

REPORT OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

**Supreme Court of Virginia
Judicial Workload Assessment
Final Report
(Chapter 1, 2022 SSI, Item 39.T.)**

TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 8

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2024**

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY &
LEGAL COUNSEL
EDWARD M. MACON

COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
SANDRA L. KARISON, DIRECTOR

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
CAROLINE E. KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR

FISCAL SERVICES
BARRY M. WENZIG, DIRECTOR

HUMAN RESOURCES
RENÉE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
100 NORTH NINTH STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-2334
(804) 786.6455

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
MICHAEL J. RIGGS, SR., DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL P. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
STEVEN L. DALLEMURA, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
ALISA W. PADDEN, DIRECTOR

MAGISTRATE SERVICES
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

October 17, 2024

The Members of the General Assembly

Dear Senators and Delegates:

Item 39, Paragraph T, of the Appropriation Act, Chapter 1, 2022 Virginia Acts of Assembly, Special Session I, provided funding for the Supreme Court of Virginia to contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to evaluate the judicial caseloads throughout the Commonwealth. At the request of the General Assembly, this evaluation was delayed for one year.

On behalf of the Court, I am now submitting the evaluation of judicial caseloads prepared by the National Center for State Courts, which details the factors that affect the judicial caseload and the judicial need at each level of trial court statewide.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,

Karl R. Hade

KRH:jrs



Supreme Court of Virginia

Judicial Workload Assessment

Final Report

DATE

October 2024

PROJECT STAFF

Suzanne Tallarico
Shannon Roth
Anthony Kim
DeShield Greene
Amy Kehner

PREPARED FOR

Office of the Executive
Secretary, Supreme
Court of Virginia

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 9

V. JNAC Review of Case Weights and Qualitative Review..... 16

VI. Calculating the Need for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court Judges 19

VII. Recommendations..... 26

Appendix A: Circuit Court Judge Case Type Categories 27

Appendix B: General District Court Judge Case Type Categories 32

Appendix C: JDR District Court Judge Case Type Categories..... 34

Appendix D: Circuit, General District, And JDR District Judge Case-Related Activities 36

Appendix E: Circuit, General District, and JDR District Judge Non-Case-Related Activities..... 37

Appendix F: Adequacy of Time Survey Results... 39

Appendix G: Staffing Survey Results 49

Appendix H: Interpreter Usage, CY 2023 Service Events % of Filings..... 53

*Appendix I: Circuit Court Judicial Need, by Circuit*57

Appendix J: General District Court Judicial Need, by District..... 58

Appendix K: Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judicial Need, by District 59

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the Virginia Circuit, General District and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court judges who contributed to the workload assessment.

Throughout this study, we were fortunate to work with a distinguished group of Circuit, General District, and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court judges and the Office of the Executive Secretary staff.

We also extend a special note of thanks to Rhonda Gardner, Assistant Director, Department of Judicial Services and Paul DeLosh, Director of Judicial Services, for their ongoing availability and behind-the-scenes assistance throughout this project and to Brian Ostrom and John Douglas for their consultation and guidance.

Judicial Needs Assessment Committee Members

Circuit Judges

The Honorable Cheryl Higgins, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit Albemarle Circuit Court

The Honorable Robert G. MacDonald, First Judicial Circuit Chesapeake Circuit Court

The Honorable Dontae L. Bugg, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Fairfax Circuit Court

The Honorable Sage B. Johnson, Twenty-eighth Judicial Circuit Bristol Circuit Court

The Honorable Tyneka L. D. Flythe, Seventh Judicial Circuit Newport News Circuit Court

The Honorable Heidi Barshinger, Clerk, Fourteenth Judicial Circuit Henrico County

General District Judges

The Honorable Tameeka M. Williams, Fourth Judicial District Norfolk General District Court

The Honorable Tina L. Snee, Nineteenth Judicial District Fairfax General District Court

The Honorable James J. O'Connell, III, Twelfth Judicial District Chesterfield General District Court

The Honorable Shawn L. Hines, Thirtieth Judicial District, Lee General District Court

The Honorable Calvin S. Spencer, Jr., Tenth Judicial District Halifax General District Court

Ms. Amanda Knighting, Clerk, Twenty-fifth Judicial District Staunton General District Court

Juvenile and Domestic Relations Judges

The Honorable H. Lee Chitwood, Twenty-seventh Judicial District Pulaski Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

The Honorable Maha-Rebekah Ramos Abejuela, Nineteenth Judicial District Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

The Honorable Vanessa L. Jones, Twelfth Judicial District Chesterfield Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

The Honorable Elizabeth Kellas Burton, Twenty-sixth Judicial District Winchester/Frederick Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

The Honorable Cheshire I'Anson Eveleigh, Second Judicial District Virginia Beach Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

Ms. Stephanie Bunch, Clerk, Sixteenth Judicial District Charlottesville Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court

Office of the Executive Secretary Staff

Karl R. Hade, Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia

Paul DeLosh, Director, Department of Judicial Services

Rhonda Gardner, Assistant Director, Department of Judicial Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

At the request of the General Assembly, the Supreme Court of Virginia contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform an independent, objective assessment of judicial workload to be conducted for judges in the Circuit, General District, and Juvenile and Domestic Relations (JDR) District Courts.

Workload assessments 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 judges needed to cover the courts' work, based on the number and types of cases filed.

For many years, the Virginia Judicial Branch has relied on workload assessment models to determine judicial staffing needs for judges. 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 2017 workload assessment model, the OES contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in October 2023 to conduct an evidence-based assessment of the workload for judges in the Circuit, General District, and JDR District Courts.

To provide oversight and guidance throughout the project, Chief Justice S. Bernard Goodwyn appointed members to serve on a Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) for this project. The NCSC consultants, with guidance from the JNAC, designed and conducted the study to produce workload assessment models for judges in the Virginia trial courts.

The workload assessment included the collection of three types of data: (1) work time data recorded by judges during a one-month period, (2) a survey of participating Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges requesting their opinions of the extent to which they have adequate time to perform their duties to their satisfaction; and (3) qualitative feedback from focus group discussions and quality adjustment sessions with Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges. From this data, the NCSC developed case weights (or average case processing times) for the case types included in the data collection.

The case weights reflect the average number of case-related minutes that judges spend processing each of the different case types; they are based upon work time recorded by time study participants in the Virginia trial courts during a one-month study period. The case weights and other components of the workload assessment 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 workload assessment models for courts and other justice system agencies.
- A high percentage (93%) of Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges participated in the study, which substantially enhances the credibility and validity of the data collected.
- It included a survey of Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges to assess whether they feel 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 six focus group meetings involving Circuit, General District, and JDR District Courts judges to review and discuss the

findings from the adequacy of time survey. Two focus groups were held with each court level. 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 case weights and workload assessment models.

NCSC consultants organized the project around the following primary tasks:

1. **Development of the research design.**
The JNAC, appointed by the Chief Justice, met with the NCSC consultants in January 2024 to provide guidance for the workload assessment. The JNAC provided advice and feedback on the overall study design, which case types and activities to include in the workload assessment model, the methodology, content, and schedule of the training sessions prior to the time study, the duration of the time study, and the content and composition of the focus groups. The JNAC also provided feedback and recommendations on key issues covered in the final report.
2. **Virginia Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judge time study.**
Ninety-three percent of Virginia judges participated in the one-month time study conducted between April 8 – May 8, 2024 for Circuit Court judges and April 22 –

May 22, 2024 for General District and JDR District judges. Before the time study began, an NCSC consultant conducted a total of nine one-hour training webinars (three for each court level) to provide detailed instructions on how all participants should track and record their work time. The NCSC also provided a recording of the training written instructions, and an online help link to participants who had questions about recording time and categorizing information. During the time study, Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges 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, 53% of Circuit Court judges, 57% of General District Court judges, and 61% of JDR 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 Virginia trial 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 and adequacy of time survey, and then drafted reports, including tables and preliminary case weights for review by the JNAC.

5. Six focus groups.

In July 2024, NCSC staff conducted six focus group discussions virtually with experienced Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges to review the project methodology and discuss the preliminary findings from the time study and adequacy of time survey results.

6. Four Quality-Adjustment Sessions.

In July and August 2024, NCSC staff conducted four quality-adjustment sessions (Delphi sessions) with knowledgeable judges in Circuit, General District, and JDR District Courts to provide a structured review of specific case weights selected by the JNAC for review and possible quality adjustment.

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

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

At the first review meeting on July 10, 2024, the JNAC and OES staff reviewed and discussed findings from the time study, including preliminary case weights, and results from the adequacy of time survey. Additionally, the JNAC worked with the NCSC to plan the focus groups and Delphi sessions.

Following the July meeting, focus groups, and Delphi sessions, the NCSC, JNAC, and OES staff met for the final time on August 14, 2024. The group discussed the recommended case weight adjustments that resulted from the Delphi groups and reviewed the non-case-related time for Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges. After reviewing all the data and recommendations, the committee accepted and approved all the adjustments made to the case weights in the Delphi sessions with the exception of the Protective Order case weight in JDR District Courts. The JNAC accepted one of the two recommendations for Protective Orders. JNAC also approved an increase in non-case-related time for Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges to allow more time for administrative work and for non-case related work, such as search warrants, research or discussions with other judges, and work performed outside of normal hours, especially weekend work, which was not consistently reported by all judges during the time study period and therefore not

accurately reflective of the amount of time judges spend on non-case-related work each day.

Findings

The final report explains in detail each step in the research and data analysis process for this workload assessment and the development of the workload assessment models. The workload assessment models are sufficiently flexible and provide OES with the framework to determine the approximate need for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges. Applying the new models reveals that the Virginia trial courts should have **159.11** full-time equivalent (FTE) Circuit Court judges, **123.53** FTE General District Court judges, and **144.06** FTE JDR District Court judges to effectively handle the current workload.

Recommendations

The NCSC encourages the OES to consider the following recommendations regarding the ongoing use of the workload assessment model.

Recommendation 1

The NCSC recommends updating the Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judge 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 workload assessment models presented in this report should be the starting point for determining the need for judges in the Virginia trial courts. There are qualitative issues that an objective workload assessment 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 cases involving self-represented parties; and the inadequate number of various judicial support staff (e.g., bailiffs, law clerks, court reporters). "While several of these support roles are not within the purview of the Judicial Branch, issues such as these that result in longer or shorter case processing times should be considered.

Recommendation 3

Over time, the integrity of any workload assessment model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies. NCSC recommends that a comprehensive review of the workload assessment models should be conducted every five to seven years. This review should include a time study in which all or most Circuit, General District, and JDR 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).

I. INTRODUCTION

Funding bodies and the public increasingly call upon state 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 judges and court staff required to provide high-quality services in the courts.

For many years, the Virginia Judicial Branch has relied on workload assessment models to determine judicial staffing needs for judges. Recognizing the utility and need to update the 2017 workload model, the Virginia General Assembly requested that the Supreme Court of Virginia contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to conduct a workload assessment to generate case weights through the process of a time study in which Circuit, General District, and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court judges tracked their time for a one-month period.

A clear measure of court workload is central to determining how many judges are needed to process all cases filed. Adequate resources are essential for the Virginia trial 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, General District, and JDR 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 workload 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 judicial 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 judges in the Virginia trial courts.

Specifically, the current study accomplished the following:

- Utilized a methodology that bases the development of case weights on all work recorded by Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges,
- Included participation from 95% of Circuit Court judges, 92% of General District Court judges, and 92% of JDR District Court judges, for a 93% participation rate across all three courts,
- Included a one-month data collection period to ensure sufficient data to develop valid case weights,
- Accounted for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judge 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges across the state.

Based on an adequacy of time survey of Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges, the participants ranged in the number of years in which they have been a judge on the bench from less than one year to over 16 years. Approximately 19% of the participants have been a judge with the Virginia trial courts for three years or less; approximately 46% have been a judge between four and ten years, and 36% have served as a judge for eleven years or more. 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 workload assessment and weighted caseload methodology and results in detail and offers recommendations for the ongoing use of the model.

The Weighted Caseload Methodology

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

The weighted caseload formula consists of three critical elements:

1. *Case filings*, 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 each type of case over the course of a year.
3. The *year value*, or the amount of time each judge has available to work in a year.

The total annual workload is calculated by multiplying the average 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 judges needed to handle the workload.

The 2024 Workload Assessment

The workload assessment's findings are based on a time study in which participants tracked their work time for one month. The data were entered into the NCSC's proprietary data entry system.

