

**REPORT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF
VIRGINIA**

**Expanded Jurisdiction Workload
Metrics Study 2022 – 2024
(2025 Appropriation Act, Item
32.E.)**

TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 7

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2025**

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY &
LEGAL COUNSEL
ALISA W. PADDEN

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



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
100 NORTH NINTH STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-2334
(804) 786-6455

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JOBY KNUTH, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
EILEEN A. LONGENECKER, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
VACANT

MAGISTRATE SERVICES
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

November 14, 2025

The General Assembly of Virginia
General Assembly Building
201 N. Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Senators and Delegates:

Item 32, Paragraph E, of the Appropriation Acts, Chapter 2, 2024 Special Session I, and Chapter 725, 2025 Regular Session, directed the Court of Appeals to examine options for workload metrics that could be used to objectively determine the necessary number of positions, including judgeships and personnel in the Clerk's Office and the Office of the Chief Staff Attorney.

Please find attached a report of the findings and recommendations of the Court of Appeals.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

Karl R. Hade

KRH:jrs
Attachment



COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA
EXPANDED JURISDICTION
WORKLOAD METRICS STUDY
2022 – 2024

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Summary of Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission Workload Metrics Study and Report on the Court of Appeals of Virginia	2
I. Introduction	2
II. The Commission’s “Workload Metrics for the Court of Appeals of Virginia” Study	2
III. The Commission Report Recommendations.....	5
IV. Conclusion	7
Appendix: Full Report from the Commission.....	8

Executive Summary

- The 2024 Appropriation Act instructed the Court of Appeals of Virginia to “examine options for workload metrics that could be used to objectively determine the necessary number of positions, including judgeships and personnel in the Clerk’s Office and the Office of the Chief Staff Attorney.”
- The Court asked the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission to study its workload and develop appropriate metrics for the Court to use to determine staffing needs.
- The Commission completed its study and made several recommendations relating to some of the challenges it faced in analyzing the Court’s data. The Commission’s recommendations underscore the critical need to modernize the Court’s case management and electronic filing systems, which are not currently integrated.
- The Commission identified factors that significantly impacted the average time a case spent in each of the three main divisions of the Court: 1) the Clerk’s Office; 2) the Chief Staff Attorney’s Office; and 3) Judicial Chambers.
- The Commission also developed an excel tool for internal Court use that calculates staffing needs based on increases or decreases to certain salient factors.
- Changing the staffing level of any one division of the Court will affect the entire Court. Accordingly, staffing scenarios should account for all of the Court’s divisions, keeping in mind the ripple effects and potential bottlenecks that increased production in one division will have on the workflow of the Court as a whole.
- The Court recommends investing in an integrated case management system for the appellate courts and allowing the Court to further monitor the statistical trends from emerging data. Including the data that would result from those improvements would improve the data set and refine the specific benchmark inputs needed to assess future staffing needs accurately.
- The Commission’s detailed study and report support the Court’s efforts to monitor certain data and statistical benchmarks over the first three years of its expanded jurisdiction. The results of the study validate the organizational changes that the Court has made to streamline case processing and make the Court’s systems more efficient.

Summary of Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

Workload Metrics Study and Report on the Court of Appeals of Virginia

I. Introduction:

The 2024 Appropriation Act instructed the Court of Appeals of Virginia to “examine options for workload metrics that could be used to objectively determine the necessary number of positions, including judgeships and personnel in the Clerk’s Office and the Office of the Chief Staff Attorney.”¹ The Court neither had the expertise nor the resources to produce workload metrics without outside assistance. After considering several options, the Chief Judge asked the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission (the Commission) to perform the study and develop a tool for the Court’s internal use to assess staffing needs based on the study’s findings.

The Court is grateful to Director Meredith Farrar-Owens, and Chang Kwon, Ph.D., for leading the Commission’s efforts. The Commission was well-suited to the task because it has assisted the Court in analyzing case-related data to prepare its annual reports on case workload since the Court’s jurisdiction expanded in 2022. The Commission also analyzed the Court’s historical performance data in 2019. Accordingly, it was familiar with the Court’s practices and data both before and since expanded jurisdiction.

This report summarizes the Commission’s methodology, findings, and recommendations. It also presents the metrics platform the Commission designed for the Court’s internal use. This tool is capable of providing a staffing recommendation that responds to likely increases in the Court’s workload and/or meets certain benchmarks the General Assembly may wish to set.

II. The Commission’s “Workload Metrics for the Court of Appeals of Virginia”:²

The Commission began its study with a background knowledge of the Court’s statistical data, personnel, and procedures. But to broaden its understanding of caseflow, the Commission interviewed the judges who currently chair the Court’s internal committees, as well as supervising members of the Clerk’s Office and the Office of the Chief Staff Attorney (“CSA”).³

¹ 2024 Special Session I; 2024 Appropriation Act (HB6001 (Chapter 2) “Judicial Department,” Item 32).

² The complete Commission Report has been included as “Appendix” of this report for review.

³ Appendix, *infra*, at pages 17-18.

Through those interviews, the Commission developed a deeper understanding of the factors that could affect average case life.

Following the interviews, the Commission sorted the cases into thirteen tracks.⁴ Examining comprehensive data from the Court's Appellate Case Management System (ACMS), the Virginia Appellate Case Electronic System (VACES) filing platform, and internal spreadsheets that tracked information not included in ACMS or VACES, the Commission measured the number of days cases spent in the Court's main divisions: the Clerk's Office, CSA, and Judicial Chambers.⁵ Using that data, the Commission developed models to identify which factors caused either a meaningful increase or decrease in the average time a case spent in each of the three divisions.⁶

The Commission then built the workload metrics tool for the Court's internal use. The tool provides separate matrices for each of the Court's main divisions with the input factors that the Commission found to be statistically significant for that specific division.⁷ Using the metrics tool, the Court can examine how changes in case filings or performance goals might affect the overall workload of each division. And the tool recommends the staffing necessary to address the target outcome.⁸ Staffing scenarios need to account for impacts across the Court's divisions as increases in production for any one division will have an impact on the workflow of the other two divisions as well.

The Commission's report also provides the mathematical formula underpinning the tool's foundation: cumulative case-days are totaled for the three divisions and then divided by the number of judges/staff that comprise that respective division.⁹ Determining staffing needs to meet a performance goal or an increase in case intake, the metrics tool balances the base average of workload, measured by the total "case-days per year" spent in a division to the current staff

⁴ A small number (159 cases or 2.5% of the total) of cases could not be sorted into the thirteen tracks and were tracked as "Unknown." See Appendix, *infra*, at page 18.

⁵ The internal tool that was developed for the Court measures the days spent in the Court's three main divisions as "case-days per year." Over the study period the 6,313 identified cases spent a total of 142,252.9 case-days per year with Judicial Chambers, 120,957.1 case-days per year with CSA, and 326,234.8 with the Clerk's Office.

⁶ Appendix, *infra*, at pages 19-21, 25, 28, 30.

⁷ For example, the study found that motions for extension of time increase the amount of time a case spends in the Clerk's Office but does not significantly increase the amount of time spent in CSA or in Judicial Chambers. Accordingly, the Clerk's Office platform includes input factors for motions for extension of time but the CSA and Judges' platforms do not.

⁸ Appendix, *infra*, at page 32.

⁹ Appendix, *infra*, at page 32-33.

level¹⁰ with the base average of “additional workload volume expected” to the additional staff needed. In the equation below, “x” is the number of additional staff needed.¹¹

$$\frac{\text{Current Judges Workload Volume}}{\text{Current Number of [Staff]}} = \frac{\text{Additional Workload Volume Expected}}{X}$$

X = Number of Additional [Staff] Needed to Handle Additional Workload Volume

The metrics tool was designed on Excel with formulas to solve the above equation.¹² Below are a few screenshots from the platform for the “CSA” division:

CSA Office							
INPUTS							
		CURRENT		PLANNING SCENARIO			
		Number of Cases Filed	Average CSA Case Life	Percentage Change Assumed	Estimated Future Level	CURRENT Average CSA case life	CURRENT CSA case-days per year
	Number of Overall Filings	6,313	57.5	0.0	6,313	57.5	120957.1

This screenshot of the tool’s inputs section shows the number of overall cases appealed during the study’s three-year timeframe and serves as the baseline for the staffing formulas. In this base section, a user can change the input from “0.0” in the “Planning Scenario” to a different value. With 6,313 cases filed since the Court’s expanded jurisdiction, the average of new cases filed was 2,104 per year. If the average were expected to increase by ten percent, the user can enter “10.0” into the “Percentage Change Assumed” field.¹³

PLANNING SCENARIO				
Percentage Change Assumed	Estimated Future Level	CURRENT Average CSA case life	CURRENT CSA case-days per year	CSA case-days under planning scenario
10.0	6,944	57.5	120957.1	133052.8

¹⁰ The tool allows the user to customize the staffing levels for the different divisions. In the three-year period covered by the study, the Court was rarely fully staffed, and the case life averages showed a significant increase in time spent in CSA during a major staffing shortage in 2024.

¹¹ Appendix, *infra*, at page 32.

¹² Appendix, *infra*, at page 31-32.

¹³ Note that the ten-percent figure is a hypothetical. A ten-percent increase in the average would mean that the Court would receive over 2,300 new case filings in an average year. The Court has not experienced that level of filings in the first three years of expanded jurisdiction.

When the ten-percent increase is entered, the tool uses the “CURRENT CSA case-days per year” field as a baseline and increases that baseline number to reach the result found under the “CSA case-days under planning scenario” column. At that point, the tool calculates “x” and provides a staffing recommendation to address the desired goal.

PLANNING SCENARIO						
Percentage Change Assumed	Estimated Future Level	CURRENT Average CSA case life	CURRENT CSA case-days per year	CSA case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional SAs needed
10.0	6,944	57.5	120957.1	133052.8	12095.7	2.0

In the example, the tool assesses the staffing needed to address the “12,095.7” additional days and recommends “2.0” additional staff attorneys to address the ten-percent increase in case filings.

The tool has many customizable input fields that can be used to create an array of planning scenarios. Another set of fields can be used to set benchmarks, such as: improving “Clearance Rate,” reducing the “Number of Pending Cases,” or reducing the average number of days cases spent with a “Merit Panel.”¹⁴ The Commission has cautioned that planning scenarios and performance benchmarks should be designed with caution, as certain fields can overlap.¹⁵ As an example, inputting a benchmark for an improved “Clearance Rate” should not be paired with an input seeking to reduce the “Number of Pending Cases.” Those independent benchmarks would accomplish similar performance goals, and pairing them would artificially magnify the suggested staffing needs.

