



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA

December 5, 2025

SC-JWC-0004

NCSC Report and Formula for Weighted Case Load Study

ORDER

The Court, having considered the December 2023 National Center for State Courts' final report of "The Alabama Circuit and District Court Judicial Officer Weighted Caseload Study,"

IT IS ORDERED that the final report and the recommendations therein are ADOPTED; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this order be spread upon the minutes of the Court,

Stewart, C.J., and Shaw, Wise, Bryan, Sellers, Mendheim, Cook, McCool, and Parker, JJ., concur.

Witness my hand and seal this 5th day of December, 2025.

Megan B. Rhodelsek

**Clerk of Court,
Supreme Court of Alabama**

**FILED
December 5, 2025
Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of Alabama**



The Alabama Circuit and District Court Judicial Officer Weighted Caseload Study

Final Report

DATE

December 2023

PREPARED FOR

Alabama Administrative
Office of Courts

PREPARED BY

National Center for
State Courts

Court Consulting Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary..... i

I. Introduction 1

II. Case Types and Events 3

III. Time Study 5

IV. Qualitative Feedback 8

V. JNAC Review of Case Weights and Qualitative Review..... 14

VI. Calculating the Need for Circuit and District Court Judges 15

VII. Recommendations 18

Appendix A: Circuit and District Judge Case Type Categories 18

Appendix B: Circuit and District Judge Case-Related Activities..... 19

Appendix C: Circuit and District Judge Non-Case-Related Activities 21

Appendix D: Adequacy of Time Survey Results .. 23

Appendix E: FY2022 Circuit Court Judge Needs Model, by Circuit 33

Appendix F: FY2022 District Court Judge Needs Model, by County..... 38

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the Alabama Circuit and District Court judges who contributed to the weighted caseload study.

Throughout this study, we were fortunate to work with a distinguished group of Circuit and District Court judges and Administrative Office of Courts staff.

We also extend a special note of thanks to Cary McMillan, Director, Family Court and Court Services Division and Michael Gregory, Administrative Office of Courts, for their ongoing availability and behind-the-scenes assistance throughout this project.

Judicial Needs Assessment Committee Members

Circuit Judges

- Bill Lewis, Presiding Circuit Judge, 19th Judicial Circuit, (Chair)
- Butch Binford, Presiding Circuit Judge, 20th Judicial Circuit
- Jody Bishop, Circuit Judge, 28th judicial Circuit
- Elisabeth French, Presiding Circuit Judge, 10th Judicial Circuit
- Karen Hall, Circuit Judge, 23rd Judicial Circuit
- Elizabeth Hamner, Circuit Judge, 6th Judicial Circuit
- David Hobdy, Circuit Judge, 10th Judicial Circuit
- Christopher Hughes, Presiding Circuit Judge, 37th Judicial Circuit
- Claude Hundley, Circuit Judge, 23rd Judicial Circuit
- Greg Williams, Circuit Judge, 14th Judicial Circuit
- Michael Youngpeter, Circuit Judge, 13th Judicial Circuit

District Judges

- Deborah Biggers, District Judge, Macon County
- Pamela Higgins, District Judge, Montgomery County
- Carole Medley, District Judge, Lauderdale County
- Wes Mobley, District Judge, Cherokee County
- Donna Silcox, District Judge, Monroe County
- Josh Wilson, District Judge, Coffee County
- Tom Wright, District Judge, Calhoun County
- George Zoghby, District Judge, Mobile County

Administrative Office of Courts Staff

- Dr. Rich Hobson, Administrative Director of Courts
- Cary McMillan, Director, Family Court and Court Services Division
- Mandi Hall, Assistant Director, Family Court and Court Services Division
- Michael Gregory, Project Manager II

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In July 2022, the Alabama Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) requested that an independent, objective assessment of judicial staffing needs be conducted for judicial officers in the Circuit and District Courts.

Weighted caseload studies provide courts with objective information about judicial staffing needs based on the amount of time required to process various types of cases. This information is useful in helping to determine the number of judicial officers needed to cover the courts' work, based on the number and types of cases filed.

For many years, the Alabama Judicial Branch has relied on weighted caseload models to determine court staffing needs for judges, court specialists, and juvenile probation officers. Over time, the integrity of workload standards is affected by multiple influences, including changes in legislation, court rules, legal practice, technology, and administrative factors. In order to measure the impact of these influences, supplemental time study data must be gathered and incorporated into the model. Recognizing the utility and need to update the 2016 weighted caseload model,

which used the Delphi method of determining average case processing times, or case weights, the AOC contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in December 2022 to conduct an evidence-based assessment of the workload for judicial officers in the Circuit and District Courts.

The AOC selected members to serve on a Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) for this project. The JNAC included 11 Circuit Court judges and 8 District Court judges from across the state, as well as AOC staff. The NCSC consultants, with guidance from the JNAC, designed and conducted the study to produce weighted caseload models for judges in the Circuit and District Courts.

The weighted caseload study included the collection of three types of data: (1) work time data recorded by judicial officers during a four-week period, (2) a survey of participating Circuit and District judges requesting their assessment of the extent to which they have adequate time to perform their duties to their satisfaction; and (3) qualitative feedback from focus group discussions with Circuit and District Court judges.

The case weights reflect the average number of case-related minutes that judicial officers spend per year processing each of the different case types; they are based upon work time recorded by time study participants in the Alabama Circuit and

District Courts during a four-week study period. The case weights and other components of the weighted caseload model were reviewed and approved by the JNAC.

This study is comprehensive and reliable because:

- It was designed and conducted by NCSC consultants who are national experts in the development of weighted caseload models for courts and other justice system agencies.
- A high percentage (84%) of Circuit and District Court judges participated in the study, which substantially enhances the credibility and validity of the data collected.
- It included a survey of Circuit and District Court judges to assess whether they have adequate time to achieve reasonable levels of quality in performing their duties. The adequacy of time survey data assisted in determining the reasonableness of the case weights which were based solely on the work time data.
- The NCSC consultants conducted a total of five focus group meetings involving knowledgeable Circuit and District Court judges to review and discuss the findings from the time study and the adequacy of time survey. Two focus groups were held with Circuit Court judges, two were held with District Court judges, and one focus group was held with judges who primarily handle juvenile and child support cases.

The focus group participants also provided feedback on other factors that might not have been captured during the time study. This qualitative input informed the discussion and decisions made by the JNAC regarding the weighted caseload model.

NCSC consultants organized the project around the following primary tasks:

1. **Development of the research design.**
The JNAC, appointed by the AOC, met with the NCSC consultants in February 2023 to provide guidance for the weighted caseload study. The JNAC provided advice and feedback on the overall study design, which case types and activities to include in the weighted caseload model, the methodology, content, and schedule of the training sessions prior to the time study, the duration of the time study, and the approach and composition of the focus groups. The JNAC also provided feedback and recommendations on key issues covered in the final report.
2. **Alabama Circuit and District Court judicial time study.**
Eighty-four percent of Circuit and District Court judges participated in the four-week time study conducted between April 10 and May 5, 2023. Before the time study began, an NCSC consultant conducted four one-hour training

webinars to provide detailed instructions on how all participants should track and record their work time. The NCSC also provided both written instructions and an online help link to participants who had questions about recording time and categorizing information. During the time study, Circuit and District Court judges and referees¹ who handle judicial work kept records of all time spent on case-related and non-case-specific activities and entered their work time data in the NCSC's secure online data entry website.

3. Adequacy of Time Survey.

After the time study data collection period, 51% of Circuit Court judges and 49% of District Court judges completed an online adequacy of time survey regarding the sufficiency of time available during regular working hours to do their work. The survey results revealed that most judges in the Circuit and District Courts believe they “usually” have enough time to effectively handle their daily tasks.

4. Data Analysis and development of preliminary case weights.

NCSC staff analyzed the data collected from the time study, adequacy of time survey, and focus group discussions, and then drafted reports, including tables and preliminary case weights for review by the JNAC.

5. Five focus groups.

In September 2023, NCSC staff conducted five focus group discussions via Zoom with experienced Circuit and District Court judges to review the project methodology and discuss the preliminary findings from the time study and adequacy of time survey.

6. JNAC review, discussion, and decision-making.

The NCSC, AOC, and JNAC held two meetings to review the data and make final decisions based on adequacy of time survey and focus group findings.

At the first review meeting on June 15, 2023, the JNAC and AOC staff reviewed and discussed findings from the time study, including preliminary case weights,

¹ Referees were considered to be ancillary participants in the time study, meaning that they only entered time that would be considered Circuit or District Court judicial officer work.

and results from the adequacy of time survey. Additionally, the JNAC worked with the NCSC to plan the focus groups, requesting the NCSC to ask specifically about case processing times for juvenile – TPR cases and property dispute cases.

Following the June meeting and the focus groups, the NCSC, JNAC, and AOC staff met for the final time on October 5, 2023. This meeting primarily focused on whether to adjust the juvenile TPR case weight and the property dispute case weight. After substantial discussion of both case weights, the JNAC agreed to adopt the average of the 2007 and 2016 case weights for juvenile TPR cases to reflect the work of judicial officers more accurately on these cases. The JNAC also agreed to combine the general civil tort and the property disputes case weights, to make the property dispute case weight more consistent with the other civil case weights.

7. Preparation of the Final Report.

After the October 5, 2023 meeting, NCSC staff developed a draft report of findings for review by the AOC.

Findings

The final report explains in detail each step in the research and data analysis process for this weighted caseload study and the development of the weighted caseload model. The weighted caseload model is

sufficiently flexible and provides the Alabama AOC with the framework to determine the approximate need for Circuit and District Court judges. Applying the new weighted caseload models reveals that the Alabama Circuit and District Courts should have **152.15** full-time equivalent (FTE) Circuit Court judges and **97.36** FTE District Court judges to effectively handle the current workload.

Recommendations

The NCSC encourages the AOC to consider the following recommendations regarding the ongoing use of the weighted caseload model.

Recommendation 1

The NCSC recommends updating the Circuit and District Court judicial officer needs assessment models annually, by inserting new case filings from the most recent year of reliable filings, or the average of the most recent three years of reliable filings.

Recommendation 2

The weighted caseload model presented in this report should be the starting point for determining the need for judges in the Alabama Circuit and District Courts. There are qualitative issues that an objective weighted caseload model cannot account for such as differences between urban and rural jurisdictions in their abilities to have judges specialize and to effectively provide backup

judges when needed; differences in jury trial rates across locations; possible variations in the proportion of civil and domestic cases involving self-represented parties; differences among counties in the percentage of persons who require court interpreting services (whose hearings require more time); and the inadequate number of various judicial support staff (e.g., bailiffs, law clerks, court reporters). Issues such as these that result in longer or shorter case processing times should be considered.

