sex crimes case weight was unexpected but was likely related to improved caseflow management. The circuit civil and probate group indicated that the drop in the auto and other negligence case weight was unsurprising, as these cases take less time now due to changes in law since the previous study.

Notably, for the county civil case type, the panel recommended decreasing the case weight from the preliminary time study results. The concern was that during the time study, judges may have incorrectly recorded their time for insurance/PIP cases under county civil instead of under small claims.⁹ As a result, the group proposed decreasing the case weight for county civil while increasing the case weight for small claims to properly account for that time. The group also recommended using a separate category for PIP cases in future studies.

Finally, the circuit juvenile Delphi panel indicated that the timing of the study may have influenced the results for these case types, as the nature of the work changes in relation to the timing of the school year. For example, juvenile delinquency cases involve more issues and require more work later in the school year, while the data collection period occurred during the beginning of the school year. Judges on this panel recommended adding time to the case weight to account for the timing of the study.

For most case types, the Delphi panels were satisfied with the results of the time study and ultimately recommended changes for only a few case types. Appendix G provides descriptions and detailed rationales for all recommended adjustments.

Following the quality adjustment sessions, JNAC reviewed and approved the recommended adjustments, which were then incorporated into the final case weights. Exhibits 10 (circuit court) and 11 (county court) compare the preliminary case weights from the time study with the Delphi-adjusted case weights. The 2016 case weights are included in the table for reference.

⁹ This conclusion was in part indicated by the sufficiency of time survey results, as *county civil* and *small claims* were the two most frequently selected case types in the civil case type category, but *county civil* was selected twice as often. Since the survey comments frequently indicated a greater need for PIP/insurance cases, the Delphi panel concluded that there might have been some confusion regarding the proper categorization of these cases.

Exhibit 10: Circuit Court Preliminary and Delphi-Adjusted Case Weights

Case Types	Time Study Case Weight	Delphi Adjusted Case Weight	2016 Case Weight
Capital Murder	3,177		3,273
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	615	636	1,130
Other Crimes Against Persons	159	169	91
Crimes Against Property	39		37
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	49		61
Adult Drug Court	311		112
DUI Drug Court	346		
Mental Health Court	320		
Veterans Court	295		
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	274	298	474
Auto & Other Negligence	81		97
Contract & Indebtedness	38	43	50
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	62		20
Insurance	91		
Business Disputes	334		229
Other Circuit Civil	160		92
Jimmy Ryce	640		686
Appeals	525		275
Bar Referee/Discipline	1,685		
Simplified Dissolution	18		23
Dissolution	93	95	79
Child Support	26		16
Order for Protection Against Violence	32	37	16
Paternity	134		79
Other Domestic Relations	44		44
Juv. Delinquency	71	72	47
Juv. Delinquency Drug Court	194		
Juv. Dependency	301	316	271
Juv. Dependency Drug Court	190		
Juv. Dep. Early Childhood Court	485		
Probate	23		18
Trusts	240		116
Commitment Acts	3		6
Guardianship	93		101
Risk Protection Orders	40	50	

Exhibit 11: County Court Preliminary and Delphi-Adjusted Case Weights

Case Types	Time Study Case Weight	Delphi Adjusted Case Weight	2016 Case Weight
Misdemeanors	28		16
Ordinance Violations	9		
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	10	15	8
DUI	89		71
Adult Drug Court	311		134
DUI Drug Court	346		
Mental Health Court	279		
Small Claims	6	7	16
County Civil	43	39	29
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	36		
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	18		21
Evictions	18		10
Civil Traffic Infractions	0.58		0.22

V. JUDICIAL NEED

In the weighted caseload model, three factors contribute to the calculation of judicial need: caseload data (filings), case weights, and the year value. The year value is equal to the amount of time each full-time judge has available for case-related work on an annual basis. The relationship among the filings, case weights, and year value is expressed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Filings x Case Weights (minutes)}}{\text{Year Value (minutes)}} = \text{Resource Need (FTE)}$$

Multiplying the filings by the corresponding case weights calculates the total annual workload in minutes. Dividing the workload by the year value yields the total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges needed to handle the workload.

A. JUDGE YEAR VALUES

To develop the year values for circuit and county court judges, it was necessary to determine the number of days each judge has available for case-related work in each year (*judge working year*) and the division of the work day between case-related and non-case-related work (*judge day value*).

1. Judge Working Year

As shown in Exhibit 12, the judge working year was constructed by beginning with 365 days per year, then subtracting weekends, legal holidays, vacation and sick leave (PTO), and full-day participation in continuing judicial education and committee work. In the current study, JNAC incorporated all state holidays and the full allotment of PTO. As such, the judge year for the 2023 study was changed to 208.

Exhibit 12: Judge Working Year Value

Total days per year	365
Weekends	– 104
Legal holidays	– 13
PTO	– 30
Judicial education and committee work	– 10
Case-related days per year	208

2. Judge Day Values

The judge day value represents the amount of time each judge has available for case-related work during each workday. The day value for judges, originally defined by the 1999 Delphi Policy Committee, remains at 8.5 hours, including lunch, breaks, and non-case-related work. Subtracting time for lunch and breaks and for non-case-related work from the total working day yields the amount of time available for case-related work, or the judge day. Following review of the time study data (Appendix H), JNAC kept the day value as it has been since 1999: (1) a 6-hour judge day for circuit court judges doing circuit court work and (2) a 6-hour judge day for county court judges comprised of 5 hours for doing county court work and 1 hour for doing circuit court work (Exhibit 13). The total workday for circuit court judges includes 6 hours of case-related work and 1.5 hours of non-case-related work, including administration and travel. The total workday for county court judges includes 5 hours for case-related work on county court cases, 1 hour for case-related work on circuit court cases, and 1.5 hours of non-case-related work.

Exhibit 13: 2023 Circuit and County Judge Day Values

	Circuit Court Judges	County Court Judges
Case-Related Hours	6.0	5.0
Circuit Court Work		1.0
Non-Case-Related Hours	1.5	1.5
TOTAL	7.5	7.5

3. Judge Year Values

To calculate the final year values for case-related work,¹⁰ the number of days in the working year was multiplied by the day value for case-related work at each judge’s own court level. This figure was then expressed in terms of minutes per year. Exhibit 14 details the calculation of the judge year values of 74,880 minutes for circuit court judges and 62,400 minutes for county court judges. County judges also have an additional 1 hour per day (12,900 minutes) in the final judge day value for circuit court work.

Exhibit 14: 2023 Judge Year Value

	Day Value	X	Working Year	X	Minutes per Hour	=	Year Value
Circuit Judges	6.0	X	208	X	60	=	74,880
County Judges	5.0	X	208	X	60	=	62,400

B. ADJUSTMENTS TO JUDICIAL NEED

To accommodate the additional administrative responsibilities of chief judges and time spent serving on county election canvassing boards, courts were credited with additional judicial need expressed in the form of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges.

1. Chief Judge Adjustment

In each judicial circuit, one circuit court judge serves as chief judge to “exercise administrative supervision over all the trial courts within the judicial circuit.”¹¹ Analysis of the time study data revealed that the amount of additional administrative work associated with the role of chief judge varies according to the size of the judicial circuit. JNAC therefore adopted adjustments ranging from .25 FTE to 1.0 FTE to accommodate the work of the chief judge in each circuit (Exhibit 15). The current chief judge adjustment by circuit is included in Appendix I.

Exhibit 15: Chief Judge Adjustment

Circuit Size (circuit court judges)	Chief Judge Adjustment (FTE)	Case-Related Hours/Day
< 10	.25	4.50
10 – 20	.50	3.00
21 – 40	.75	1.50
41 +	1.00	.00

¹⁰ Because only county court cases are included in the calculations of total county court judicial workload, case-related time devoted to circuit court cases was deducted from the day value for county court judges. The final year value for county court judges includes only time available for working on county court cases.

¹¹ FLA. STAT. § 43.26(1).