¹⁴ The “Merit panel” designation is a relic of the pre-expanded jurisdiction Court. Many fields in the Court’s current case management system refer to “Merit panels,” but almost all appeals are now by right. The report refers to these panels as regional argument panels, but the Commission, as it was working from the ACMS data with its long-established fields, labeled these inputs in the platform as “Merit panels.”

¹⁵ Appendix, *infra*, at page 36.

III. The Commission Report Recommendations:

The Commission noted that the metrics tool it developed is a first-generation platform.¹⁶ As it developed the tool, the Commission identified certain issues with the Court's data collection in its case management and electronic filing platforms. The Commission provided five recommendations that it believed would yield more accurate data and improve the tool's accuracy in future versions. The recommendations were:

- 1) Modify ACMS to collect information that is now compiled in supplemental spreadsheets.
- 2) Issue case record numbers earlier in the filing process.
- 3) Require a consistent format for VACES entries.
- 4) Establish a method to better track the time a case remains in the Clerk's Office waiting for the parties or the lower tribunal to act as directed by the Court.
- 5) Utilize a standardized format to record lower tribunal case number[s] in ACMS.

Many of the Commission's recommendations can be addressed by improving ACMS. While working to modernize ACMS, it will be important to include data fields and reports that better track case movement for the many cases that move back and forth between CSA and the Clerk's Office and for cases that require multiple reviews by CSA due to complex motions.¹⁷ The Clerk's Office Dispositions Team also had extensive internal records that helped the Commission track that team's workload.¹⁸ Data collected on those spreadsheets should also be tracked in the new case management system.

The Commission's other recommendations challenge the Court and its technology partners to evaluate the electronic filing system, VACES. As with the case management system, there are plans to upgrade and integrate the Court's electronic filing platform. Future developments should link submissions to a case file number automatically and seamlessly. Additionally, finding measures that can help guide external stakeholders (lower tribunals, parties' counsel, and pro se parties) in filing more uniform submissions would improve tracking and monitoring case

¹⁶ Appendix, *infra*, at page 32.

¹⁷ See Appendix, *infra*, at page 16.

¹⁸ See *id.*

filings.¹⁹ Currently the interplay between the Court's Administration and Records Teams and lower courts and case parties is a significant blind spot for data collection in the case life process. Accordingly, if the filing system was better integrated into the Court's case management system, data collection would improve, and the metrics tool could better analyze the staffing needs for the Clerk's Office Administrative and Records teams in the future.

In completing the workload metrics study the Commission identified the weakest areas of the Court's data collection. The Court and its technology partners should be mindful of the Commission's recommendations to ensure that new versions of ACMS and VACES maximize tracking relevant data to enhance data-based decision making by the Court and the General Assembly.

IV. Conclusion:

The Commission produced an outstanding first-generation platform to assess the Court's staffing needs objectively. This metrics-driven tool will improve as more data is collected and ACMS and VACES are modernized and a new integrated system is created. As this new tool is equipped with more extensive data sets and more accurate data points from a modernized case management system, the staffing recommendations it generates will be more reliable.

The Court is extremely grateful for the efforts of Meredith Farrar-Owens and her team to ensure that this tool is user-friendly and accurately identifies the factors that can extend and reduce case processing times. The Court looks forward to using this tool in the future. It hopes to integrate the concepts and foundations of this platform into its efforts to modernize the case management system, so the metrics tool not only remains current but evolves with the newest data. Additionally, the Court is optimistic that this tool meets the requirement set by the General Assembly for a viable staffing metric and provides insight into the Court's workload.

¹⁹ Having electronic records are a step in uniformity but there are still jurisdictions that submit paper records to the Court. Notably, this year after the Commission's metrics study concluded, four jurisdictions (the City of Alexandria, the City of Colonial Heights, and Surry County) that had been filing paper records with the Court (*see* Appendix, *infra*, at page 16, n. 2) made the decision to begin submitting records electronically, joining the vast majority of jurisdictions in the Commonwealth. Now only three jurisdictions submit records as physical paper files.

Appendix

Full Report from the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

Workload Metrics for the Court of Appeals of Virginia

WORKLOAD METRICS FOR THE COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA



Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

2025

Revised 10/09/2025

Members of the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

APPOINTED BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA AND CONFIRMED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Judge Dennis L. Hupp (Ret.), Chair, Strasburg

APPOINTMENTS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

Judge Steven C. Frucci, 2nd Judicial Circuit

Judge Jack S. Hurley, Jr., 29th Judicial Circuit

Judge Stacey W. Moreau, 22nd Judicial Circuit

Judge Tania M.L. Saylor, 19th Judicial Circuit

Judge Bryant L. Sugg, 7th Judicial Circuit

Judge Victoria A. B. Willis, 15th Judicial Circuit

SENATE APPOINTMENTS

The Honorable Russet W. Perry, Senate of Virginia

Marcus Elam, Corrections Operations Administrator,
Virginia Department of Corrections

HOUSE OF DELEGATES APPOINTMENTS

The Honorable Rae C. Cousins, Virginia House of Delegates

K. Scott Miles, Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney, City of Norfolk

Vacant

GOVERNOR'S APPOINTMENTS

The Honorable Bethany Harrison, Commonwealth's Attorney, Lynchburg

Judge Robert J. Humphreys (Ret.), Virginia Beach

Michon J. Moon, Ph.D., Director of Operations and Grants, The JXN Project

Nancy Parr, Chesapeake

ATTORNEY GENERAL OR DESIGNEE

The Honorable Jason S. Miyares

(**Theo Stamos**, Attorney General's Representative)

INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION DIRECTOR OR DESIGNEE

Maria Jankowski, Director, Indigent Defense Commission

HON. DENNIS L. HUPP (RET.)
CHAIRMAN

Commonwealth of Virginia



MEREDITH FARRAR-OWENS
DIRECTOR

100 NORTH NINTH STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219

Supreme Court of Virginia Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

August 29, 2025

The Honorable Marla Graff Decker
Court of Appeals of Virginia
109 North Eighth Street
Richmond, Virginia, 23219

Dear Chief Judge Decker:

Earlier this year, the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission received a request from the Court of Appeals of Virginia for assistance with the development of workload metrics for the Court. The goal was to develop objective, empirically-based workload metrics that could be used as a tool for position and resource planning. As you know, the Sentencing Commission has assisted the Court of Appeals with trend and caseload analyses in the past and the Commission was familiar with the appeals process, the Appeals Case Management System (ACMS), and other data collected by the Court. Thus, the Sentencing Commission was in an excellent position to extend its work with the Court into the development of a data-driven workload metrics tool.

For this project, the Sentencing Commission conducted interviews with Court of Appeals judges and key staff, completed a thorough analysis of available data, developed statistical models to identify key drivers of case life, and formulated a workload metrics tool that will allow the Court to test scenarios and estimate judge and staffing needs.

This report, documenting the Sentencing Commission's work, is respectfully submitted for your consideration. Please contact the Commission should you have questions regarding any aspect of the workload metrics project.

The Sentencing Commission wishes to sincerely thank the Court of Appeals judges, Chief Staff Attorney's Office, and Clerk's Office for their detailed explanations of Court operations and for their swift response to questions. In particular, the Sentencing Commission would like to thank Robert Blosser and Gordon Dobbs, who were especially generous with their time throughout the project and whose expertise and insight were invaluable.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Owens".

Meredith Farrar-Owens
Director

Staff of the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

Meredith Farrar-Owens

Director

Jody T. Fridley

Deputy Director

Thomas Y. Barnes

Research Associate

Alfreda A. Cheatham

Data Processing Specialist

Catherine Chen, Ph.D.

Data Scientist

Matthew Gilbert

Research Assistant

Chang B. Kwon, Ph.D.

Chief Methodologist

Marc E. Leslie

Research Associate

Michael Massingill

Training/Research Associate

Kimberly F. Thomas

Training Associate

Carolyn A. Williamson

Research Associate

Kate Firehammer

Judy Nunnally

Mark O'Connell

Data Quality Assistants

Table of Contents

Introduction	15
Data Collection and Preparation for Analysis	15
Interviews	17
Classification of Cases into Case Tracks	18
Computation of Case Life	19
Development of Statistical Models	23
Formulation of a Workload Metrics Tool	31
Limitations	36
Recommendations	37
Appendix: Final Statistical Models for Clerk Case Time, CSA Case Time, and Judge Case Time	27

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Court of Appeals Cases Filed in CY2022-CY2024 by Case Track

Table 2: Average Case Life by Case Track

Table 3: Average Case Time by Case Track for the Clerk's Office, CSA's Office, and Judges

Table 4: Results from the Statistical Model of Clerk Case Time

Table 5: Results from the Statistical Model of CSA Case Time

Table 6: Results from Statistical Model of Judge Case Time

Figure 1: Judges Workload Metrics Tool Inputs by Case Track Specified by the CAV

Figure 2: Judges Workload Metrics Tool Benchmarks for Case Times, Pending Active Cases, and Clearance Rate

Introduction

In April 2025, the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission received a request from the Court of Appeals of Virginia (CAV) for assistance with the development of workload metrics for the Court. The goal was to develop objective, empirically-based workload metrics that could be used as a tool for position and resource planning. For several years, the Sentencing Commission has assisted the Court of Appeals with trend and caseload analyses. As a result of that work, the Sentencing Commission was familiar with the appeals process, the information contained in the Appeals Case Management System (ACMS), and other data collected by the CAV. Thus, the Sentencing Commission was in an excellent position to extend its work with the CAV into the development of a data-driven workload metrics tool.

The workload metrics project had several stages: 1) data cleaning and preparation for analysis, 2) interviews with a number of Court of Appeals judges¹ and key personnel in the Chief Staff Attorney's and Clerk's Offices, 3) classification of cases into case tracks specified by the CAV, 4) computation of case life (i.e., duration of the case from notice of appeal to disposition), 5) development of statistical models to identify key drivers of case life, and 6) formulation of a workload metrics tool that will allow the CAV to test scenarios and estimate judge and staffing needs. Work on the project began in May and was completed in August 2025. The Sentencing Commission demonstrated a prototype of the workload metrics tool for the CAV and received input before finalizing the tool.