The Chief Justice appointed members to serve on a Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) for this project. The JNAC included five Circuit Court judges, one Circuit Court clerk, five General District Court judges, one District Court clerk, five JDR District Court judges, and one JDR District Court clerk from across the state, as well as OES 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 January 2024 to define the parameters of the study and again in July to review the preliminary data. A final meeting was held with the JNAC in August to make final decisions regarding the case weights and judicial needs models.

The workload assessment was conducted in two phases:

1. A *time study* in which all Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges were asked to record all case-related and non-case-related work over a one-month 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 workload assessment models incorporate sufficient time for efficient and effective case processing. The quality adjustment process included:
 - An *adequacy of time survey* asking Circuit, General District, and JDR 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,
 - Six *focus groups* conducted by NCSC including Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges,
 - Four *quality adjustments sessions* (Delphi sessions) conducted by NCSC to review and make recommendations for select case weights, and
 - A review and acceptance of the case weights by the JNAC and OES staff.

II. CASE TYPES AND EVENTS

At the JNAC's first meeting in January 2024, 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 judges in the Virginia trial 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 judge 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 Virginia OES.

Drawing from the 2017 workload assessment, the JNAC defined 14 case type categories for Circuit Court, 9 case type categories for General District Court, and 10 case type categories for JDR District Court, listed in Figures 1 – 3. A more detailed description of the case types can be found in Appendices A - C.

Figure 1: Circuit Court Case Types

1	Felony (less complex)
2	Felony (more complex)
3	Misdemeanor
4	Other Criminally Related Matters
5	Administrative Law
6	Other Domestic and Family - Level 1 (more complex)
7	Other Domestic and Family - Level 2 (less complex)
8	General Civil - Level 1 (more complex)
9	General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity)
10	General Civil - Level 3 (less complex)
11	Miscellaneous (civil)
12	Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 1 (more complex)
13	Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex)
14	Protective Order

Figure 2: General District Court Case Types

1	Traffic Infraction/Civil Violation
2	Misdemeanor
3	Felony
4	Garnishment
5	Landlord /Tenant
6	General Civil
7	Protective Orders
8	Civil Commitments
9	Other

Figure 3: JDR District Court Case Types

1	Child Dependency
2	Child in Need of Services/Supervision
3	Custody and Visitation
4	Juvenile Miscellaneous
5	Delinquency
6	Traffic
7	Adult Criminal
8	Protective Orders
9	Support/Desertion
10	Other

Tasks and Activities

Circuit, General District, and JDR 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges is provided in Figure 4. The non-case-related activities are provided in Figure 5. A more detailed description of the case-related and non-case-related activities can be found in Appendices D and E, respectively.

The workload assessment model is based on a uniform amount of time Circuit, General District, and JDR 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 workload assessment model, so knowing how much time is spent on both case-related and non-case-related work is essential.

Figure 4: Circuit, General District, and JDR District Judges Case-Related Activities

1	Pre-Disposition/ Pre-Trial Court Activities
2	Non-Trial/ Uncontested Disposition
3	Bench Trial/ Contested Disposition
4	Jury Trial
5	Post-Trial/ Post-Disposition
6	Specialty Dockets

Non-Case-Related Events

Work that is not related to a particular case before the court, such as court administration, committee meetings, travel, and professional education, is also an essential part of the workday. To compile a detailed profile of Virginia 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, General District Court, and JDR District judges (Figure 5). To simplify the task of completing the time study forms and aid in the validation of the time study data, vacation and other leave, lunch and breaks, and time spent filling out time study forms were included as non-case-related events.

Figure 5: Circuit, General District, and JDR District Judge Non-Case-Related Activities

1	Non-Case-Related Administration
2	Judicial Education and Training
3	Search Warrants
4	General Legal Research
5	Committees, Other Meetings, and Related Work
6	Community Activities/ Outreach
7	Travel
8	Vacation/ Sick Leave/ Holiday
9	Lunch and Breaks
10	Time Study Data Reporting & Entry

III. TIME STUDY

The time study phase of the workload assessment measured current practice—the amount of time Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges currently take to process cases of each type, as well as time spent on non-case-related work. During the time study, all Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges were asked to track their working time by case type and event. Separately, the OES provided a three-year average of the number 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 one-month period from April 8 through May 8, 2024 for Circuit Court judges and April 22 through May 22, 2024 for General District and JDR District Court judges, judges 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 online data entry site that 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 6, 395 of 425 expected Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges fully participated in the time study, for an overall participation rate of 93%. This level of participation ensured sufficient data to develop an accurate and reliable profile of current practice in the Virginia trial courts.

Figure 6: Time Study Participation Rates

	Expected Count	Actual	Participation Rate
Circuit Judges	167	158	95%
General District Judges	126	116	92%
JDR District Judges	132	121	92%
Total	425	395	93%

¹ Filings for 2019 through 2023 were provided for a comparison of pre-COVID and post-COVID numbers. However, the filings between the years did not fluctuate greatly, so the decision was made to use an average of the most recent 3 years of filings, which provides the most current and accurate reflection of the number of cases in the Virginia trial courts.

Caseload Data

To translate the time study data into the average amount of time spent on each type of case (preliminary case weights), it was first necessary to determine the number of individual cases of each type that are filed annually. The Virginia OES provided filing data for calendar years 2019 through 2023 for each of the case type categories for all three levels of court. The caseload data for fiscal years 2021, 2022, and 2023 were then averaged to provide an annual count of filings within each case type category.¹ Using a three-year average rather than the caseload data for a single year minimizes the potential for any temporary fluctuations in caseloads to influence the case weights.

In the Circuit Court, a court may authorize the clerk to issue concealed handgun permits, without judicial review, to applicants who have submitted complete applications, for whom the criminal history records check does not indicate a disqualification and, after consulting with either the sheriff or police department of the county or city, about which application there are no outstanding questions or issues.² In Circuits where the clerk has been authorized to issue the concealed handgun permits, this results in little to no judicial work on these cases. To account

²<https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title18.2/chapter7/section18.2-308.04/>

for the reduced judicial work in these Circuits, an adjustment was made to reduce the 3-year average filings for just these cases by 65%. This adjustment resulted in the total 3-year average filings for miscellaneous civil (where concealed handgun permits are counted) being reduced from 180,218 to 133,428 and more accurately reflects the actual number of these cases that judges handle.

Figure 7 provides an example to illustrate the calculations for adjusting the number of concealed handgun permit cases in the First Judicial Circuit.

Figure 7: Example -- Calculating Adjusted Concealed Handgun Permit Cases for the First Judicial Circuit

Total 3-Year Average Concealed Handgun Permit Cases, First Judicial Circuit	4,116		
		<i>Multiply by</i>	x
Sixty-five Percent			0.65
Sixty-five Percent of Concealed Handgun Permit Cases	2,675		
<hr/>			
Total 3-Year Average Miscellaneous Civil Cases	5,834		
		<i>Subtract</i>	-
Sixty-five Percent of Concealed Handgun Permit Cases	2,675		
		<i>Equals</i>	=
Total 3-Year Average Miscellaneous Civil Cases less 65% of Concealed Handgun Permit Cases	3,159		

Preliminary Case Weights

The workload assessment model accounts for the fact that case types vary in complexity and require different amounts of judge time and attention. Relying solely on the sheer number of cases to assess the demands placed on judges 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, General District, and JDR 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges on each case type during the data collection period (the time was aggregated by case type for each court level), (2) dividing the total amount of time for each case type by 23 (the number of working 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges are expected to work in a year (the year value), which yields the annual amount of work time on each case type, 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 (CY2021, 2022, and 2023). This result provides a picture of the average amount of case-related time currently spent by all Circuit General District, and JDR District Court judges in the Virginia trial courts on each of the identified case types. Figure 8 illustrates the calculations for determining the preliminary case weight for other criminally related cases for Circuit Court judges.

Figure 8: Example -- Calculating Annualized Minutes and Preliminary Case Weight for Circuit Court Judges Other Criminally Related Matters Cases

Other Criminally Related Cases- Total Minutes Recorded During Data Collection Period	28,820		
		<i>Divide by</i>	÷
Work Days of Data Collection Period	23		
Average Statewide Minutes per Day Working on Other Criminally Related Cases	1,253		
		<i>Multiply by</i>	X
Total Judge Working Days per Year	214		
		<i>Equals</i>	=
Annualized Minutes for Other Criminally Related Cases	268,151		
<hr/>			
Developing Preliminary Case Weight			
Annualized Minutes for Other Criminally Related Cases	268,151		
		<i>Divide by</i>	÷
3-Year Average Filings	13,929		
		<i>Equals</i>	=
Preliminary Case Weight (minutes)	19.25		

Based on the time study, Circuit Court judges spend a combined total of 268,151 minutes of case-related time on other criminally related cases annually. Dividing that time by the 3-year average number of other criminally related cases filed (13,929) yields a preliminary case weight of 19.25 minutes, or 19 minutes rounded to a whole number. Specialty Docket time was recorded as an activity during the time study. However, due to the unique nature of these dockets, the JNAC opted to have a case weight developed specifically for specialty dockets. The case weight was developed by dividing the total time entered during the time study for the specialty docket activity (annualized) by the current number of active participants.

Figures 9, 10, and 11 show the complete set of preliminary case weights for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges.

Figure 9: Circuit Judges Preliminary Case Weights

Case Type	Preliminary Case Weight (in minutes)
Felony (less complex)	43
Felony (more complex)	5,262
Misdemeanor	6
Other Criminally Related Matters	19
Administrative Law	112
Other Domestic and Family - Level 1 (more complex)	118
Other Domestic and Family - Level 2 (less complex)	24
General Civil - Level 1 (more complex)	1,161
General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity)	103
General Civil - Level 3 (less complex)	45
Miscellaneous (civil)	3
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 1 (more complex)	119
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex)	19
Protective Order	86
Specialty Dockets	275

Figure 10: General District Judges Preliminary Case Weights

Case Type	Preliminary Case Weight (in minutes)
Traffic Infraction/Civil Violation	2.9
Misdemeanor	6.5
Felony	20.1
Garnishment	1.0
Landlord /Tenant	6.4
General Civil	6.5
Protective Orders	10.0
Civil Commitments	0.2
Other	2.0
Specialty Dockets	524.7

Figure 11: Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Judges Preliminary Case Weights

Case Type	Preliminary Case Weight (in minutes)
Child Dependency	46
Child in Need of Services/Supervision	116
Custody and Visitation	24
Juvenile Miscellaneous	49
Delinquency	41
Traffic	14
Adult Criminal	18
Protective Orders	13
Support/Desertion	20
Other	9
Specialty Dockets	979

IV. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

The preliminary case weights generated during the time study measure the amount of time Circuit, General District, and JDR 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges over six 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, General District, and JDR District Court judges were asked to complete a web-based adequacy of time survey in June of 2024. Judges were asked to respond to several questions related to the data collection period and their current workload. Respondents were also asked to identify any obstacles that negatively impact case processing times. The survey was completed by 53% of Circuit Court judges, 57% of General District Court judges, and 61% of JDR District Court judges. Appendix F 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 six separate focus group sessions remotely between July 22-24, 2024. Two sessions were held for each judicial group: Circuit Court, General District, and JDR District judges. The focus group findings are detailed within this summary, categorized by each of the three different groups.

The focus groups provided an opportunity for the NCSC team to obtain more detailed explanations of the adequacy of time survey results from each focus group and for judges to share any additional thoughts or concerns

regarding their workload. A total of 36 judges participated in the focus groups: 12 Circuit judges, 11 General District judges, and 13 Juvenile and Domestic Relations judges. The focus group findings and adequacy of time survey data were also presented to the JNAC and Delphi groups to provide information to base potential case weight adjustments on.

Focus Group Themes and Adequacy of Time Survey Findings

Was the data collection period typical?

Circuit Court: Judges in both Circuit Court focus groups indicated the work, and workload was not typical during the data collection period. Several judges noted there was no recovery court held during the time study. One concern raised by some of the judges was that a conference for Commonwealth's Attorneys occurred during the time study, which resulted in no large criminal cases being held during the week of the conference. To compensate for this, judges heard more civil cases than usual. Several other judges stated that the data collection period was typical and reflective of their workload.

General District Court: During the time study, one judge reported they were working to establish a behavioral health docket, which meant more non-case related work than usual in the form of after-hours meetings and work. Another judge noted that the rotation period changed during the time study so one court was busier than usual. However, the other judges felt the time study period was mostly typical.