Recommendation 3

Over time, the integrity of any weighted caseload model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies. NCSC recommends that the AOC conduct a comprehensive review of the weighted caseload model every five to seven years. This review should include a time study in which all or most Circuit and District Court judges participate.

Between updates, if a major change in the law appears to have a significant impact on workload, a Delphi panel of experts can be convened to make interim adjustments to the affected case weight(s).

Recommendation 4

NCSC recommends regularly updating the FTE values for referees and for District Court judges performing Circuit Court work, as well as the District Court work that is occasionally being done by Circuit Court judges. As these values are likely to remain fluid, it is important to recognize their potential impact on resource implications throughout Alabama.

I. INTRODUCTION

Funding bodies and the public increasingly call upon the courts and other government agencies to be more efficient – to “operate more like a business.” One of the challenges for courts in responding to this demand is determining the appropriate number of judicial officers and court staff required to provide high-quality services in the courts.

For many years, the Alabama Judicial Branch has relied on weighted caseload models to determine court staffing needs for judges, court specialists, and juvenile probation officers. Over time, the integrity of workload standards is affected by multiple influences, including changes in legislation, court rules, legal practice, technology, and administrative factors. In order to measure the impact of these influences, supplemental time study data must be gathered and incorporated into the model. Recognizing the utility and need to update the 2016 weighted caseload model, which used the Delphi method of determining average case processing times, or case weights, the Alabama Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) sought the assistance of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to conduct a weighted caseload study to generate case weights through the process of a time study in which Circuit and District Court judges tracked their time for a four-week period.

A clear measure of court workload is central to determining how many judicial officers are needed to process all cases filed. Adequate resources are essential for the Alabama Courts to effectively process court business without delay while also delivering quality service to the

public. Meeting these challenges involves objectively assessing the number of Circuit and District Court judges required to handle the caseload and whether those resources are being allocated and used prudently. In response, court leaders around the country are increasingly turning to empirically based weighted caseload assessments to provide a strong foundation of resource needs.

Different types of cases create different amounts of judicial workload: for example, a felony case typically requires more case processing time than a traffic case. Unlike resource allocation methods that are based on population or raw, unweighted caseloads, the weighted caseload methodology explicitly incorporates the differences in judicial workload associated with different types of cases, producing a more accurate and nuanced profile of the need for judicial officers in Alabama’s Circuit and District Courts.

Specifically, the current study accomplished the following:

- Utilized a methodology that bases the development of case weights on all work recorded by Circuit and District Court judges,
- Included participation from 85% of Circuit Court judges and 83% of District Court judges,
- Included a four-week data collection period to ensure sufficient data to develop valid case weights,
- Accounted for Circuit and District Court judicial work for all phases of case processing,

- Accounted for non-case-related activities and travel that are a normal part of daily work, and
- Established a transparent and flexible model to determine the need for Circuit and District Court judges across the state.

Based on a survey of Circuit and District Court judges, (adequacy of time) the participants ranged in the number of years in which they have been employed by the courts from less than one year to over 16 years. Approximately 24% of the participants have been employed with the Alabama Courts for less than three years; approximately 46% have been employed between four and ten years, and 30% have served the Alabama Courts for more than eleven years. This variation in time on the job likely translates into differing case processing times, which is one key reason for using a statewide average of those case processing times.

This report explains the weighted caseload methodology and results in detail and offers recommendations for the ongoing use of the model.

The Weighted Caseload Model

The weighted caseload method of workload analysis is grounded in the understanding that different types of court cases vary in complexity and, consequently, in the amount of judicial officer work they generate. For example, a typical felony creates a greater need for judicial officer resources than the average traffic case. The weighted caseload methodology calculates

judicial officer need based on the court's total workload.

The weighted caseload formula consists of three critical elements:

1. *Case filings and counts* or the number of new cases or counts of each type filed each year (or the average of the most recent three years).
2. *Case weights*, which represent the average amount of time required to handle cases and counts of each type over the life of the case.
3. The *year value*, or the amount of time each judicial officer has available to work in a year.

The total annual workload is calculated by multiplying the annual filings and counts (or a three-year average of annual filings and counts) for each case type by the corresponding case weight, then summing the workload across all case types. The court's workload is then divided by the year value to determine the total number of full-time equivalent judicial officers needed to handle the workload.

The 2023 Weighted Caseload Study

The weighted caseload study's findings are based on a time study in which participants tracked their work time for four weeks. The data were entered into the NCSC's proprietary data entry system.

The AOC selected members to serve on a Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) for this project. The JNAC included 11 Circuit Court

judges and 8 District Court judges from across the State, as well as AOC staff. The JNAC's role was to advise the NCSC on the selection of case types and activities, the time study design, as well as to make policy decisions regarding the development of the case weights and needs models. The JNAC met in February 2023 to define the parameters of the study and again in June to review the preliminary data. A final meeting was held with the JNAC in October to make final decisions regarding the case weights and judicial needs models.

The weighted caseload study was conducted in two phases:

1. A *time study* in which all Circuit and District Court judges and referees handling judicial work were asked to record all case-related and non-case-related work over a four-week period. The time study provided 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 incorporate sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing. The quality adjustment process included:
 - An *adequacy of time survey* asking Circuit and District Court judges about the amount of time currently available to perform their work, including their perceived levels of work-related stress and whether the current pace of work is sustainable,

- Five *focus groups* conducted by NCSC including Circuit and District Court judges, and
- A review and acceptance of the case weights by the JNAC and AOC staff.

II. CASE TYPES AND EVENTS

At the JNAC's first meeting in February 2023, one of the committee's primary tasks was to establish the case type and event categories upon which to base the time study. The case types, case-related events, and non-case-related events describe all the work required and expected of judicial officers in the Alabama Circuit and District Courts.

Case Type Categories

The JNAC was charged with establishing case type categories that 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 logically distinct.
- There are meaningful differences among categories in the amount of judicial officer work required to process the average case.
- There are enough case filings within each category to develop a valid case weight.
- Filings for each case type category or its component case types are tracked consistently and reliably by the Alabama AOC.

The JNAC defined 24 case type categories, listed in Figure 1. Since District Court judges sometimes work on Circuit Court cases and vice versa, all judges were given access to all case types at both court levels. A more detailed description of the case types can be found in Appendix A.

Figure 1: Case Types

1	Capital Crimes
2	Class A Felonies
3	Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)
4	Other Felonies - B, C, D
5	Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit
6	Misdemeanor
7	DUI - District
8	Traffic - District
9	Other Civil - District
10	Small Claims - District
11	Unlawful Detainer - District
12	General Civil Tort - Circuit
13	General Civil Other - Circuit
14	Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit
15	Property Disputes - Circuit
16	Complex Litigation - Circuit
17	Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit
18	Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit
19	Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit
20	Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other
21	Juvenile - Dependency
22	Juvenile - TPR
23	Child Support/Paternity
24	Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)

Tasks and Activities

Circuit and District Court judges perform a variety of functions in and out of court that can be directly related to the processing of cases (case-related activities), as well as non-case-related activities. NCSC staff worked closely with the JNAC to develop a comprehensive list and description of these essential activities. The list of activities served as an organizing tool to guide

data collection during the time study. A list of case-related activities for Circuit and District Court judges is provided in Figure 2. The non-case-related activities are provided in Figure 3. A more detailed description of the case-related and non-case-related activities can be found in Appendices B and C.

The weighted caseload model is based on a uniform amount of time Circuit and District Court judges have available to perform all their work annually, including both case-related and non-case-related tasks. To determine judicial staffing needs, the average amount of time spent on non-case-related activities is held constant for each group, and the remainder of time available is calculated to determine the average amount of time available for judges to perform case-related work. This is a critical component of the weighted caseload model, so knowing how much time is spent on both case-related and non-case-related work is essential.

Figure 2: Circuit and District Judges Case-Related Activities

1	Pretrial/preliminary matters
2	Non-trial disposition
3	Bench trial
4	Jury Trial
5	Post-Judgment (or Post Verdict)
6	Specialty/Treatment Courts

Non-Case-Related Events

Work that is not related to a particular case before the court, such as court management, committee meetings, travel, and professional education, is also an essential part of the workday. To compile a detailed profile of Circuit and District Court judges’ non-case-related

activities and provide an empirical basis for constructing the day and year values, the JNAC defined non-case-related event categories for Circuit and District Court judges (Figure 3). To simplify the task of completing the time study forms and aid in the validation of the time study data, vacation and other leave and time spent filling out time study forms were included as non-case-related events.

**Figure 3: Circuit and District Judge
Non-Case-Related Activities**

-
- 1 Non-Case-Related Administration
 - 2 Judicial Education and Training
 - 3 General Legal Research and Training
 - 4 Community activities and public outreach
 - 5 Work-Related Travel
 - 6 Vacation, Sick, and Other Leave
 - 7 Other
 - 8 NCSC Time Study Data Entry
 - 9 Unengaged Duty Judge During Regular Working Hours
 - 10 Non-Case-Related Specialty/Treatment Courts
-

III. TIME STUDY

The time study phase of the weighted caseload study measured current practice—the amount of time Circuit and District Court judges currently take to process cases of each type, as well as time spent on non-case-related work. For a period of four weeks, all Circuit and District Court judges and referees who engage in judicial work were asked to track their working time by case type and event. Separately, the AOC provided counts of filings by case type category. The NCSC used the time study and filing data to calculate the average number of minutes currently spent

processing cases within each case type category (preliminary case weights).

Data Collection

Time Study

During the four weeks from April 10 through May 5, 2023, judges and referees handling judicial work were asked to track their time by case type category and activity or by a non-case-related event. Participants were instructed to record all working time, including time spent processing cases outside of regular working hours, if applicable, and all non-case-related work. Participants tracked their time in five-minute increments using a web-based form.

To maximize data quality, all time study participants were asked to attend a webinar training module explaining how to categorize and record their time. In addition to the live training module, participants were provided with a recording of the training webinar and web-based reference materials. Additionally, there was a help desk link on the data entry form time study participants could use to ask questions, when necessary. The web-based data collection method allowed time study participants to verify that their data was accurately entered and permitted real-time monitoring of participation rates, helping to maximize the quality and completeness of the time study data.

As shown in Figure 4, 210 of 250 expected Circuit and District Court judges fully participated in the time study, for an overall 84% participation rate. This level of participation ensured sufficient data

to develop an accurate and reliable profile of current practice in the Alabama Courts.