2. Canvassing Board Adjustment

Florida law requires county court judges to serve on county election canvassing boards.¹² Each county handles the assignment of judges to the canvassing board differently. In some counties, a single judge serves on the canvassing board; in others, canvassing board duties are divided among several judges. In some counties, circuit court judges also take on some canvassing board responsibilities. The sufficiency of time survey asked county and circuit court judges to estimate the number of full working days typically devoted to election canvassing board duties in presidential election years, other even-numbered years, and odd-numbered years. Additionally, the President-Elect of the Florida Conference of County Court Judges provided additional data collected during the 2022 election cycle (Appendix J). Based on the survey responses and data, canvassing board time varies by county court size and whether or not it is a presidential election year. JNAC adopted adjustments ranging from .05 FTE to 0.14 FTE. Details are provided in Exhibit 16.¹³

Exhibit 16: Suggested Canvassing Board Adjustment

No. of Judges in County	Hours per Year				Annual Average	FTE Adjustment
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 Presidential Primary (1.5)		
1	45	45	45	68	51	0.05
1.1 to 10	75	75	75	113	84	0.08
10.1 to 30	105	105	105	158	118	0.11
30.1+	130	130	130	195	146	0.14

C. JUDICIAL NEED

To calculate the number of judges needed in each of Florida’s trial courts, the annual average filings for each case type was multiplied by the corresponding case weight to calculate the annual judicial workload associated with that case type, in minutes. Judicial workload was summed across all case types, then divided by the judge year value, or the amount of time each full-time judge has available for case-related work in one year. This yielded the number of judges required to handle the court’s case-related workload and judges’ ordinary non-case-related responsibilities. In circuit court, adding the appropriate chief judge adjustment reveals the total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges required to handle the court’s total case-related and non-case-related workload.

The Florida Constitution requires a minimum of one judge per county court.¹⁴ As a result, after adding the canvassing board adjustment of 0.05 to 0.14 FTE per county, judicial need must be rounded to 1.0 FTE in any single judge county with a workload-based need of less than 1.0 FTE.

¹² FLA. STAT. § 102.141.

¹³ FLA. R. GEN. PRAC. & JUD. ADMIN. 2.240(c)(14).

¹⁴ FLA. CONST. art. V, § 6(a).

Exhibit 17 compares total judge need in each circuit court (column e) with the number of judicial positions currently authorized (column b). Exhibit 18 performs the same comparison for county court (columns f and b). The next step is to determine a rule for resolving any differences that occur between the number of judges the weighted caseload model recommends and the current number of judges.

Where judicial need exceeds the current number of authorized positions, the impact of excess need on each individual judge's workload will vary according to the number of judges in the court. For example, if a court needs 26 judges and currently has 25 judges, each judge can take on a small share of the excess work, leaving each judge with a total of 1.04 FTE of judicial work ($26/25 = 1.04$). In a smaller court, however, the same shortage of one judge will have a much greater impact. For example, in a court with a need of three judges and a current allocation of two, each judge will be required to perform 1.5 FTE of judicial work. Exhibits 17 (column f) and 18 (column g) show the ratio of judicial workload to judicial positions in each court. To provide a common yardstick for jurisdictions of all sizes and to assist in directing additional judicial resources to the jurisdictions with the greatest relative need, JNAC voted to adopt the following rules:

1. In any court where the ratio of judicial need to existing positions is greater than 1.10, additional judicial positions should be allocated to bring the ratio below 1.10.
2. In any court where the ratio of judicial need to existing positions is between 1.10 and 0.90, no change to the number of judicial positions is recommended.
3. In any court where the ratio of judicial need to existing positions is below 0.90, judicial positions should be subtracted until the ratio is above 0.90, unless subtracting positions brings the ratio above 1.10.

For instance, in the First Judicial Circuit, 26 judges are currently handling the work of 31.9 judges, or the equivalent of 1.23 FTE of work per judge. Adding a single judge would bring the ratio to 1.16 FTE, still in excess of 1.10. Adding three judges would reduce the ratio to 1.10, equaling the 1.10 threshold. The recommended allocation for the First Judicial Circuit is therefore 29 judges, an increase of three. In Monroe County, on the other hand, total judicial need is 2.1 FTE. Under the current allocation of four judges, each judge has .51 FTE of judicial work. Removing two judges would bring the ratio to 1.03 FTE per judge. The recommended allocation for Monroe County is therefore two judges, or two fewer than the current allocation. Exhibit 17 (column g) indicates the final judicial officer need for circuit court using these rules, while Exhibit 18 (column h) indicates the final judicial officer need for county court.

In the aggregate, the weighted caseload model suggests a need for a total of 663 circuit court judges (bottom of column g) and 371 county court judges (bottom of column h) in the state of Florida. This represents an increase of 55 circuit court judgeships and an increase of 29 county court judgeships in comparison with current allocations.¹⁵

¹⁵ The 55 additional circuit court judgeships and 29 county court judgeships are in addition to the number of judges that will be statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024 (608 circuit court judges and 342 county court judges).

Exhibit 17: Summary of Judicial Need and Availability, Circuit Court (FTE)

Circuit	Current Judicial Officers (FTE)	Time Study Implied Need (FTE)	Delphi Implied Need (FTE)	Implied Need w/Chief (FTE)	Current Workload per Judicial Officer (FTE)	Judicial Officer Need (FTE) using 1.10/.90	Final Workload per Judicial Officer
1	26	30.2	31.2	31.9	1.23	29	1.10
2	16	16.7	17.2	17.7	1.10	16	1.10
3	7	7.3	7.5	7.7	1.11	8	.97
4	35	40.2	41.6	42.3	1.21	39	1.08
5	31	38.5	39.7	40.4	1.30	37	1.09
6	45	49.1	50.5	51.5	1.14	47	1.10
7	27	33.1	34.0	34.8	1.29	32	1.09
8	13	13.9	14.3	14.8	1.14	14	1.06
9	46	53.3	54.8	55.8	1.21	51	1.09
10	28	31.5	32.4	33.2	1.19	31	1.07
11	80	74.5	76.7	77.7	.97	80	.97
12	22	24.8	25.4	26.1	1.19	24	1.09
13	45	47.5	48.9	49.9	1.11	45	1.11
14	13	15.5	15.9	16.4	1.26	15	1.09
15	35	42.0	43.0	43.8	1.25	40	1.09
16	4	3.2	3.3	3.5	.89	4	.89
17	58	59.4	61.0	62.0	1.07	58	1.07
18	26	30.9	31.7	32.5	1.25	30	1.08
19	19	22.3	22.8	23.3	1.23	22	1.06
20	32	42.6	43.9	44.6	1.39	41	1.09
Total	608 ¹⁶	676.4	695.7	709.9	1.17	663	1.07
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f = e/b)	(g)	(h = g/b)

¹⁶ Reflects the number of circuit court judgeships statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024.

Exhibit 18: Summary of Judicial Need and Availability, County Court (FTE)

Circuit	County	Current Judicial Officers (FTE)	Time Study Implied Need (FTE)	Delphi Implied Need (FTE)	Implied Need w/Canv. Board Adj.	Implied Need w/Min. 1 Judge/County (FTE)	Current Workload per Judicial Officer (FTE)	Judicial Officer Need using 1.10/.90	Final Workload per Judicial Officer
1	Escambia	5	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.8	.96	5	.96
1	Okaloosa	3	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.3	1.08	3	1.08
1	Santa Rosa	3	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	.89	3	.89
1	Walton	1	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.65	2	.82
2	Franklin	1	.4	.4	0.4	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
2	Gadsden	1	.5	.5	0.6	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
2	Jefferson	1	.2	.2	0.2	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
2	Leon	5	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.2	.65	3	1.08
2	Liberty	1	.1	.1	0.2	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
2	Wakulla	1	.5	.5	0.5	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Columbia	2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	.67	2	.67
3	Dixie	1	.2	.2	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Hamilton	1	.2	.2	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Lafayette	1	.1	.1	0.1	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Madison	1	.3	.3	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Suwannee	1	.6	.7	0.7	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
3	Taylor	1	.4	.4	0.5	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
4	Clay	2	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.6	1.28	3	.86
4	Duval	17	21.9	23.3	23.4	23.4	1.37	22	1.06
4	Nassau	1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.28	2	.64
5	Citrus	3	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	.55	2	.82
5	Hernando	2	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.27	3	.84
5	Lake	4	4.6	4.9	5.0	5.0	1.25	5	1.00
5	Marion	4	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4	1.36	5	1.09
5	Sumter	1	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.52	2	.76
	<i>(a)</i>	<i>(b)</i>	<i>(c)</i>	<i>(d)</i>	<i>(e)</i>	<i>(f)</i>	<i>(g = f/b)</i>	<i>(h)</i>	<i>(i = h/b)</i>