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court: Judges in the JDR District focus groups stated

that there were some conferences during the time study. The study also occurred during spring break, which meant some attorneys were out of the office, leading to more continuances. The judges noted that court is often cyclical with certain times busier than others (e.g., holidays, before school starts, when tax refunds are received). Some judges felt that the study period did not capture contested cases, however, the majority stated that they handled both contested and uncontested cases during the time study.

Adequacy of Time Survey: The survey results reflected that half of the Circuit Court judges found the data collection period to be typical while 63% of General District Court judges and 56% of Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court judges agreed it was typical. Survey results indicated the time period was different from a normal month, but the reasons why varied. Some respondents stated that there were fewer criminal cases, and no jury trials held while others said there were more criminal cases and more jury trials during the time study. Some judges also stated that the civil docket was lighter than usual, but others said they had more civil cases than normal.

In Circuit Court, was time recorded to the appropriate case type according to the instructions provided?

In addition to being asked about the data collection period, at the request of the JNAC, Circuit Court judges were asked if they recorded their time for felony (less and more complex), general civil (levels 1-3) and probate/wills and trusts case types based on the definitions provided in the study instructions or if they

recorded time based on their own definitions of these case types. Responses varied from the two Circuit Court focus groups with some judges indicating they referred to the definitions provided, while others indicated they used their own definitions as they found the two definitions for the felony confusing. They added that as a result, data entry was likely inconsistent among the judges for the felony case types. One focus group suggested that the two felony case types should be combined to a single felony case type.

Was travel during the time study period typical?

Circuit Court: Both groups indicated that travel time during the time study was representative of typical work-related travel.

General District Court: Reactions were slightly mixed among this group, with most indicating travel was typical during the data collection period. However, a few judges stated that they typically travel more or less than they did during the data collection period.

Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court: Judges in these groups stated that some travel may not have been reported, such as conducting a detention hearing in another courthouse where the travel was not reimbursable. Another judge indicated being confused about which travel was to be recorded. However, overall the group agreed that their travel was typical.

Adequacy of Time Survey: The survey results reflected that the majority of Circuit Court (84%), General District Court (88%), and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court (75%) judges found travel during the data collection was

typical. Those judges who thought it was atypical indicated there was more or less travel than usual, and more travel due to a conference or a meeting.

Was there work performed during the time study that did not get reported?

Circuit Court: Circuit Court judges reported that non-case related work, especially search warrants, administrative work and work that was performed outside of normal hours, especially weekend work, often went unreported as the judges did not track the time or neglected to enter the time. Others stated that they did not record all their time spent on legal research and writing opinions.

General District Court: All General District judges reported that there was time that did not get reported during the time study as they found it difficult to track all their work or would forget to track their work. Much of the unreported work was non-case related work, such as research or discussions with other judges. Judges reported it was much more difficult to track the work that occurred outside of court due to interruptions and also to track non-case related work.

JDR District Court: Juvenile and Domestic Relations judges stated that work performed on days the judge was off, done in another office, or work that was performed outside of the office was not always recorded. Judges believed that the time study was not able to capture how emotionally overwhelming it can be to hear cases and that decision fatigue should be taken into account. One judge suggested that every 50 minutes, judges should take a 10-minute break for self-care.

Adequacy of Time Survey: Approximately one third of the judges indicated they performed work that was not reported or recorded in the data collection tool during the study period. Most of the unreported work included administrative work and work that was done after hours and/or at home.

Sufficient time to complete all work?

Circuit Court: Focus group members indicated that there is a general ebb and flow of work where some weeks have a heavier workload than others. Overall, judges felt rushed or felt there was not enough time to complete their work. Judges also state that there has been an increase in probation violations and more jury trials are being held compared to previous years, increasing their workload. The judges also noted that they lack the time to write opinions.

General District Court: The judges in both focus groups reported their primary focus is on completing their court dockets. They have little time for administrative issues and find it difficult to engage in efforts to move their court forward through policies or new initiatives. While they may be able to complete their work, judges stated that they are working through lunch and are unable to take time off.

JDR District Court: Judges reported having to work through lunch breaks to complete their work and feeling rushed in their decision-making, therefore not able to give each case the attention it deserves. They would like more time to address each case fully and consider all of the facts when reaching decisions. They also felt that they do not have sufficient time in chambers to prepare for cases or attend meetings.

Adequacy of Time Survey: Survey responses varied from the responses shared by focus group participants regarding the perceived sufficiency of time with 61% (54 judges) of Circuit Court judges that responded to the survey stating that they often or almost always have enough time to get their work done, and 87% (77 judges) felt they sometimes, often, or almost always have time to complete their work. General District Court judges were even higher with 87% (63 judges) stating that they often or almost always have enough time to get their work done, and 97% (72 judges) felt they sometimes, often, or almost always have time to complete their work. JDR District Court judges were similar to General District Court judges indicating that 77% (63 judges) felt they almost always or often have enough time and 96% (78 judges) felt they sometimes, often, or almost always have sufficient time to complete their work.

Obstacles

Circuit Court: The following obstacles were noted for Circuit judges: a lack of law clerks, a heavy volume of cases that have extensive exhibits, interruptions, attorney availability, continuance requests, technology, such as WebEx, regional housing of inmates (as opposed to local housing), and judicial assignment methods.

General District Court: The following obstacles were noted for General District judges: the lack of a duty judge who could handle certain issues while other judges are in court, understaffed and underpaid clerks' offices resulting in turnover, uneven work allocation between judges, technical issues, lack of both American Sign

Language and non-English speaking interpreters, and increased case complexity.

JDR District Court: The following obstacles were noted for Juvenile and Domestic Relations judges: segmented dockets, multiple logins for various applications, having to provide remote hearing technical assistance, availability of in-person interpreters, and a lack of attorneys and guardians ad litem (GALs).

Adequacy of Time Survey: In the survey, judges reported that heavy workloads, high volume of cases, uneven allocation of duties, lack of resources, not having law clerks, and a lack of judges, staff, and attorneys were all identified as obstacles that impede their ability to process cases.

Non-Case-Related and Travel Time

In an effort to determine an appropriate average of non-case-related time and time for work-related travel, focus group participants were asked to provide an average amount of time they believe they spend on non-case related work and on work related travel.

Circuit Court: Judges were hesitant to estimate non-case related time as it varies by week and may depend on the number of meetings scheduled in a given time period. Chief judges have more non-case related time and, as a result, may take a lighter caseload to compensate for the extra administrative responsibilities. The amount of judicial travel varies by judge as not all judges travel as part of their work. However, one judge reported traveling 45 minutes to an hour daily.

General District Court: There was significant variation in non-case related time between chief judges and non-chief judges. Chief judges reported anywhere from 10-15 hours per week of non-case related time whereas non-chief judges reported anywhere from 3-7 hours per week. The amount of time spent traveling depends on when and where the judge is needed or requested.

JDR District Court: Like the other two court levels, Juvenile and Domestic Relations judges stated that chief judges incur more administrative time than non-chief judges. The judges suggested at least an hour to 90 minutes per day for non-case related time was needed. Judges reported traveling anywhere from 2 hours per week to 3.5 hours per week for travel.

Specialty Dockets

At the request of the JNAC, focus group participants were asked if different types of specialty dockets take longer to process.

Circuit Court: One group stated that recovery court is more intensive than behavioral health court. However, the majority of judges indicated that the length of a specialty court docket depends more on the number of participants in the court than the type of specialty docket.

General District Court: Both focus groups indicated different dockets take more time than others but in general, this is because of the number of participants. It was suggested that some dockets should be grouped by the number of participants. However, it was noted that one specialty docket judge does not work harder than another. The consensus was that the more

participants on the docket, the longer the court session will take.

JDR District Court: Like Circuit Court and General District Court judges, the judges in both focus groups stated that the amount of time depends mostly on the number of participants. However, the type of docket can also impact the time takes. For example, the behavioral health docket takes longer to hear than other specialty dockets.

Case Complexity

Focus group participants were also asked how the increased complexity of cases has affected judicial workload as compared to the 2017 workload assessment.

Circuit Court: Legislative changes impacting criminal jury cases wherein the court must now ascertain the extent of punishment unless the accused has requested that the jury ascertain punishment are now resulting in more jury trial requests, as well as lengthier jury trials. Legislation impacting probation violations has resulted in more probation violation hearings per defendant.³ Another judge noted that legislation enacted in 2020 regarding deferred disposition in criminal cases (§19.2-298.02) has resulted in greater case complexity for those cases that are tried.

General District Court: Body-worn camera evidence has lengthened all driving while intoxicated cases and also can result in more continuances to allow for extra discovery time. Legislative changes have created more complexity in unlawful detainer cases. As the Circuit Court judges indicated, legislative changes impacting probation violations and deferred dispositions are resulting in more violations and cases taking longer. Cases involving interpreters have also impacted case complexity and are taking longer. Remote hearings, which are allowed in civil cases and arraignments, result in longer hearings due to technical issues and document sharing. In criminal cases, competency and restoration of competency issues have increased case processing times; judges spend more time reading reports. There is an entire docket for tracking competency cases in at least one court.

JDR District Court: Case complexity has increased with more electronic evidence, such as text and social media posts, and forensic evaluations of phone and computers. Judges are also seeing more body-worn camera evidence introduced, which takes longer to set up in a courtroom. They are also seeing more discovery motions filed and more hearings that have to be held as a result of the body-worn camera evidence. Courts with new public defender offices have had more cases go to trial and more hearings. There are more contested cases, and the custody, visitation, and child support cases have more complex discovery disputes.

³ <https://legacylis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?212+sum+HB2038>

Staff Shortages

Focus group participants were asked how staffing shortages, both within the court and with outside agencies, impact workloads.

Circuit Court: The shortage in the sheriff's offices has resulted in an inability to run more than one courtroom per day and may result in road patrol deputies providing courtroom security who are not trained to do so. Clerks are underpaid, which affects retention, leading to vacancies, the need to fill positions, and the need to train new hires. Scheduling cases that require the attendance of staff in Department of Forensic Science can be a struggle as they are often scheduled to appear in other jurisdictions.

General District Court: General District judges stated that there were instances when they had to start court late due to the lack of clerks. A lack of staff at the sheriff's offices has led to delays in virtual arraignments, lack of staffing in courtrooms (security and fingerprinting), and delays in transporting defendants from the jail to court.

Judges also mentioned that a lack of staff in the Commonwealth's Attorneys' offices has resulted in court delays. Some of the Commonwealth's Attorneys do not represent the state on certain misdemeanors because they lack sufficient staff.⁴ One court recently had to continue an entire docket because there was just one

prosecutor who was tied up in a jury trial in another courtroom. There is also a shortage of attorneys on the court-appointed list, which causes delays if no one is available to represent the defendant.

JDR District Court: A lack of bailiffs, sheriff's office staff, and clerk turnover were most noted as impacting court operations and workloads. Judges often must review bond orders to ensure they are written consistently with their findings. They also have to train deputies on courtroom duty expectations. They also stated that there are court delays if a bailiff is not available to provide security or to transport inmates.

Survey of Court Staff

In addition to the adequacy of time survey and the focus groups, NCSC staff conducted a survey of the chief judges in Circuit Court to determine the availability of law clerks, judicial assistants, staff attorneys, and court administrators in each of the circuits and to summarize their primary responsibilities. Statewide information on the number of law clerks, judicial assistants, staff attorneys, and court administrators (not including court clerks) currently in the Circuit Courts is not readily available because many of these positions are locally funded. Data from the survey shows a total of 90 law clerks, 121.2 judicial assistants, 10 staff attorneys, and 35 court administrators statewide.

⁴ Constitutionally, Commonwealth's Attorneys are not required to prosecute misdemeanors, and the state compensation board does not provide staffing

resource to prosecute them. Where they are prosecuted, local funds are used.

Law clerks' responsibilities are primarily case-related. They assist the judges with trial preparation by identifying key arguments and issues in legal filings, compiling relevant case materials and organizing exhibits. Law clerks also conduct legal research, draft opinions, review divorce decrees and adoptions, and prepare memos for civil and criminal cases summarizing facts, legal issues, and relevant case law. Other duties include assisting with scheduling, serving as a point of contact for attorneys, training interns and new law clerks, providing courtroom technology assistance, coordinating Web-Ex meetings, reviewing inmate mail from the jail, and keeping up to date on new laws and legislation.