Figure 4: Time Study Participation Rates

	Expected (Count)	Actual	Participation Rate
Circuit Judges	145	123	85%
District Judge	105	87	83%
Total	145	123	84%

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 the number of individual cases of each type are filed annually. The Alabama AOC provided filing data for fiscal years 2018 through 2022 for each of the case type categories. The caseload data for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2022 were then averaged to provide an annual count of filings within each case type category.² Using an annual average rather than the caseload data for a single year minimizes the potential for any temporary fluctuations in caseloads to influence the case weights.

² Typically, case weights are built on the most recent three-year average of filings. For the current study, however, case filings for 2020 and 2021 were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, so the previous two years’ of filings and FY 2022 filings were used to calculate an average.

Preliminary Case Weights

The weighted caseload model accounts for the fact that case types vary in complexity and require different amounts of judicial officer time and attention. Relying solely on the sheer number of cases to assess the demands placed on judicial officers ignores the varying levels of resources needed to process different types of cases.

Following the data collection period, the time study and caseload data were used to calculate preliminary case weights. A preliminary case weight represents the average amount of time Circuit and District Court judges currently spend processing a case of a particular type, from initial filing activity to all post-disposition matters. The use of separate case weights for each case type category accounts for the fact that cases of varying levels of complexity require different amounts of judicial case processing time.

The preliminary case weights were calculated by: (1) adding all time spent by Circuit and District Court judges on each case type during the 19-day data collection period³, (2) dividing the total amount of time for each case type by 19 (the number of days in the time study) – to determine the average daily amount of work time, (3) multiplying the daily average time by the number of days Circuit and District Court judges

³ The data collection period covered 20 working days; however April 24, 2023 was a State holiday in the Alabama Courts, reducing the number of working days to 19.

are expected to work in a year (the year value), which yields the annual amount of work time on each case type, for both Circuit and District Court judges, and (4) dividing the annual work time by the number of cases filed for each case type during the most recent and representative 3-year average of filings (FY2018, 2019 and 2022). This result provides a picture of the average amount of case-related time currently spent by all Circuit and District Court judges in the Alabama Courts on each of the identified case types. Figure 5 illustrates the calculations for determining the preliminary case weight for child support/paternity cases for Circuit and District Court judges.

Figure 5: Example -- Calculating Annualized Minutes and Preliminary Case Weight for Circuit and District Judges Child Support/Paternity Cases

Child Support/Paternity - Total Minutes Recorded During Data Collection Period	76,993		
		<i>Divide by</i>	÷
Days of Data Collection Period	19		
Average Statewide Minutes per Day Working on Child Support/Paternity Cases	4,052		
		<i>Multiply by</i>	X
Total Judge Working Days per Year	215		
		<i>Equals</i>	=
Annualized Minutes for Child Support/Paternity Cases	871,237		
Developing Preliminary Case Weight			
Annualized Minutes for Child Support/Paternity	871,237		
		<i>Divide by</i>	÷
3-Year Average Filings	26,454		
		<i>Equals</i>	=
Preliminary Case Weight (minutes)	32.93		

Based on the time study, Circuit and District Court judges spend a combined total of 871,237 minutes of case-related time on child support/paternity cases annually. Dividing that time by the 3-year average number of child support/paternity cases filed (26,454) yields a preliminary case weight of 32.93 minutes, or 33 minutes rounded to a whole number.

Figures 6 and 7 show the complete set of preliminary case weights for Circuit and District Court judges.

Figure 6: Circuit Judges Preliminary Case Weights

Case Type	Preliminary Case Weight (in minutes)
Capital Crimes	2,259
Class A Felonies	202
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37
Misdemeanor	3
General Civil Tort - Circuit	158
General Civil Other - Circuit	83
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40
Property Disputes - Circuit	2,667
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32
Juvenile - Dependency	108
Juvenile - TPR	152
Child Support/Paternity	33
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182

Figure 7: District Judges Preliminary Case Weights

Case Type	Preliminary Case Weight (in minutes)
Capital Crimes	217
Class A Felonies	45
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14
Misdemeanor	12
DUI - District	22
Traffic - District	2
Other Civil - District	29
Small Claims - District	7
Unlawful Detainer - District	17
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32
Juvenile - Dependency	108
Juvenile - TPR	152
Child Support/Paternity	33
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182

IV. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

The preliminary case weights generated during the time study measure the amount of time Circuit and District Court judges *currently* spend handling various types of cases, but do not necessarily indicate whether this is the amount of time they *should* spend on each case. To provide a qualitative assessment of whether current practice allows adequate time for quality performance, time study participants were provided the opportunity to complete an adequacy of time survey. The NCSC also conducted focus groups with Circuit and District Court judges over five sessions to obtain feedback about the data collection period, current workloads, levels of stress related to workload, and the ability to maintain the current pace of work.

Adequacy of Time Survey

All Circuit and District Court judges were asked to complete a web-based adequacy of time survey in May of 2023. Judges were asked to respond to several questions related to the data collection period and their current workloads. Respondents were also asked to identify the case types and activities, if any, for which additional time would help to improve the quality of justice. The survey also included space for respondents to comment freely on their workload. The survey was completed by 51% of Circuit Court judges and 49% of District Court judges. Appendix D presents the survey results in detail.

The survey data provided information to help the JNAC determine whether the case weights derived from the time study data are sufficient to allow judges to complete work in a timely and high-quality manner. Findings from the adequacy of time survey are presented below in tandem with the focus group findings.

Focus Groups

To gain an in-depth understanding of the issues judges face in processing cases, the NCSC held five separate focus group sessions between September 11 - 22, 2023, with two sessions each devoted to Circuit and District Court and one specifically for judges that handle Juvenile and Child Support cases.

The focus groups allowed NCSC staff to understand the different issues facing judges in the Alabama Circuit and District Courts, and to gain perspective on whether the time study adequately captured a clear picture of their work. The focus group findings and adequacy of

time survey data were also presented to the JNAC to provide information to base potential case weight adjustments on.

Focus Group Themes and Adequacy of Time Survey Findings

Relative Case Weights

During the focus groups, NCSC shared preliminary data with the participants in each group to help generate discussion. The case weights (or average case processing times) derived from the time study data collection period were shown to the participants in graph form so participants could see how the case weights compare across case type categories. Participants were then asked to provide their reactions to the data and any additional relevant work-related information they chose to provide.

Circuit Court: In both Circuit Court focus groups, all participants agreed that the property disputes case weight looked very high in comparison to the other case types. The judges acknowledged that property dispute cases do not typically settle and frequently go to trial resulting in more pre-trial and prep work in addition to the trial time. Indeed, nearly 25% of the time recorded for property disputes was for bench trials, but there was no jury trial time recorded. However, they all felt that the time it takes to process an average property dispute case should take less time than capital crimes, complex litigation, class A felonies, and contested domestic relations cases, and the preliminary case weight was significantly higher than all those case types. Several participants stated that a property dispute case takes approximately the same amount of time as a general civil tort case.

Participants also agreed that the TPR case weight looked low in relation to the other case types indicating that TPR hearings can take several days and typically take more time than a contested domestic relations case. In the previous two weighted caseload studies, the TPR case weight was significantly higher than the preliminary TPR case weight from the current study. Some judges also said they felt that B, C, and D felonies take longer than misdemeanor appeals, but the preliminary case weights for both case types are almost identical.

District Court: When reviewing the case weight graph, the District Court judges agreed that overall, the case weights seemed fairly accurate, in comparison to one another. However, there was some discussion on a few of the case types. One judge stated that the case weight for TPRs looked a little low. Another judge initially felt that the DUI case weight seemed high, stating that pleas in these cases go quickly, but later acknowledged that the case weight seemed right when factoring in DUI cases that go to trial. Participants also discussed civil cases, saying that other civil and unlawful detainers take about the same amount of time; however, after further discussion, it was agreed that unlawful detainers take less time on average due to default judgments and other civil cases probably take longer due to a higher trial rate.

One participant thought B, C, and D felonies should be about equal to A felonies when handling bonds because the issues are the same, but the judge only handles bonds in these cases and therefore was unable to say how long other parts of these cases may take. There is a significant difference between the A felonies and

B, C, and D felonies, and that difference is consistent with previous case weights.

Juvenile/Child Support: Judges in the Juvenile and Child Support group believed that the relative order of the case weights looked accurate. However, like the Circuit and District groups, they did express that they felt the time it takes to process TPRs, on average, is longer than what the case weight indicated. All participants stated that even cases with little parental involvement take approximately two hours, and for cases that have hearings and involve attorneys, the hearing alone can take a full day which does not include any prep time or post-hearing work. One judge felt that a lower number of TPRs were being heard during the time study which likely resulted in a lower than usual case weight. When asked what they believe a more accurate average would be, they stated approximately 9 to 10 hours, which aligns with the previous case weights (9.25 hours in the 2016 study, and 12 hours in the 2007 study).

Was the data collection period typical?

Circuit Court: Several of the judges in the Circuit Court focus groups group felt the data collection period was typical and reflective of their workload. However, some participants did not agree. A couple judges stated that there were fewer jury trials than usual and that it was not as busy as it typically is. Another judge felt this could have been a result of data collection starting the Monday after Easter because litigants and attorneys are more likely to be on vacation during that time.

District Court: The District Court judges were asked if the data collection period occurred during a representative sample of their work.

Most of the judges stated that the timeframe was typical and accurately reflected their workload. One judge stated that there were not as many dockets as usual, so the workload was a little lighter, and a couple other judges mentioned taking leave during the data collection period. Leave time is accounted for in the analysis and does not impact the case weights.

Juvenile/Child Support: When asked about the data collection period, nearly all focus group participants in the Juvenile and Child Support group indicated that the time frame was typical and accurately portrayed their workload, with the exception of one judge stating that his workload was different for the first week because he was assisting another judge who was out on medical leave.

Adequacy of Time Survey: The adequacy of time survey received 107 completed responses (55 from Circuit Court judges and 52 from District Court judges). Survey results indicate 58% Circuit Court judges and 67% of District Court judges believed the data collection period was typical. Judges responding ‘no’ indicated that fewer jury trials, cases not being set, lack of availability of resources due to COVID-19, no 72-hour hearings being held, and being out for conferences, vacation, or illness as reasons for stating the time study period was atypical.

Was it difficult to track time or was work not captured?

Circuit Court: The Circuit Court judges also had mixed responses to whether they were able to record all their work. Several felt they captured everything but mentioned that there were some

questions on where to record a few tasks. Other judges stated that they probably did not record all of their time for miscellaneous administrative tasks. Another judge stated that much of his “duty judge” work done after-hours was recorded as non-case-related work.

District Court: When asked if all work was reported during the data collection period, responses were mixed. One judge said that all work was recorded, and another judge agreed but said a lot of time was recorded to non-case-related work such as council work which is typically done after-hours or on weekends. Additionally, time for initial appearances (48 - 72-hour hearings) which do not have case numbers, were recorded as non-case-related by one participant. Participants also stated that not all drug court case management conversations regarding staffing were recorded during the data collection period.