This report documents the Sentencing Commission's work on this project, summarizes its findings, provides an overview of the workload metrics tool developed for the CAV, and presents recommendations for data improvements to support future studies.

Data Collection and Preparation for Analysis

The Department of Judicial Information Technology (DJIT) provided ACMS data to the Sentencing Commission. This included a dataset for each case entry type (Criminal/Civil, Actual Innocence, Original Jurisdiction, Injunction, and Concealed Weapons Permits). These ACMS data files were downloaded on May 14, 2025, with the exception of the Criminal/Civil file, which was downloaded on June 18, 2025. In addition to these primary datasets, DJIT also extracted information from other tabs, or screens, used in the ACMS system and made this information available to the Sentencing Commission. These were:

- Case Party – Appellant, Appellee, and Other Party tabs,
- Clerk's Office Activity tab,
- Intracourt Activity tab, and
- Records tab.

¹ The judges interviewed by the Sentencing Commission were selected by Chief Judge Marla Graff Decker.

Because ACMS does not capture all elements relevant to case processing or staff workload, supplemental data was provided by the Chief Staff Attorney (CSA) and the Clerk of Court of Appeals. These data proved to be vital in the analysis of workload and development of workload metrics. Supplemental datasets are described below.

- The Sentencing Commission received Excel spreadsheets compiled by the CSA listing active cases for each month of the study period, including the CSA's assessment of the difficulty level or complexity of the case and the number of issues cited, the date the CSA initiated its review of the case, the date the case was assigned to a staff attorney, and the date the staff attorney submitted work product for review. These files also included important notes about the case, such as when a case file was returned to the Clerk's Office due to an incomplete record from the lower tribunal, a deficient brief submitted by a party, or other reason. Information in the CSA's active case files is not currently captured by ACMS.
- The CSA provided Excel spreadsheets listing the cases referred for expedited handling by a standing panel without oral argument (pursuant to §17.1-403).
- The Clerk's Office made available an Excel file tracking all opinions released by the Court. This file contained key dates, the opinion type, the number of pages of each opinion, and relevant notes for the case. This information is not currently captured by ACMS.
- The Clerk's Office also provided an Excel file identifying orders released by the Court and the number of pages in each final order. This information is not currently captured by ACMS.
- The Sentencing Commission received Excel files documenting all motions submitted by the parties in appealed cases. These files captured case type, the lower tribunal name, the type of motion submitted, and the date it was received.
- DJIT provided a data file that captured the size (in kilobytes) of case records submitted by lower tribunals. This file contained information for records electronically submitted via the VACES system and did not include the size of case records submitted in paper form.² For the analysis, the size of all records electronically-submitted in a case were summed. It should be noted that this file did not contain CAV case number, which made it extremely difficult to match records to the ACMS data files.
- In addition to case record sizes, the Sentencing Commission was given a data file that captured the size (in kilobytes) of briefs filed electronically through the VACES system. For the analysis, the size of all briefs submitted in a case were summed.

² Six courts currently submit records in paper form only: the Cities of Alexandria, Hampton and Colonial Heights and the Counties of Sussex, Essex and Surry.

Once the Sentencing Commission received the ACMS information and supplemental files, the Commission cleaned and formatted the data. The data was then uploaded into the statistical analysis software used by the Sentencing Commission.³ Datasets were merged based on CAV case number into one primary dataset for the workload study. Because the VACES Records file did not contain CAV case number, the Sentencing Commission conducted several rounds of matching based on names of the parties, the lower tribunal name, and the lower tribunal case number. The entire process of cleaning, formatting and merging of the files required approximately 20,000 lines of computer coding. Throughout this process, the Sentencing Commission encountered missing data (e.g., for some cases, certain data fields were blank) and data that contained apparent errors (particularly dates entered into the system).

For the development of statistical models and the workload metrics tool, the Sentencing Commission focused on cases filed during calendar years (CY) 2022 through CY2024.

Interviews

While Sentencing Commission staff was already familiar with CAV case flow due to its previous work with the Court, Chief Judge Marla Graff Decker and Commission staff agreed that input from judges and key staff would benefit the workload metrics study and provide the Commission with a more detailed understanding of Court operations and duties. Between May 27 and June 6, Sentencing Commission staff conducted 16 interviews. The individuals interviewed are listed below.

Judges⁴

- Chief Judge Marla Decker,
- Judge Randolph Beales (Chair, Facilities Committee),
- Judge Dominique Callins (Chair, Personnel Committee),
- Judge Vernida Chaney (Chair, Technology Committee),
- Judge Junius Fulton (Chair, Continuing Education Committee),
- Judge Lisa Lorish (Chair, Modernization Committee),
- Judge Mary Grace O'Brien (Chair, Operations Committee), and
- Judge Stuart Raphael (Chair, Rules Committee)

Chief Staff Attorney's Office

- Chief Staff Attorney Alice Armstrong,
- Ottie Allgood (Team Leader, Senior Judge/Utility)
- Gloria Marotta (Head Paralegal),
- Janet Rosser (Team Leader, Actual Innocence/Original Jurisdiction), and
- Alan Wenger (Team Leader, Motions)

³ The Sentencing Commission uses the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, commonly known as SPSS.

⁴ The judges interviewed by the Sentencing Commission were selected by Chief Judge Marla Graff Decker.

Clerk's Office

- Clerk of Court John Vollino,
- Marty Ring (Team Leader, Dispositions)
- Megan Scanlon (Team Leader, Motions)
- Deborah Uitvlucht (Team Leader, Dockets)⁵, and
- Stacie Venable (Team Leader, Case Records and Administration)

These interviews yielded valuable insight into Court operations, factors and case characteristics that impact workflow and case processing, as well as some of the challenges that judges, staff attorneys and Clerk's staff face in the course of their work.

Classification of Cases into Case Tracks

To aid in the development of statistical models and a workload metrics tool, the CAV identified distinct tracks that cases follow through the appeals process. Based on parameters provided by CAV staff, the Sentencing Commission classified cases into specified tracks. Table 1 describes each track and provides the number of cases filed in CY2022-CY2024 that followed each track.

**Table 1: Court of Appeals Cases Filed in CY2022-CY2024
by Case Track**

Case Tracks Specified by CAV	Number of Cases	Percent
Chief Judge Dismissal (e.g., Case is Procedurally Defective)	1,375	21.8%
Anders Case	237	3.8%
CSA No Oral Standing Panel (Expedited) Case	634	10.0%
Senior Judge or Standing Panel Case with Disposition (Excluding Cases Identified as No Oral Standing Panel)	354	5.6%
Merit Panel - CSA Identified as Probable No-Oral Prior to April 2023	155	2.5%
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	403	6.4%
Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	1,002	15.9%
Merit Panel - Chambers Case (Not Including Actual Innocence Cases)	780	12.4%
Actual Innocence Case	103	1.6%
Petition Case - Commonwealth Appeal	66	1.0%
Petition Case - Other than Commonwealth Appeal	75	1.2%
Case Withdrawn/Settled - Preliminary Review Stage	451	7.1%
No Determination by CSA (Active Case)	519	8.2%
Unknown	159	2.5%
Total	6,313	100%

⁵ Deborah Uitvlucht was not interviewed in person but she responded to the interview questions in written form.

Computation of Case Life

After cleaning and preparing the data, completing interviews with judges and key personnel, and classifying cases into tracks, the Sentencing Commission began the analysis phase of the project. As a first step, the Commission computed the overall Case Life, or the length of time between the date that the notice of appeal was received and disposition, for each case.⁶ Case Life was computed for cases filed during CY2022-CY2024 and disposed as of the date the data were downloaded (June 18, 2025, for criminal and civil cases and May 14, 2025, for other cases).

Of the 6,313 cases filed during CY2022-CY2024, 5,242 (83.0%) were disposed as of the download date. For these 5,242 cases, the average case life was 271.8 days. For approximately 27% of the 5,242 disposed cases, overall Case Life exceeded one year. Table 2 presents average Case Life for each Case Track identified by the CAV.

Table 2: Average Case Life by Case Track

Case Tracks Specified by CAV	Average Case Life (in days)
Chief Judge Dismissal (e.g., Case is Procedurally Defective)	100.7
Anders Case	314.9
CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	319.9
Senior Judge or Standing Panel Case with Disposition (Excluding Cases Identified as No Oral Standing Panel)	240.6
Merit Panel - CSA Identified as Probable No-Oral Prior to April 2023	316.1
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	383.9
Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	441.6
Merit Panel - Chambers Case (Not Including Actual Innocence Cases)	452.5
Actual Innocence Case	142.6
Petition Case - Commonwealth Appeal	108.0
Petition Case - Other than Commonwealth Appeal	155.8
Case Withdrawn/Settled - Preliminary Review Stage	108.7
All Cases	271.8

Note(s): Case Life was computed for cases filed during CY2022-CY2024 and disposed as of the date the data were downloaded (June 18, 2025, for criminal and civil cases and May 14, 2025, for other cases). Of the 6,313 cases filed during CY2022-CY2024, 5,242 (83.0%) were disposed by the download date.

⁶ Per the Court of Appeals, a case officially ends 30 days prior to the due date for a notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of Virginia.

Case life was then disaggregated to reflect the amount of time that a case spends in the Clerk's Office, the CSA's Office, and the judges' chambers. The manner in which the Sentencing Commission calculated Case Times by role is described below.

Clerk Case Time

Clerk Case Time was computed as the time between the date that the notice of appeal was received and the date all briefing for the case was complete (this represents the clerks' "front end" time with a case) plus the time between the date the case was received by the Clerk's Disposition Team and the date the opinion or order was released by the Clerk's Office (the "back end" time). In some instances, a case is returned by the CSA to Clerk's Office pending resolution of problem or issue with the case (e.g., an incomplete record or deficient brief). When this occurs, the case file will remain in the Clerk's Office until the additional or corrected information is received, at which time the file is sent on to the CSA once again. Based on the CSA supplemental data, 14.8% of cases are returned by the CSA to the Clerk's Office at least once. To address this back and forth in case handling, the Sentencing Commission used supplemental data from the CSA's Office to identify cases that were returned to the Clerk's Office and to determine the amount of time the case remained in the Clerk's Office until the case was "pulled" into the CSA's Office again for review and assignment. Because the returned case is officially within the purview of the Clerk's Office, this time was added to the "front end" time the case spends in the Clerk's Office.