Judicial assistants are primarily used for docket management, scheduling, and document review and preparation. They assist with preparing orders and reviewing opinion letters, work in the courtroom as a clerk or court reporter, if needed, and deal with issues related to the needs of the jury and multi-jurisdictional grand jury. Judicial assistants also perform a variety of non-case-specific work such as preparing and maintaining the budget, ordering office supplies, updating code books, and conducting general legal research.

Staff Attorneys conduct research and prepare letter opinions and orders for complex cases. They also review and research civil motions and conduct research during the course of a trial. Staff attorneys assist law clerks with their duties and are also responsible for hiring, training, and supervising interns.

Court administrators are similar to judicial assistants with one of their primary duties being scheduling and docket management. They also supervise the judicial assistants and serve as their back up when needed. Other case-related work includes reviewing and formatting opinion letters, processing designations for recusal cases, and case-specific research. Court administrators also perform many tasks related to office management such as personnel management and training of staff, budgeting and resource allocation, obtaining substitute and retired judges when needed, acting as a liaison with other courts, OES, and the clerk's office, and providing general customer service to the public.

The number of these positions by jurisdiction is provided in Appendix G.

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 facilitated a series of Delphi sessions in July and August 2024, with judges in Circuit, General District, and JDR District Courts. A panel was held with Circuit Court judges for a select subset of case types, including felony (less and more complex), specialty dockets, general civil - level 2 (intermediate complexity), and probate/wills and trusts - level 2 (less complex). The panel of General District Court reviewed the

case weights for civil commitments and specialty dockets and the JDR District Court judges reviewed case weights for protective orders and specialty dockets.

The Delphi panels provided opportunities for NCSC staff to hear from judges how much time it takes to handle the identified types of cases from each of their perspectives. The sessions included a systematic review for the Delphi participants to make recommendations and provide specific rationales to determine the appropriate time for the case weights and come to a consensus that the adjusted case weights are reasonable.

Following the July meeting, focus groups, and Delphi sessions the NCSC, JNAC, and OES staff met for the final time on August 14, 2024. The group discussed the recommended case weight adjustments that resulted from the Delphi panels and reviewed the non-case-related time for Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges. After reviewing all the data and recommendations, the committee accepted and approved all of the adjustments made to case weights in the Delphi sessions with the exception of the Protective Order case weight in JDR District Court. The JNAC accepted one of the two recommendations for Protective Orders.

The following case types were reviewed by the Delphi panels and the JNAC.

Circuit Court Judges

Felony (more and less complex): Delphi panel participants recommended combining the felony (more complex) and the felony (less complex) into one case weight due to confusion on which types of case were more or less complex. During

the data collection period, the instructions changed and were not clear on how to record the time for the different felonies. This resulted in a case weight of 57 minutes for all felonies.

Specialty Dockets: Delphi participants recommended adding 90 minutes to 100% of specialty docket cases to account for time not being accurately recorded during the data collection period and the data collection period not being reflective of the time spent on specialty dockets. Some jurisdictions did not have a specialty docket during the data collection period. Others had more participants than normal and therefore spent less time per individual than they typically would have. After hours work, which is common due to “unusual” activities that may happen related to specialty dockets, was not recorded by every judge. Additionally, during the time study period, recovery court judges were moved from their specialty docket to assist with the higher than usual number of jury trials. This adjustment resulted in a new case weight of 365 minutes.

General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity): Delphi participants made no change to this case weight. The group felt this number was accurate, stating that some of the case types in this category can be very time-consuming.

Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex): No change was made to this case weight either. The group felt this number was accurate, stating that the prep time in these cases is minimal and they typically only allow 15 minutes on the docket for them.

General District Court Judges

Civil Commitments: Delphi participants recommended eliminating this case type and moving the time to another case type since these cases are heard by special justices. Judges rarely hear these cases, and the majority of judicial work is administrative. While a .2 minute case weight is likely accurate for General District Court judges, it misrepresents the complexity and significance of these cases that are heard by special justices who were not included in the study. The time and 3-year average filings for civil commitments were moved to the general civil case type category, resulting in a slight decrease in the general civil case weight from 6.5 to 5.5.

Specialty Dockets: Participants recommended adding 99 minutes to 100% of specialty docket cases to account for administrative work not being consistently recorded during the data collection period and time for the specialty docket court “start-up” process which was not captured during the data collection period. This will also allow additional time to capture the work that occurs outside of the court session, such as coordinating and following up with outside agencies and partners. This resulted in a new case weight of 624 minutes.

JDR District Court Judges

Protective Orders: The JDR District Court Delphi made several recommendations to adjust the protective order case weights. The first was to add 20 minutes in 65% of the cases to allow more time for the second protective order hearing in these cases which the panel felt was not fully captured during the data collection period. The

JNAC declined to accept this recommendation noting that many courts conducted the second permanent hearing during the time study period and this time was accurately captured in the time study and therefore reflected in the case weight. The Delphi group also recommended an adjustment for the increase in interpreter usage. However, since the workload assessment model already includes a jurisdictional-specific adjustment for the increase in interpreter usage, this recommendation was not accepted. Lastly, the group recommended adding 45 minutes in 35% of the cases to allow more time for explaining orders to litigants and to process and complete orders. This addition resulted in a new case weight of 29 minutes.

Specialty Dockets: The Delphi group made no change to this case weight. The group felt the time was representative of a specialty docket case.

Non-Case-Related Time

Based on the comments in the adequacy of time survey and in the focus groups, in addition to the case weight adjustments, the JNAC also approved an increase of 20% for non-case-related work for Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges to allow more time for administrative work and for non-case related work, such as search warrants, research or discussions with other judges, and work performed outside of normal hours, especially weekend work, which was not consistently reported by all judges during the time study period and therefore not accurately reflective of the amount of time judges spend on non-case-related work each day.

The final case weights are shown in Figures 12, 13, and 14. The case weights, along with the number of cases filed, are critical factors in the calculation of the need for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges. These calculations are the focus of the next section of this report.

Figure 12: Circuit Court Judge Final Case Weights

Case Type	Final Case Weight (in minutes)
Felony (combined)	57
Misdemeanor	6
Other Criminally Related Matters	19
Administrative Law	112
Other Domestic and Family - Level 1 (more complex)	118
Other Domestic and Family - Level 2 (less complex)	24
General Civil - Level 1 (more complex)	1,161
General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity)	103
General Civil - Level 3 (less complex)	45
Miscellaneous (civil)	3
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 1 (more complex)	119
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex)	19
Protective Order	86
Specialty Dockets	365

Figure 13: General District Court Judge Final Case Weights

Case Type	Final Case Weight (in minutes)
Traffic Infraction/Civil Violation	2.9
Misdemeanor	6.5
Felony	20.1
Garnishment	1.0
Landlord /Tenant	6.4
General Civil, including Civil Commitments	5.5
Protective Orders	10.0
Other	2.0
Specialty Dockets	624.0

Figure 14: JDR District Court Judge Final Case Weights

Case Type	Final Case Weight (in minutes)
Child Dependency	46
Child in Need of Services/Supervision	116
Custody and Visitation	24
Juvenile Miscellaneous	49
Delinquency	41
Traffic	14
Adult Criminal	18
Protective Orders	29
Support/Desertion	20
Other	9
Specialty Dockets	979

VI. CALCULATING THE NEED FOR CIRCUIT, GENERAL DISTRICT, AND JDR DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

In the workload assessment model, three factors contribute to the calculation of judge 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 judge has available for case-related work on an annual basis. The relationship among the filings, case weights, and year value is expressed in Figure 15.

Figure 15: Virginia Judge 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) judges needed to handle the workload.

Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court Judge Day Values

The judge day values represent the amount of time each Circuit, General District, and JDR 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 time study and the previous studies. The committees for the 2013 and 2017 workload assessments adopted two separate day values: one for single jurisdictions and the other for multi- jurisdictions. The different day values in the previous studies were adopted to account for the variation in travel that exists between judges in the multi-jurisdiction circuits and districts and those in single jurisdiction circuits and districts. Using this same logic, the JNAC for the current study adopted two separate values for travel for each of the three court levels. The time study data indicated that judges in Circuit Court in single jurisdiction circuits traveled an average of 3.8 minutes per day per judge, while judges in multi-

jurisdiction circuits traveled an average of 18 minutes per day per judge. In General District Court, the average travel per day per judge for a single jurisdiction district was 3.2 minutes and in multi- jurisdiction districts, the travel was 35.5 minutes per day. JDR District Court judges in single jurisdiction districts traveled an average of 9.1 minutes per judge per day and in multi jurisdiction districts, they traveled an average of 36.5 minutes per day.

For non-case-related time, the JNAC agreed that there is no variation in the time spent on non-case-related work in single versus multi-jurisdiction jurisdictions. Time study data indicated that judges in all three court levels spend an average of just over an hour per day on non-case-related work (72 minutes per judge per day in Circuit Court and 71 minutes per day per judge in in General District and JDR District Court). However, based on the adequacy of time survey results and the focus group findings, the JNAC approved an increase of 20% for non-case-related work for Circuit, General District, and JDR District judges to allow more time for administrative work and other non-case related work increasing Circuit Court judges’ non-case-related time to 86 minutes per day per judge and increasing General District and JDR District judges’ to 85 minutes per day per judge. The adjustments result in a case-related day that equates to 6.0 hours for Circuit judges in a single jurisdiction circuit and 5.77 hours for Circuit judges in a multi- jurisdiction circuit, 6.03 hours for General District judges in a single jurisdiction district and 5.49 hours for General District judges in a multi- jurisdiction district, and 5.93 hours for JDR District judges in a single jurisdiction district and 5.47 hours for JDR District judges in a multi-jurisdiction district.

Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court Judge Year Value

The judge year value was determined by JNAC with input from the NCSC project team. The 2013 and 2017 studies used a year value of 216 days available per year for judges to process cases. However since 2017, the Virginia trial courts have been granted an additional official holiday, so the JNAC adjusted the year value accordingly to 214 days. The year value was calculated by subtracting weekend days, holidays, time related to illness, vacation time, and time spent professional development and CLEs from the calendar year. The calculations are shown in Figure 16.

Figure 16: Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court Judge Year

	Days
Total Days per Year	365
Weekends	-104
Holidays	-14
Combined vacation, sick, other leave and professional development/CLEs	-33
Case-Related Days per Year	214

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 17, 18, and 19 show the calculation of the year value for multi jurisdiction and single jurisdiction Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judges.

Figure 17: Circuit Judge Case-Specific Year Values, Multi and Single Jurisdiction

Single Jurisdiction Circuit					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	6.00	x	60	= 77,081

Multi-Jurisdiction Circuit					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	5.77	x	60	= 74,053

Figure 18: General District Judge Case-Specific Year Values, Multi and Single Jurisdiction

Single Jurisdiction General District					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	6.03	x	60	= 77,427

Multi-Jurisdiction General District					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	5.49	x	60	= 70,506

Figure 19: JDR District Judge Case-Specific Year Values, Multi and Single Jurisdiction

Single Jurisdiction JDR District					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	5.93	x	60	= 76,158

Multi-Jurisdiction JDR District					
Judge Year (days)		Judge Day (hours)		Minutes per hour	Year Value (minutes)
214	x	5.47	x	60	= 70,287

Increase in Interpreter Usage Adjustment

A key component incorporated into this study is the accurate measurement of the judicial work associated with language interpretation services. Since the workload assessment was conducted in 2017, the use of interpreters has increased across the state.

In 2017, during the time study, judges tracked both the number and duration of hearings involving interpreters and those that did not. The 2017 time study results revealed that use of interpreter services varied by court level and by jurisdiction. Overall, in Circuit Court, about 1.23 percent of the total hearings held involved an interpreter and, on average, took 1.5 times as long as hearings without an interpreter. In General District Court, 2.19 percent of hearings involved an interpreter and hearings with an interpreter took 2.25 times as long as hearings without. In JDR District Court, 3.79 percent of hearings involved an interpreter, and these hearings took 1.5 times as long as hearings without an interpreter.

During the current time study, judges were asked to record whether a particular activity involved the use of an interpreter. In addition to the data from the time study, OES provided counts of interpreter service events by jurisdiction for calendar years 2019 through 2023.⁵

NCSC staff annualized the time from the time study that involved an interpreter and divided that time by the 3-year average filings to determine the percentage of cases that involved

an interpreter. As a comparison, NCSC also divided the total 2023 interpreter events by the 3-year average filings. Both methods were consistent with each other. Therefore, NCSC recommended to the JNAC and OES that the most recent year of interpreter events be used to determine the percentage of cases that involve the use of an interpreter for this study and for future updates to the judicial need models.