Juvenile/Child Support: Focus group participants in the Juvenile and Child Support group shared that they believed they were able to record all their working time, including miscellaneous tasks. The judges stated that they worked hard to ensure they entered all their time.

Adequacy of Time: From the AOT survey, 60% of Circuit Court judges and 52% of District Court judges reported they were able to track and record all work for which they were engaged in during the study period. Those who did not believe all their work was recorded shared that there was time unaccounted for throughout the study period for tasks such as work done after-hours, warrants and bonds, community work, miscellaneous administrative duties, interruptions or over-lapping tasks, phone calls

and emails, and time spent communicating with each other.

Sufficient time to complete all work?

Circuit Court: When asked if they felt they had sufficient time to complete all their work, all participants in the Circuit Court focus groups said no. They all agreed that the work is getting done but that is due to their working after-hours and on weekends. Some participants also stated that there are tasks that get completed but are not given the full attention that they should be given due to the overwhelming caseload and lack of time. The main tasks that Circuit Court judges expressed a desire to have more time for were researching and analyzing the law and for writing orders. Many stated that they do this type of work at home after-hours.

District Court: Participants had varied reactions when asked if they had enough time to complete their work on a regular basis. Two judges indicated that they regularly work through lunch and work after-hours, while another judge stated that there was rarely a need to take work home or skip lunch. All participants agreed that while the work that needs to get done is being done, they have to prioritize their workload and certain things are not being handled frequently or as thoroughly as they should be. For example, the judges indicated that there is not enough time to review the jail list on a regular basis, which can result in defendants being incarcerated longer than they should be. Judges also expressed a desire for more time to read and respond to email and go through motion queues. Conversely, some participants stated that their court was a test court for implementing Online Dispute Resolution and

those judges agreed that they are already seeing a positive impact and believe that once it is fully implemented across the State, it will result in judges having a little more time to handle other tasks.

Juvenile/Child Support: The judges in the Juvenile and Child Support group agreed that they generally have enough time to complete their work and rarely have to work after-hours. There was also consensus that having the ability to work remotely has made their work more efficient and less stressful.

Adequacy of Time Survey: Survey responses were similar to the responses shared by focus group participants regarding the perceived sufficiency of time with 44% of Circuit Court judges stating that they often or almost always have enough time to get their work done, and 80% felt they sometimes, often, or almost always had time to complete their work. District Court judges were slightly higher with 64% stating that they often or almost always have enough time to get their work done, and 89% felt they sometimes, often, or almost always had time to complete their work.

Obstacles

Circuit Court: The obstacles that prevented the judges in the Circuit Court focus groups from being more efficient in the performance of their jobs are listed below without prioritization:

- Lack of experienced law clerks
- Not enough support staff and the lack of funding to pay staff
- Courtroom technology that should be improved to increase efficiency

- The need for clerks and court administration to assist with running the courtroom more efficiently
- Self-represented litigants require more judicial time and attention and should have access to more resources

District Court: Focus group participants were asked what obstacles prevented them from being as efficient as possible in the performance of their jobs. Listed below without prioritization are the main themes discussed as obstacles in the District Court focus groups:

- A need for more and better paid support staff
- A need for more efficient practices
- Inefficient attorneys
- A need for more bailiffs to ensure courtroom security, as well as other support staff

Juvenile/Child Support: The obstacles that prevented judges in the Juvenile and Child Support group from being more efficient in the performance of their jobs are listed below without prioritization:

- Self-represented litigants need more time and attention
- High turnover in the Circuit Court clerks' offices resulting in a continuous learning curve which affects timely case processing
- Lack of training for clerks
- Not enough attorneys
- Need for additional support staff (bailiffs, court reporters, and law clerks)

Participants in this group also suggested that improving the process for self-represented litigants, such as putting more information and forms on the website and suggested taking

advantage of the mediation program that is being piloted.

Adequacy of Time Survey: Survey respondents also reported many of the same obstacles listed above.

The common obstacles identified in the AOT are consistent with those discussed in the focus groups, and are listed below without prioritization:

- Additional staff and judges needed
- Not enough time/ volume of work
- Poor internet connection/ technology issues/ Alacourt
- Poor facilities/ outdated courthouses
- Case backlog due to COVID-19
- Lack of resources and lack of funding for hiring staff
- Self-represented litigants need additional assistance and explanation
- Poorly trained staff/lack of training in other departments
- Not enough attorneys
- Lack of security

V. JNAC REVIEW OF CASE WEIGHTS AND QUALITATIVE REVIEW

After completing the time study, the adequacy of time survey, and the focus group discussions, the NCSC staff conducted a third and final meeting with the AOC and JNAC on October 5, 2023. The JNAC members reviewed tables prepared by NCSC staff that included findings from the time study, the proposed final case weights, and the qualitative input from the adequacy of time survey and focus group feedback.

The primary focus of this meeting was to determine whether to adjust the juvenile TPR case weight and the property dispute case weight. After substantial discussion of both case weights, the JNAC agreed to adopt the average of the 2007 and 2016 case weights for juvenile TPR cases, to reflect the work of judicial officers more accurately on these cases. Additionally, based on the focus group findings, the JNAC agreed to combine the case weight for general civil tort with the property disputes case weight, bringing the property dispute case weight more in line with what the judges and the JNAC felt was more appropriate. The final case weights are shown in Figures 8 and 9. The case weights, along with the number of cases filed, are critical factors in the calculation of the need for judicial officers.

Figure 8: Circuit Judge Final Case Weights

Case Type	Final Case Weight (in minutes)
Capital Crimes	2,259
Class A Felonies	202
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37
Misdemeanor	3
General Civil Tort/Property Disputes - Circuit	194
General Civil Other - Circuit	83
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32
Juvenile - Dependency	108
Juvenile - TPR	640
Child Support/Paternity	33
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182

Figure 9: District Judge Final Case Weights

Case Type	Final Case Weight (in minutes)
Capital Crimes	217
Class A Felonies	45
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14
Misdemeanor	12
DUI - District	22
Traffic - District	2
Other Civil - District	29
Small Claims - District	7
Unlawful Detainer - District	17
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32
Juvenile - Dependency	108
Juvenile - TPR	640
Child Support/Paternity	33
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182

VI. CALCULATING THE NEED FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

In the weighted caseload model, three factors contribute to the calculation of judicial officer needs models. These include caseload data (filings), case weights, and the year value. The year value is equal to the amount of time each full-time judicial officer has available for case-related work on an annual basis. The relationship among the filings, case weights, and year value is expressed in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Alabama Circuit and District Court Judicial Officer Needs Model Computation

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

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) judicial officers needed to handle the workload.

Circuit and District Court Judge Day Values

The judge day values represent the amount of time each Circuit and District Court judge has available for case-related work each day. This value is calculated by subtracting time for lunch, breaks, and non-case-related work (e.g.,

administration, travel, training) from the total working day.

Both travel time and non-case related time were tracked in the current study and the 2007 time study. The committees for the 2007 and 2016 weighted caseload studies adopted two separate day values: one for rural and the other for non-rural judicial officers. In the 2016 study, judicial officers in multi-county circuits were expected to work 6 hours per day on case-related matters and 1.5 hours a day on non-case-related matters, while the single county Circuit judges and all District judges were expected to work 7 hours per day on case-related matters and 1 hour per day on non-case-related matters. The different day values were adopted to account for the variation in travel that exists between judges in the multi-county and single county circuits. Using this same logic, the JNAC for the current study adopted the two separate day values used in the 2016 study.

Circuit and District Court Judge Year Value

The judge year value was determined by JNAC with input from the NCSC project team. The 2007 and 2016 studies used a year value of 215 days available per year for judges to process cases and the JNAC agreed to use the same value for the current study. The year value was calculated by subtracting weekend days, holidays, time related to illness, vacation time, and time spent attending the judicial conferences and seminars from the calendar year. The calculations are shown in Figure 11.

Figure 11: Circuit and District Court Judge Year

	Days
Total Days per Year	365
Weekends	-104
Holidays	-13
Vacation Leave	-12
Sick Leave	-5
Conferences	-6
Continuing Education	-10
Case-Related Days per Year	215
Case-Related Minutes per Year	103,200

To calculate the final year values for case-related work, the number of days in the working year was multiplied by the day value for case-related work. This figure is then expressed in terms of minutes per year. Figures 12 and 13 show the calculation of the year value for multi-county Circuit Court judges and for single county Circuit and District Court judges.

Figure 12: Multi County Circuit Court Judge Case-Specific Year Value

Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour		Year Value (minutes)
215	x	6.5	x	60	=	83,850

Figure 13: Single County Circuit and District Court Judge Case-Specific Year Value

Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour		Year Value (minutes)
215	x	7	x	60	=	90,300

Applying the computation shown in Figures 12 and 13 above, the judicial needs models indicate a net need for **152.15** full-time equivalent (FTE) Circuit Court judges and **97.36** FTE District Court judges to effectively handle the current workload. The judicial need figure is based only

on the weighted caseload model and does not account for the constitutional requirement in Alabama that states there must be one District Court judge per county.

Figures 14 and 15 show the statewide needs model for Circuit and District Courts. The needs models by circuit and by county can be found in Appendices E and F.

Figure 14: FY2022 Circuit Needs Model

	Final Case Weights	3-Year Average Cases Filed by Circuit
Capital Crimes	2,259	265
Class A Felonies	202	6,607
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13	2,347
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33	79,776
Misdemeanor	37	5,563
DUI - District	3	25,487
Traffic - District	194	8,774
Other Civil - District	83	18,453
Small Claims - District	40	8,585
Unlawful Detainer - District	194	126
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	560	556
Juvenile - Dependency	46	9,912
Juvenile - TPR	147	20,980
Child Support/Paternity	31	12,425
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32	9,002
Juvenile - Dependency	108	6,123
Juvenile - TPR	640	487
Child Support/Paternity	33	12,516
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182	2,771
Total Cases		230,755
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		14,895,184
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time*		12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		168.13
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)	-	10.95
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)	-	7.19
District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)	+	2.16
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer FTE Demand		152.15

*Separate year values were used for single county Circuits and multi county circuits. However, for the sake of simplicity only one value is displayed

Figure 15: FY2022 District Judge Needs Model

	Final Case Weights	3-Year Average Cases Filed by District
Capital Crimes	217	187
Class A Felonies	45	5,823
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2	1,815
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14	75,171
Misdemeanor	12	83,981
DUI - District	22	5,024
Traffic - District	2	296,619
Other Civil - District	29	16,076
Small Claims - District	7	98,941
Unlawful Detainer - District	17	52,902
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32	12,021
Juvenile - Dependency	108	9,094
Juvenile - TPR	640	1,127
Child Support/Paternity	33	14,785
Specialty/Treatment Courts	182	2,771
Total Cases		676,337
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		8,208,632
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		90.90
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)	-	2.16
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)	-	2.33
Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)	+	10.95
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		97.36

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

The NCSC encourages the AOC to consider the following recommendations regarding the ongoing use of the weighted caseload model.