Due to the unique way that Actual Innocence and other petition cases move through the appeals process, Sentencing Commission staff worked with CAV staff to determine the total time such cases spent in the Clerk's Office.

It should be noted that Clerk Case Time does not include time the case spends with the Clerk's Dockets Team, as docketing is usually completed within 24 hours.

CSA Case Time

CSA Case Time was measured from the date the briefing period was complete to the date the case was assigned to the judge(s). CSA Case Time was then adjusted in two ways. Data indicated that, in some cases, the CSA initiated work on the case prior to submission of the Appellant Reply Brief (or, if no Appellant Reply Brief was filed, the due date for the brief). This approach allows the CSA to start reviewing the case earlier. When the CSA initiated case work prior to the end of the briefing period, the CSA Case Time was adjusted by adding the days between CSA initiation of work and the end of briefing period, as it better reflects the total amount of time a case spends within the

purview of the CSA's Office. CSA Case Time was also adjusted to address the back and forth that sometimes occurs between the CSA's Office and the Clerk's Office. If the CSA sent a case back to the Clerk's Office pending resolution of a problem or issue, that time was subtracted from the CSA Case Time. This reflects the fact that staff attorneys are not working on the case during that period. The time subtracted from the CSA Case Time was added to the Clerk's Case Time, as noted above.

If the Clerk's Office identifies a defect in the case, it may be sent directly to the Chief Judge for drafting of a dismissal order and the CSA's Office will never see the case. For a case handled in such a manner, the CSA Case Time was assumed to be zero.

As Actual Innocence and other petition cases are unique, Sentencing Commission staff worked with CAV staff to determine the total time such cases spent in CSA's Office.

Judge Case Time

Judge Case Time was calculated as the period between the date a case is assigned to the judge(s) and the date the case was received by the Clerk's Disposition Team. If a case never progresses to point of judge assignment, Judge Case Time is computed as zero. This may occur if the case settled/withdrawn early in the process. Again, given the unique nature of Actual Innocence and other petition cases, the Sentencing Commission worked with CAV staff to compute the total time those cases spent in the judges' chambers.

It is important to note that Judge Case Time includes the time from assignment to the merit panel date. The merit panel date is scheduled by the Clerk's Office. Although judges are reviewing cases and preparing for merit panels during that time, the duration of this "front end" portion of Judge Case Time is not controlled by the judges.

Table 3 presents average Clerk Case Time, CSA Case Time, and Judge Case time for each Case Track. Due to time constraints, Commonwealth Appeals and Original Jurisdiction cases were not included in the calculation of Case Time for the Clerk's Office, CSA's Office and judges. Such cases are included in the overall case life computation. It is important to note that the sum of Clerk, CSA and Judge Case Times may not total the overall Case Life because 1) there may be an overlap of CSA and Clerk Time if the CSA pulled the case prior to the end of the briefing process in order to begin preliminary review, and/or 2) missing dates may be affecting the calculation of Case Time by role.

**Table 3: Average Case Time by Case Track
for the Clerk's Office, CSA's Office, and Judges**

Case Tracks Specified by CAV	Average Case Time (in days)		
	Clerk's Office	CSA's Office	Judges
Chief Judge Dismissal (e.g., Case is Procedurally Defective)	93.7	0.0	1.4
Anders Case	201.2	104.9	19.2
CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	182.5	120.2	23.6
Senior Judge or Standing Panel Case with Disposition (Excluding Cases Identified as No Oral Standing Panel)	126.1	108.6	13.7
Merit Panel - CSA Identified as Probable No-Oral Prior to April 2023	167.6	51.7	105.2
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	197.6	111.5	81.7
Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	216.6	81.6	149.8
Merit Panel - Chambers Case (Not Including Actual Innocence Cases)	206.5	54.67	196.9
Actual Innocence Case	66.6	63.2	13.3
Petition Case - Commonwealth Appeal	na	na	na
Petition Case - Other than Commonwealth Appeal	42.5	61.5	58.0
Case Withdrawn/Settled - Preliminary Review Stage	103.0	2.3	0.3
All Cases	155.0	57.5	67.6

Note(s): Case Life was computed for cases filed during CY2022-CY2024 and disposed as of the date the data were downloaded (June 18, 2025, for criminal and civil cases and May 14, 2025, for other cases). Of the 6,313 cases filed during CY2022-CY2024, 5,242 (83.0%) were disposed by the download date. Analysis by role excludes Commonwealth Appeals and Original Jurisdiction cases.

The sum of Clerk, CSA and Judge Case Times may not total the overall Case Life because 1) there may be an overlap of CSA and Clerk Time if the CSA pulled the case prior to the end of the briefing process in order to begin preliminary review, and/or 2) missing dates may be affecting the calculation of case time by role.

Measuring Case Life Using Automated Data Versus Conducting a Time Study

Using the approach described above, Case Life and Case Time by role is measured in days. Case Time for the Clerk's Office, CSA's Office and judges reflects the amount of time a case remains in each office and the judges' chambers. It does not represent time spent actively working on a case. ACMS and available supplemental data are insufficient to measure the time spent on active case work. An alternate approach for computing case life is to conduct a time study. A time study requires participants to record time spent on specific work activities over a period of weeks or months. Using the time study approach, time spent on active case work can be calculated by case type. Such an approach has the advantage of measuring case life more precisely. However, it can be time consuming for judges, staff attorneys, and clerks to complete, further reducing the amount of time available to perform case work. Furthermore, case life measured through a time study cannot be updated without conducting another time study. An advantage of the approach used by the Sentencing Commission for the CAV project (utilizing ACMS and supplemental data) is that case life measures can be updated each year, as additional automated data become available.

Development of Statistical Models

Once Case Time was computed for the Clerk's Office, CSA's Office and judges, the Sentencing Commission turned to the development of statistical models. The objective of this stage of the project was to identify key drivers of case times for each group. To accomplish this, the Commission developed statistical models using factors and characteristics contained in ACMS and available supplemental data. A separate model was developed for Clerk Time, CSA Time, and Judge Time as factors affecting case time may be different, or the same factors may have different degrees of impact across the three groups. The Sentencing Commission used a well-known and accepted statistical method known as ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. In these models, Case Time was the predicted outcome. The Sentencing Commission tested all of the factors in the available data to identify which ones were statistically significant in predicting Case Time. The Sentencing Commission examined cases filed during CY2022-CY2024 and disposed as of the download date (June 18, 2025, for criminal and civil cases and May 14, 2025, for other cases). Key results are discussed below. Additional details regarding the final statistical models can be found in the Appendix. All factors listed in the final models are statistically significant at a level that is commonly used in social science research (significant at $p < .05$).

Clerk Case Time

Results from the Clerk Case Time model are shown in Table 4. The statistical model explains 62.2% of the variation in Clerk Case Time. In social science research, this percentage of explained variance is generally considered to be very good.

Table 4 lists the factors found to be statistically significant in the Clerk Case Time model and the associated unstandardized coefficients. The unstandardized coefficients are interpreted as follows: holding all other factors constant, a unit increase in that factor is associated with a change in Clerk Case Time equal to the unstandardized coefficient, as measured in days. For example, as shown in Table 4, holding all other factors constant, a Merit Panel Chambers case was associated with an increase in Clerk Case Time of 29.3 days on average compared to cases that are dismissed due to procedural or other defect (this latter type of case served as the comparison group for the model). Four other Case Tracks were correlated with longer Clerk Case Time. Holding all other factors constant, Merit Panel cases in which the judges agree that no oral argument is needed (pursuant to § 17.1-403) and Merit Panel cases with Suggested Disposition Memos from the CSA increased Clerk Case Time between 41-42 days on average. However, the group of cases in which the CSA has identified the case for an expedited track without oral argument (No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case) had the highest coefficient in the model (44.1), which indicates that such cases are associated with longer Clerk Case Time, all other factors remaining the same.

Several case types also proved to be significant. Criminal Appeals by Right had the largest coefficient of these, adding an average of 40.2 days to Clerk Case Time. Fast Track cases, both Termination of Parental Rights cases and other cases identified for Fast Track, were associated with lower Clerk Case Time (these factors have negative unstandardized coefficients in Table 4).

As discussed in the previous section, a case may be returned by the CSA to the Clerk's Office due to an incomplete record, deficient brief, or other reason. The Sentencing Commission calculated the Clerk Case Time to include the number of days that a case file spent in the Clerk's Office before the case was "pulled" into the CSA Office once again for review and assignment. The statistical model revealed that cases with two or more CSA "pull" dates increased Clerk Case Time by an average 38.4 days. The CSA's assigned level of difficulty (1, 2 or 3, with 3 assigned to cases that are the most complex) was also a good indicator for Clerk Case Time, with time increasing by an average of 4.3 days for each level increase (from 1 to 2, or 2 to 3). For clerks, cases from the Northern region had longer average case times than other regions, holding all other factors constant.

Cases resolved through a Merit Panel opinion were found to increase Clerk Case Time by an average of 35.4 days, all other factors remaining the same. Based on the model results, the number of pages in an opinion also contributed to Clerk Case Time. Each page of an opinion was found to increase Clerk Case Time by an average of 0.4 days.

The model results suggest that cases with one or both parties acting pro se reduced the total length of Clerk Case Time. It was noted during several of the interviews that pro se cases are often more time-consuming. In the statistical model, Clerk Case Time includes both the front-end time the Clerk spends with case when it is filed and back-end time when the case is returned to the Clerk's Office for release. While these cases may require more time initially, many of these cases may end up being dismissed and disposed of quickly. Given the results of the analysis, pro se parties did not increase the overall Clerk Case Time. However, certain types of motions were significant in contributing to CSA Case Time, as shown in Table 4. Motions for sanctions produced the highest unstandardized coefficient among the motions, adding 42.5 days on average to Clerk Case Time.

The Sentencing Commission also tested certain factors that apply only to the clerks. The Commission received data extracted from the Clerk's tab in ACMS. This dataset included 25 different tasks that are carried out by staff in the Clerk's Office. When a clerk completes one of the included tasks, it is recorded in the ACMS tab. For this analysis, the Sentencing Commission calculated the total number of times a clerk completed each such task for a case. These task factors were introduced into the Clerk Time Model and four emerged as statistically significant. There were: Record Request from Lower Tribunal by Email – Total; Notes Entered into Case File – Total; Record Rejected – Total; and E-mail Correspondence – Total. While all tasks take time for clerks to perform, these four increase Clerk Case Time consistently enough that they were statistically significant in the model.