Exhibit 18: Summary of Judicial Need and Availability, County Court (FTE) (Continued)

Circuit	County	Current Judicial Officers (FTE)	Time Study Implied Need (FTE)	Delphi Implied Need (FTE)	Implied Need w/Canv. Board Adj.	Implied Need w/Min. 1 Judge/County (FTE)	Current Workload per Judicial Officer (FTE)	Judicial Officer Need using 1.10/.90	Final Workload per Judicial Officer
6	Pasco	7	6.5	6.6	6.7	6.7	.95	7	.95
6	Pinellas	17	15.6	16.3	16.4	16.4	.96	17	.96
7	Flagler	2	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.02	2	1.02
7	Putnam	2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	.67	2	.67
7	St. Johns	3	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	1.16	4	.87
7	Volusia	10	11.1	11.7	11.8	11.8	1.18	11	1.08
8	Alachua	5	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	.64	3	1.06
8	Baker	1	.4	.4	0.4	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
8	Bradford	1	.5	.5	0.6	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
8	Gilchrist	1	.3	.3	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
8	Levy	1	.7	.7	0.8	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
8	Union	1	.1	.1	0.2	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
9	Orange	22	25.8	27.1	27.2	27.2	1.24	25	1.09
9	Osceola	4	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.1	1.28	5	1.03
10	Hardee	1	.4	.4	0.5	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
10	Highlands	1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.19	2	.60
10	Polk	10	10.6	11.1	11.2	11.2	1.12	11	1.02
11	Miami-Dade	43	54.1	58.1	58.3	58.3	1.36	53	1.10
12	Desoto	1	.4	.5	0.5	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
12	Manatee	4	4.7	5.0	5.1	5.1	1.27	5	1.02
12	Sarasota	5	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.8	.97	5	.97
13	Hillsborough	25	29.1	31.3	31.4	31.4	1.26	29	1.08
	<i>(a)</i>	<i>(b)</i>	<i>(c)</i>	<i>(d)</i>	<i>(e)</i>	<i>(f)</i>	<i>(g = f/b)</i>	<i>(h)</i>	<i>(i = h/b)</i>

Exhibit 18: Summary of Judicial Need and Availability, County Court (FTE) (Continued)

Circuit	County	Current Judicial Officers (FTE)	Time Study Implied Need (FTE)	Delphi Implied Need (FTE)	Implied Need w/Canv. Board Adj.	Implied Need w/Min. 1 Judge/County (FTE)	Current Workload per Judicial Officer (FTE)	Judicial Officer Need using 1.10/.90	Final Workload per Judicial Officer
14	Bay	4	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.7	1.17	5	.94
14	Calhoun	1	.2	.2	0.2	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
14	Gulf	1	.3	.3	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
14	Holmes	1	.3	.3	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
14	Jackson	1	.5	.6	0.6	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
14	Washington	1	.3	.3	0.4	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
15	Palm Beach	19	21.7	23.4	23.6	23.6	1.24	22	1.07
16	Monroe	4	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	.51	2	1.03
17	Broward	32	31.8	33.2	33.4	33.4	1.04	32	1.04
18	Brevard	11	8.3	8.6	8.7	8.7	.79	9	.96
18	Seminole	6	5.8	6.0	6.1	6.1	1.02	6	1.02
19	Indian River	2	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	.97	2	.97
19	Martin	3	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	.67	2	1.00
19	Okeechobee	1	.8	.8	0.9	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
19	St. Lucie	4	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	1.05	4	1.05
20	Charlotte	3	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.3	.77	3	.77
20	Collier	6	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.2	.86	5	1.03
20	Glades	1	.2	.2	0.3	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
20	Hendry	1	.7	.7	0.8	1.0	1.00	1	1.00
20	Lee	9	10.4	10.7	10.8	10.8	1.20	10	1.08
		342 ¹⁷	341.9	360.7	365.7	380.5	1.11	371	1.03
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g = f/b)	(h)	(i = h/b)

¹⁷ Reflects the number of county court judgeships statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024.

D. SECONDARY ANALYSIS

Under the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration, factors other than the weighted caseload model “may be used in the determination of need for one or more additional judges. These factors include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. The availability and use of county court judges in circuit court.
- ii. The availability and use of senior judges to serve on a particular court.
- iii. The availability and use of magistrates and hearing officers.
- iv. The extent of use of alternative dispute resolution.
- v. The number of jury trials.
- vi. Foreign language interpretations.
- vii. The geographic size and composition of a circuit, including travel times between courthouses in a particular jurisdiction and the presence of community facilities such as correctional facilities, medical facilities, and universities.
- viii. Prosecutorial practices and law enforcement activities in the court’s jurisdiction, including any substantial commitment of additional resources for state attorneys, public defenders, and local law enforcement.
- ix. The availability and use of case-related support staff and case management policies and practices.
- x. Caseload trends.”¹⁸

Other potential factors have been noted, including: the existence of alternative problem-solving courts; prosecutor and law enforcement practices; the location of correctional facilities, hospitals, universities; and the quality and scope of court technology. There was also considerable discussion among JNAC members about the exact threshold values to be used in the rounding rule based on workload per judge (currently no change to the number of judicial positions is recommended when the ratio of judicial need to existing positions is between 1.10 and 0.90).

The impact of these factors is specific to individual courts and may vary over time. Whenever the weighted caseload model suggests a change to the number of judges allocated to a particular court, NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System continue to conduct a secondary analysis of the impact of the factors enumerated in Rule 2.240(b)(1)(B) of the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration on judicial workload in the affected court.¹⁹ For example, the weighted caseload model shows a need for two county court judges in Monroe County; however, the county has three separate courthouses spread out across the Florida Keys. To help maintain access to justice, an allocation of three or four full-time county court judges may be more appropriate in Monroe County.

¹⁸ FLA. R. GEN. PRAC. & JUD. ADMIN. 2.240(b)(1)(B).

¹⁹ Ibid

E. QUASI-JUDICIAL OFFICERS

Florida uses magistrates, senior judges, and hearing officers to increase the courts' capacity to handle a wide range of cases. The work of these quasi-judicial officers, as well as county court judges working in circuit court, is critical for efficient and effective case resolution overall and for the determination of specific circuit and county court judicial need. In fact, as discussed above, the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration state that the determination of judicial need should incorporate:

- i. The availability and use of county court judges in circuit court.
- ii. The availability and use of senior judges to serve on a particular court.
- iii. The availability and use of magistrates and hearing officers.

The time study data show the relative contributions of circuit and county court judges and the availability and use of quasi-judicial officers in the handling of cases of each type.

1. Quasi-Judicial Officer Workload

Quasi-judicial officers in Florida handle a variety of case assignments:

- Magistrates are judicial officers appointed by the court to assist the work of circuit court judges. Magistrates hold formal court hearings providing recommendations to judges in the areas of family law, support enforcement, juvenile dependency, mental health, and guardianship. For example, magistrates can be appointed to proceedings involving the establishment, modification, and enforcement of child support or to hear and consider Baker and Marchman Act proceedings.
- Senior judges are retired judges who have agreed to accept assignments to temporary judicial duty to fill-in for long-term judicial absences (e.g., illness or death) and to assist with excess workload (e.g., foreclosure cases). Senior judges enable parties to have improved access to courts, help reduce backlogs, and support more timely hearings.
- Child support enforcement hearing officers are attorneys who have been appointed by administrative order of the court. These hearing officers are typically used in family court to take testimony and recommend decisions in cases involving the establishment, enforcement, and/or modification of child support and paternity matters.
- Civil traffic infraction hearing officers are contractual attorneys who serve on a part-time basis to provide assistance to judges by hearing and making decisions in non-criminal traffic matters. These hearing officers typically serve in county court, and the decisions they make can be appealed to a regular sitting judge.