Recommendation 1

The NCSC recommends updating the Circuit and District Court judicial officer needs assessment models annually, by inserting new case filings from the most recent year of reliable filings, or the average of the most recent three years of reliable filings.

Recommendation 2

The weighted caseload model presented in this report should be the starting point for determining the need for judges in the Alabama Circuit and District Courts. There are qualitative issues that an objective weighted caseload model cannot account for such as differences between urban and rural jurisdictions in their abilities to have judges specialize and to effectively provide backup judges when needed; differences in jury trial rates across locations; possible variations in the proportion of civil and domestic cases involving self-represented parties; differences among counties in the percentage of persons who require court interpreting services (whose hearings require more time); and the inadequate number of various judicial support staff (e.g., bailiffs, law clerks, court reporters). Issues such as these that result in longer or shorter case processing times should be considered.

Recommendation 3

Over time, the integrity of any weighted caseload model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies. NCSC recommends that the AOC conduct a comprehensive review of the weighted caseload model every five to seven years. This review should include a time study in which all or most Circuit and District Court judges participate. Between updates, if a major change in the law appears to have a significant impact on workload, a Delphi panel of experts can be convened to make interim adjustments to the affected case weight(s).

Recommendation 4

NCSC recommends regularly updating the FTE values for referees and for District Court judges performing Circuit Court work, as well as the District Court work that is occasionally being done by Circuit Court judges. As these values are likely to remain fluid, it is important to recognize their potential impact on resource implications throughout Alabama.

APPENDIX A: CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGE CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

A	Capital Crimes <i>Circuit and District</i>	M	General Civil, Other ● <i>Workers Comp.</i> <i>Circuit</i>
B	Class A Felonies <i>Circuit and District</i>	N	Contracts/Debt Collection <i>Circuit</i>
C	Possession of Obscene Materials of a Minor (PMIO) <i>Circuit and District</i>	O	Property Disputes <i>Circuit</i>
D	Other Felonies – B, C, D <i>Circuit and District</i>	P	Complex Litigation ● <i>Wrongful Death</i> ● <i>Product Liability/AEMLD</i> ● <i>Malpractice – Medical, Legal, and Other</i> <i>Circuit</i>
E	Misdemeanor court appeals <i>Circuit</i>	Q	Protection from Abuse (PFAs) <i>Circuit</i>
F	Misdemeanor <i>Circuit and District</i>	R	Domestic Relations – Contested <i>Circuit</i>
G	DUI <i>District</i>	S	Domestic Relations – Uncontested <i>Circuit</i>
H	Traffic <i>District</i>	T	Juvenile – Delinquency/CHINS/Other <i>Circuit and District</i>
I	Other Civil <i>District</i>	U	Juvenile-Dependency <i>Circuit and District</i>
J	Small Claims <i>District</i>	V	Juvenile-TPR <i>Circuit and District</i>
K	Unlawful Detainer <i>District</i>	W	Child Support/Paternity <i>Circuit and District</i>
L	General Civil-Tort ● <i>Car wrecks</i> ● <i>Slip and falls</i> <i>Circuit</i>	X	Specialty/Treatment Courts

APPENDIX B: CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGE CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

1. Pretrial/preliminary matters

All of the routine matters that occur in cases before a trial or other disposition is reached and/or before a case comes to trial. The controlling assumption here is that 100% of all cases would have some activity in this category.

Examples include:

- Initial/first appearance, preliminary hearings, bail/bond hearings/setting, and arraignments
- Non-dispositive pre-trial motions
- Scheduling and pre-trial conferences
- Issuing/signing warrants
- Shelter care and detention hearings
- Hearings on temporary custody or support, or temporary financial hearings in domestic cases
- Review of petitions
- Case review, writing findings related to motions
- Service and answer review

2. Non-trial disposition

This category is intended to capture the time spent in dispositive hearings and related work **where a trial is not required** (i.e., settled cases, summary judgments that fully dispose of a case, etc.). The unifying factor of work in this group is that the matters will not be determined by a bench or jury trial. Most frequently hearings in this group will result in both findings and orders, but the group will also include hearings where adjudication and disposition have been bifurcated.

Examples include:

- Plea hearings and sentencing
- Divorce dissolution/divorce hearings
- Juvenile court adjudicatory or dispositional hearings
- Summary judgments
- Any work by the judicial officer related to research, case review, writing findings and conclusions on non-trial dispositions

3. Bench trial

This category includes work on matters that are counted as bench trials in state court statistical reporting. This includes cases tried before the judge alone (“bench trials”).

Examples include:

- Bench trial: counted as a trial when the case is called. Includes criminal trials, civil trials, contested divorces, contested adjudicatory and/or disposition hearings in juvenile cases, contested probate matters, etc.
 - Any work by the judicial officer related to research, case review, writing findings of fact and conclusions of law on specific cases that have gone to bench trial
 - Sentencing hearing following bench trial
-

APPENDIX B (CONTINUED): CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGE CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

4. Jury Trial

This category includes time associated with cases tried before a jury only.

Examples include:

- Jury trial: counted as a trial when a jury is empaneled. Includes jury selection, arguments and evidence, jury deliberation, jury polling, announcement of verdict.
 - Any work by the judicial officer related to research, case review, writing findings of fact and conclusions of law on specific cases that have gone to jury trial
 - Sentencing hearing following jury trial
-

5. Post-Judgment (or Post Verdict)

Post-judgment includes all the work related to cases that are “reopened” after a judgment has been previously entered. These proceedings typically occur in family and juvenile cases and in civil, criminal, and guardianships. Included are hearings required to enforce or modify any judgment.

Examples include:

- Probation violation hearing or Probation review (adult or juvenile)
 - Juvenile petitions for extension, revision or change of placement
 - Review and or modification of orders for support, custody, or visitation
 - Orders to enforce civil judgments
 - Motions for reconsideration, after verdict, for post-conviction relief, and to modify sentence
 - Sentencing after revocation
 - Community Correction oversight docket
-

6. Specialty/Treatment Courts Activities

All case-related activity related to specialty/treatment courts.

APPENDIX C: CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGE NON-CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

a. Non-Case-Related Administration

All non-bench, non-case-related working time related to administration. Time spent on activities such as routine office matters, staff meetings, docket analysis should be reported under this code. These events are not related to a particular case(s). Examples include:

- Judges' meetings
- Court committee meeting (e.g., Weighted Caseload Advisory Committee)
- Docket Analysis
- Personnel matters
- Any required meeting for administrative purposes
- Work on court projects
- Presiding Judge duties

b. Judicial Education and Training

All time spent in judicial training, judicial continuing education, and attending judicial conferences.

c. General Legal Research and Training

Routine review of new/updated statutes, reading of reports of decisions, law review article

d. Community activities and public outreach

Any community-based work conducted in your role as a judge. Examples include:

- State Boards and Commissions
- Community education (including speeches)
- Community meetings with local judges, county boards, and committees
- Bar association meetings

e. Work-Related Travel

Time spent traveling on court business but does not include time spent traveling from your residence to your home base. It does include travel time for which you seek reimbursement; for example, traveling from your home to another county or to a different location in a county from the routine place(s) you work.

f. Vacation, Sick, and Other Leave

Includes all time where the judicial officer is away from the court due to vacation, personal time, or illness. Please record time for unexpected court closures to this activity as well.

g. Other

Any work that is not related to a case but is not captured elsewhere in the list of activities.

h. NCSC Time Study Data Entry

Filling out forms and online data entry for time study project.

APPENDIX C (CONTINUED): CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGE NON-CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

i. Unengaged Duty Judge Time During Regular Working Hours

Any time spent waiting when a judge is serving as the duty judge during regular working hours with no additional work to do. This only includes time in which the judge is not engaged in any work. Any work performed as duty judge should be recorded to the appropriate case type and activity. This activity does not apply to time spent as duty judge after business hours, holidays and weekends.

j. Non-Case-Related Specialty/Treatment Courts Activities

All non-case-related activity related to specialty/treatment courts.

APPENDIX D: ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Adequacy of Time Survey Respondents

Please tell us your position

Circuit Court Judge	55	51%
District Court Judge	52	49%
Total	52	49%

Number of Years Working for Alabama Courts

Less than one year	12	11%
1-3 years	14	13%
4-5 years	21	20%
6-10 years	28	26%
11-15 years	21	20%
16+ years	11	10%
Total	107	100%

Time Study Period Questions

Circuit Judges

During the time study, was your work and workload representative of a typical 4-week period?

Yes	32	58%
No	23	42%
Total	55	100%

Was your travel time typical during the study period?

Yes	48	87%
No	7	13%
Total	55	100%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

During the time survey period, was there work that you engaged in that did not get reported?

Yes	22	40%
No	33	60%
Total	55	100%

District Judges

During the time study, was your work and workload representative of a typical 4-week period?

Yes	35	67%
No	17	33%
Total	52	100%

Was your travel time typical during the study period?

Yes	47	90%
No	5	10%
Total	52	100%

During the time survey period, was there work that you engaged in that did not get reported?

Yes	25	48%
No	27	52%
Total	52	100%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Circuit Judges

	1 Almost Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Almost Always	N/A	Average Score
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis to get my work done.	2	9	20	16	8	0	3.35
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	2	8	20	17	8	0	3.38
When I start a task, I typically have the time to complete the task.	1	12	28	8	6	0	3.11
I have the tools and resources to do my job efficiently and effectively.	1	3	21	19	11	0	3.65
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient.	2	7	10	20	16	0	3.75
I have enough time to adequately assist court users and ensure they understand what is expected of them.	2	9	15	14	8	9	3.35
There is sufficient time for learning opportunities aligned with my job duties.	7	10	22	11	5	0	2.95
I am regularly able to meet deadlines without rushing at the last minute.	1	7	15	16	16	0	3.71
I have time to take lunch and breaks throughout the day.	2	6	23	12	12	0	3.47

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	N/A	Average Score
I rarely feel stressed about deadlines or commitments.	6	21	15	11	2	0	2.67
I rarely feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	5	24	14	11	1	0	2.62
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	2	11	20	17	5	0	3.22

I feel I am asked to perform unnecessary tasks on a regular basis.