The current data show similar findings to those from the 2017 study with regard to interpreter usage. The use of interpreters varies by court level and jurisdiction, and the data also verified that the use of interpreters has increased since 2017. In the current study, in Circuit Court 1.71 percent of cases involved an interpreter compared to 1.23 percent in 2017. In General District Court, interpreter usage increased from 2.19 percent to 3.10 percent, and JDR District Court interpreter usage increased from 3.79 percent to 5.5 percent. Appendix H shows the percentage of interpreter usage for each of the court levels by jurisdiction. Jurisdictions that are bold represent counties or cities that have an interpreter usage that is above the statewide average.

Since interpreter usage took place during the time study, the case weights developed from the time study data include an average amount of time spent by judges handling cases that involve an interpreter. In 2017, an interpreter multiplier was applied in situations where the proportion of interpreter cases exceeded the statewide average (i.e., the circuits and districts in

⁵ The 2019 - 2023 interpreter service events include staff interpreter, phone interpreters, contract interpreters, and interpreters used for the hearing impaired.

Appendix H where the percentage of hearings with interpreter is in bold). Following the same logic for the current study, the multiplier (1.5 for Circuit and JDR District Courts and 2.25 for General District Court) was applied to the share of judicial workload involving an interpreter in those situations where the proportion of hearings involving an interpreter is greater than the statewide average. Figure 20 provides an example of the calculation for Prince William General District Court.

Figure 20: Example – Interpreter Adjustment, Prince William General District Court

Total 2023 Service Events		6,065
	<i>Divide by</i>	÷
Total 3-year Average Filings		79,611
Percent of Cases that Involve an Interpreter		7.62%
	<i>Multiply by</i>	x
Total Workload (filings x case weights)		404,234
	<i>Equals</i>	=
Total Percent of Interpreter Workload (minutes)		30,796

Determining the Total Additional Interpreter Workload		
Amount of Additional Time Interpreter Cases Take (multiplier)		1.25
	<i>Multiply by</i>	x
Total Percent of Interpreter Workload		30,796
	<i>Equals</i>	=
Total Additional Interpreter Workload (minutes)		38,495
	<i>Add to</i>	+
Total Workload (filings x case weights)		404,234
	<i>Equals</i>	=
Total Workload including Additional Interpreter Workload (minutes)		442,729

In Prince William General District Court, the percentage of cases that involve an interpreter is 7.65 percent, which equals 30,796 minutes of the jurisdiction’s workload when an interpreter is involved. As previously noted, when an interpreter is involved in General District Court, cases take 2.25 times longer. Therefore, the 30,796 minutes of interpreter workload is multiplied by 1.25 times for a total *additional* workload of 38,495 minutes which is then added to the jurisdiction’s total workload (404,234 minutes) for an adjusted total workload of 442,729 minutes. For multi-jurisdiction circuits and districts, the new adjusted workload with the interpreter minutes is summed together for a total adjusted workload for each circuit or district.

Final Judge Need Models

Applying the adjustment for interpreter usage and the computations shown in Figures 17 – 19 above, the judicial needs models indicate a net need for **159.11** full-time equivalent (FTE) Circuit Court judges, **123.53** FTE General District Court judges, and **144.06** FTE JDR District Court judges to effectively handle the current workload.

Figures 21 - 23 show the statewide needs model for Circuit, General District, and JDR District Courts. The judge need by circuit and district can be found in Appendices I - K.⁶

⁶ In Circuit Courts, practices may vary in the docketing of indictments based on charging practices of the Commonwealth’s Attorney. The docketing of probation violations, which leads to the reinstatement of cases, may vary by clerk’s office

depending on how case numbers are assigned. Some courts enter a separate probation violation for each charge on which the defendant violated while others enter only a single probation violation covering multiple charges.

Figure 21: Circuit Court Judge Needs Model

	Final Case Weights	3-Year Average Cases Filed
Felony Combined	57	66,579
Misdemeanor	6	42,673
Other Criminally Related Matters	19	63,701
Administrative Law	112	402
Other Domestic and Family - Level 1 (more complex)	118	15,030
Other Domestic and Family - Level 2 (less complex)	24	24,300
General Civil - Level 1 (more complex)	1,161	819
General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity)	103	14,893
General Civil - Level 3 (less complex)	45	10,682
Miscellaneous (civil)	3	133,428
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 1 (more complex)	119	992
Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex)	19	5,797
Protective Order	86	1,378
Specialty Dockets	365	1,355
Total Cases		382,029
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		11,870,210
Interpreter Workload Over Statewide Average		87,674
Case-specific Work Minutes plus Interpreter Workload		11,957,884
Judge Annual Availability		96,300
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		18,404
Subtract Annual Travel Time*		3,843
Judge Annual Case-Related Availability		74,053
Judge FTE Demand		159.11

*Separate values for travel were used for single jurisdiction circuits and multi jurisdiction circuits. However, for the sake of simplicity only one value is displayed here.

Figure 23: JDR District Court Judge Needs Model

	Final Case Weights	3-Year Average Cases Filed
Child Dependency	46	18,561
Child in Need of Services/Supervision	116	3,280
Custody and Visitation	24	120,863
Juvenile Miscellaneous	49	1,713
Delinquency	41	25,390
Traffic	14	11,883
Adult Criminal	18	99,261
Protective Orders	29	59,839
Support/Desertion	20	53,275
Other	9	17,731
Specialty Dockets	979	48
Total Cases		411,844
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		10,220,387
Interpreter Workload Over Statewide Average		210,365
Case-specific Work Minutes plus Interpreter Workload		10,430,752
Judge Annual Availability		96,300
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		18,190
Subtract Annual Travel Time*		7,823
Judge Annual Case-Related Availability		70,287
Judge FTE Demand		144.06

*Separate values for travel were used for single jurisdiction districts and multi jurisdiction districts. However, for the sake of simplicity only one value is displayed here.

Figure 22: General District Court Judge Needs Model

	Final Case Weights	3-Year Average Cases Filed
Traffic Infraction/Civil Violation	2.9	591,744
Misdemeanor	6.5	385,690
Felony	20.1	80,603
Garnishment	1.0	169,150
Landlord /Tenant	6.4	92,628
General Civil with Civil Commitments	5.5	260,140
Protective Order	10.0	35,915
Other	2.0	96,789
Specialty Dockets	624.0	361
Total Cases		1,713,020
Case-specific Work Minutes (sum of WT x cases)		8,813,894
Interpreter Workload Over Statewide Average		236,494
Case-specific Work Minutes plus Interpreter Workload		9,050,388
Judge Annual Availability		96,300
Subtract Annual Non-Case-Related Time		18,190
Subtract Annual Travel Time*		7,604
Judge Annual Case-Related Availability		70,506
Judge FTE Demand		123.53

*Separate values for travel were used for single jurisdiction districts and multi jurisdiction districts. However, for the sake of simplicity only one value is displayed here.

As shown in figures 21 - 23, the judge need calculation can sometimes result in a need that contains fractional judgeships. In some instances when implied need exceeds the number of current judges, the additional workload can be handled by the current judges or a retired or substitute judge. However, at some point, the additional workload crosses a threshold that means the circuit or district needs another full-time judicial position to effectively handle the workload.

In the 2017 study, the JNAC adopted a rounding rule that was based upon the workload per judge. Workload per judge is calculated by dividing the total judge need in each circuit and district by the number of authorized judicial positions. The workload per judge is displayed in Appendices I – K for each of the circuits and districts.

In 2017, when the workload per judge was greater than or equal to 1.15 FTE, this indicated that there was a need for one or more additional judicial positions, and when the workload per judge was below .9 FTE, this indicated a need for fewer positions. Figure 24 shows the calculation for the 12th District in JDR District Court.

**Figure 24: Example – Workload per Judge
12th District, JDR District Court**

Judge FTE Demand		Current Allocated Judges	=	Workload per Judge
7.1	÷	6.0	=	1.19

In the 12th District in JDR District Court, there are currently 6 authorized and funded FTE judges. Dividing the FTE demand by the current number of allocated judges (7.1 FTE ÷ 6 FTE) results in a workload per judge of 1.19 FTE. Since workload per judge exceeds the threshold of 1.15 FTE, this suggests that a judicial position should be added to bring workload per judge below 1.15.

The rounding rule is summarized as:

Rule 1: If workload per judge > 1.15, add judges until workload per judge < 1.15

Rule 2: If workload per judge < 0.90, subtract a judge ONLY if resulting workload per judge < 1.15

The rounding rule using workload per judge was designed to provide empirical guidance as to which courts are over- or under-resourced. It also provides a means to rank jurisdictions regarding their relative need. The higher the workload per judge, the greater the need for additional resources (e.g., a court with a workload per judge of 1.36 would have a greater need for an additional judge than a court with a workload per judge of 1.18). The upper and lower thresholds are guidelines for an initial identification of courts that may need additional (or fewer) resources.

When applying the rounding rule, the judicial needs models indicate a net need for **163** full-time equivalent (FTE) Circuit Court judges, **128** FTE General District Court judges, and **143** FTE JDR District Court judges to effectively handle the current workload. Appendices I – K show the rounded judge need for each of the circuits and districts.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

The NCSC encourages the OES to consider the following recommendations regarding the ongoing use of the workload assessment model.

Recommendation 1

The NCSC recommends updating the Circuit, General District, and JDR District Court judge 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 workload assessment models presented in this report should be the starting point for determining the need for judges in the Virginia trial courts. There are qualitative issues that an objective workload assessment 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 cases involving self-represented parties; and the inadequate number of various judicial support staff (e.g., bailiffs, law clerks, court reporters). "While several of these support roles are not within the purview of the Judicial Branch, issues such as these that result in longer or shorter case processing times should be considered.

Recommendation 3

Over time, the integrity of any workload assessment model may be affected by external factors such as changes in legislation, case law, legal practice, court technology, and administrative policies. NCSC recommends that a comprehensive review of the workload assessment models should be conducted every five to seven years. This review should include a time study in which all or most Circuit, General District, and JDR 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).

G. Other Domestic and Family - Level 2 (less complex)

Adoption - ADOP	JAPL - Show Cause – JASC
Child Abuse and Neglect - Unfounded – CAN	JAPL - Temporary Detention Order – JATD
Civil Contempt – CCON	JAPL - Civil Support – JAVS
Relief of Custody – CR	Judicial Bypass – JB
Criminal Support – CS	Mental Commitment – MC
Emancipation – EP	Other – OT
Foreign Adoption – FOR A	Show Cause – SC
Involuntary Commitment – IC	Separate Maintenance Counterclaim Responsive Pleading – SCRIP
JAPL - Bond Forfeiture Show Cause – JABF	Separate Maintenance – SEP
JAPL - Criminal Support – JACS	Status Petitions – ST
JAPL - Emergency Custody Order – JAEC	Civil Support -VS
JAPL - Mental Commitment – JAMC	Uncontested Divorce – DIV
JAPL - Other – JAOT	
JAPL - Remand Support – JARS	

H. General Civil - Level 1 (more complex)

Asbestos Litigation – AL	Medical Malpractice – MED
Annexation – ANEX	Product Liability – PROD
Establish Boundaries – ESTB	Wrongful Death - WD

I. General Civil - Level 2 (intermediate complexity)

Contract Action – CNTR	Mechanic's Lien – MECH
Condemnation – COND	Termination of Mineral Rights – MIN
Correct/Error. State/Local Taxes – CTAX	Motor Vehicle – MV
Declaratory Judgment – DECL	Partition – PART
General Tort Liability – GTOR	Specific Performance – PERF
Injunction – INJ	Quiet Title - QT
Intentional Tort – ITOR	