Exhibits 19 and 20 show the case weights calculated for the quasi-judicial officers for circuit and county court, respectively. These were calculated by taking the total time reported by quasi-judicial officers for each case type and dividing by the number of filings. Senior judges work as needed in both circuit and county court and therefore have case weights calculated in both exhibits.

Exhibit 19: Quasi-Judicial Officer Case Weights (Minutes), Circuit Court

Circuit Court	3-Year Average Filings	Case Weights		
		Magistrates	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers	Senior Judges
Capital Murder	417			13
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	4,811	12		11
Other Crimes Against Persons	31,735			1
Crimes Against Property	66,727			1
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	47,630			1
Adult Drug Court	2,360	39		1
DUI Drug Court	112			
Mental Health Court	826	289		
Veterans Court	704			
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	3,386	3		
Auto & Other Negligence	48,156	2		1
Contract and Indebtedness	43,780	2		
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	25,014	4		3
Insurance	18,101	4		
Business Disputes	4,782	15		
Other Circuit Civil	14,490	4		7
Jimmy Ryce	62			
Appeals	290			
Bar Referee/Discipline	73			
Simplified Dissolution	11,206	7		1
Dissolution	75,305	43	1	1
Child Support	10,581	55	293	1
Order for Protection Against Violence	78,264	1		
Paternity	14,146	99	17	1
Other Domestic Relations	21,920	35		2
Juv. Delinquency	22,003	1		1
Juv. Delinquency Drug Court	180			
Juv. Dependency	10,520	174		6
Juv. Dependency Drug Court	207	100		
Juv. Dep. Early Childhood Court	162	191		
Probate	79,497	2		1
Trusts	733			
Commitment Acts	65,537	7		
Guardianship	9,050	57		2
Risk Protection Orders	5,237	1		

Exhibit 20: Quasi-Judicial Officer Case Weights (Minutes), County Court

County Court	Case Weights		
Case Types	3-Year Average Filings	Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers	Senior Judges
Misdemeanors	201,672		0.3
Ordinance Violations	28,719		0.1
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	183,999		0.1
DUI	23,544		0.2
Adult Drug Court	2,360		0.7
DUI Drug Court	112		
Mental Health Court	576		
Small Claims	643,793		
County Civil	97,365		0.1
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	4,062		0.2
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	12,134		
Evictions	119,945		
Civil Traffic Infractions	1,279,634	1	

2. Day Values for Quasi-Judicial Officers

As with circuit and county court judges, the time study permitted an empirical examination of the division of the workday between case-related and non-case-related work for magistrates and hearing officers, and OSCA provided a comprehensive census of judges and quasi-judicial officers.

Starting with the state employment standard of an eight-hour workday excluding non-case-related time, day values were developed for magistrates and child support enforcement hearing officers (Exhibit 21).²⁰ Because civil traffic infraction hearing officers are hourly contract employees and most are not paid for non-case-related administrative time, a day value was not developed for civil traffic infraction hearing officers.²¹ Likewise, senior judges work as needed and no day value was developed.

²⁰ Magistrates and child support hearing officers are state employees and therefore subject to state employment standards. 2007 JRS, *supra* note 9, at 9.

²¹ *Id.*, at 53.

Exhibit 21: Final Quasi-Judicial Officer Day Values (Hours)

	Magistrates	Child Support Hearing Officers
Case-Related Hours	6.5	6.5
Non-Case-Related Hours	1.5	1.5
TOTAL	8.0	8.0

Exhibit 22 shows the current complement of judges and quasi-judicial officers by circuit. A total of 186 senior judges and 170 magistrates and hearing officers are available throughout the state of Florida.²² These quasi-judicial officers make a substantial contribution to the efficient and effective disposition of cases in Florida’s trial courts.

Exhibit 22: Census of Judges and Quasi-Judicial Officers by Circuit (FTE)

Circuit	Authorized Circuit Judges	Authorized County Judges	Senior Judges	Magistrates (State Funded)	Magistrates (Locally Funded)	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers (State Funded)	Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers	Total
1	26	12	8	3.5	0.5	2.0	0.1	52
2	16	10	3	2.5		1.5	0.1	33
3	7	8	2	1.0		1.0	0.0	19
4	35	20	14	7.0	3.0	4.0	0.3	83
5	31	14	13	5.0	2.0	2.5	0.9	68
6	45	24	16	7.3	2.3	3.0	0.2	98
7	27	17	7	3.5		1.5	0.0	56
8	13	10	6	2.0		1.0	0.0	32
9	46	26	23	6.0	2.0	3.0	1.9	108
10	28	12	12	4.0		3.0	0.4	59
11	80	43	20	11.0	1.0	4.0	3.7	163
12	22	10	8	4.0	1.5	2.0	0.4	48
13	45	25	9	7.0	1.0	3.8	0.8	92
14	13	9	2	2.0		1.5	0.2	28
15	35	19	7	7.0		1.0	1.1	70
16	4	4	3	1.0			0.1	12
17	58	32	11	9.0		2.0	3.3	115
18	26	17	10	4.0	3.0	1.0	0.3	61
19	19	10	6	3.0		2.0	0.4	40
20	32	20	6	5.0	4.0	1.5	0.5	69
Total	608²³	342²⁴	186	94.8	20.3	41.3	14.5	1,307

²² An additional 20 child support hearing officers have been approved but have not yet been allocated to specific jurisdictions. As such, these positions are not included in the current census.

²³ Reflects the number of circuit court judgeships statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024.

²⁴ Reflects the number of county court judgeships statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The updated weighted caseload model developed during this workload assessment provides an empirically grounded basis for analyzing judicial workload in each of Florida’s trial courts. The following recommendations are intended to ensure the effective use of the weighted caseload model for the purpose of judicial certification and to preserve the model’s integrity and utility over time.

Recommendation 1

The revised weighted caseload model clearly shows the changing character of judicial workload in Florida. When applied, the new case weights adopted by the JNAC provide an accurate means to determine the number of judges needed in each circuit and county court. Currently, application of the revised case weights demonstrates that the existing number of judges in some jurisdictions is insufficient to effectively resolve the cases coming before the court. It is recommended that the Florida Supreme Court annually use the weighted caseload model as a primary consideration in certifying judicial need to the Florida Legislature.

Recommendation 2

Over time, the integrity of any weighted caseload model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, rules of court, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies (e.g., recent legislative changes to pretrial detention statutes and recent Florida Supreme Court rules changes governing civil case management). The certification procedures outlined in the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration call for the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability to review the weighted caseload model “and consider adjustments no less than every five years.”²⁵ NCSC recommends that each review incorporate a time study to capture empirically any changes in the amount of judicial work associated with cases of various types, as well as a Delphi quality adjustment process to ensure sufficient time for quality performance. JNAC members recommended that future studies should more closely examine the role of interpreters in the courtroom and consider further case-type distinctions. In particular for county courts, separating domestic violence misdemeanors from non-domestic violence misdemeanors and creating a separate case weight for insurance cases may improve the overall accuracy of county court case weights. NCSC also recommends establishing a practice under which the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability meets, as warranted, to review new legislation, changes to rules of court, or other contextual factors that impact the judicial case weights. The present study considerably enhances the potential for keeping the case weights current. Through a regular review process, targeted adjustments can be made to the case weights at the case level to respond to new court rules, legislative mandates, and improved case processing strategies.

Recommendation 3

No weighted caseload model can fully quantify the impact of all jurisdiction-specific factors on judicial workload. Whenever the weighted caseload model suggests a change to the number of judges allocated to

²⁵ FLA. R. GEN. PRAC. & JUD. ADMIN. 2.240(b)(1)(C).

a particular court, NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System continue to conduct a secondary analysis of the impact of the factors enumerated in Rule 2.240(b)(1)(B) of the Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration on judicial workload in the affected court.