Table 4: Results from the Statistical Model of Clerk Case Time

	Unstandardized Coefficient
Case Tracks (as specified by CAV):	
Anders Case	35.1
CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	44.1
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	41.1
Merit Panel - Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	42.0
Merit Panel - Chambers Case	29.3
Compared to: Cases dismissed due to procedural or other defect	
Case Types:	
Criminal Appeal by Right	40.2
Civil Appeal by Right	39.0
Other Civil Appeal	30.2
Domestic Relations	36.8
Workers' Compensation	24.2
Administrative Agency	30.4
Compared to: No Jurisdiction, Original Jurisdiction, Injunction, Interlocutory, and Contempt cases	
Fast Track Cases:	
Not Termination of Parental Rights	-15.7
Termination of Parental Rights	-25.2
CSA Case Management:	
CSA Number of Case Pulls – 2 or More (Excluding Reassignments to Other Attys)	38.4
CSA Assigned Level of Difficulty (1=Least Complex; 3=Most Complex)	4.3
Regions:	
Northern	3.9
Compared to: Western	
Case Resolution:	
Merit Panel Opinion	35.4
Number of Pages in Opinion	0.4
Attorney Types:	
One or Both Parties Is Pro Se	-16.7
Appellant Attorney Is Public Defender	14.3
Compared to: Privately retained attorneys	
Motion Types:	
Number of Motions Received - Extension of Time	17.1
Number of Motions Received - Sanctions	42.5
Number of Motions Received - Withdraw as Counsel	12.5
Number of Motions Received - Dismiss Case	4.7
Clerk's Office Activities:	
Record Request from Lower Tribunal - Email - Total	35.7
Notes Entered into Case File - Total	2.9
Record Rejected - Number of Times	11.6
E-mail Correspondence - Total	25.3

Percentage of variation in Clerk Case Time explained by the model: 62.2%

CSA Case Time

Results from the CSA Case Time model are shown in Table 5. The statistical model explains 45.4% of the variation in CSA Case Time. The percentage of explained variation in CSA Case Time is lower than the percentage of explained variation in the Clerk Case Time or Judge Case Time models. This means there is more variation in CSA Case Time that cannot be explained by the factors/characteristics captured in ACMS and supplemental data.

Table 5 displays the factors found to be statistically significant in the CSA Case Time model and the associated unstandardized coefficients. Holding all other factors constant, a Merit Panel Chambers case was associated with a decrease in CSA Case Time of 7.2 days on average compared to cases that are dismissed due to procedural or other defect (the comparison group). This finding is different than the result for the Clerk's Office, which indicated an increase of 29.3 days for a Merit Panel Chambers case. The CSA finding reflects the fact that, once a case is identified as a chambers case (typically the more complex cases), staff attorneys generally spend less time preparing materials before the case is sent to the assigned panel judges. Based on the final CSA Case Time model, other Merit Panel cases were associated with increased case time compared to cases dismissed due to procedural or other defect. It is interesting to note that No Oral Standing Panel (Expedited) Cases were found to be statistically significant, increasing CSA Case Time by an average of 35.0 days. All other things being equal, a Civil by Right case increased CSA Case Time by an average of 4.2 days compared to No Jurisdiction and criminal cases that were not by right (which collectively served as the comparison group). Other Civil cases were found to reduce CSA Case Time.

Ways in which the CSA manages cases also affect Case Time. As noted above, the CSA may return a case to the Clerk's Office due to an incomplete record, deficient brief, or other reason. When this occurs, the time the file remains in the Clerk's Office is added to the calculation of Clerk Case Time and it is not included in CSA Case Time. Nonetheless, according to the statistical model, this back and forth did ultimately increase the total CSA Case Time. As shown in Table 5, each time the CSA "pulled" the case (i.e., the CSA brought a case in for review and assignment to a staff attorney), it increased CSA Case Time by an average of 49.0 days.

After reviewing a case and before assigning it to a staff attorney, the CSA assigns the case a level of difficulty reflecting complexity of the case. The CSA assigns a 1 for the least complex cases, a 2 for cases involving moderate complexity, and a 3 for cases

that are the most complex. Cases never reviewed by the CSA (e.g., if a case was withdrawn/settled early in the appeals process) were assigned a 0 in the Sentencing Commission's analysis. The assigned level of difficulty was found to be statistically significant in the final CSA Case Time model. As the level of case difficulty increases (from 1 to 2, or 2 to 3), the length of CSA Case Time increased by 5.7 days on average. The fact that the CSA assigned level of difficulty is statistically significant suggests the CSA's approach provides a reasonable measure of case complexity that, itself, is indicative of the time it takes for the CSA's Office to complete its work on the case.

In the CSA Case Time model, cases from the Central and Eastern regions were statistically significant and both were related to increases in CSA Case Time compared to cases from the Western region (the comparison group). For CSA Case Time, merit panel opinions, published opinions/orders, and the number of pages in an opinion were not significant; however, the number of pages in orders was significant. For every additional page in an order, the CSA Case Time increased by an average of 4.8 days.

Appellant attorney types were also significant in this model. Here, pro se appellants added to time spent by CSA's working the case. For example, when the appellant attorney was listed as a pro se inmate, CSA Case Time increased by an average of 27.3 days, all other factors remaining the same. As in the Clerk's Case Time model, certain types of motions were significant in contributing to CSA Case Time. Motions to Strike had the largest coefficient of all the motions in the CSA model, increasing CSA Case Time by 26.3 days on average.

Finally, the year in which the case was filed was found to be significant in explaining CSA Case Time. Cases filed in CY2023 and the first half of CY2024 were associated with longer CSA Case Time compared to cases filed in CY2022.

Table 5: Results from the Statistical Model of CSA Case Time

	Unstandardized Coefficient
Case Tracks (as specified by CAV):	
Actual Innocence	-41.0
Anders Case	31.4
CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	35.0
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	26.2
Merit Panel - Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	22.3
Merit Panel - Chambers Case	-7.2
Withdrawn or Settled Case - Preliminary Review Stage	-23.0
Compared to: Cases dismissed due to procedural or other defect	
Case Types:	
Civil Appeal by Right	4.2
Other Civil Appeal	-18.0
Compared to: No Jurisdiction and criminal cases that were not by right	
CSA Case Management:	
CSA Number of Pull Dates (Excluding Reassignments to Other Attorneys)	49.0
CSA Assigned Level of Difficulty (1=Least Complex; 3=Most Complex)	5.7
Regions:	
Central	12.1
East	5.3
Compared to: Western	
Case Resolution:	
Number of Pages in Order	4.8
Attorney Types:	
Appellant Attorney Is ProSe Inmate	27.3
Appellant Attorney is ProSe NonInmate	15.1
Compared to: Privately retained attorneys	
Motion Types:	
Number of Motions Received - Dismiss Case	13.4
Number of Motions Received - Stay - CAV Proceedings	18.0
Number of Motions Received - Amend	12.1
Number of Motions Received - Strike	26.3
Number of Motions Received - Miscellaneous	4.1
Number of Motions Received - Extension of Time	1.5
Time Period:	
Cases filed in CY2023	19.6
Cases filed in January-June CY2024	23.4
Compared to: Cases filed in CY2022	

Percentage of variation in CSA Case Time explained by the model: 45.4%

Judge Case Time

Results from the Judge Case Time model are shown in Table 6. The statistical model explains 80.0% of the variation in Judge Case Time. The percentage of explained variation in Judge Case Time is the highest of all three models. The finding means that the factors/characteristics captured in CMS and supplemental data explain most of variation in time judges spend with a case.

Table 6 shows the factors found to be statistically significant in the Judge Case Time model and the associated unstandardized coefficients. Holding all other factors constant, a Merit Panel Chambers Case was associated with an increase in Judge Case Time of 140.0 days compared to cases that are dismissed due to procedural or other defect (the comparison group). A Merit Panel Case with a Suggested Disposition Memo provided by the CSA's Office was found to increase Judge Case Time by 106.3 days on average. All other things being equal, a Withdrawn or Settled Case was associated with a decrease in Judge Case Time of 7.1 days on average.

One case type proved to be significant. Civil Appeals by Right were associated with increased Judge Case Time, adding an average of 5.0 days. Cases from the Central, Eastern and Northern regions required additional Judge Case Time compared to Western region cases, all other factors held constant.

Cases that are resolved through a Merit Panel opinion were associated with longer Judge Case Time. Based on the final model, Merit Panel opinion extended Judge Case Time 14.6 days on average, all other factors remaining the same. An opinion/order that is published increased the time judges spend with the case by an average of 8.3 days. The number of pages in an opinion added to Judge Case Time, as well. Each page of an opinion was found to increase Judge Case Time by an average of 1.7 days. Cases that included a rehearing after the Merit Panel had longer Judge Case Times by an average of 20.6 days, all other factors held constant.

Certain attorney types were also found to be statistically significant in the Judge Case Time model. Having one or both parties pro se or having a public defender as the appellant's attorney was associated with slightly fewer days of Judge Case Time, while having a government attorney representing the appellant (e.g., the Attorney General's Office) increased case time on average compared to retained attorneys (the comparison group assigned in the model).

The number of motions received in a case had a statistically significant impact on Judge Case Time, but only certain types of motions. For example, a motion for continuance of oral argument added 20.5 days on average to Judge Case Time.

Finally, the year in which the case was filed was found to be statistically significant with the model indicating that cases filed in CY2023 and CY2024 had shorter Judge Case Time compared to cases filed in CY2022.

