



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE
EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Michelle Williams Court
Hon. Charles S. Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan
Hon. Maria D. Hernandez
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Brian Maienschein
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Tamara L. Wood

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Hon. Khymerli S. Apaloo
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Ryan Davis
Hon. Joan K. Irion
Mr. Charles Johnson
Mr. Darrel E. Parker
Hon. Lisa M. Rogan
Mr. David H. Yamasaki

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

November 1, 2024

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Legislative Counsel
1021 O Street, Suite 3210
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 305
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Sue Parker
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 319
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice*, as required under Government Code section 77001.5

Dear Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Contreras, and Ms. Parker:

Under Government Code section [77001.5](#), the Judicial Council is submitting *Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice*, on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, at 415-865-7708 or leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Michelle Curran
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Ms. Erika Contreras
Ms. Sue Parker
November 1, 2024
Page 2

MC/KC

Enclosures

cc: Eric Dang, Counsel, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Emelyn Rodriguez, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas
Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Mark Jimenez, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Henry Ng, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Liah Burnley, Principal Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Hans Hemann, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Andrew Ironside, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Annika Carlson, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Cory T. Jaspersen, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, Judicial Council
Alona Daniliuk, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE
EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Michelle Williams Court
Hon. Charles S. Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan
Hon. Maria D. Hernandez
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Brian Maienschein
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Tamara L. Wood

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Khymerli S. Apaloo
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Ryan Davis
Hon. Joan K. Irion
Mr. Charles Johnson
Mr. Darrel E. Parker
Hon. Lisa M. Rogan
Mr. David H. Yamasaki

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Report title: *Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice*

Statutory citation: Government Code section 77001.5

Date of report: November 1, 2024

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Government Code section [77001.5](#). The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section [9795](#).

Government Code section 77001.5 required the Judicial Council to adopt and requires the council to annually report on “judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, including, but not limited to, the following subjects:

- (1) Providing equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants.
- (2) Case processing, including the efficient use of judicial resources.
- (3) General court administration.”

The attached report identifies and reports on existing Judicial Council–adopted measures that respond to the reporting requirements.

The report to the Legislature provides information on the following standards and measures of trial court operations:

- Caseload clearance rates;
- Time to disposition;
- Stage of case at disposition; and
- Trials by type of proceeding.

The full report is available at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

November 1, 2024

Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE UNDER
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 77001.5



Judicial Council of California

Introduction

Government Code section [77001.5](#) required the Judicial Council to adopt and annually report on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, including but not limited to:

- Provision of equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants;
- Case processing, including the efficient use of judicial resources; and
- General court administration.

Standards and Measures

The Judicial Council has identified measures and collected data that respond to the reporting requirements. The following standards and measures of judicial administration are reported in the annual *Court Statistics Report*:¹

- Caseload clearance rates;
- Time to disposition;
- Stage of case at disposition; and
- Trials by type of proceeding.

Judicial Workload and Other Branch Programs and Resources

The need for new judgeships is a calculation of the judicial need among courts that have fewer judgeships than their workload demands. Based on the most recent Judicial Needs Assessment (2024), 11 courts need new judgeships, for a total need of 56 judges statewide (see Appendix A).

Conversions of subordinate judicial officer (SJO) positions were authorized in fiscal year (FY) 2011–12 (Gov. Code, § 69616).² Although the conversion of SJO positions does not provide the courts with much-needed additional judicial officer positions, it does provide the courts with greater flexibility in the assignment of its judicial officers. Specifically, judges are authorized to preside over a broader range of proceedings than subordinate judicial officers are. A total of 157 SJO positions have been converted to judgeships since FY 2007–08. Five positions remain to convert (see Appendix B).

Workload Models Update

Finally, this report provides a brief narrative describing the Judicial Council–approved weighted caseload models, both judicial and staff, and how they relate to standards and measures of judicial administration.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., *2024 Court Statistics Report: Statewide Caseload Trends 2013–14 Through 2022–23*, www.courts.ca.gov/13421.htm.

² As authorized by Government Code section 69615(c)(1)(C).

The Judicial Council has approved workload models that use weighted caseloads to assess where new judgeships and additional nonjudicial resources are most urgently needed and will have the biggest impact. The relative weight applied to different types of cases, however, requires periodic review because of changes in the law, rules of court, technology, and practice, all of which affect the average amount of time required for case processing. Periodic review and, where necessary, revision of caseweights ensure that the allocation formulas reported to the Legislature and the Governor accurately reflect the current average amount of time required to resolve cases.

The Judicial Council’s Workload Assessment Advisory Committee recommended that judicial and staff workload models be updated every five years to ensure that the models used to measure workload and to allocate resources use the most up-to-date information possible.³ Updates to the workload models were delayed because of the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and its resulting impact on court operations. The staff workload model is currently being updated for use in FY 2025–26 trial court budget allocations. The judicial workload model was updated in 2018, and new weights were finalized in 2019. The next update is planned to begin in 2025, with updates reflected in the 2026 legislatively mandated report on assessed judicial need.

Conclusion

This report has highlighted *quantitative* measures of trial court performance that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice.

Appendixes

1. Appendix A: 2024 Judicial Needs Assessment
2. Appendix B: SJO Conversions to Date

³ The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee sunsetted on September 14, 2022, and its duties and responsibilities were assumed by the Data Analytics Advisory Committee, which was formed on March 11, 2022.

Appendix A. 2024 Judicial Needs Assessment

	A	B	C	D
Court	Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions*	2024 Assessed Judicial Need	Number of Judgeships Needed* (B – A)	Additional Judicial Need (C / A)
Riverside	89	111	21	23.6%
Lake	5	6	1	21.3%
San Bernardino	103	121	17	16.5%
Kern	47	54	7	14.9%
Madera	11	12	1	9.5%
Tulare	25	27	2	8.0%
Merced	13	14	1	7.7%
Stanislaus	26	28	2	7.7%
Shasta	13	14	1	7.7%
Placer	16	16	1	6.5%
San Joaquin	36	38	2	5.6%
Total			56	

* Rounded down to the nearest whole number.

Appendix B. SJO Conversions to Date

Summary of SJO Conversions

	Positions Eligible for Conversion	SJO Conversions																	Total Conversions to Date	Positions Remaining to Convert	
		07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12*	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24			
Courts Still Eligible for SJO Conversions																					
Placer	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unallocated SJO Conversion Positions**																					
	3																				
Courts That Have Completed Their SJO Conversions																					
Alameda	6	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Contra Costa	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
El Dorado	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Fresno	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Imperial	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kern	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Los Angeles	79	4	5	7	7	8	6	7	7	7	5	5	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	79
Marin	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Merced	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Napa	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange	17	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Riverside	6	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Sacramento	6	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
San Diego	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
San Francisco	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
San Luis Obispo	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
San Mateo	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Santa Barbara	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Santa Cruz	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Solano	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Sonoma	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Stanislaus	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tulare	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Yolo	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	162	16	16	16	16	20	13	11	9	11	6	6	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	157

Last Updated: September 2024

* Note: The total conversions in FY 2011-2012 exceed 16 because of the enactment of Senate Bill 405, which increased the number of allowable conversions in specific circumstances for this fiscal year.
 **Note: Three positions became newly available for reallocation as a result of the Contra Costa Superior Court's elimination of 3 conversion eligible SJO positions.
 Shaded rows represent courts that have completed all of the conversions for which they are eligible.