J. General Civil - Level 3 (less complex)

Attachment – ATT	GAPL - Mechanic's Lien – GAML
Confessed Judgment – CJ	GAPL - Medical Emergency Temporary Detention Order (TDO) – GAMT
Compromise Settlement (Injury/Wrongful Death) – COMP	GAPL - Motor Carrier – GAMV
Detinue – DET	GAPL - Overweight Citation – GAOC
Delinquent Taxes - DTAX	GAPL - Other – GAOT
Ejectment – EJCT	GAPL - Emergency Protective Order (EPO) Issued – GAPE
Escheat – ESC	General District Court Appeal – GAPL
Freedom of Information – FOI	GAPL - Protection Order – GAPO
GAPL - Abstract of Judgment – GAAJ	GAPL - Preliminary Protection Order – GAPP
GAPL - Admin License Suspension – GAAL	GAPL - Petition to Restore Right to Bear Arms – GAPR
GAPL - Attachment – GAAT	GAPL - Petition – GAPT
GAPL - Bond Forfeiture (show cause) – GABF	APL - Restricted License – GARL
GAPL - Blood Test – GABT	GAPL - Tenant's Assertion – GATA
GAPL - Counterclaim – GACC	GAPL - Temporary Detention Order (TDO) – GATD
GAPL - Cross-Warrant – GACR	GAPL - Third-Party Claim – GATH
GAPL - Distress Seizure – GADS	GAPL - Unlawful Detainer – GAUD
GAPL - Detinue – GADT	GAPL - Warrant in Debt – GAWD
GAPL - Detinue Seizure – GADZ	GAPL - Zoning Violation – GAZO
GAPL - Emergency Custody Order – GAEC	Landlord/Tenant – LT
GAPL - Impoundment – GAIM	Encumber/Sell Real Estate – RE
GAPL - Jail Fee License Suspension – GAJF	Unlawful Detainer – UD
GAPL - Mental Commitment Order – GAMC	Enforce Vendor's Lien - VEND
GAPL - Medical Emergency Custody Order – GAME	
GAPL - Motion for Judgment – GAMJ	

K. Miscellaneous (civil)

Accounting – ACCT
Appointment of Church Trustee
Substitute Fiduciaries – AOCT
Amend Vital Record – AVR
Bond Forfeiture – BF
Bond Forfeiture - Appeal – BFA
Counterclaim – CC
Concealed Handgun Permit – CHP
Concealed Handgun Permit - Lost – CHPL
Concealed Handgun Permit - Name Change – CHPN
Concealed Handgun Permit - Reissue – CHPR
Contest Notice of Restriction – CNOR
Complaint – COM
Conservator of the Peace – COP
Conservator of the Peace - Revocation – COPR
Correct Orders (Default Judgment)
Change of Sex – COS, Change of Sex - Minor – COS
Cross Claim – CROS
Claim Impleading Third Party Defendant – CTP
Declare Death – DDTH
Reinstatement of Driving Privileges – DRIV
Referendum Elections – ELEC
Forfeiture of Property or Money – FORF
Garnishment – GARN
Genetic Data Privacy Violation – GDPV
Grievance Procedures – GRV
Involuntary Commitment – IC
Interdiction – INTD, Interpleader – INTP
Interrogatory Summons – INTR
Intervener – INTV
JAPL - Authorization for Restricted License – JARL
JAPL - Restricted License for Non-Support – JASL
Judicial Review – JR
Lawyer Discipline - LDIS
Law Enforcement Officer Petition – LEP
Judgment Lien (Bill to Enforce) – LIEN
Local Unconstitutional Condition – LUC
Materials Harmful to Minors – MHM
Motion to Quash – MTQ
Name Change – NC, Name Change Void – NCV
Operation of Gambling Device – OGD
Pawnbroker Application – PAWN
Petition – PET
Remove Constitutional or Appointed Officer – RCAO
Remove Electoral Board Member – REBM
Receiver – RECV
Reinstatement (General) – REIN
Relief from Registration - Sex Offender Registry – RELF
Removal – REM
Restore Driving Privilege – REST
Recognize Foreign Country Judgment – RFCJ
Restore Firearm Rights Felony – RFRF
Restore Firearm Rights Review – RFRR
Remove General Registrar – RGR
Rites of Marriage Celebrant – ROMC
Sell Land of Person Under a Disability - SELL
Order to Sever – SEVR
Special Elections – SPEC
Substantial Risk Order – SRO
Approval of Transfer of Structured Settlement – SS
Surcharge to Falsify an Accounting – SUR
Suspension of Professional License – SUSP
Teacher Licensure Decision – TLD
Transfer – TRAN
Uniform Transfer to Minors Act – UTMA
Vehicle Confiscation – VEH
Violation of Election Law – VEL
Approval of Right to be Eligible to Vote – VOTE
Workers Compensation Lien – WORK
Writ of Vacatur - WV, Expunge - XPUN

L. Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 1 (more complex)

Aid and Guidance – AID

Will Construction - WILL

Construe Will – CNST

M. Probate/Wills and Trusts - Level 2 (less complex)

Appointment of Guardian and/or Conservator –
APPT

Guardian for Minor by Court – GMCT

Reformation of Trust – REFT

Guardian/Conservator Review Hearing – GCRV

Standby Guardian and/or Conservator – STND

Guardian for Minor by Clerk – GMCL

Trust - Impress/Declare/Create - TRST

N. Protective Order

JAPL - Non-Family Abuse Protective Order – JAAP

PO Issued - Stalking/Acts of Violence – PC

JAPL - Family Abuse Protective Order – JAFP

Emergency PO – PE

JAPL - Motion to Modify Protective Order – JAMP

Preliminary Protective Order – PPO

JAPL - Emergency Protective Order Issued – JAPE

Adult Protection – PROT

JAPL - Violation of Family Abuse Protective Order
(post-conviction) – JAPS

Violation of PO – Criminal (post-conviction) – PV

APPENDIX B: GENERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

A. Traffic Infraction/Civil Violation

Animal Violation – AV	Motor Carrier – MC
Civil Violation – CV	Other – O
Infraction (Traffic including Photo Infraction/Violation) – I	Overweight – OC
	Tobacco – TB

B. Misdemeanor

Misdemeanor – M	Restricted Operators License – RL
Other – O	Zoning Violation – ZO

C. Felony

Felony - F

D. Garnishment

Garnishment – GA	Interrogatory - IN
------------------	--------------------

E. Landlord /Tenant

Tenants Assertion – TA (includes unlawful exclusions)	Unlawful Detainer – UD
	Unlawful Detainer Expungements

F. General Civil

Distress Seizure – DS	Non-Case – NC
Detinue – DT	Other – OT
Detinue Seizure – DZ	Petition-Restore Right to Bear Arms – PR
Motion for Judgment – MJ	Warrant in Debt – WD
Mechanic's Lien – ML	Emergency Substantial Risk Order - SR

G. Protective Orders

Emergency Protective Order Issued – PE	Post Conviction Order – PV
Protective Order – PO	Show Cause – SC
Preliminary Protective Order – PP	

H. Civil Commitments

Other - OT, Petition – PT

Temporary Detention Order – TD

Voluntary Commitment – V

Mental Commitment – MC

Medical Emergency Custody Order – ME

Medical Emergency Temporary Detention Order – MT

TDO/Med Emergency Unexecuted – TU

I. Other

Abstract – AJ

Admin License Suspension – AL

Attachment – AT

Order and Notice Bond Forfeiture – BF

Petition to Require Blood Test – BT

Capias – CA

Counter Claim – CC

Cross Warrant – CR, DI

Emergency Custody Order – EC

Interrogatory- Heard by a Commissioner Not Docketed – IC

Impoundment – IM

Jail Fee License Suspension – JF

Motion – MO

Show Cause – SC

Third Party Claim - TH

APPENDIX C: JDR DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CASE TYPE CATEGORIES

A. Child Dependency

Abuse and Neglect – AN

Relief of Custody – CR

Entrustment – ET

Foster Care Review – FC

Initial Foster Care – IF

Permanency Planning – PH

Child at Risk – RI

Terminate Parental Rights – TP

Voluntary Continuing Services and Support Agreement – VA

Restoration of Parental Rights – RR

B. Child in Need of Services/Supervision

Child In Need of Services – CS

Show Cause – SC

Truancy/Runaway – TR

Status – ST

C. Custody and Visitation

Capias – CA

Custody Visitation – CV

Paternity – PT

Show Cause – SC

D. Juvenile Miscellaneous

Emancipation – EP

Judicial Bypass – JB

Other – OT

Special Immigrant Juvenile Status – SI

Status - ST

E. Delinquency

Capias – CA

Felony – DF

Misdemeanor – DM (DF and DM include detention orders)

Protective Order – PC

Violation Family Abuse Protective Order (post-conviction) - PS

Violation of Protective Order (post-conviction) – PV

Show Cause – SC

F. Traffic

Civil violation – CI

Restricted Operators License – RL

Traffic – T

Curfew Violation/Status - ST

G. Adult Criminal

Bond Forfeiture – BF	Violation Family Abuse Protective Order (post-conviction) – PS
Capias – CA	Violation Protective Order (post-conviction) – PV
Felony – CF	Show Cause – SC
Misdemeanor – CM	
Protective Order (post-conviction) – PC	

H. Protective Orders

Non-Family Abuse Protective Order – AP	Emergency Substantial Risk Order – SR
Family Abuse - Protective Order – FP	Show Cause – SC
Motion - Protective Order – MP	Emergency Protective Order – PE

I. Support/Desertion

Capias – CA	Show Cause – SC
Criminal/Desertion Support – CS	Restricted License for Non-Support – SL
Juvenile/Child Support – JS	Civil/Spousal Support - VS

J. Other

Emergency Custody Order – EC	Return of Deposit – RD
Mental Commitment – MC	Remand Support – RS
Other – OT	Remand Visitation – RV
Remand Custody – RC	Temporary Detention Order – TD

APPENDIX D: CIRCUIT, GENERAL DISTRICT, AND JDR DISTRICT JUDGE CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

1. Pre-Disposition/ Pre-Trial Court Activities

Includes all on-bench and off-bench activity related to proceedings that occur prior to the trial or other dispositional proceeding, excluding work related to a jury trial. Includes all off-bench research and preparation related to pre-trial activities or all on-bench and off-bench activity that occurs prior to a proceeding that results in the entry of an appealable order, and any other work by the judge related to research, case review, or writing findings related to pre-disposition matters.

2. Non-Trial/ Uncontested Disposition

This phase is intended to capture the time spent in dispositive hearings and related work where a trial is not required (e.g., settled cases, summary judgments that fully dispose of a case, guilty pleas). The unifying factor of work in this group is that 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. Both “phases” of the disposition should be counted in this group in the time study and any other work by the judge related to research, case review, or writing findings and conclusions on non-trial dispositions.

3. Bench Trial/ Contested Disposition

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

4. Jury Trial

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

5. Post-Trial/ Post-Disposition

The post-disposition phase includes all on-bench and off-bench work after a judgment has been entered. This category includes required hearings to enforce or modify a judgment. This also includes probation violations.

6. Specialty Dockets

Includes all worked related to specialty dockets.

APPENDIX E: CIRCUIT, GENERAL DISTRICT, AND JDR DISTRICT JUDGE NON-CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

a. Non-Case-Related Administration

Includes work directly related to the administration or operation of the court, for example:

- Personnel issues
 - Management issues
 - Budget
 - Case assignment
 - Internal staff meeting
 - Technology
 - Calendaring
 - Facilities
-

b. Judicial Education and Training

Includes continuing education and professional development, and education programs permitted by the state. *Includes both receiving and providing training.*

c. Search Warrants

Includes time spent on search warrants.

d. General Legal Research

Includes keeping up on legal decisions and other legal research and/or policy issues pertinent to your job.

e. Committees, Other Meetings, and Related Work

Includes time spent in state, local or other work-related committee meetings, staff or other meetings that are job-related. Also includes any work done (prep or post-meeting) for these meetings outside of the actual meeting time.

f. Community Activities/ Outreach

Includes time spent on community and civic activities in your role as a judge, e.g., speaking at a local bar luncheon, attending rotary functions, or Law Day at the local high school. This activity also includes preparing or officiating at weddings for which you are not paid.

g. Travel

Includes any reimbursable travel. This includes time spent traveling to and from a court or other facility outside one's county of residence for any court-related business, including meetings. Traveling to the court in one's county is local "commuting time" and should NOT be counted as travel time.

h. Vacation/ Sick Leave/ Holiday

Includes any vacation, sick leave and holiday time.

i. Lunch and Breaks

Includes time taken for lunch and/or breaks.

j. Time Study Data Reporting & Entry

Time spent each day to record and log the time for the workload assessment.