Recommendation 4

As Florida continues to expand its use of different types of problem-solving courts, such programs will have an increasing impact on judicial workloads. An improvement in the present study, as compared to the 2016 study, was the development of individual case weights for additional problem-solving courts. However, there are current limitations in tracking the case counts for some of these problem-solving courts (e.g., the ability to classify cases within the appropriate tier of trial court for felony and misdemeanor cases is limited). NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System invest additional resources in collecting and tracking data for problem-solving courts to improve the ability to accurately calculate case weights.

Recommendation 5

The availability of support personnel, especially case managers and staff attorneys, has a profound impact on judges' ability to perform their work efficiently and effectively. During the course of this study, judges indicated that these positions, particularly case managers, are not used uniformly across the state. To assist funding authorities in allocating resources, NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System conduct a staffing workload assessment to expand the use of weighted caseload throughout all court staff positions.

Recommendation 6

The current workload assessment documents the important contribution made by quasi-judicial officers to the efficient and effective resolution of cases in circuit and county courts. NCSC recommends that the Florida Court System conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the various roles and uses of quasi-judicial officers (e.g., magistrates, child support enforcement hearing officers, and civil traffic infraction hearing officers) across the state. A targeted evaluation would provide a deeper understanding of the current availability of quasi-judicial resources, the specific functions that quasi-judicial officers perform, and the impact that their work has on the need for county court and circuit court judges. The study would also assist in identifying variations among counties and circuits in the availability and use of quasi-judicial officers and facilitate the review and enhancement of current standards for allocating quasi-judicial officers on the basis of workload – thereby contributing to the equitable distribution of resources.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms, Circuit Court

CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

A. Capital Murder

- First degree murder

B. Non-Capital Homicide and Sex Crimes

Includes the following matters:

- Non-Capital Murder (examples include negligent manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter, second degree murder, aggravated manslaughter, etc.)
- Sexual Offenses

C. Other Crimes Against Persons

Includes the following matters:

- Robbery
- Other Crimes Against Persons

D. Crimes Against Property

Includes the following matters:

- Burglary
- Theft, Forgery, Fraud
- Worthless Check (felony)
- Other Crimes Against Property
- Other Felony Offenses (examples include weapon charges, resisting arrest, contempt of court, failure to appear, accessory after the fact, book-making, etc.)

E. Drug Offenses (excluding Problem-Solving Courts)

F. Adult Drug Court

G. DUI Drug Court

H. Mental Health Court

I. Veterans Court

J. Other Problem-Solving Courts

K. Professional Malpractice and Product Liability

Includes the following matters:

- Business, Medical and Other Malpractice
- Products Liability
- Construction Defects

L. Auto and Other Negligence

Includes the following matters:

- Auto Negligence
- Other Negligence (examples include environmental/toxic tort, mass tort, negligent security, nursing home negligence, premises liability commercial, premises liability residential, etc.)

M. Contract and Indebtedness

- Unsecured debt (examples include credit card debt, consumer debt, etc.)
- Commercial landlord tenant

N. Foreclosure and Other Real Property

Includes the following matters:

- Commercial
- Homestead Residential
- Non-Homestead Residential
- Other Real Property/Mortgage Foreclosure Actions
- Condominium

O. Insurance

- First party disputes
- Declaratory judgment actions

P. Business Disputes

Includes the following matters:

- Other (examples include antitrust/trade regulation, business transaction, corporate trust, intellectual property, discrimination employment or other, shareholder derivative action, securities litigation, trade secret, etc.)
- Other Negligence (examples include business governance, business tort, third party indemnification, etc.)

Q. Other Circuit Civil

Includes the following matters:

- Eminent Domain
- Other (examples include constitutional challenge statute or ordinance, constitutional challenge proposed amendment, insurance claim, libel/slander, trust litigation, other circuit civil, etc.)

R. Jimmy Ryce

S. Appeals

T. Bar Referee/Discipline

U. Simplified Dissolution

V. Dissolution

W. Child Support

Includes the following matters:

- Child Support (IV-D and non IV-D)
- Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (IV-D and non IV-D)

X. Order for Protection Against Violence

Includes the following matters:

- Domestic Violence
- Dating Violence
- Repeat Violence
- Sexual Violence
- Stalking Violence

Y. Paternity

Includes the following matters:

- Paternity/disestablishment of paternity
- Other Family Court

Z. Other Domestic Relations

Includes the following matters:

- Adoption Arising out of Chapter 63, F.S.
- Name Change
- Other Family Court

ZA. Juvenile Delinquency

ZB. Juvenile Delinquency Drug Court

ZC. Juvenile Dependency*

Includes the following matters:

- Dependency
- Termination of Parental Rights Adoption Arising out of Chapter 39, F.S.
- Children in Need of Services and Families in Need of Services
- Injunctions from Chapter 39, F.S.

ZD. Juvenile Dependency Drug Court*

ZE. Juvenile Dependency Early Childhood Court*

ZF. Probate

Includes the following matters:

- Probate
- Other Social Cases (examples include developmental disability, tuberculosis control, Adult Protective Services Act, etc.)

ZG. Trusts

ZH. Commitment Acts

Includes the following matters:

- Baker Act
- Substance Abuse Act (Marchman Act)

ZI. Guardianship

ZJ. Risk Protection Orders

ZK. County Court Case Types

Flags:

1. Identify complex civil cases (Form 1.999 required) with a flag in the time study.
2. Capture re-open separate in all family cases, except simplified dissolution, with a flag in the time study.

* Note: Juvenile Dependency, Juvenile Dependency Drug Court and Juvenile Dependency Early Childhood Court cases will be weighted according to number of children.

CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK

1. Pre-Disposition/Uncontested Disposition

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to proceedings that occur prior to the trial or any non-trial proceeding that disposes of the entire case. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to pre-trial activities and non-trial dispositions. Some examples include:

- Arraignment/initial appearance
- Non-dispositive pre-trial motion (e.g., motion to suppress, motion in limine)
- Scheduling conference
- Pre-trial conference
- Preparation of findings and orders related to pre-trial matters
- Entry of guilty plea and sentencing
- Motion to dismiss that disposes of all issues
- Motion for summary judgment that disposes of all issues
- Preparation of findings and orders related to non-trial dispositions
- Pre-trial drug court and other problem-solving court team staffings and hearings

2. Bench Trial/Contested Disposition/Summary Judgment

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to a trial in which the judge is the finder of fact. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to bench trials, and sentencing following a bench trial. Some examples include:

- Bench trial
- Sentencing after conviction at bench trial
- Preparation of findings and orders related to bench trials

3. Jury Trial

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to a trial in which a jury is the finder of fact. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to jury trials, and sentencing following a jury trial. Some examples include:

- Jury selection
- Jury trial
- Sentencing after conviction at jury trial
- Preparation of orders related to jury trials

4. Post-Judgment/Post-Disposition

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity that occurs after the entry of judgment. Some examples include:

- Post-trial motion (e.g., motion for rehearing, motion for new trial)
- Show cause or capias on post-disposition matter
- Preparation of findings and orders related to post-judgment/post-disposition matters
- Post-adjudicatory drug court and other problem-solving court team staffings and hearings
- Probation violation hearings or probation reviews

NON-CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK

a. Non-Case-Related Administration

Includes all non-case-related administrative work such as:

- Staff meetings
- Judges' meetings
- Personnel matters
- Staff supervision and mentoring
- Court management

b. General Legal Research

Includes all reading and research that is *not* related to a particular case before the court.