Yes	8	15%
No	47	85%
Total	55	100%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Adequacy of Time to Perform Work

District Court Judges

	1 Almost Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Almost Always	N/A	Average Score
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis to get my work done.	3	3	13	19	14	0	3.73
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	1	4	13	19	15	0	3.83
When I start a task, I typically have the time to complete the task.	1	3	21	17	10	0	3.62
I have the tools and resources to do my job efficiently and effectively.	1	0	17	19	15	0	3.90
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient.	2	6	10	20	14	0	3.73
I have enough time to adequately assist court users and ensure they understand what is expected of them.	0	2	12	23	13	9	3.94
There is sufficient time for learning opportunities aligned with my job duties.	2	10	15	15	10	0	3.40
I am regularly able to meet deadlines without rushing at the last minute.	0	2	15	15	20	0	4.02
I have time to take lunch and breaks throughout the day.	3	7	21	8	13	0	3.40

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	N/A	Average Score
I rarely feel stressed about deadlines or commitments.	1	9	20	14	8	0	3.37
I rarely feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	2	12	20	11	7	0	3.17
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	0	4	13	25	10	0	3.79

I feel I am asked to perform unnecessary tasks on a regular basis.

Yes	8	15%
No	44	85%
Total	52	100%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Circuit Judges

Please select up to 5 activities for which more time you feel would improve the quality of justice, if any.

Activities	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Conduct legal research	31	56.36%
Prepare findings and orders related to dispositive pretrial motions	25	45.45%
Attend training and educational opportunities	24	43.64%
Prepare for trials/hearings	22	40.00%
Prepare findings and orders related to trials	21	38.18%
Review and hear dispositive pretrial motions	17	30.91%
Conduct trials/hearings	17	30.91%
Prepare findings and orders related to non-dispositive pretrial motions	14	25.45%
Address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	11	20.00%
Staff and committee meetings	8	14.55%
Review and hear non-dispositive pretrial motions	7	12.73%
Explain orders and rulings	7	12.73%
Specialty/Treatment court activities	7	12.73%
Prepare findings and orders related to post-trial/post-verdict motions	5	9.09%
Read and respond to email	5	9.09%
Ensure that parties and their counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	4	7.27%
Personnel-related work	4	7.27%
Process/sign warrants	1	1.82%
Review and hear post-trial/post-verdict motions	0	.00%
I do not need additional time for any tasks	2	3.64%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Are there specific case types for which you feel more time would improve the quality of justice?

Case Types	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Capital Crimes	27	49.09%
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	24	43.64%
Class A Felonies	21	38.18%
Complex Litigation - Circuit	17	30.91%
General Civil Tort - Circuit	15	27.27%
Other Felonies - B, C, D	12	21.82%
General Civil Other - Circuit	12	21.82%
Property Disputes - Circuit	8	14.55%
Protection from Abuse	7	12.73%
Specialty/Treatment Courts	5	9.09%
Juvenile - Dependency	4	7.27%
Possession of Obscene Materials Minor	3	5.45%
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	3	5.45%
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	3	5.45%
Juvenile - TPR	3	5.45%
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	1	1.82%
Child Support/Paternity	1	1.82%
Misdemeanor	0	.00%
DUI - District	0	.00%
Traffic - District	0	.00%
Other Civil - District	0	.00%
Small Claims - District	0	.00%
Unlawful Detainer - District	0	.00%
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	0	.00%
I do not need additional time for any case types.	6	10.91%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Additional Time Needed for Which Activities and Case Types?

District Judges

Please select up to 5 activities for which more time you feel would improve the quality of justice, if any.

Activities	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Address the issues surrounding self-represented litigants	24	46.15%
Conduct legal research	23	44.23%
Prepare findings and orders related to trials	19	36.54%
Conduct trials/hearings	16	30.77%
Attend training and educational opportunities	13	25.00%
Prepare for trials/hearings	12	23.08%
Explain orders and rulings	12	23.08%
Prepare findings and orders related to dispositive pretrial motions	9	17.31%
Ensure that parties and their counsel feel that their questions/concerns are addressed	7	13.46%
Read and respond to email	7	13.46%
Prepare findings and orders related to non-dispositive pretrial motions	6	11.54%
Specialty/Treatment court activities	5	9.62%
Process/sign warrants	4	7.69%
Staff and committee meetings	4	7.69%
Review and hear dispositive pretrial motions	3	5.77%
Personnel-related work	3	5.77%
Review and hear post-trial/post-verdict motions	2	3.85%
Prepare findings and orders related to post-trial/post-verdict motions	2	3.85%
Review and hear non-dispositive pretrial motions	1	1.92%
I do not need additional time for any tasks	5	9.62%

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED): ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Are there specific case types for which you feel more time would improve the quality of justice?

Case Types	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Juvenile - Dependency	21	40.38%
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	16	30.77%
Juvenile - TPR	12	23.08%
Unlawful Detainer - District	10	19.23%
Child Support/Paternity	10	19.23%
Misdemeanor	9	17.31%
Small Claims - District	9	17.31%
Class A Felonies	8	15.38%
Other Felonies - B, C, D	8	15.38%
DUI - District	8	15.38%
Other Civil - District	6	11.54%
Traffic - District	5	9.62%
Protection from Abuse	5	9.62%
Specialty/Treatment Courts	5	9.62%
Capital Crimes	3	5.77%
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	3	5.77%
Possession of Obscene Materials Minor	0	.00%
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	0	.00%
General Civil Tort - Circuit	0	.00%
General Civil Other - Circuit	0	.00%
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	0	.00%
Property Disputes - Circuit	0	.00%
Complex Litigation - Circuit	0	.00%
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	0	.00%
I do not need additional time for any case types.	10	19.23%

APPENDIX E: FY2022 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY CIRCUIT (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

	Case Weight	Circuit 1	Circuit 2	Circuit 3	Circuit 4	Circuit 5	Circuit 6	Circuit 7	Circuit 8
Capital Crimes	2,259.00	3	0	5	17	13	14	5	11
Class A Felonies	202.00	43	47	43	163	175	362	199	113
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13.00	6	5	0	3	17	146	15	17
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33.00	699	698	447	945	2,628	5,168	4,329	2,471
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37.00	18	62	5	23	42	268	100	74
Misdemeanor	3.00	233	176	187	382	1,051	1,568	1,515	833
General Civil Tort - Circuit	194.00	98	60	66	209	209	390	210	149
General Civil Other - Circuit	83.00	175	155	136	340	440	1,000	472	318
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40.00	95	93	46	154	197	323	233	131
Property Disputes - Circuit	194.00	1	2	0	2	1	4	3	1
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560.00	6	5	8	16	14	24	15	10
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46.00	26	51	83	162	240	500	561	295
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147.00	229	228	94	312	441	785	611	622
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31.00	140	110	73	188	291	478	333	339
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	0	0	0	0	0	735	773	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	0	1	0	0	0	383	322	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	0	0	0	0	0	881	883	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	36	36	21	56	134	0	220	50
Total Cases by Location		1,808	1,729	1,214	2,972	5,893	13,062	10,842	5,434
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		126,615	112,760	89,611	258,160	358,625	745,898	583,165	325,623
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time/Travel		19,350	19,350	19,350	19,350	19,350	12,900	19,350	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		83,850	83,850	83,850	83,850	83,850	90,300	83,850	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.51	1.34	1.07	3.08	4.28	8.26	6.95	3.61
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.30	0.20	0.00	0.03	0.00	1.00	0.00
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.06	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by District Judges and Referees)		1.51	1.04	0.87	3.08	4.25	7.51	5.89	3.61
Plus District Work Done by Circuit Judges		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer Demand		1.51	1.04	0.87	3.08	4.25	7.51	5.89	3.61
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	6.00	5.00	3.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.49	-0.04	0.13	-0.08	-1.25	-1.51	-0.89	-0.61

APPENDIX E (CONTINUED): FY2022 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY CIRCUIT (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

	Case Weight	Circuit 9	Circuit 10	Circuit 11	Circuit 12	Circuit 13	Circuit 14	Circuit 15	Circuit 16
Capital Crimes	2,259.00	2	53	0	3	16	6	26	3
Class A Felonies	202.00	56	785	1,280	67	506	93	352	124
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13.00	43	27	368	0	23	19	6	116
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33.00	1,799	4,312	1,677	1,395	8,432	911	2,903	2,380
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37.00	38	536	77	50	302	22	127	273
Misdemeanor	3.00	703	1,192	1,051	549	2,054	307	525	623
General Civil Tort - Circuit	194.00	87	1,903	115	112	790	106	652	235
General Civil Other - Circuit	83.00	308	2,965	303	359	1,498	242	1,496	610
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40.00	119	1,473	116	128	902	123	568	174
Property Disputes - Circuit	194.00	3	21	2	1	13	5	4	3
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560.00	6	127	7	9	54	9	47	13
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46.00	193	1,187	205	252	634	64	425	350
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147.00	462	2,431	429	326	1,503	309	1,033	476
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31.00	290	1,113	242	286	963	214	533	362
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	0	1,452	692	0	2,207	0	1,025	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	2	1,650	450	0	1,603	0	474	1
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	0	126	35	0	64	0	40	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	0	2,924	467	0	3,593	0	1,894	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	197	332	70	0	36	2	45	22
Total Cases by Location		4,308	24,609	7,586	3,537	25,193	2,432	12,175	5,765
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		252,267	2,102,425	582,384	200,102	1,470,470	171,330	900,669	336,291
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time/Travel		19,350	12,900	12,900	19,350	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		83,850	90,300	90,300	83,850	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		3.01	23.28	6.45	2.39	16.28	1.90	9.97	3.72
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	3.40	0.00	0.11	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.15
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	2.25	0.28	0.00	2.25	0.00	1.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by District Judges and Referees)		3.01	17.63	6.17	2.28	13.03	1.90	8.98	3.57
Plus District Work Done by Circuit Judges		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer Demand		3.01	17.63	6.17	2.28	13.04	1.90	8.98	3.57
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		3.00	26.00	3.00	3.00	11.00	3.00	9.00	4.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.01	8.37	-3.17	0.72	-2.04	1.10	0.02	0.43

APPENDIX E (CONTINUED): FY2022 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY CIRCUIT (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