APPENDIX F: ADEQUACY OF TIME SURVEY RESULTS

Adequacy of Time Survey Respondents

Please tell us your position

Circuit Court Judge	88	37%
General District Court Judge	72	30%
JDR District Court Judge	81	34%
Total	241	100%

Number of Years as a Judge for Virginia trial courts

Less than one year	9	4%
1-3 years	35	15%
4-5 years	50	21%
6-10 years	61	25%
11-15 years	45	19%
16+ years	41	17%
Total	241	100%

Time Study Period Questions

Circuit Judges

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

Yes	44	50%
No	44	50%
Total	88	100%

Please explain how your work was different during the survey period?

Civil docket was light
Lighter docket overall due to lack of attorneys
Took vacation, sick leave, other leave
Fewer jury trials/ jury trials that settled
Workload was lighter than usual
Criminal docket/jury trials canceled due to Commonwealth's Attorney conference

Was your travel time typical during the study period?

Yes	74	84%
No	14	16%
Total	88	100%

Please explain how your travel was different.

Traveled for meeting, conference, or training
Did not record travel time
Less travel than usual
More travel than usual

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

Yes	26	30%
No	62	70%
Total	88	100%

Please tell us what work did not get reported.

Administrative tasks and work
Misc. questions, requests, emergencies, or interruptions that occur.
Email, phone call, discussions about various issues
May have forgotten to record some misc. tasks
Research and writing done at home

Time Study Period Questions

General District Judges

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

Yes	45	82%
No	27	49%
Total	72	131%

Please explain how your work was different during the survey period?

Lighter caseload than usual

Vacation/other leave/illness

Out for conferences or training

Did not have meetings that regularly occur for CCJB, Behavioral Health Docket Advisory Committee, etc

Was your travel time typical during the study period?

Yes	63	115%
No	9	16%
Total	72	131%

Please explain how your travel was different.

More travel than usual

Less travel than usual

Typically travel for meetings and committees but did not during the study period

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

Yes	25	45%
No	47	85%
Total	72	131%

Please tell us what work did not get reported.

Administrative tasks and work
Misc. questions, requests, emergencies, or interruptions that occur.
Issues and questions from the clerk
May have forgotten to record some misc. tasks
Research, writing, and other misc. tasks done at home

Time Study Period Questions

JDR District Judges

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

Yes	45	82%
No	36	65%
Total	81	147%

Please explain how your work was different during the survey period?

Lighter caseload than usual
Vacation/other leave/illness
Out for conferences or training
Fewer interpreters and more settlements

Was your travel time typical during the study period?

Yes	61	111%
No	20	36%
Total	81	147%

Please explain how your travel was different.

More travel than usual
More travel than usual due to the JDR conference

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

Yes	24	44%
No	57	104%
Total	81	147%

Please tell us what work did not get reported.

Administrative tasks and work

Misc. questions, requests, emergencies, or interruptions that occur.

Communication with other agencies

May have forgotten to record some misc. tasks

Research and other misc. tasks done at home

Adequacy of Time to Perform Work

Circuit Judges

	1 Almost Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Almost Always	Average Score
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis to get my work done.	3	7	23	30	24	3.75
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	4	7	23	29	24	3.71
When I start a task, I typically have the time to complete the task.	2	11	24	31	19	3.62
I have the tools and resources to do my job efficiently and effectively.	1	10	12	32	33	3.98
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient.	1	0	10	22	54	4.47
I have enough time to adequately assist court users and ensure they understand what is expected of them.	0	3	21	22	33	4.08
There is sufficient time for learning opportunities aligned with my job duties.	5	24	26	21	10	3.08
I am regularly able to meet deadlines without rushing at the last minute.	0	5	23	36	22	3.87
I have time to take lunch and breaks throughout the day.	5	8	29	25	20	3.54

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Average Score
I rarely feel stressed about deadlines or commitments.	9	22	23	25	9	3.03
I rarely feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	7	17	35	19	10	3.09
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	4	12	20	40	12	3.50

Adequacy of Time to Perform Work

General District Court Judges

	1 Almost Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Almost Always	Average Score
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis to get my work done.	1	1	7	26	37	4.35
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	1	2	9	22	38	4.31
When I start a task, I typically have the time to complete the task.	1	7	11	28	25	3.96
I have the tools and resources to do my job efficiently and effectively.	0	3	20	16	33	4.10
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient.	2	0	3	20	46	4.52
I have enough time to adequately assist court users and ensure they understand what is expected of them.	0	3	15	25	28	4.10
There is sufficient time for learning opportunities aligned with my job duties.	3	13	16	22	18	3.54
I am regularly able to meet deadlines without rushing at the last minute.	1	2	12	17	40	4.29
I have time to take lunch and breaks throughout the day.	4	8	22	21	16	3.52

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Average Score
I rarely feel stressed about deadlines or commitments.	0	14	13	25	20	3.71
I rarely feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	2	12	20	22	16	3.53
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	3	6	14	30	19	3.78

Adequacy of Time to Perform Work

JDR District Court Judges

	1 Almost Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Almost Always	Average Score
I have sufficient time, on a regular basis to get my work done.	0	3	15	36	27	4.07
I am able to accomplish what needs to be done during the workday.	0	1	15	35	30	4.16
When I start a task, I typically have the time to complete the task.	0	1	23	37	20	3.94
I have the tools and resources to do my job efficiently and effectively.	0	3	9	34	35	4.25
The reliability and speed of the internet connections are sufficient.	0	1	17	23	39	4.25
I have enough time to adequately assist court users and ensure they understand what is expected of them.	1	0	19	40	20	3.98
There is sufficient time for learning opportunities aligned with my job duties.	1	9	27	30	14	3.58
I am regularly able to meet deadlines without rushing at the last minute.	0	0	10	44	24	4.18
I have time to take lunch and breaks throughout the day.	6	9	31	20	15	3.36

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Average Score
I rarely feel stressed about deadlines or commitments.	3	15	22	28	12	3.39
I rarely feel stressed or overwhelmed by the amount of work I have to complete.	3	22	15	31	10	3.28
The pace at which I work is sustainable.	1	10	21	33	16	3.65

Obstacles

Circuit Court Judges

Please tell us of any obstacles that exist (if any) that hinder your ability to process cases efficiently. Choose all that apply. If there are no obstacles, please select "None".

	Number of Judges	% of Judges
Heavy volume of cases and workload	45	51.1%
Not enough judges/court staff/attorneys	41	46.6%
Constant interruptions and having to multi-task	39	44.3%
Lack of time	28	31.8%
Uneven allocation of work and duties	19	21.6%
Lack of resources	17	19.3%
Continuous changes in laws, processes, public information, etc.	14	15.9%
Inadequate training	5	5.7%
Other	15	17.0%
None	18	20.5%

Obstacles

General District Court Judges

Please tell us of any obstacles that exist (if any) that hinder your ability to process cases efficiently. Choose all that apply. If there are no obstacles, please select "None".

	Number of Judges	% of Judges
Heavy volume of cases and workload	31	43.1%
Not enough judges/court staff/attorneys	30	41.7%
Constant interruptions and having to multi-task	22	30.6%
Uneven allocation of work and duties	12	16.7%
Lack of time	10	13.9%
Lack of resources	7	9.7%
Continuous changes in laws, processes, public information, etc.	7	9.7%
Inadequate training	5	6.9%
Other	15	20.8%
None	16	22.2%

Obstacles

JDR District Court Judges

Please tell us of any obstacles that exist (if any) that hinder your ability to process cases efficiently. Choose all that apply. If there are no obstacles, please select "None".

	Number of Judges	% of Judges
Not enough judges/court staff/attorneys	43	53.1%
Heavy volume of cases and workload	42	51.9%
Lack of time	23	28.4%
Constant interruptions and having to multi-task	21	25.9%
Lack of resources	14	17.3%
Uneven allocation of work and duties	13	16.0%
Continuous changes in laws, processes, public information, etc.	8	9.9%
Inadequate training	6	7.4%
Other	18	22.2%
None	15	18.5%

APPENDIX G: STAFFING SURVEY RESULTS

Circuit	Jurisdiction	Number of Law Clerks	Number of Judicial Assistants	Number of Staff Attorneys	Number of Court Administrators
1	Chesapeake		1	3	1
2	Accomack		1		
2	Northampton		1		
2	Virginia Beach	4	4	1	1
3	Portsmouth	1	4	1	1
4	Norfolk	4	4		1
5	Isle of Wight				1
5	Southampton		1		
5	Suffolk				2
6	Brunswick	1	1		1
6	Greensville	1	1		1
6	Hopewell	1	1		1
6	Prince George	1	1		1
6	Surry	1	1		1
6	Sussex	1	1		1
7	Newport News	2	5		1
8	Hampton		3		1
9	Charles City				
9	Gloucester		1		
9	King & Queen				1
9	King William				1
9	Mathews		1		
9	Middlesex				
9	New Kent				1
9	Williamsburg/JCC				1
9	York/Poquoson		2		

Circuit	Jurisdiction	Number of Law Clerks	Number of Judicial Assistants	Number of Staff Attorneys	Number of Court Administrators
10	Appomattox				
10	Buckingham				
10	Charlotte		1		
10	Cumberland				
10	Halifax		1		
10	Lunenburg				
10	Mecklenburg				1
10	Prince Edward		1		
11	Amelia				1
11	Dinwiddie				1
11	Nottoway				1
11	Petersburg				1
11	Powhatan				1
12	Chesterfield	6	3		1
12	Colonial Heights	1			
13	Richmond	4	7	1	1
14	Henrico	5	3		1
15	Caroline		1		
15	Essex				
15	Fredericksburg		1.2		
15	Hanover	2			1
15	King George	NR	0.6		
15	Lancaster	NR	0.33		
15	Northumberland	NR	0.33		
15	Richmond County	NR	0.33		
15	Spotsylvania	1	2		
15	Stafford	3	3		
15	Westmoreland		0.4		
16	Albemarle	1	1		
16	Charlottesville	2	1		
16	Culpeper	1	1		
16	Fluvanna		1		
16	Goochland				
16	Greene		1		
16	Louisa				
16	Madison		1		
16	Orange		1		

Circuit	Jurisdiction	Number of Law Clerks	Number of Judicial Assistants	Number of Staff Attorneys	Number of Court Administrators
17	Arlington	4	3		1
18	Alexandria	3			3
19	Fairfax	15			
20	Loudoun		5	4	
20	Fauquier				
20	Rappahannock				
21	Henry		2		
21	Martinsville	1	1		
21	Patrick		1		
22	Danville	1	2		
22	Franklin		1		
22	Pittsylvania		1		
23	Roanoke City	3			
23	Roanoke County	3			
23	Salem	1			
24	Amherst		1		
24	Bedford		1		
24	Campbell		1		
24	Lynchburg	1	1		
24	Nelson		1		
25	Alleghany		1		
25	Augusta	1	2		
25	Bath				
25	Botetourt		1		
25	Buena Vista		0.5		
25	Craig				
25	Highland				
25	Rockbridge		0.5		
25	Staunton	1	1		
25	Waynesboro		1		
26	Clarke				
26	Frederick		1		
26	Harrisonburg	1	1		
26	Page				
26	Shenandoah	1	1		
26	Warren	1			
26	Winchester		1		

Circuit	Jurisdiction	Number of Law Clerks	Number of Judicial Assistants	Number of Staff Attorneys	Number of Court Administrators
27	Bland				
27	Carroll		1		
27	Floyd	1	1		
27	Giles		1		
27	Grayson		1		
27	Montgomery	1	2		
27	Pulaski		1		
27	Radford		1		
27	Wythe		1		
28	Smyth		1		
28	Bristol		1		
28	Washington		2		
29	Buchanan	NR			
29	Dickenson	NR			
29	Russell	NR			
29	Tazewell		1		
30	Lee		1		
30	Scott		1		
30	Wise	1	1		
31	Prince William	7	6		2
Statewide Total		90	121.20	10	35

* NR = No response. A survey was never completed for the jurisdictions that have "NR".