Examples include:

- Reading journals
- Reading professional newsletters
- Reviewing appellate court decisions

c. Judicial Education and Training

Includes all educational and training activities such as:

- Judicial education
- Conferences

d. Committee Meetings, Other Meetings and Related Work

Includes all work related to and preparation for meetings of state and local committees, boards, and task forces such as:

- Community criminal justice board meetings
- Supreme Court appointed commissions, committees or workgroups

e. Community Activities and Public Outreach

Includes all public outreach and community service that is performed in your official capacity as a judge. This category does not include work for which you are compensated through an outside source, such as teaching law school courses or personal community service work, that is not performed in your official capacity as a judge. Examples of work-related community activities and public outreach include:

- Speaking at schools about legal careers
- Judging moot court competitions

f. Work-Related Travel

Includes all time spent traveling on court business to or from a location other than your primary court. For purposes of the time study, your primary court is the court where you most frequently sit. You should not record travel time spent on your commute between your home and your primary court. You should record any travel time between your home and other courts that is greater than the length of your commute between your home and your primary court.

g. Time Study Data Reporting and Entry

Includes all time spent filling out time study forms and entering time study data using the web-

based form.

LEAVE/BREAKS

h. Vacation, Sick Leave and Holidays

Includes all time away from work due to vacation, personal leave, illness or medical leave and court holidays.

i. Lunch and Breaks

Includes all routine breaks during the working day.

Appendix B: Glossary of Terms, County Court

CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

A. Misdemeanors

Includes the following matters:

- Misdemeanors
- Worthless Checks (misdemeanor)

B. Ordinance Violations

Includes the following matters:

- County Ordinance
- Municipal Ordinance
- Non-Traffic Civil Infractions

C. Non-DUI Criminal Traffic

D. DUI

E. Adult Drug Court

F. DUI Drug Court

G. Mental Health Court

H. Veterans Court

I. Other Problem-Solving Courts

J. Small Claims

K. County Civil

L. Foreclosure and Other Real Property

Includes the following matters:

- Commercial
- Homestead Residential
- Non-Homestead Residential
- Other Real Property/Mortgage Foreclosure Actions
- Condominium

M. Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)

Includes the following matters:

- Replevins

- Other County Civil (examples include non-monetary equity matters, control of animals, interred bodies, injunctive relief, declaratory judgments, etc.)

N. Evictions

O. Civil Traffic Infractions

P. Circuit Court Case Types

CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK

1. Pre-Disposition/Uncontested Disposition

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to proceedings that occur prior to the trial or any non-trial proceeding that disposes of the entire case. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to pre-trial activities and non-trial dispositions. Some examples include:

- Arraignment/initial appearance
- Non-dispositive pre-trial motion (e.g., motion to suppress, motion in limine)
- Scheduling conference
- Pre-trial conference
- Preparation of findings and orders related to pre-trial matters
- Entry of guilty plea and sentencing
- Motion to dismiss that disposes of all issues
- Motion for summary judgment that disposes of all issues
- Preparation of findings and orders related to non-trial dispositions
- Pre-trial drug court and other problem-solving court team staffings and hearings

2. Bench Trial/Contested Disposition/Summary Judgment

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to a trial in which the judge is the finder of fact. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to bench trials, and sentencing following a bench trial. Some examples include:

- Bench trial
- Sentencing after conviction at bench trial
- Preparation of findings and orders related to bench trials

3. Jury Trial

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to a trial in which a jury is the finder of fact. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to jury trials, and sentencing following a jury trial. Some examples include:

- Jury selection
- Jury trial
- Sentencing after conviction at jury trial
- Preparation of orders related to jury trials

4. Post-Judgment/Post-Disposition

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity that occurs after the entry of judgment. Some examples include:

- Post-trial motion (e.g., motion for rehearing, motion for new trial)
- Show cause or capias on post-disposition matter
- Preparation of findings and orders related to post-judgment/post-disposition matters
- Post-adjudicatory drug court and other problem-solving court team staffings and hearings
- Probation violation hearings or probation reviews

NON-CASE-SPECIFIC JUDICIAL WORK²⁶

a. Non-Case-Related Administration

Includes all non-case-related administrative work such as:

- Staff meetings
- Judges' meetings
- Personnel matters
- Staff supervision and mentoring
- Court management

b. General Legal Research

Includes all reading and research that is *not* related to a particular case before the court.

Examples include:

- Reading journals
- Reading professional newsletters
- Reviewing appellate court decisions

c. Judicial Education and Training

Includes all educational and training activities such as:

- Judicial education
- Conferences

d. Committee Meetings, Other Meetings and Related Work

Includes all work related to and preparation for meetings of state and local committees, boards, and task forces such as:

- Community criminal justice board meetings
- Supreme Court appointed commissions, committees or workgroups

e. Community Activities and Public Outreach

Includes all public outreach and community service that is performed in your official capacity as a judge. This category does not include work for which you are compensated through an outside source, such as teaching law school courses or personal community service work, that is not performed in your official capacity as a judge. Examples of work-related community activities and public outreach include:

- Speaking at schools about legal careers
- Judging moot court competitions

f. Work-Related Travel

Includes all time spent traveling on court business to or from a location other than your primary court. For purposes of the time study, your primary court is the court where you most frequently sit. You should not record travel time spent on your commute between your home and your primary court. You should record any travel time between your home and other courts that is greater than the length of your commute between your home and your primary court.

²⁶ Canvassing board will be included in sufficiency of time survey and quality adjustment phase.

g. Time Study Data Reporting and Entry

Includes all time spent filling out time study forms and entering time study data using the web-based form.

LEAVE/BREAKS

h. Vacation, Sick Leave and Holidays

Includes all time away from work due to vacation, personal leave, illness or medical leave and court holidays.

i. Lunch and Breaks

Includes all routine breaks during the working day.

Appendix C: Sufficiency of Time Survey Results, Participant Demographics

Table 1. Participation by Position

Position	Respondents	Time Study	
		Participants	Response Rate
Circuit Judge	416	588	71%
Civil Traffic Hearing Officer	39	108	36%
County Judge	241	328	73%
General Magistrate	96	123	78%
Hearing Officer	44	44	100%
Senior Judge	43	186	23%
TOTAL	879	1,377	64%

Table 2. Participation by Circuit

Circuit	Respondents	Circuit	Respondents
1	35	11	112
2	23	12	42
3	14	13	58
4	66	14	23
5	43	15	56
6	68	16	5
7	28	17	103
8	20	18	31
9	57	19	29
10	26	20	35

Table 3. Participation by Experience

Years of Experience	Respondents	Percent
11+ years	414	47%
6-10 years	166	19%
1-5 years	231	26%
Less than 1 year	65	7%

Table 4. Court Level

Primary Court Level	Respondents	Percent
Circuit Court Survey	561	64%
County Court Survey	252	29%
Both	66	8%

Appendix D: Sufficiency of Time Survey Results, by General Workload and Case Type

Note: Scale was from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Percent in general agreement indicates the percentage of participants who selected Often or Almost Always. Percent with insufficient time indicates the percentage of participants who selected Almost Never or Rarely.

Table 1. General Workload

	% in General Agreement
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis, to get my work done.	46%
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	48%
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient for me to complete my work.	71%
I feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	33%
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	48%

Table 2. General Workload, by Position

	% in General Agreement					
	Circuit Judge	Civil Traffic Hearing Officer	County Judge	General Magistrate	Hearing Officer	Senior Judge
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis, to get my work done.	41%	97%	39%	37%	76%	78%
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	42%	94%	43%	43%	79%	74%
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient for me to complete my work.	70%	79%	63%	82%	80%	74%
I feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	40%	8%	34%	32%	10%	10%
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	43%	89%	43%	42%	67%	83%

Table 3. Case Types, Circuit Court

During the course of a normal work week, to what extent do you have sufficient time to effectively handle the case-related aspects of your job at a level of quality to your satisfaction for the following case types?