Table 6: Results from Statistical Model of Judge Case Time

	Unstandardized Coefficient
Case Tracks (as specified by CAV):	
Actual Innocence Case	8.4
CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	9.3
Merit Panel - CSA Identified as Probable No-Oral Prior to April 2023	68.6
Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	58.2
Merit Panel - Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	106.3
Merit Panel - Chambers Case	140.0
Withdrawn or Settled Case - Preliminary Review Stage	-7.1
Compared to: Cases dismissed due to procedural or other defect	
Case Types:	
Civil Appeal by Right	5.0
Compared to: No Jurisdiction or Original Jurisdiction cases	
Fast Track Cases:	
Termination of Parental Rights case	-26.5
Regions:	
Central	11.4
Eastern	9.5
Northern	4.3
Compared to: Western	
Case Resolution:	
Case Included a Rehearing after Merit Panel	20.6
Merit Panel Opinion	14.6
Merit Panel Opinion/Order Published	8.3
Number of Pages in Opinion	1.7
Attorney Types:	
One or Both Parties Is Pro Se	-4.9
Appellant Attorney - Government (e.g., Attorney General's Office)	29.8
Appellant Attorney Is Public Defender	-3.9
Compared to: Privately Retained Attorneys	
Motion Types:	
Number of Motions Received - Continuance of Oral Argument	20.5
Number of Motions Received - Amicus	18.7
Number of Motions Received - Death of Party	57.0
Number of Motions Received - Seal Record/Document	12.5
Number of Motions Received - Withdraw as Counsel	5.4
Number of Motions Received - Cost Bond	16.1
Number of Motions Received - PHV	7.1
Number of Motions Received - Substitution of Counsel	9.1
Time Period:	
Cases filed in CY2023	-7.5
Cases filed in January-June CY2024	-18.1
Cases filed in July-December 2024	-9.9
Compared to: Cases filed in CY2022	

Percentage of variation in Judge Case Time explained by the model: 80.0%

Formulation of a Workload Metrics Tool

In this stage of the project, the Sentencing Commission focused on the development of workload metrics for the CAV. The goal was to develop objective, empirically-based workload metrics that could be used as a tool for position and resource planning. The Workload Metrics Tool designed by the Sentencing Commission is Excel-based and provides a first-generation platform for estimating judge and staffing needs. The tool provides a way for the CAV to modify inputs based on current trends or expected changes to estimate future judge and staffing needs compared to current levels. The Tool also provides a way for the CAV to examine outputs, or benchmarks. The tool can be used to specify targets for these benchmarks and generate estimates of additional judges and personnel needed to meet those targets. Specifically, the Tool incorporates measures for the length of time it takes a case to move through the appeals process, the clearance rate, and the number of pending active cases. The Sentencing Commission formulated a separate tool for the judges, the CSA's Office, and the Clerk's Office.⁷

The Workload Metrics Tool is designed such that the CAV can test scenarios and estimate future judge and staffing needs that may result under each scenario. Current workload and current judge and staffing levels are the basis against which future scenarios are compared. In making the current versus future comparison, the assumption is that the current workload volume per judge, staff attorney, and clerk is to remain the same in the future. To calculate the current workload volume, the following equations were used⁸:

Judges Workload Volume = Number of Cases Filed * Average Judge Case Time

CSA's Office Workload Volume = Number of Cases Filed * Average CSA Case Time

Clerk's Office Workload Volume = Number of Cases Filed * Average Clerk Case Time

Workload volume is measured in case-days. It represents the total amount of time it would take to complete all of the work for the cases filed during the period of interest, given the current average Case Time. To calculate workload volume, the Sentencing Commission used the average number of cases filed per year during CY2022-CY2024. Using a multi-year average rather than a single-year figure reduces the effect an abnormal year may have on the results. Similarly, average Case Times were computed based on all cases filed in CY2022-CY2024 that were disposed as of the date the data were downloaded (June 18, 2025, for criminal and civil cases and May 14, 2025, for other cases).

⁷ The Workload Metric Tools do not include law clerks or other staff who work in the judges' chambers.

⁸ Due to time constraints, Commonwealth Appeals and Original Jurisdiction cases were not included in the calculation of Clerk, CSA and Judge Case Time. Such cases are included in the overall case life computation.

The calculation of total workload volume is shown below.

Judges Workload Volume = (6,313 cases/3) x 67.6 days = 142,252.9 case-days

CSA Office Workload Volume = (6,313 cases/3) x 57.5 days = 120,957.1 case-days

Clerk's Office Workload Volume = (6,313 cases/3) x 155.0 days = 326,234.8 case-days

Underlying the Workload Metric Tool is the assumption that the current ratio of Workload Volume per judge, staff attorney, and clerk is to remain the same in the future. Implicit in this assumption is that average Case Times are to remain the same in the future. In other words, it assumes that there will be no changes to current procedures or processes that would increase or decrease the average time it takes for cases to move through the appeals process. Given these assumptions, the number of additional positions needed in a future scenario can be calculated using the equations below.

$$\frac{\text{Current Judges Workload Volume}}{\text{Current Number of Judges}} = \frac{\text{Additional Workload Volume Expected}}{\mathbf{X}}$$

X = Number of Additional Judges Needed to Handle Additional Workload Volume

$$\frac{\text{Current CSA Office Workload Volume}}{\text{Current Number of Staff Attorneys}} = \frac{\text{Additional Workload Volume Expected}}{\mathbf{Y}}$$

Y = Number of Additional Staff Attorneys Needed to Handle Additional Workload Volume

$$\frac{\text{Current Clerk's Office Workload Volume}}{\text{Current Number of Clerks}} = \frac{\text{Additional Workload Volume Expected}}{\mathbf{Z}}$$

Z = Number of Additional Clerks Needed to Handle Additional Workload Volume

Using the assumptions described above, a Workload Metric Tool was created for the judges, the CSA's Office, and the Clerk's Office. Workload volume for each group was also calculated by Case Track, Case Category, Region and other relevant case characteristics. Select sections of the Judges Workload Metric Tool are shown in Figure 1 below. In this section of the Workload Metrics Tool, the CAV can specify percentage increases in the number of cases in each Case Track or Case Category. The tool uses the current ratio of Workload Volume per judge to estimate future need for judges to handle the additional workload that would be produced under the specified scenario.

Figure 1: Judges Workload Metrics Tool (Select Sections)
Inputs by Case Track Specified by the CAV, Case Category, and Region

INPUTS										
		CURRENT		PLANNING SCENARIO		CURRENT Average judge case life	CURRENT Judge case-days per year	Judge case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional judges needed
		Number of Cases Filed	Average Judge Case Life	Percentage Change Assumed	Estimated Future Level					
	CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case*	789	23.6	0.0	789	23.6	6217.3	6217.3	0.0	0.0
	Senior Judge or Standing Panel Case with Disposition**	354	13.7	0.0	354	13.7	1614.2	1614.2	0.0	0.0
	Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	403	81.7	0.0	403	81.7	10975.0	10975.0	0.0	0.0
	Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	1,002	149.8	0.0	1,002	149.8	50026.5	50026.5	0.0	0.0
	Merit Panel - Chambers Case (Not Including Act Inn Cases)	780	196.9	0.0	780	196.9	51201.8	51201.8	0.0	0.0
	Actual Innocence Case	103	13.3	0.0	103	13.3	455.9	455.9	0.0	0.0
	Petition Case - Commonwealth Appeal	66	na							
	Petition Case - Other than Commonwealth Appeal	75	58.0	0.0	75	58.0	1450.8	1450.8	0.0	0.0
	Case Withdrawn/Settled - Preliminary Review Stage	451	0.3	0.0	451	0.3	46.6	46.6	0.0	0.0
	No Determination by CSA (Active Case)	519	na							
	Unknown	159	102.4	0.0	159	102.4	5428.3	5428.3	0.0	0.0
OR	Case Category									
	Criminal by Right	3,182	77.2	0.0	3,182	77.2	81862.3	81862.3	0.0	0.0
	Other Criminal Filings	124	16.1	0.0	124	16.1	664.2	664.2	0.0	0.0
	Civil by Right	1,869	63.2	0.0	1,869	63.2	39354.9	39354.9	0.0	0.0
	Other Civil	79	67.1	0.0	79	67.1	1768.0	1768.0	0.0	0.0
	Domestic Relations	605	55.1	0.0	605	55.1	11105.8	11105.8	0.0	0.0
	Workers' Comp	179	51.6	0.0	179	51.6	3076.4	3076.4	0.0	0.0
	Administrative Agency	38	66.5	0.0	38	66.5	841.8	841.8	0.0	0.0
	Original Juris/Actual Innocence	131	13.3	0.0	131	13.3	579.9	579.9	0.0	0.0
	Other	47	58.0	0.0	47	58.0	909.1	909.1	0.0	0.0
	No Jurisdiction	59	6.9	0.0	59	6.9	136.5	136.5	0.0	0.0
	Region									
	Eastern	1,552	69.10	0.0	1,552	69.1	35747.7	35747.7	0.0	0.0
	Central	1,722	72.50	0.0	1,722	72.5	41615.0	41615.0	0.0	0.0
	Western	1,426	63.48	0.0	1,426	63.5	30174.2	30174.2	0.0	0.0
	Northern	1,613	64.66	0.0	1,613	64.7	34765.5	34765.5	0.0	0.0

To examine changes in outputs or benchmarks, the CAV would utilize the portion of the Workload Metrics Tool developed for that purpose. Selected sections of the Benchmarks section of the Judges Workload Metric Tool are shown in Figure 2. This portion of the tool allows the CAV to estimate additional judge positions needed for the Court to achieve specified Case Times, clearance rates⁹, or number of pending active cases. As with the Inputs section of the Workload Metrics Tool, the Benchmark section uses the current ratio of Workload Volume per judge to estimate future need for judges to accommodate the additional workload that would be produced under the specified scenario.

The Judges Workload Metrics Tool is shown in this report as an example. Using the same approach, Workload Metrics Tools were created for the CSA's Office and the Clerk's Office.

After testing prototypes of the tools, the Sentencing Commission demonstrated a prototype of the Workload Metrics Tool for the CAV and received input before finalizing the Tools.

⁹ The clearance rate is calculated as the number of cases disposed in a year divided by the number of case filings during the year.