APPENDIX H: INTERPRETER USAGE, CY 2023 SERVICE EVENTS % OF FILINGS

Circuit/ District	Jurisdiction	Circuit Court	General District Court	JDR District Court
		2023 Service Events % of filings	2023 Service Events % of filings	2023 Service Events % of filings
1	Chesapeake	0.68%	1.22%	1.66%
2	Virginia Beach	0.92%	1.35%	0.98%
2/2A	Accomack	1.40%	1.55%	2.18%
2/2A	Northampton	0.15%	1.37%	1.21%
3	Portsmouth	0.09%	.37%	0.23%
4	Norfolk	0.39%	.78%	1.81%
5	Franklin City	0.00%	.41%	0.32%
5	Isle of Wight	0.24%	1.15%	0.54%
5	Southampton	0.26%	.75%	0.66%
5	Suffolk	0.14%	.82%	0.32%
6	Brunswick	0.43%	2.87%	3.08%
6	Emporia	0.00%	.00%	0.00%
6	Greensville	0.72%	.72%	0.51%
6	Hopewell	0.57%	1.78%	1.73%
6	Prince George	1.05%	1.30%	1.57%
6	Surry	8.09%	.38%	0.41%
6	Sussex	3.71%	2.74%	3.12%
7	Newport News	1.71%	1.42%	3.05%
8	Hampton	0.27%	.38%	0.23%
9	Charles City	0.00%	1.03%	1.08%
9	Gloucester	0.21%	.69%	0.77%
9	King & Queen	0.00%	1.29%	1.52%
9	King William	0.21%	.80%	0.19%
9	Mathews	0.00%	.98%	0.48%
9	Middlesex	1.12%	2.88%	0.34%
9	New Kent	0.26%	3.55%	1.66%
9	Williamsburg	0.77%	1.94%	3.48%
9	York	0.61%	1.37%	1.01%

Circuit/ District	Jurisdiction	Circuit Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	General District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	JDR District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings
10	Appomattox	0.00%	.94%	0.85%
10	Buckingham	0.57%	.00%	1.59%
10	Charlotte	1.02%	4.60%	2.52%
10	Cumberland	0.88%	2.19%	1.56%
10	Halifax	0.04%	.71%	0.10%
10	Lunenburg	0.16%	3.72%	3.42%
10	Mecklenburg	0.29%	1.52%	1.12%
10	Prince Edward	0.24%	1.98%	0.45%
11	Amelia	0.98%	3.13%	2.89%
11	Dinwiddie	0.81%	1.94%	1.87%
11	Nottoway	0.38%	2.64%	2.34%
11	Petersburg	0.51%	.54%	1.00%
11	Powhatan	0.88%	1.92%	1.47%
12	Chesterfield	2.45%	5.00%	6.24%
12	Colonial Heights	0.86%	1.05%	1.25%
13	Richmond	0.94%	2.54%	6.62%
14	Henrico	1.54%	2.06%	5.27%
15	Caroline	1.50%	1.88%	1.36%
15	Essex	0.00%	1.64%	1.19%
15	Fredericksburg	1.52%	1.63%	6.81%
15	Hanover	0.79%	1.29%	3.00%
15	King George	0.09%	1.99%	2.13%
15	Lancaster	0.00%	.37%	0.60%
15	Northumberland	0.40%	1.35%	2.33%
15	Richmond County	1.05%	1.31%	1.70%
15	Spotsylvania	2.07%	2.65%	5.48%
15	Stafford	2.10%	4.56%	4.06%
15	Westmoreland	1.54%	2.00%	1.98%
16	Albemarle	3.57%	2.46%	6.46%
16	Charlottesville	9.22%	2.16%	5.74%
16	Culpeper	1.90%	7.95%	5.75%
16	Fluvanna	1.15%	1.69%	1.40%
16	Goochland	0.13%	3.49%	2.77%
16	Greene	0.64%	2.68%	2.69%
16	Louisa	0.68%	1.54%	1.10%
16	Madison	0.13%	2.01%	1.72%
16	Orange	1.97%	1.35%	2.70%

Circuit/ District	Jurisdiction	Circuit Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	General District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	JDR District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings
17	Arlington	4.50%	6.36%	26.68%
17	Falls Church	0.00%	13.85%	10.32%
18	Alexandria	5.73%	7.79%	23.53%
19	Fairfax	6.68%	9.53%	24.30%
20	Fauquier	1.31%	6.54%	4.79%
20	Loudoun	2.67%	8.52%	29.87%
20	Rappahannock	0.71%	5.00%	3.04%
21	Henry	0.83%	1.46%	2.19%
21	Martinsville	0.27%	1.17%	1.66%
21	Patrick	0.49%	.52%	0.70%
22	Danville	0.21%	.74%	1.67%
22	Franklin County	0.12%	.61%	0.57%
22	Pittsylvania	1.54%	.23%	0.43%
23	Roanoke	0.81%	2.18%	2.99%
23	Roanoke County	0.56%	1.48%	1.71%
23	Salem	0.00%	1.72%	1.69%
24	Amherst	0.15%	.70%	0.45%
24	Bedford	0.30%	2.26%	1.17%
24	Campbell	0.09%	.84%	0.52%
24	Lynchburg	3.03%	1.37%	1.54%
24	Nelson	0.08%	.77%	0.10%
25	Alleghany	0.06%	.91%	0.84%
25	Augusta	0.37%	1.14%	1.74%
25	Bath	0.44%	.85%	0.86%
25	Botetourt	0.78%	1.41%	1.62%
25	Buena Vista	0.00%	.07%	0.00%
25	Craig	0.47%	.21%	1.06%
25	Highland	0.00%	.18%	0.00%
25	Rockbridge	0.25%	2.70%	0.42%
25	Staunton	0.86%	.58%	1.83%
25	Waynesboro	0.64%	3.35%	3.98%
26	Clarke	0.68%	10.22%	0.00%
26	Frederick	0.90%	2.52%	3.86%
26	Page	0.12%	.44%	1.02%
26	Rockingham	4.37%	7.20%	14.36%
26	Shenandoah	1.30%	3.54%	5.02%
26	Warren	0.62%	.97%	0.63%
26	Winchester	0.95%	2.18%	6.60%

Circuit/ District	Jurisdiction	Circuit Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	General District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings	JDR District Court 2023 Service Events % of filings
27	Bland	0.00%	2.02%	1.51%
27	Carroll	0.39%	1.04%	0.87%
27	Floyd	0.28%	1.57%	1.40%
27	Galax	0.00%	3.60%	2.36%
27	Giles	0.00%	.27%	0.23%
27	Grayson	0.52%	2.19%	2.08%
27	Montgomery	0.48%	1.11%	1.87%
27	Pulaski	0.11%	.45%	1.25%
27	Radford	0.18%	.25%	0.20%
27	Wythe	0.00%	.63%	0.17%
28	Bristol	0.00%	.36%	0.17%
28	Smyth	0.00%	.66%	0.03%
28	Washington	0.09%	.34%	0.37%
29	Buchanan	0.00%	1.10%	0.06%
29	Dickenson	0.11%	.04%	0.00%
29	Russell	0.00%	.02%	0.05%
29	Tazewell	0.11%	.02%	0.13%
30	Lee	0.08%	.09%	0.12%
30	Scott	0.03%	.15%	0.15%
30	Wise	0.00%	.03%	0.08%
31	Prince William	7.62%	7.65%	22.77%
	Statewide	1.71%	3.10%	5.50%

APPENDIX I: CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE NEED, BY CIRCUIT

Circuit	Current Authorized Judges	Total Judge Need FTE	Workload per Judge	Judge Need (FTE) rounded 1.15/.9	Final Workload per Judge
1	6.0	5.44	.91	6.00	.91
2	8.0	7.53	.94	8.00	.94
3	4.0	2.91	.73	3.00	.97
4	8.0	7.08	.88	7.00	1.01
5	4.0	3.17	.79	3.00	1.06
6	3.0	2.50	.83	3.00	.83
7	5.0	4.00	.80	4.00	1.00
8	3.0	2.60	.87	3.00	.87
9	5.0	4.15	.83	4.00	1.04
10	4.0	3.64	.91	4.00	.91
11	3.0	2.65	.88	3.00	.88
12	6.0	5.80	.97	6.00	.97
13	7.0	5.45	.78	6.00	.91
14	5.0	5.38	1.08	5.00	1.08
15	12.0	11.59	.97	12.00	.97
16	6.0	5.88	.98	6.00	.98
17	4.0	4.26	1.06	4.00	1.06
18	3.0	2.46	.82	3.00	.82
19	15.0	13.47	.90	15.00	.90
20	5.0	3.95	.79	4.00	.99
21	3.0	2.84	.95	3.00	.95
22	4.0	3.84	.96	4.00	.96
23	5.0	5.20	1.04	5.00	1.04
24	6.0	5.78	.96	6.00	.96
25	7.0	5.77	.82	6.00	.96
26	8.0	8.30	1.04	8.00	1.04
27	6.0	7.88	1.31	7.00	1.13
28	4.0	3.21	.80	3.00	1.07
29	5.0	4.39	.88	4.00	1.10
30	4.0	3.21	.80	3.00	1.07
31	7.0	4.80	.69	5.00	.96
Total	175.0	159.11	.91	163.00	.98

APPENDIX J: GENERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEED, BY DISTRICT

District	Current Authorized Judges	Total Judge Need FTE	Workload per Judge	Judge Need (FTE) rounded 1.15/.9	Final Workload per Judge
1	4.0	3.33	.83	3.00	1.11
2	7.0	6.17	.88	6.00	1.03
2A	2.0	1.55	.78	2.00	.78
3	2.0	1.62	.81	2.00	.81
4	6.0	4.28	.71	4.00	1.07
5	3.0	2.60	.87	3.00	.87
6	5.0	4.49	.90	5.00	.90
7	4.0	3.68	.92	4.00	.92
8	3.0	2.56	.85	3.00	.85
9	3.0	3.79	1.26	4.00	.95
10	3.0	2.53	.84	3.00	.84
11	3.0	2.71	.90	3.00	.90
12	5.0	6.46	1.29	6.00	1.08
13	6.0	4.56	.76	5.00	.91
14	5.0	5.29	1.06	5.00	1.06
15	8.0	7.37	.92	8.00	.92
16	4.0	4.28	1.07	4.00	1.07
17	3.0	2.87	.96	3.00	.96
18	2.0	1.45	.72	2.00	.72
19	12.0	10.58	.88	11.00	.96
20	4.0	4.23	1.06	4.00	1.06
21	2.0	1.21	.61	2.00	.61
22	3.0	2.28	.76	2.00	1.14
23	4.0	4.17	1.04	4.00	1.04
24	3.0	3.39	1.13	3.00	1.13
25	4.0	4.22	1.06	4.00	1.06
26	5.0	5.85	1.17	6.00	.97
27	5.0	4.69	.94	5.00	.94
28	3.0	2.43	.81	3.00	.81
29	2.0	1.67	.84	2.00	.84
30	2.0	1.49	.74	2.00	.74
31	5.0	5.72	1.14	5.00	1.14
Total	132.0	123.53	.94	128.00	.97

APPENDIX K: JUVENILE & DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NEED, BY DISTRICT

District	Current Authorized Judges	Total Judge Need FTE	Workload per Judge	Judge Need (FTE) rounded 1.15/.9	Final Workload per Judge
1	4.0	4.30	1.07	4.00	1.07
2	6.0	7.62	1.27	7.00	1.09
2A	1.0	.76	.76	1.00	.76
3	3.0	2.65	.88	3.00	.88
4	5.0	5.03	1.01	5.00	1.01
5	2.0	3.23	1.61	3.00	1.08
6	3.0	2.43	.81	3.00	.81
7	4.0	4.12	1.03	4.00	1.03
8	3.0	3.42	1.14	3.00	1.14
9	4.0	4.49	1.12	4.00	1.12
10	3.0	3.28	1.09	3.00	1.09
11	3.0	2.74	.91	3.00	.91
12	6.0	7.14	1.19	7.00	1.02
13	5.0	4.62	.92	5.00	.92
14	5.0	4.73	.95	5.00	.95
15	9.0	10.35	1.15	10.00	1.03
16	6.0	6.40	1.07	6.00	1.07
17	2.0	1.82	.91	2.00	.91
18	2.0	1.56	.78	2.00	.78
19	8.0	7.89	.99	8.00	.99
20	4.0	3.48	.87	4.00	.87
21	2.0	2.27	1.14	2.00	1.14
22	4.0	4.50	1.12	4.00	1.12
23	5.0	5.83	1.17	6.00	.97
24	6.0	6.92	1.15	7.00	.99
25	5.0	4.93	.99	5.00	.99
26	7.0	7.63	1.09	7.00	1.09
27	5.0	5.51	1.10	5.00	1.10
28	3.0	2.81	.94	3.00	.94
29	3.0	2.97	.99	3.00	.99
30	3.0	2.60	.87	3.00	.87
31	6.0	6.03	1.01	6.00	1.01
Total	137.0	144.06	1.05	143.00	1.01