Case Type	N	% With Insufficient Time
Capital Murder	159	26%
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	202	17%
Other Crimes Against Persons	216	12%
Crimes Against Property	213	10%
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	209	10%
Adult Drug Court	60	32%
DUI Drug Court	28	71%
Mental Health Court	79	34%
Veterans Court	47	47%
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	181	31%
Auto and Other Negligence	194	23%
Contract & Indebtedness	202	21%
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	203	18%
Insurance	195	28%
Business Disputes	193	25%
Other Circuit Civil	207	22%
Jimmy Ryce	90	34%
Appeals	117	43%
Bar Referee/Discipline	174	30%
Simplified Dissolution	220	14%
Dissolution	241	26%
Child Support	265	20%
Order for Protection Against Violence	222	20%
Paternity	268	24%
Other Domestic Relations	258	17%
Juv. Delinquency	116	22%
Juv. Delinquency Drug Court	44	55%
Juv. Dependency	144	30%
Juv. Dependency Drug Court	42	45%
Juv. Dep. Early Childhood Court	56	41%
Probate	110	40%
Trusts	94	34%
Commitment Acts	120	24%
Guardianship	117	36%
Risk Protection Orders	113	25%

Table 4. Case Types, County Court

During the course of a normal work week, to what extent do you have sufficient time to effectively handle the case-related aspects of your job at a level of quality to your satisfaction for the following case types?

Case Type	N	% With Insufficient Time
Misdemeanors	192	18%
Ordinance Violations	171	10%
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	177	17%
DUI	166	20%
Civil Traffic Infractions	222	10%
Adult Drug Court	35	37%
DUI Drug Court	21	48%
Mental Health Court	38	39%
Veterans Court	28	36%
Small Claims	190	19%
County Civil	187	25%
Foreclosure & Other Real Property	158	16%
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	189	17%
Evictions	183	24%

Table 5. Case Type Categories, Circuit Court

If you feel the current volume of business causes you to NOT have sufficient time to handle all the case related aspects of your job, please select the main case type category (either Criminal, Problem-solving, Civil, Family, Juvenile, or Probate) where you think the issue is most pressing.

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Criminal	73	12%
Problem-Solving	6	1%
Civil	108	18%
Family Law	162	26%
Juvenile	40	7%
Probate	31	5%
I have sufficient time	193	31%
Total	613	

Tables 5A-F. Case Type Category Details, Circuit Court

Please select one case type from the list below that causes you the greatest concern of NOT having sufficient time to handle all the case-related aspects of your job. (Note: Participants were only able to select options from one case type, depending on their answer to the previous case type category question. See Table 5.)

5A. Criminal

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Capital Murder	16	25%
Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	30	47%
Other Crimes Against Persons	15	23%
Drug Offenses (excluding PSCs)	3	5%
Total	64	

5B. Problem-solving Courts

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Adult Drug Court	3	50%
Mental Health Court	1	17%
Veterans Court	2	33%
Total	6	

5C. Civil

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Prof. Malpractice & Product Liability	17	18%
Auto & Other Negligence	16	16%
Contract & Indebtedness	8	8%
Insurance	20	21%
Business Disputes	25	26%
Other Circuit Civil	10	10%
Appeals	1	1%
Total	97	

5D. Family Law

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Dissolution	116	72%
Child Support	13	8%
Order for Protection Against Violence	16	10%
Paternity	9	6%
Other Domestic Relations	8	5%
Total	162	

5E. Juvenile

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Juvenile Delinquency	2	7%
Juvenile Dependency	28	93%
Total	30	

5F. Probate

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Probate	14	45%
Trusts	1	3%
Commitment Acts	3	10%
Guardianship	13	42%
Total	31	

Table 6. Case Type Categories, County Court

If you feel the current volume of business causes you to NOT have sufficient time to handle all the case related aspects of your job, please select the main case type category (either Criminal, Problem-solving, or Civil) where you think the issue is most pressing.

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Criminal	62	20%
Problem-Solving	6	2%
Civil	112	36%
I have sufficient time	133	42%
Total	313	

Tables 6A-C. Case Type Category Details, Circuit Court

Please select one case type from the list below that causes you the greatest concern of NOT having sufficient time to handle all the case-related aspects of your job. (Note: Participants were only able to select options from one case type, depending on their answer to the previous case type category question. See Table 6.)

6A. Criminal

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Misdemeanors	28	47%
Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	8	13%
DUI	22	37%
Civil Traffic Infractions	2	3%
Total	60	

6B. Problem-solving Courts

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Mental Health Court	4	80%
Veterans Court	1	20%
Total	5	

6C. Civil

Case Type	Frequency	Percent
Small Claims	27	25%
County Civil	59	55%
Foreclosure and Other Real Property	1	1%
Other County Civil (Non-Monetary)	1	1%
Evictions	19	18%
Total	107	

Appendix E: Sufficiency of Time Survey Results, Case-Related Activities

Table 1. Circuit Criminal

Please check up to 5 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in criminal cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
review and hear non-dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion to suppress)	37	56%
prepare findings and orders related to non-dispositive pretrial motions	37	56%
conduct trials	33	50%
review and hear dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion to dismiss)	27	41%
prepare findings and orders related to dispositive pretrial motions	26	39%
conduct legal research	23	35%
review the case file	20	30%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	15	23%
prepare for and conduct pretrial hearing and scheduling conferences	12	18%
prepare for trials	12	18%
prepare findings and orders related to trials and sentencing	11	17%
ensure that defendants, victims, and counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	11	17%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	10	15%
review and hear post-trial motions (e.g., motion for new trial, motion for modification of sentence)	9	14%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	9	14%
conduct sentencing hearings	5	8%
explain orders and rulings	5	8%
conduct advisements (e.g., initial explanation of rights)	4	6%
conduct probation revocation hearings	4	6%
review the pre-sentence report in advance of sentencing	0	0%
Number of Respondents	66	

Table 2. Circuit Civil

Please check up to 4 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in criminal cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
review and hear dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion for summary judgment)	73	69%
prepare findings and orders related to dispositive pretrial motions	65	61%
prepare findings and orders related to trials/final hearings	45	42%
review and hear non-dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion in limine)	41	39%
prepare findings and orders related to non-dispositive pretrial motions	37	35%
conduct legal research	37	35%
review the case file	28	26%
prepare for and conduct pre-disposition hearings and settlement conferences	25	24%
conduct trials	20	19%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	14	13%
prepare for trials	10	9%
ensure that parties and their counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	7	7%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	6	6%
review and hear post-judgment motions (e.g., motion for new trial)	4	4%
explain orders and rulings	3	3%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	2	2%
Number of Respondents	106	

Table 3. Circuit Family (Dissolution)

Please check up to 4 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in dissolution cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
prepare findings and orders related to trials/final hearings	96	84%
conduct trials/final hearings	50	44%
prepare findings and orders related to motions for modification	42	37%
prepare for trials/final hearings	31	27%
prepare findings and orders related to pendente lite motions	27	24%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	27	24%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	27	24%
conduct case management and pretrial conferences	21	18%
conduct legal research	21	18%
prepare findings and orders related to contempt hearings	15	13%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	15	13%
review and hear motions for modification	14	12%
prepare findings and orders related to other pretrial motions (e.g., motion in limine)	12	11%
review and hear pendente lite motions	8	7%
review and hear other pretrial motions (e.g., motion in limine)	8	7%
review and hear post-trial motions (e.g., motion for new trial)	7	6%
prepare for and conduct contempt hearings	7	6%
review the case file and reports	6	5%
ensure that parties and their counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	5	4%
explain orders and rulings	4	4%
Number of Respondents	114	

Table 4. Circuit Juvenile (Juvenile Dependency)

Please check up to 5 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in juvenile dependency cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
conduct judicial review hearings (initial and subsequent)	17	46%
prepare for judicial reviews (initial and subsequent)	13	35%
ensure that children, parents, and their counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	13	35%
prepare findings and orders related to judicial review hearings (initial and subsequent)	11	30%
review the case file and reports	11	30%
prepare findings and orders related to TPR adjudicatory hearings	10	27%
prepare findings and orders related to motions (e.g., motion for change of placement)	9	24%
hear motions (e.g., motion for change of placement)	8	22%
conduct TPR adjudicatory hearings	8	22%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	7	19%
conduct shelter hearings	6	16%
conduct permanency hearings	6	16%
prepare findings and orders related to permanency hearings	6	16%
prepare findings and orders related to disposition hearings	5	14%
review case plans	5	14%
review motions and prepare for motion hearings (e.g., motion for change of placement)	5	14%
prepare findings and orders related to TPR disposition hearings	5	14%
conduct arraignments	4	11%
conduct adjudication hearings on dependency petitions	4	11%
prepare findings and orders related to adjudication hearings on dependency petitions	4	11%
prepare for TPR adjudicatory hearings	4	11%
conduct disposition hearings	3	8%
prepare for permanency hearings	3	8%
prepare for adjudication hearings on dependency petitions	2	5%
conduct pretrial status conferences (TPR)	2	5%
conduct legal research	2	5%
prepare for disposition hearings	1	3%
prepare for problem-solving court (e.g., staffings, file review, administration)	1	3%
hold problem-solving court hearings	1	3%
explain orders and rulings	1	3%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	1	3%
prepare for TPR disposition hearings	0	0%
conduct TPR disposition hearings	0	0%
Number of Respondents	37	

