STATISTICS

WEIGHTED CASELOAD MEASURES & THE QUARTERLY CASE STATUS REPORT (QCSR)

CONTACT:
Jim Diller
jim.diller@courts.IN.gov

Since 1996, Indiana has utilized a weighted caseload measurement system (WCMS) to establish a uniform statewide method for comparing trial court caseloads. The system is necessary as it provides an objective method of determining the adequate resources needed to effectively manage the caseloads around the state. The development of the weighting system began in 1993 when the Judicial Administration Committee of the Indiana Judicial Conference, the Indiana Supreme Court, the former Division of State Court Administration, and an independent consultant began a two-year study to design a system for measuring trial court caseloads. Subsequent studies have been completed in 2002, 2009, with the most recent Indiana Caseload Assessment Plan to Utilize Resources Efficiently (CAPTURE) report being published in 2016.

The basic premise of a caseload assessment system is that all case types are not equal and each case type requires a different amount of time to complete from initial filing up through the final disposition of the case. To establish the "weight" each particular case type should be given, it first has to be determined the *average* amount of time in minutes each case type takes to complete. During the most recent weighted caseload assessment study, thirty-nine case categories were examined,

Specifically, the weighted caseload assessment studies have asked judicial officers to track the time they spent on case-related activities such as prejudgment hearings, trial preparation, plea/admissions, bench trials, settlements, jury trials, opinions, orders, sentencing/disposition, post judgment hearings, and research. As part of the weighted caseload assessment studies completed in 1996, 2002 and 2009 only a sample of judicial officers from around the state were asked to participate in the study. As part of the study completed in 2016, every judicial officer in the state was asked to participate and 472 of the 475 judicial officers kept track of their time.

Three factors contribute to the calculation of resource need: case filings, case weights and judicial officer year value.

Workload = Cases Filed X Case Weight
Resource Need= Workload ÷ Judge Year Value

Based on the caseload study, it was determined that a judicial officer has an average of 77,745 minutes available during a calendar year for case related activities. The following charts illustrate how this number was determined.

Calculating Judicial Officer Work Year

	Days	Minutes
Total Year (8 hours per day X 60 Minutes=480 Minutes per day)	365	175,200
Subtract		
Weekends	104	49,920
Holidays	13	6,240
Vacation Leave	21	10,080
Sick Leave	2	960
Personal Leave	2	960
Judicial Training	10	4,800
Total Available Days/Minutes for All Activities	**213**	**102,240**

Non-Case-Related Time

	Average Minutes Per Day	Minutes Per Year
Non-Case Related Administration	39	8,307
Community Speaking Activities	14	2982
Community, Meetings, etc.	24	5112
General Legal Research	21	4,473
Other	9	1,917
Reimbursable Travel	8	1,704
Total Non-Case-Related Minutes	**115**	**24,495**

Judicial Year Value

	Days	Minutes
Total Year (8 hours per day X 60 Minutes=480 Minutes per day)	213	102,240
Subtract		
Non-Case-Related Time		24,495
Total Available Minutes Per Year for Case Related Activities		**77,745**

2015 Statewide Judicial Officer Need Model

Calandar Year 2015 Total Caseload Minutes	36,376,828
Divided by	÷
Judicial Officer Year Value	77,745
Equals	=
Total Judicial Officer Need	**467.90**

The weighted statistics provide the Indiana Supreme Court and the Indiana General Assembly with information necessary for the allocation of judicial resources. Trial courts also use these statistical measures to develop county caseload plans to reduce the disparity in caseloads and judicial resources.

In 2002, the Indiana Supreme Court, Division of State Court Administration worked with the Judicial Administration Committee of the Indiana Judicial Conference to conduct an update and validation of the WCMS. The Committee evaluated and included additional categories including Murder (MR); A, B, and C Felonies (FA, FB, FC); Mortgage Foreclosure (MF); and Civil Collections (CC). The results of the update to the Weighted Caseload Measures (WCM) were completed in the fall of 2002 and were approved by the Indiana Supreme Court. If you would like further details of the 2002 study, please see the Indiana Judicial Weighted Caseload Study Update Final Draft October 2002.