	Case Weight	Circuit 17	Circuit 18	Circuit 19	Circuit 20	Circuit 21	Circuit 22	Circuit 23	Circuit 24
Capital Crimes	2,259.00	2	2	3	8	6	0	13	15
Class A Felonies	202.00	37	99	180	209	68	47	339	56
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13.00	0	37	71	95	5	2	23	8
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33.00	295	704	2,814	3,970	1,232	1,039	5,581	1,085
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37.00	6	121	210	130	11	28	2,238	53
Misdemeanor	3.00	84	303	1,280	879	319	528	1,432	348
General Civil Tort - Circuit	194.00	117	283	239	232	40	42	645	43
General Civil Other - Circuit	83.00	91	772	564	517	116	101	969	315
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40.00	74	351	372	173	66	64	572	90
Property Disputes - Circuit	194.00	4	6	3	2	0	1	5	0
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560.00	7	15	11	14	2	5	30	4
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46.00	32	360	141	214	86	183	633	110
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147.00	85	1,049	1,119	621	164	221	1,335	328
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31.00	51	364	473	364	93	113	937	192
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	0	0	3	500	0	0	0	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	0	0	3	308	0	0	0	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	0	0	2	43	0	0	0	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	0	0	0	580	0	0	0	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	43	114	126	0	54	79	86	61
Total Cases by Location		928	4,580	7,614	8,859	2,262	2,453	14,838	2,708
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		83,482	398,992	473,606	511,388	131,298	127,298	885,688	194,768
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time/Travel		19,350	12,900	19,350	19,350	12,900	12,900	12,900	19,350
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		83,850	90,300	83,850	83,850	90,300	90,300	90,300	83,850
Judicial Officer FTE Demand	1.00	4.42	5.65	6.10	1.45	1.41	9.81	2.32	
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)	0.00	0.35	0.05	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by District Judges and Referees)	1.00	4.07	5.60	5.39	1.45	1.41	9.81	2.26	
Plus District Work Done by Circuit Judges	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer Demand	1.00	4.07	5.75	5.39	1.83	1.41	9.81	2.26	
Current Allocated Judicial Officer	1.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	8.00	1.00	
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)	0.00	-0.07	-2.75	-0.39	0.17	0.59	-1.81	-1.26	

APPENDIX E (CONTINUED): FY2022 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY CIRCUIT (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

	Case Weight	Circuit 25	Circuit 26	Circuit 27	Circuit 28	Circuit 29	Circuit 30	Circuit 31	Circuit 32
Capital Crimes	2,259.00	0	7	3	5	1	2	3	0
Class A Felonies	202.00	86	117	42	148	28	67	88	73
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13.00	43	23	9	18	0	9	678	22
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33.00	2,155	1,213	2,116	3,780	853	1,165	63	1,349
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37.00	41	18	37	245	17	22	57	5
Misdemeanor	3.00	990	266	366	644	260	259	98	465
General Civil Tort - Circuit	194.00	51	107	122	401	128	112	88	120
General Civil Other - Circuit	83.00	170	156	290	881	239	362	204	249
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40.00	78	100	95	391	171	149	105	105
Property Disputes - Circuit	194.00	3	2	2	13	2	2	1	2
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560.00	3	5	7	20	9	7	7	7
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46.00	88	107	250	408	176	221	232	314
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147.00	356	274	338	1,167	271	414	227	452
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31.00	181	202	369	573	250	327	159	335
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	0	0	0	1,068	0	0	0	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	0	0	0	563	0	0	0	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	0	0	0	81	0	0	0	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	0	0	0	491	0	0	0	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	0	192	255	154	2	147	2	52
Total Cases by Location		4,245	2,789	4,301	11,051	2,407	3,265	2,012	3,550
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		184,910	208,539	262,554	756,572	150,457	228,162	129,501	214,321
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time/Travel		19,350	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		83,850	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		2.21	2.31	2.91	8.38	1.67	2.53	1.43	2.37
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.56	0.50	0.82	0.66	0.40	0.30	0.00	0.00
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by District Judges and Referees)		1.65	1.81	2.09	7.60	1.27	2.23	1.43	2.37
Plus District Work Done by Circuit Judges		0.00	0.36	1.09	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer Demand		1.65	2.17	3.18	7.60	1.44	2.23	1.43	2.37
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		2.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.35	-0.17	-0.18	-2.60	0.56	-0.23	0.57	-0.37

APPENDIX E (CONTINUED): FY2022 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY CIRCUIT (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

	Case Weight	Circuit 33	Circuit 34	Circuit 35	Circuit 36	Circuit 37	Circuit 38	Circuit 39	Circuit 40	Circuit 41	State Total
Capital Crimes	2,259.00	2	0	2	1	3	0	3	1	6	265
Class A Felonies	202.00	64	54	34	47	155	34	67	19	41	6,607
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	13.00	19	352	0	0	46	2	10	3	61	2,347
Other Felonies - B, C, D	33.00	1,116	845	355	966	1,938	1,443	1,297	421	787	79,776
Misdemeanor Court Appeals - Circuit	37.00	17	10	1	21	167	13	57	10	11	5,563
Misdemeanor	3.00	242	439	58	563	854	958	378	176	349	25,487
General Civil Tort - Circuit	194.00	74	39	67	33	182	54	97	16	51	8,774
General Civil Other - Circuit	83.00	191	147	134	94	414	156	257	72	175	18,453
Contracts/Debt Collection - Circuit	40.00	106	40	65	53	217	67	94	37	75	8,585
Property Disputes - Circuit	194.00	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	0	0	126
Complex Litigation - Circuit	560.00	6	4	3	1	8	3	5	2	1	556
Protection from Abuse (PFAs) - Circuit	46.00	215	66	62	77	236	168	143	26	136	9,912
Domestic Relations, Contested - Circuit	147.00	394	151	135	131	531	236	356	91	243	20,980
Domestic Relations, Uncontested - Circuit	31.00	234	107	72	85	286	184	326	50	143	12,425
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	0	0	0	0	547	0	0	0	0	9,002
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	0	0	0	0	361	2	0	0	0	6,123
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	487
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	0	0	0	0	803	0	0	0	0	12,516
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	31	10	0	0	0	71	9	23	3	2,771
Total Cases by Location		2,712	2,265	990	2,073	6,770	3,394	3,101	947	2,082	230,755
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		174,583	99,227	77,029	88,609	388,168	147,496	184,236	52,916	124,989	14,895,184
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time/Travel		19,350	12,900	19,350	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	19,350	12,900	
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		83,850	90,300	83,850	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	83,850	90,300	
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		2.08	1.10	0.92	0.98	4.30	1.63	2.04	0.63	1.38	168.13
Less Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	10.95
Less Circuit Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.19
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by District Judges and Referees)		2.08	1.10	0.92	0.98	3.47	1.63	2.04	0.62	1.38	149.99
Plus District Work Done by Circuit Judges		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.16
Total Adjusted Circuit Judicial Officer Demand		2.08	1.10	0.92	0.98	3.47	1.63	2.04	0.62	1.38	152.15
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	146.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.08	-0.10	0.08	0.02	-0.47	0.37	-0.04	0.38	-0.38	-6.15

APPENDIX F: FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY

(3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	Autauga	Baldwin	Barbour	Bibb	Blount	Bullock	Butler	Calhoun
Capital Crimes	217.00	0	0	1	3	5	1	9	0
Class A Felonies	45.00	65	150	34	52	32	13	36	152
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	8	16	0	1	161	0	5	17
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	465	3,090	435	559	506	78	335	3,022
Misdemeanor	12.00	581	4,064	433	653	834	87	799	2,908
DUI - District	22.00	49	286	37	65	66	11	47	164
Traffic - District	2.00	4,140	11,901	1,929	2,195	3,640	873	3,708	9,171
Other Civil - District	29.00	166	747	67	69	123	33	70	361
Small Claims - District	7.00	1,220	3,604	686	315	899	247	592	2,700
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	337	1,618	74	36	134	38	102	1,154
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	273	0	66	196	234	51	103	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	181	0	105	214	311	18	59	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	23	0	11	12	44	0	2	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	426	0	368	178	138	100	179	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	19	154	10	5	3	11	12	154
Total Cases by Location		7,953	25,630	4,256	4,553	7,130	1,561	6,058	19,803
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		105,384	231,329	60,164	73,141	115,145	17,136	53,258	183,043
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.17	2.56	0.67	0.81	1.28	0.19	0.59	2.03
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.01	2.56	0.67	0.81	1.18	0.19	0.59	2.03
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.02	0.66	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	1.00
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.03	3.22	0.77	0.81	1.18	0.29	0.69	3.03
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.03	-1.22	0.23	0.19	-0.18	0.71	0.31	-0.03

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case								
	Weight	Chambers	Cherokee	Chilton	Choctaw	Clarke	Clay	Cleburne	Coffee
Capital Crimes	217.00	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Class A Felonies	45.00	61	34	41	6	43	15	42	38
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	13	0	5	0	0	0	3	14
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	881	817	921	146	530	233	512	789
Misdemeanor	12.00	1,922	1,427	1,740	304	497	309	872	595
DUI - District	22.00	137	73	82	13	14	13	54	74
Traffic - District	2.00	5,033	2,110	2,983	781	1,094	918	7,710	3,827
Other Civil - District	29.00	112	62	137	33	64	37	40	145
Small Claims - District	7.00	665	396	970	249	559	256	224	1,760
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	342	105	217	9	97	52	37	336
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	174	151	138	55	121	74	41	192
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	103	88	153	38	40	38	61	129
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	16	22	30	6	3	2	12	21
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	184	113	415	57	207	117	82	252
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	67	75	15	12	12	12	66	
Total Cases by Location		9,712	5,474	7,847	1,709	3,282	2,076	9,756	8,173
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		110,598	88,285	114,416	24,432	44,577	27,313	69,791	93,492
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.22	0.98	1.27	0.27	0.49	0.30	0.77	1.04
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.03	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.22	0.95	1.10	0.27	0.49	0.30	0.77	1.04
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.22	0.95	1.10	0.27	0.49	0.30	0.77	1.10
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.22	0.05	-0.10	0.73	0.51	0.70	0.23	-0.10

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	Colbert	Conecuh	Coosa	Covington	Crenshaw	Cullman	Dale	Dallas
Capital Crimes	217.00	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	4
Class A Felonies	45.00	41	13	9	40	12	63	46	65
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	667	0	0	8	0	9	22	2
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	205	126	186	580	240	1,806	623	562
Misdemeanor	12.00	530	180	382	1,287	418	2,991	644	609
DUI - District	22.00	35	35	32	60	38	173	36	48
Traffic - District	2.00	3,146	2,388	1,913	2,938	2,156	6,025	3,912	4,570
Other Civil - District	29.00	146	36	23	92	42	256	155	158
Small Claims - District	7.00	1,317	236	156	838	324	1,467	1,854	915
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	358	27	22	225	65	418	407	248
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	398	37	42	155	65	262	185	207
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	278	52	42	122	49	458	194	120
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	19	15	1	13	4	59	16	9
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	321	209	54	277	83	356	292	411
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	2		11	79	12	52		35
Total Cases by Location		7,465	3,354	2,874	6,714	3,508	14,395	8,388	7,963
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		105,321	36,507	24,777	94,910	33,510	221,504	98,754	89,649
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.17	0.40	0.27	1.05	0.37	2.45	1.09	0.99
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.17	0.40	0.27	1.05	0.37	2.45	1.09	0.99
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.17	0.40	0.28	1.05	0.47	2.45	1.09	0.99
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.17	0.60	0.72	-0.05	0.53	-0.45	0.91	0.01