Figure 2: Judges Workload Metrics Tool (Select Sections)
Benchmarks for Case Times, Pending Active Cases, and Clearance Rate

BENCHMARKS										
				CURRENT		PLANNING SCENARIO				
				Percentage Change Assumed	Estimated Future Level	CURRENT Judge case-days per year	Reduction in average case life necessary (days)	Number of additional case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional judges needed	
Average Case Life (in days)				Overall	Judge					
All Cases				271.8	67.6	0.0	67.6	142252.9	0.0	0.0
Cases analyzed: Cases filed in CY2022-CY2024 and Disposed as of 6/18/2025 for criminal/civil cases and as of 5/14/2025 for other cases.										
OR	CaseTrack									
	Chief Judge Dismissal (Procedurally Defective)	100.7	1.4	0.0	1.4	632.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Anders Case	314.9	19.2	0.0	19.2	1518.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	319.9	23.6	0.0	23.6	6217.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Senior Judge or Standing Panel Case with Disposition**	240.6	13.7	0.0	13.7	1614.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-40)	383.9	81.7	0.0	81.7	10975.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	441.6	149.8	0.0	149.8	50026.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Merit Panel - Chambers Case (Not Including Act Inn Cases)	452.5	196.9	0.0	196.9	51201.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Actual Innocence Case	142.6	13.3	0.0	13.3	455.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Petition Case - Commonwealth Appeal	108.0	na							
	Petition Case - Other than Commonwealth Appeal	155.8	58.0	0.0	58.0	1450.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Case Withdrawn/Settled - Preliminary Review Stage	108.7	0.3	0.0	0.3	46.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	No Determination by CSA (Active Case)	na	na							
	Unknown	329.9	102.4	0.0	102.4	5428.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
						Reduction in backlog in first year (number of cases)	CURRENT Average judge case life	Number of additional case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional judges needed	
	Number of Pending Cases	Number		Number						
	As of 12/31/2022	1,388								
	As of 12/31/2023	1,789								
	As of 12/31/2024	1,917		1,917		0	67.6	0	0.0	
	Time period assumed for reduction in pending cases (years)			2						
OR	Clearance Rate	Rate		Rate		Number of additional cases that must be concluded in year	CURRENT Average judge case life	Number of additional case-days under planning scenario	Number of additional judges needed	
	2024Q1	93.4%								
	2024Q2	90.2%								
	2024Q3	92.7%								
	2024Q4	100.0%								
	Number of Disposed Cases in Year (regardless of year filed)		2,001							
	Number Cases Filed in Year		2,127							
	Overall Clearance Rate for Year	94.08%		94.08%		0.0	67.6	0	0.0	

Limitations

The Workload Metrics Tools designed by the Sentencing Commission provide a first-generation platform for estimating judge and staffing needs. The Tools have certain limitations which are described in this section.

For each Tool, some sections overlap (i.e., represent the same cases) and using multiple sections of the Tool at the same time will result in an inflated figure for judge/staffing needs. For example, the Case Track, Case Category, and Region sections represent the same cases. The cases have simply been classified in different ways. This provides the CAV with flexibility in the types of planning scenarios it wishes to run. Due to this overlap, however, the CAV should not run scenarios changing inputs or benchmarks in the Case Track, Case Category, and Region sections at the same time and then sum the additional judge/staff numbers calculated by the Tool. Doing so will result in an inflated needs figure. Similarly, the CAV should not run scenarios changing benchmarks for the number of pending active cases and the clearance rate at the same time. In essence, pending cases and clearance rate are two ways to measure the number of cases not completed during a given time period. Using both pending cases and clearance rate sections at the same time will result in an inflated need figure. Both were included in the Tool to provide the CAV with options for running scenarios based on the measure of its choosing.

In addition to the limitation described above, this first-generation does not have a mechanism for updating benchmark figures based on changes entered into the Input section. In other words, when the CAV runs scenarios by changing inputs, such as the number of cases filed, the benchmarks shown on the Tool (Case Time, Pending active cases, and clearance rate) do not automatically recalculate based on the input changes. This enhancement was suggested during demonstration of the Tool for CAV staff and could be added at a later date.

Finally, the accuracy of any tool is dependent on the quality (accuracy and completeness) of the data used to produce the tool. In the course of the study, the Sentencing Commission encountered date entries that, when used to compute Case Times, resulted in negative values. This indicates that one or both dates used in the calculation was entered incorrectly by Court staff. Cases resulting in negative Case Times were not included in the computation of Case Times.

Analysis also revealed that most data fields had some degree of missing information. While the degree of missing information was not an issue for most data fields when the Sentencing Commission conducted its analysis, certain fields contained a higher percentage of missing data. The Commission did not include fields with a large percentage of missing data in its statistical models, as such models would be based on fewer cases and the subset of cases may not accurately reflect the universe of cases filed with the CAV.

Recommendations

In the course of this project, the Sentencing Commission identified areas where the CAV could improve the quality and availability of data. Improvements would support a more detailed measurement of judge, staff attorney, and clerk workload in the future. The Sentencing Commission's recommendations are discussed below.

Recommendation 1: Modify ACMS or design another automated system to capture information now collected by the CSA's Office and the Clerk's Office in supplemental spreadsheets.

Due to limitations of the legacy ACMS, the CSA records considerable detail about each case in Excel spreadsheets. This supplemental information includes dates and notes regarding cases returned to the Clerk's Office, as well as the level of difficulty (case complexity) assigned by the CSA, and the number of issues cited in the appeal. It also includes dates related to case flow through the CSA Office, such as the date the CSA "pulled" the case for review and assignment, the date it was assigned to a staff attorney, and the date work product was submitted by the staff attorney for review by a supervisor. Another CSA spreadsheet documents assignments of expedited cases to standing panels. These spreadsheets are used as tools by the CSA for case management, but they contain critical information that proved to be significant in the Sentencing Commission's statistical models.

Similarly, due to ACMS limitations, the Clerk's Office captures information about opinions and orders released through the Clerk's Disposition Team that is not otherwise available. The Clerk's supplemental spreadsheets record the opinion type, important dates related to case flow through the office, and the length of the opinion/order (number of pages). The length of opinion/orders proved to be relevant to Case Time as it was statistically significant in some form in all three statistical models.

Should a change in key personnel occur, the critical information contained in these spreadsheets may not be collected or may not be collected in the same way. The CAV should consider modifications to its automated data systems to ensure the availability of these data in the future.

Recommendation 2: Issue CAV case numbers earlier in the process.

In the data provided to the Sentencing Commission, there were 1,894 cases (out of a total of 19,360) that did not have a CAV Case Number. This amounted to 9.8% of the cases. In these cases, the ACMS record contained the parties' names, case type, and the lower tribunal name, but nearly all other fields, including dates fields, were empty.

In its 2024 *Report to the General Assembly*, the CAV referred to these cases as “pre-case matters.” These matters include, but are not limited to, pre-trial bond appeals and motions for delayed appeals.¹⁰ The limited information that ACMS contains indicates that the Court may receive roughly 200 pre-case matters per year. As case numbers are not issued at that stage, the actual number of pre-case matters filed each year is difficult to determine. Presumably, these pre-case matters require attention and generate some amount of work for judges or Court staff. Because there is almost no information entered into ACMS for pre-case matters, the amount of work performed by judges and Court staff cannot be assessed and could not be included in the Sentencing Commission’s workload metrics study.

Furthermore, lack of case numbers at the record submission stage prevented the Sentencing Commission from including record size in its statistical models. A number of individuals interviewed for this study noted that the size of the record submitted to the CAV is often, although not always, an indicator of the time it takes to work a case. When records are submitted through the VACES system, the size of the files submitted is stored electronically. VACES information was provided to the Sentencing Commission; however, the lack of case numbers made it extremely challenging to match these data to the ACMS dataset. Without case numbers, the Sentencing Commission attempted to match the files using appellant name, lower tribunal name, and the lower tribunal case number. Names and lower tribunal case numbers were not entered into VACES in a consistent format and, as with any information entered manually, were subject to human error. As a result, the Sentencing Commission was not able to match a sufficiently high percentage of the VACES record data to include record size in the statistical models. Issuing case numbers at the record submission stage would address this problem. As an alternative, the confirmation number that is generated when a record is submitted through VACES could be captured in ACMS or through other means. Moreover, VACES only contains record size for cases submitted electronically and does not capture record size for the six courts that only submit paper records.

Recommendation 3: Require consistent formatting for VACES entries.

The Sentencing Commission found that appellant and appellee names, lower tribunal names, and lower tribunal case numbers were not entered in a consistent format and it required considerable time to clean and format the data before attempts to match VACES data to the ACMS dataset could be made. If possible, the CAV should require standardized formats for VACES entries.

¹⁰ *Report to the Senate and House Committees for Courts of Justice*, Court of Appeals of Virginia, 2024.

Recommendation 4: Establish a method to better account for time a case remains in the Clerk’s Office waiting for action by the parties or by the lower tribunal court (i.e., periods during which little to no direct case work is performed).

The current ACMS does not contain sufficiently detailed information related to the periods during which a case remains in the Clerk’s Office awaiting action by the parties or when a case is returned by the CSA to the Clerk’s Office due to an incomplete record, deficient brief, or other reason. When the latter occurs, the Clerk’s Office must request the necessary documents or information and wait for the parties or the lower tribunal to submit the requested items.

For the workload metrics project, the Sentencing Commission attempted to account for the back and forth between the Clerk’s Office and the CSA that occurs in some cases by using one of the CSA’s supplemental spreadsheets. This spreadsheet contained CSA “pull” dates and notations documenting if a case was returned to the Clerk’s Office; however, the date the case was returned to the Clerk’s Office was not always included in the notes. When this occurred, the Sentencing Commission estimated the return date based on other dates entered into the spreadsheet. The Commission’s approach to capturing the back and forth between the two offices proved to be useful as these exchanges contributed to Case Time for both the Clerk’s Office and the CSA’s Office (see Clerk and CSA statistical models). Establishing a formal protocol to better account for the additional time a case spends in the Clerk’s Office may enable a more precise measurement of case flow. One such approach may be to establish a case log in ACMS to capture each date the file moves between the Clerk’s Office and the CSA’s Office.

In the circumstances described in the previous paragraph, little to no direct case work occurs until action by the parties or lower tribunal. The Clerk’s Office has no control over the time it takes the parties or the lower court to respond. In the current study, this pause in the case was included in the Clerk Case Time. The CAV may wish to examine alternative approaches for future studies.

Recommendation 5: Establish a standardized format for recording lower tribunal case number in ACMS.

The Sentencing Commission found that the lower tribunal case number was entered into ACMS without any standard format. Often the way lower tribunal case numbers were entered into ACMS did not match other data, such as the VACES Briefs Submissions file or the Circuit Court CMS system. Some ACMS entries appeared to be abbreviated versions of the lower tribunal case number. Some ACMS entries included multiple lower tribunal case numbers separated in various ways (use of “and,” “&,” “through,” or “;”) or multiple case numbers were indicated by the use of “etc.” after the first entry. While Circuit Court Clerk’s Offices may use varying case numbering schemes or use abbreviated case numbers when submitting records in VACES, it is recommended that the CAV develop a consistent format for recording the complete lower tribunal case numbers in ACMS.