Beginning in 2007, the Judicial Administration Committee and the former Division of State Court Administration, working with consultants and researchers undertook yet another update study, employing essentially the same methodology as the previous studies and culminating in a Final Report prepared in the Spring of 2009. The case types included in this study were Murder; all felony types, Classes A, B, C and D (FA, FB, FC, FD); Post-Conviction Relief (PC); Child in Need of Services (JC), and Termination of Parental Rights (JT) cases. Additionally, due to the intensive involvement of the judicial officer in the Problem Solving Court models for Drug Courts and Reentry Courts, it was determined that the time judges devote to Problem Solving Court dockets should be included in the study as well. Only those Problem Solving Courts certified by the Indiana Judicial Center were included in the study.

In 2015, the Judicial Administration Committee and the Indiana Office of Court Services, contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to complete the Indiana Assessment Plan to Utilize Resources Efficiently (CAPTURE) report, which was published in 2016. It is important to note significant changes were made to the mythology utilized to complete the CAPTURE report as compared to prior weighted caseload studies conducted in Indiana. Rather than asking just a sample of judicial officers to participate in the study and to study only a limited number of specific case types, all of the judicial officers in the state were asked to participate and all of the case types were examined for the CAPTURE report. The CAPTURE report also recalculated another important variable in weighted caseloads, the average amount of time a judicial officer is said to have available each year to completed case related activities. This figure has been 80,640 minutes since the first weighted caseload study was completed in 1996, but following the CAPTURE report, the minutes have been changed to 77,745. The CAPTURE report also recommended that Indiana create four additional case types: Domestic Relations with Children (DC), Domestic Relations No Children (DN), Tax Sale-Application for Judgment (TS) and Tax Sale-Petition for Issuance of Tax Deed. Finally, the CAPTURE report also included a recommendation to amend Administrative Rule 1(E) and remove the requirement that all courts of record in a county be within a .40 utilization variance of one another for a caseload allocation plan to be approved by the Supreme Court.

The chart below contains the weighting factors (minutes) by case category for each year studied.

Case Category	Abbreviation	Minutes 1996	Minutes 2002	Minutes 2009	Minutes 2016
Capital Murder	LP, DP	155	2,649	2,649	2,649
Murder	MR	155	453	1,209	1,038
A Felony	FA	155	420	359	359
B Felony	FB	155	260	218	218
C Felony	FC	155	210	211	211
D Felony	DF, FD	75	75	125	125
Level 1 Felony	F1	-	-	-	679
Level 2 Felony	F2	-	-	-	269
Level 3 Felony	F3	-	-	-	232
Level 4 Felony	F4	-	-	-	195
Level 5 Felony	F5	-	-	-	149
Level 6 Felony	F6	-	-	-	92
Criminal Misdemeanor	CM	40	40	40	39
Post-Conviction Relief	PC	0	0	345	351
Expungements	XP	-	-	-	25
Miscellaneous Criminal	MC	18	18	18	17
Infractions	IF	3	2	2	1
Ordinance Violations	OV	3	2	2	2
Certified Problem Solving Court Referrals	-	-	-	172	423
Juvenile CHINS	JC	112	111	209	176
Juvenile Delinquency	JD	62	60	60	91
Juvenile Status	JS	38	58	58	17
Juvenile Paternity	JP	106	82	82	146
Juvenile Miscellaneous	JM	12	12	12	8
Juvenile Termination Parental Rights	JT	141	194	475	124
Juvenile Protective Order	JQ	-	-	-	28
Civil Plenary	CP, PL	106	121	121	121
Mortgage Foreclosure	MF	121	23	23	24
Civil Collections	CC	121	26	26	16
Civil Tort	CT	118	118	118	148
Tax Sale-Application for Judgment	TS	-	-	-	128
Tax Sale-Petition for Issuance of Tax Deed	TP	-	-	-	21
Small Claims	SC	13	13	13	12
Domestic Relations	DR	139	185	185	185
Domestic Relations with Children	DC	-	-	-	259
Domestic Relations No Children	DN	-	-	-	39
Reciprocal Support	RS	31	31	31	37

Case Category	Abbreviation	Minutes 1996	Minutes 2002	Minutes 2009	Minutes 2016
Mental Health	MH	37	37	37	21
Adoption	AD	53	53	53	49
Estate Supervised	ES	85	85	85	50
Estate Unsupervised	EU	85	85	85	44
Estate Miscellaneous	EM	85	85	85	9
Guardianship	GU	93	93	93	93
Trusts	TR	40	40	40	126
Protective Orders	PO	34	37	37	28
Civil Miscellaneous	MI	87	87	87	32