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	DeKalb	Elmore	Escambia	Etowah	Fayette	Franklin	Geneva	Greene
Capital Crimes	217.00	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0
Class A Felonies	45.00	54	66	79	157	9	39	20	18
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	40	2	5	112	0	48	1	0
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	1,233	1,260	1,170	2,230	321	791	446	97
Misdemeanor	12.00	2,030	1,495	1,025	1,738	487	607	554	187
DUI - District	22.00	83	84	72	91	14	39	24	12
Traffic - District	2.00	3,616	5,526	4,876	5,207	1,249	1,980	2,174	1,522
Other Civil - District	29.00	157	250	99	341	30	52	106	19
Small Claims - District	7.00	1,339	1,360	628	2,785	306	530	517	137
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	265	427	138	1,302	43	143	63	36
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	230	365	314	312	67	200	186	49
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	339	309	187	402	68	107	114	19
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	58	39	24	68	4	24	16	2
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	273	392	292	471	141	159	190	61
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	122	92	54	22	20	10	31	15
Total Cases by Location		9,840	11,667	8,966	15,241	2,760	4,729	4,442	2,174
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		184,143	175,175	118,913	240,417	37,850	73,059	66,850	19,485
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		2.04	1.94	1.32	2.66	0.42	0.81	0.74	0.22
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.05	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.05	0.05	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.99	1.84	0.94	2.12	0.42	0.81	0.74	0.22
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.03	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.99	1.87	0.94	2.27	0.43	0.81	0.74	0.22
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.99	0.13	0.06	-0.27	0.57	0.19	0.26	0.78

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	Hale	Henry	Houston	Jackson	Jefferson-Bessemer	Jefferson-Birmingham	Lamar	Lauderdale
Capital Crimes	217.00	4	2	16	0	13	30	0	0
Class A Felonies	45.00	14	32	166	42	287	937	7	144
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	0	0	92	2	3	34	3	158
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	149	395	2,858	1,079	2,168	6,847	238	1,842
Misdemeanor	12.00	268	548	1,639	2,274	2,123	5,039	565	2,246
DUI - District	22.00	27	28	90	56	79	252	41	65
Traffic - District	2.00	2,651	3,276	5,333	2,862	3,835	17,591	1,613	3,162
Other Civil - District	29.00	45	51	498	149	418	2,277	17	206
Small Claims - District	7.00	330	410	4,377	1,043	2,263	9,962	180	1,709
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	62	53	1,229	273	1,740	11,245	53	668
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	69	95	0	199	0	0	74	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	54	50	0	186	0	0	59	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	2	14	0	40	0	0	8	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	134	83	0	247	0	0	100	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	5			71	0	332	20	70
Total Cases by Location		3,814	5,037	16,298	8,523	12,929	54,546	2,978	10,270
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		32,017	46,537	149,426	140,636	138,521	633,151	38,015	109,323
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.35	0.52	1.65	1.56	1.53	7.01	0.42	1.21
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		0.35	0.52	1.65	1.49	1.53	7.01	0.42	1.21
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	1.40	2.00	0.03	0.00
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.35	0.52	2.25	1.49	2.93	9.01	0.45	1.21
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	10.00	1.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.65	0.48	-0.25	-0.49	-0.93	0.99	0.55	-0.21

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case	Lawrence	Lee	Limestone	Lowndes	Macon	Madison	Marengo	Marion
	Weight								
Capital Crimes	217.00	0	3	2	0	4	16	0	1
Class A Felonies	45.00	35	125	70	15	27	411	12	42
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	2	59	8	0	0	44	0	7
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	558	1,324	1,148	111	186	4,752	268	954
Misdemeanor	12.00	1,097	2,219	1,295	379	216	3,723	246	1,091
DUI - District	22.00	55	348	110	34	39	270	16	27
Traffic - District	2.00	2,969	9,723	6,853	2,518	4,936	9,372	1,974	5,090
Other Civil - District	29.00	74	409	182	39	59	1,037	58	67
Small Claims - District	7.00	537	2,456	1,475	223	401	6,832	423	729
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	97	1,253	469	21	61	4,324	87	115
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	269	0	246	51	56	882	238	214
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	163	0	169	33	25	702	55	135
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	18	0	39	3	1	109	2	17
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	152	0	354	150	165	1,230	210	280
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00			9	12	47	86	15	
Total Cases by Location		6,026	17,919	12,429	3,589	6,223	33,790	3,604	8,769
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		80,005	129,014	139,318	29,860	42,695	539,390	42,162	89,892
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.89	1.43	1.54	0.33	0.47	5.97	0.47	1.00
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.04
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		0.86	1.43	1.54	0.33	0.47	5.22	0.47	0.96
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.45	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.86	1.88	1.54	0.43	0.47	5.22	0.47	1.38
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.14	0.12	0.46	0.57	0.53	-1.22	0.53	-0.38

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case								
	Weight	Marshall	Mobile	Monroe	Montgomery	Morgan	Perry	Pickens	Pike
Capital Crimes	217.00	2	6	1	18	2	0	1	0
Class A Felonies	45.00	79	519	22	314	100	23	26	42
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	4	12	2	7	15	0	0	0
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	1,263	7,088	261	1,842	1,360	99	294	379
Misdemeanor	12.00	1,801	6,579	256	870	1,980	111	399	404
DUI - District	22.00	69	215	29	154	76	6	14	47
Traffic - District	2.00	3,478	17,476	2,449	10,273	5,812	1,165	609	4,900
Other Civil - District	29.00	268	1,838	71	1,117	292	24	54	103
Small Claims - District	7.00	2,018	7,234	470	6,695	2,228	203	280	993
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	542	5,457	85	6,681	1,171	21	55	438
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	520	0	80	0	906	18	141	169
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	360	0	48	0	360	21	58	92
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	66	0	1	0	46	0	6	7
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	348	0	152	0	913	84	422	210
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	255	36		45	50	5	21	
Total Cases by Location		11,073	46,460	3,927	28,016	15,311	1,780	2,380	7,784
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		238,531	445,804	33,667	279,237	241,572	15,215	48,642	67,016
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		2.64	4.94	0.37	3.09	2.68	0.17	0.54	0.74
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		1.09	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.55	4.93	0.37	3.09	2.68	0.17	0.54	0.74
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.82	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.05
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		2.37	5.93	0.37	3.09	2.68	0.17	0.56	0.79
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		2.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		-0.37	-0.93	0.63	-0.09	0.32	0.83	0.44	0.21

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	Randolph	Russell	Shelby	St. Clair	Sumter	Talladega	Tallapoosa	Tuscaloosa
Capital Crimes	217.00	0	7	1	1	1	3	1	8
Class A Felonies	45.00	31	118	109	60	18	38	60	225
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	0	13	58	4	0	1	3	85
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	445	856	3,026	1,313	67	761	1,106	2,613
Misdemeanor	12.00	613	942	2,523	1,448	130	1,128	1,029	2,577
DUI - District	22.00	26	64	169	133	5	72	44	189
Traffic - District	2.00	1,266	2,286	6,073	7,182	846	5,462	1,744	17,365
Other Civil - District	29.00	53	222	567	280	26	269	108	663
Small Claims - District	7.00	433	1,556	2,696	2,164	183	2,075	852	3,643
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	50	1,131	1,478	497	19	634	354	3,313
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	93	337	613	563	7	363	361	0
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	80	174	635	432	12	301	112	0
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	6	10	44	15	0	19	26	0
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	131	455	413	354	114	519	293	0
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	8	192	114	147	13	2	12	
Total Cases by Location		3,235	8,363	18,519	14,593	1,441	11,647	6,105	30,681
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		44,738	158,615	304,916	200,398	15,333	145,940	102,466	219,474
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.50	1.76	3.38	2.22	0.17	1.62	1.13	2.43
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.37	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		0.50	1.40	3.01	2.12	0.17	1.45	1.13	2.43
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.03	0.50	0.35	0.30	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.00
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		0.53	1.90	3.36	2.42	0.17	1.85	1.13	2.43
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.47	0.10	-1.36	-0.42	0.83	0.15	-0.13	-0.43

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED): FY2022 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEEDS MODEL, BY COUNTY (3-YEAR AVERAGE FILINGS, FY2018, FY2019, AND FY2022)

Case Types	Case Weight	Walker	Washington	Wilcox	Winston	State Total
Capital Crimes	217.00	0	1	2	0	187
Class A Felonies	45.00	70	9	23	26	5,823
Possession of Obscene Materials of Minor (PMIO)	2.00	30	0	2	8	1,815
Other Felonies - B, C, D	14.00	1,445	173	264	444	75,171
Misdemeanor	12.00	1,367	573	404	690	83,981
DUI - District	22.00	46	36	11	21	5,024
Traffic - District	2.00	5,295	1,651	822	1,496	296,619
Other Civil - District	29.00	190	45	25	47	16,076
Small Claims - District	7.00	1,073	238	225	281	98,941
Unlawful Detainer - District	17.00	281	9	16	45	52,902
Juvenile - Delinquency/CHINS/Other	32.00	302	47	112	53	12,021
Juvenile - Dependency	108.00	181	44	27	128	9,094
Juvenile - TPR	640.00	34	4	0	15	1,127
Child Support/Paternity	33.00	96	72	165	141	14,785
Specialty/Treatment Courts (Excluding dedicated dockets)	182.00	2	12	6		2,771
Total Cases by Location		10,412	2,914	2,104	3,395	676,337
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		123,748	30,514	27,512	53,004	8,208,632
Judicial Officer Annual Availability		103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200	103,200
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900
Judicial Officer Annual Case-Related Availability		90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300	90,300
Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.37	0.34	0.30	0.59	90.90
Less District Work Done by Circuit Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.16
Less District Work Done by Referees (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33
Judicial Officer FTE Demand (Less Work Done by Circuit Judges/Referees)		1.37	0.34	0.30	0.59	86.41
Plus Circuit Work Done by District Judges (FTE)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	10.95
Total Adjusted District Judicial Officer FTE Demand		1.37	0.34	0.30	0.73	97.36
Current Allocated Judicial Officer		2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	106.00
Total Judicial Surplus (+)/Deficit (-)		0.63	0.66	0.70	0.27	8.64