Appendix

Final Statistical Models for Clerk Case Time, CSA Case Time, and Judge Case Time

Clerk Case Time Model

		Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	43.521	4.857		8.961	<.001		
	Anders Case	35.120	5.798	.083	6.057	<.001	.452	2.213
	CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	44.103	3.118	.179	14.143	<.001	.530	1.888
	Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	41.097	3.801	.134	10.812	<.001	.550	1.820
	Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	41.976	3.843	.197	10.923	<.001	.262	3.823
	Merit Panel - Chambers Case	29.347	4.195	.124	6.996	<.001	.268	3.732
	Year2023	5.628	1.591	.034	3.538	<.001	.927	1.079
	Region_North	3.880	1.828	.020	2.123	.034	.908	1.101
	FastTrackInd_NotTermPar Rts	-15.672	5.350	-.031	-2.929	.003	.779	1.284
	TermParentalRightsCaseInd	-25.173	6.024	-.044	-4.179	<.001	.777	1.287
	CSA_NumPullDates2orMore	38.401	2.628	.143	14.612	<.001	.883	1.132
	CSA Assigned Level of Difficulty - 1st	4.340	.994	.060	4.364	<.001	.444	2.254
	CaseCat_CrimAppCrimby Right	40.219	4.615	.245	8.715	<.001	.107	9.346
	CaseCat_CivilbyRight	38.956	4.484	.218	8.688	<.001	.135	7.430
	CaseCat_DomRel	36.762	5.003	.135	7.347	<.001	.250	3.994
	CaseCat_OthCivil	30.150	7.795	.042	3.868	<.001	.718	1.392
	CaseCat_WorkersComp	24.172	6.145	.050	3.933	<.001	.521	1.918
	CaseCat_AdminAgency	30.424	10.172	.030	2.991	.003	.824	1.213
	CRMerit_Opinion	35.368	3.185	.210	11.105	<.001	.238	4.204
	Clerks Dispositions - Opinions - Number of Pages	.388	.173	.033	2.239	.025	.385	2.595
	Pro Se Parties Indicator	-16.666	2.276	-.098	-7.322	<.001	.472	2.118
	AttyType_Appellant_PubIDe nVSB	14.304	2.641	.055	5.417	<.001	.835	1.197
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Extension of Time	17.127	.625	.280	27.400	<.001	.812	1.231
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Sanctions	42.529	8.679	.045	4.900	<.001	.994	1.006
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Withdraw as Counsel	12.489	3.231	.048	3.865	<.001	.544	1.839
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Dismiss Case	4.735	2.174	.021	2.178	.029	.899	1.113
	Clerks Office - Action - Record Request from LowerTribunal - Email - Total	35.652	1.594	.212	22.362	<.001	.938	1.066
	Clerks Office - Note - Total	2.850	.323	.088	8.819	<.001	.853	1.173
	Clerks Office - Action - Record Rejected - Total	11.621	1.524	.072	7.624	<.001	.937	1.067
	Clerks Office - Correspondence Email - Total	25.250	6.623	.035	3.813	<.001	.991	1.009

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Clerks Office Time with Case (in days): Total - Adjusted for Time Case Is Returned to Clerk for Incomplete Record, Motion, Etc

Clerk Case Time Model (continued)**Model Summary^b**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.790 ^a	.625	.622	50.408	1.853

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18744435.896	29	646359.858	254.374	<.001 ^b
	Residual	11256548.528	4430	2540.982		
	Total	30000984.424	4459			

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Clerks Office Time with Case (in days): Total - Adjusted for Time Case Is Returned to Clerk for Incomplete Record, Motion, Etc

CSA Case Time Model

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-28.606	2.633		-10.865	<.001		
	Anders Case	31.443	5.116	.082	6.146	<.001	.681	1.468
	CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	34.962	3.588	.157	9.744	<.001	.464	2.153
	Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	26.248	4.336	.094	6.053	<.001	.496	2.018
	Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	22.344	3.433	.114	6.509	<.001	.392	2.550
	Merit Panel - Chambers Case	-7.216	3.639	-.033	-1.983	.047	.426	2.347
	Actual Innocence Case	-41.032	6.906	-.076	-5.942	<.001	.745	1.343
	Withdrawn or Settled Case - Preliminary Review Stage	-23.042	11.613	-.022	-1.984	.047	.952	1.051
	Year2023	19.619	1.845	.129	10.634	<.001	.820	1.219
	Year2024_BeforeAddlStaff	23.392	2.603	.109	8.986	<.001	.817	1.225
	Region_Central	12.067	1.983	.072	6.085	<.001	.861	1.162
	Region_East	5.254	2.065	.030	2.544	.011	.859	1.164
	CSA Number of Pull Dates in File (Excluding Reassignments to Other Attorneys)	48.987	1.740	.425	28.146	<.001	.529	1.890
	CSA Assigned Level of Difficulty - 1st	5.684	1.078	.086	5.271	<.001	.448	2.233
	CaseCat_CivilbyRight	4.246	2.046	.026	2.076	.038	.770	1.299
	CaseCat_OthCivil	-17.996	6.976	-.029	-2.580	.010	.983	1.017
	Clerks Dispositions - Orders - Number of Pages	4.769	.436	.151	10.940	<.001	.629	1.589
	AttyType_Appellant_ProSel nmate	27.270	3.364	.107	8.106	<.001	.693	1.443
	AttyType_Appellant_ProSe NonInmate	15.149	2.625	.089	5.772	<.001	.507	1.974
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Dismiss Case	13.359	2.382	.065	5.609	<.001	.886	1.128
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Stay - CAV Proceedings	18.006	3.862	.054	4.663	<.001	.882	1.133
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Amend	12.080	3.720	.038	3.248	.001	.882	1.133
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Strike	26.279	8.417	.036	3.122	.002	.890	1.124
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Miscellaneous	4.110	1.428	.034	2.878	.004	.866	1.155
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Extension of Time	1.544	.680	.028	2.269	.023	.820	1.220

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Chief Staff Attys Office Time with Case (in days): Last Brief Received Date (or Due Date If Brief Not Filed) to Assignment Date - Adjusted If CSA Pulls Case Prior to End of Briefing Phase or Case Is Returned to Clerks Office

CSA Case Time Model (continued)**Model Summary^b**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.676 ^a	.457	.454	55.360	1.843

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11617383.089	24	484057.629	157.947	<.001 ^b
	Residual	13812541.399	4507	3064.686		
	Total	25429924.488	4531			

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Chief Staff Attys Office Time with Case (in days): Last Brief Received Date (or Due Date If Brief Not Filed) to Assignment Date - Adjusted If CSA Pulls Case Prior to End of Briefing Phase or Case Is Returned to Clerks Office

Judge Case Time Model

		Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6.751	2.024		3.335	<.001		
	Actual Innocence Case	8.360	4.270	.013	1.958	.050	.925	1.081
	CSA No Oral Standing Panel Expedited Case	9.255	2.050	.036	4.514	<.001	.662	1.510
	Merit Panel - CSA Identified as Probable No-Oral Prior to April 2023	68.558	4.485	.142	15.287	<.001	.487	2.054
	Merit Panel - Judges Agree No Oral Argument Needed (§ 17.1-403)	58.242	2.892	.181	20.141	<.001	.523	1.912
	Merit Panel with Suggested Disposition Memo from CSA	106.313	3.581	.471	29.686	<.001	.167	5.971
	Merit Panel - Chambers Case	139.985	3.854	.565	36.324	<.001	.174	5.733
	Withdrawn or Settled Case - Preliminary Review Stage	-7.118	2.223	-.025	-3.203	.001	.713	1.403
	Year2023	-7.547	1.323	-.044	-5.704	<.001	.720	1.389
	Year2024_BeforeAddlStaff	-18.093	1.768	-.077	-10.231	<.001	.753	1.328
	Year2024_AfterAddlStaff	-9.891	2.270	-.032	-4.357	<.001	.792	1.263
	TermParentalRightsCaseI nd	-26.471	3.969	-.044	-6.669	<.001	.962	1.039
	Region_Central	11.428	1.567	.060	7.295	<.001	.623	1.604
	Region_East	9.487	1.622	.048	5.847	<.001	.625	1.601
	Region_North	4.266	1.630	.022	2.617	.009	.607	1.648
	CaseCat_CivilbyRight	5.038	1.370	.027	3.677	<.001	.758	1.320
	Clerks Dispositions - Opinions - Number of Pages	1.703	.131	.139	12.996	<.001	.366	2.730
	CRMerit_Opinion	14.602	3.023	.083	4.830	<.001	.143	6.990
	CRMerit_Published	8.332	2.703	.024	3.083	.002	.710	1.407
	Rehearing	20.579	10.453	.013	1.969	.049	.944	1.059
	AttyType_Appellant_GovtVS B	29.816	7.142	.027	4.175	<.001	.980	1.021
	Pro Se Parties Indicator	-4.880	1.579	-.027	-3.090	.002	.550	1.818
	AttyType_Appellant_PublDe tVSB	-3.904	1.840	-.015	-2.122	.034	.834	1.199
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Continuance of Oral Argument	20.525	3.016	.046	6.806	<.001	.925	1.081
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Amicus	18.654	4.054	.034	4.602	<.001	.793	1.262
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Death of Party	56.990	11.017	.034	5.173	<.001	.992	1.009
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Seal Record/Document	12.544	3.344	.025	3.752	<.001	.955	1.047
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Withdraw as Counsel	5.350	1.857	.020	2.881	.004	.887	1.127
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Cost Bond	16.053	6.307	.017	2.545	.011	.986	1.015
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - PHV	7.099	3.226	.015	2.200	.028	.856	1.168
	Motions - Number of Motions Received - Substitution of Counsel	9.071	4.421	.013	2.052	.040	.978	1.022

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Judge Time with Case (in days): Assignment Date to Filing with Clerks Office Disposition Team

Judge Case Time Model (continued)**Model Summary^b**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.895 ^a	.801	.800	37.954	1.782

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27379503.589	30	912650.120	633.557	<.001 ^b
	Residual	6805001.527	4724	1440.517		
	Total	34184505.115	4754			

a. Dependent Variable: Case Life - Judge Time with Case (in days): Assignment Date to Filing with Clerks Office Disposition Team