The Quarterly Case Status Report

Each quarter, every court within the state of Indiana is required to submit to the Indiana Supreme Court, Indiana Office of Judicial Administration (IOJA), a Quarterly Case Status Report (QCSR). The QCSR, as set out in Ind. Administrative Rule 1(B), is a report used to gather statistical data and other information regarding the judicial activities of each court in Indiana. All new case filings, broken down by case type, and the number of judicial officers regularly assigned to the court are reported on the QCSR, and this data is used in conjunction with Indiana's weighted caseload measurement system to prepare a Weighted Caseload Report each year. QCSRs are required to be submitted to the IOJA no later than ten (10) calendar days following the end of each quarter. Since 2007, all courts have been required to submit their QCSR electronically using the Indiana Court Reports Online (ICOR) system.

The data provided in QCSRs is extremely important to overall court operations within Indiana. QCSRs provide the IOJA with more than simply descriptive statistics; the Supreme Court and the General Assembly often use the data provided to determine the allocation of judicial resources. The weighted caseload measurement system is used to provide a uniform manner in which to compare all the trial court caseloads.

How the Weighted Caseload Process Works

Multiplying the number of cases filed in a case type by the weight assigned to that case type provides the amount of judicial time, on average, that will be required to handle those cases. By then dividing the total weighted caseload minutes for all cases filed in the court by 77,745 (the number of minutes available in a year for case related work), we arrive at how many judicial officers are needed to handle the caseload. In weighted caseload parlance, this constitutes the judicial "need" for the court. The next step is to divide the "need" by the number of judicial officers regularly assigned to the court which would include the judge and any magistrates or commissioners assigned to the court. The resulting figure is called the court's "utilization". It is the utilization number that is used as a basis for comparison of the case workload of courts throughout the state. A simple example using the weights assigned by the 2016 study will illustrate.

Assume a Circuit Court handles only the following case types: MR, F1, F2, F3 and F4

Types of Cases	MR	F1	F2	F3	F4
# of Cases Filed	3	21	53	106	211
x Minutes per Case	1,038	679	269	232	195
= Total Minutes	**3,114**	**14,259**	**14,257**	**24,592**	**41,145**

Total Case Minutes = 3,114 + 14,259 + 14,257 + 24,592 + 41,145 = 97,367
97,367 ÷ 77,745 = 1.25. Thus, this caseload requires the time of 1.25 judicial officers. Assuming the Circuit Court has only the judge available to handle this caseload, the Court's utilization then would be 1.25 (1.25÷1=1.25). Now let us assume that the judge also has a full-time magistrate assigned to his court; this means the court has 2 judicial officers available to handle the caseload, thereby providing the court with an additional 77,745 available minutes of judicial time to handle the caseload. The calculation now would be 97,367 ÷ 155,490 = 0.63, and the court's utilization is now 0.63.

Ind. Administrative Rule 1(E) requires the courts of record in each county shall, by local rule, implement a County Caseload Allocation Plan that ensures the even distribution of judicial workloads among the judges of the courts of record in the county. Although Administrative Rule 1 (E) was amended 1/26/17 and removed the requirement that each court in the county be within a certain variance of one another, weighted caseload measures remain an important means of equalizing caseloads. Along with the weighted caseload measurement system, the data provided by the QCSR is also another invaluable tool to make these types of calculations and decisions.

In addition to the Weighted Caseload Report that is based on new case filings and helps in evaluating caseload allocation plans, the IOJA also publishes a Temporary Adjusted Weighted Caseload Report that takes into account various factors that affect a court's actual utilization during a year. This report is compiled by adding to the court's total minutes: the cases in which the reporting judge assumed jurisdiction as special judge in other courts; cases venued in and transferred in to the reporting court; the time that senior judges spend in the reporting court, and subtracting from the court's total minutes: cases in which another judge assumed jurisdiction as special judge in the report court, and cases venued out and transferred out of the reporting court. Because the shifts are temporary and do not change the fundamental filing patterns in the trial courts, the Temporary Adjusted Caseload Report should only be used as an additional reference and not as the baseline for weighted caseload statistics.