Table 5. County Criminal

Please check up to 5 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in criminal cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
review and hear non-dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion to suppress)	26	45%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	26	45%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	24	41%
conduct trials	23	40%
conduct the arraignment/initial appearance	22	38%
review and hear dispositive pretrial motions (e.g., motion to dismiss, motion for summary judgment)	21	36%
ensure that defendants, victims, and counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	21	36%
prepare findings and orders related to dispositive pretrial motions	19	33%
conduct pretrial and scheduling conferences	13	22%
conduct legal research	13	22%
prepare findings and orders related to non-dispositive pretrial motions	12	21%
prepare for and conduct probation violation hearings	10	17%
prepare for trials	9	16%
make a pretrial release determination	8	14%
explain orders and rulings	8	14%
review the case file and pre-sentence report in advance of sentencing	6	10%
conduct sentencing hearings	4	7%
prepare findings and orders related to trials and sentencing	4	7%
prepare findings and orders related to probation violations	2	3%
address petitions for post-conviction relief	2	3%
review and hear post-trial motions (e.g., motion for new trial)	1	2%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	0	0%
Number of Respondents	58	

Table 5. County Civil (Small Claims)

Please check up to 3 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in small claims cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
prepare findings and orders related to trials	13	46%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	13	46%
conduct pretrial conferences	9	32%
conduct trials	9	32%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	8	29%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	8	29%
explain orders and rulings	7	25%
ensure that parties feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	7	25%
review default judgments	4	14%
review and hear post-trial motions	4	14%
Number of Respondents	28	

Table 6. County Civil (County Civil, Foreclosure, and Other County Civil)

Please check up to 3 activities for which you believe more time would improve the quality of justice in county civil cases.

Activity	Freq.	%
review and hear pretrial motions	33	57%
prepare findings and orders related to pretrial motions	27	47%
conduct pretrial and scheduling conferences	23	40%
address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	20	34%
prepare findings and orders related to trials	18	31%
conduct trials	15	26%
ensure that parties and their attorneys feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	7	12%
conduct hearings that involve use of interpreters	6	10%
review default judgments	5	9%
prepare findings and orders related to post-trial motions	5	9%
explain orders and rulings	4	7%
conduct settlement conferences	2	3%
review and hear post-trial motions	1	2%
Number of Respondents	58	

Appendix F: Sufficiency of Time Survey Results, Non-Case-Related Activities

With respect to general court management, please select up to 3 activities for which more time would improve the quality of justice.

Activity	Freq.	%
participate in judicial education and training	402	58%
read professional journals, appellate opinions, etc.	375	54%
participate in court planning and administration	270	39%
participate in public outreach and education	246	35%
participate in or hold regularly scheduled meetings with justice system and community partners	237	34%
prepare for and participate in meetings of committees, conferences, and work groups	177	25%
supervise and evaluate staff	92	13%
Number of Respondents	698	

Appendix G: Delphi Adjustments and Rationales

Delphi Session	Case Type	Preliminary Weight	Adjusted Weight	Rationale
Circuit Criminal	Non-Capital Homicide & Sex Crimes	615	636	Pre trial detention hearings required as of Jan. 2024
	Other Crimes Against Persons	159	169	Pre trial detention hearings required as of Jan. 2024
Circuit Civil & Probate	Professional Malpractice & Product Liability	274	298	Complex civil cases which usually involve more parties/attorneys. Cases have grown more complex since 2016 (numbers from study don't reflect that)
	Contract & Indebtedness	38	43	Jurisdictional thresholds have increased which increases the complexity of cases. Complexity has not decreased since last time study; no reason for case weight to decrease
Circuit Family	Dissolution	93	95	Cases have become more complex and high conflict
	Order for Protection Against Violence	32	37	Domestic violence with children cases require additional time. Changes in technology, predominantly pro se, new requirements for reviewing coercive control (effective July 2023)
	Risk Protection Orders	40	50	Post judgment motions and compliance, preliminary review - contacting law enforcement, body cam footage, public safety
Circuit Juvenile	Juv. Delinquency	71	72	Time study period did not capture more time demanding case events that happen later in the school year
	Juv. Dependency	301	311	Increasing complexity of cases (increasing rates of children diagnosed with mental health disorders and special needs)
	Juv. Dependency	311	315	Additional time needed for judicial review
County Criminal	Non-DUI Criminal Traffic	10	15	Legislation change since time study: 10 days of mandated jail time for driving without a license
County Civil	Small Claims	6	7	Additional time needed for case management for insurance/PIP cases
	County Civil	43	39	Concern by group that time had been incorrectly put here for insurance/PIP cases instead of small claims

Appendix H: Average Daily Case-Related and Non-Case-Related Time, Time Study

	Circuit Court Judges	County Court Judges
Case-Related Minutes	412	378
Case-Related Hours	6.9	6.3
County Court Work		5.3
Circuit Court Work		1.0
 Non-Case-Related		
Non-Case-Related Administration	39	40
General Legal Research	13	15
Committee Meetings, Other Meetings and Related Work	18	14
Community Activities and Public Outreach	17	22
Work-Related Travel	6	5
Time Study Data Reporting and Entry	9	9
Non-Case-Related Total Minutes (No L&B)	102	106
Non-Case-Related Total Hours (No L&B)	1.7	1.8
 Case-Related Hours	6.9	6.3
Non-Case-Related Hours	1.7	1.8
TOTAL	8.6	8.1

Appendix I: 2024 Chief Judge Adjustment by Circuit

Location	Hours/Day	NCR Hours/Day	Case- Related Hours/Day	Circuit Judges	2024 Chief Judge Adj.
1	9.5	6.3	3.2	26	0.75
2	10.4	6.4	4.0	16	0.50
3	8.1	2.1	6.0	7	0.25
4	10.7	8.1	2.6	35	0.75
5	9.0	3.1	5.9	31	0.75
6	9.3	9.3	0.0	45	1.00
7	8.4	4.2	4.3	27	0.75
8	8.7	5.0	3.7	13	0.50
9	9.6	4.5	5.1	46	1.00
10	7.6	6.5	1.1	28	0.75
11	7.5	7.2	0.2	80	1.00
12	9.5	3.7	5.8	22	0.75
13	9.0	7.5	1.5	45	1.00
14	9.1	3.8	5.3	13	0.50
15	9.4	8.9	0.5	35	0.75
16	7.0	2.3	4.7	4	0.25
17	7.1	3.0	4.0	58	1.00
18	7.9	4.8	3.0	26	0.75
19	8.0	5.2	2.8	19	0.50
20	9.7	6.5	3.2	32	0.75
Statewide	8.8	5.4	3.3	608²⁷	14.3

²⁷ Reflects the number of circuit court judgeships statutorily authorized as of July 1, 2024.

Appendix J: Additional Canvassing Board Data

Data below provided by County Court Conference President for 53 of 67 counties. Data include the estimated number of hours spent canvassing during the 2022 primary and general elections but do not include the Presidential Preference Primary; one suggestion is to multiply the total hours by 1.5 to accommodate this additional duty.

No. of Judges in County	Avg. hours reported
1	38.6
2 to 10	68.5
11 to 30	96.25
30+	122

Additional annual training requirements (not included above):

4 hour online canvassing board education program

2 hour signature verification education program each election year