TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT
TO
PROTOCOL COMMITTEE

In 2016, the Protocol Committee approved a new set of protocol indicators. The newly adapted indicators will be used to monitor the adequacy of judicial resources in King County Superior Court starting 2017.

There are three protocol indicators. If one or more of them show a continuous trend, the Technical Committee shall conduct an in-depth analysis to determine the causes, explore solutions, and make recommendations to the Protocol Committee.

Indicator A: Weighted Caseload Index (WCI)

$$WCI = \sum(\text{weight} * \text{current pending caseload}) = 0.131 * P_1 + 0.042 * P_2 + 0.080 * P_3 + 0.086 * P_4$$

Where P_1 is the pending criminal caseload for the current quarter; P_2 is the pending civil and domestic without children caseload for the current quarter; P_3 is the pending domestic with children and paternity caseload for the current quarter; P_4 is the pending juvenile offender caseload for the current quarter.

Table 1. Weighted Caseload Index

Quarter	Criminal (P1)	Civil and Domestic Cases without Children (P2)	Domestic Cases with Children and Paternity (P3)	Juvenile Offender (P4)	Weighted Caseload Index (WCI)	"Smoothed" WCI: Running Average of WCIs of 4 Quarters
Q1/2022	62.90	30.58	18.40	2.00	113.9	122.1
Q2/2022	55.58	30.36	18.63	2.20	106.8	116.0
Q3/2022	55.24	31.23	18.87	2.20	107.5	110.9
Q4/2022	56.23	31.81	18.87	2.59	109.5	109.4
Q1/2023	60.64	32.33	18.71	2.87	114.6	109.6
Q2/2023	56.07	33.11	19.15	2.66	111.0	110.6
Q3/2023	55.24	34.13	19.45	2.57	111.4	111.6
Q4/2023	51.27	32.76	19.00	2.60	105.6	110.6
Q1/2024	51.26	33.22	19.59	3.17	107.2	108.8
Q2/2024	53.24	34.72	20.02	3.85	111.8	109.0
Q3/2024	52.46	36.38	20.45	3.51	112.8	109.4
Q4/2024	52.78	35.91	19.86	3.59	112.1	111.0
Q1/2025	54.20	38.55	20.69	4.27	117.7	113.6
Q2/2025	51.74	39.02	20.63	3.85	115.2	114.5
Q3/2025	51.25	40.00	20.66	3.49	115.4	115.1

Note: The computation of the weighted caseload index (WCI) is based on the number of pending criminal cases, juvenile offender cases; cases with judge assignments in general civil, domestic, and paternity.

Explanation: The WCI (weighted caseload index) is compared to a base value of 106 since the court has added 3 more judges after the adaption of the agreement. Approximately, a 2-point deviation from 106 indicates being one judicial position over or under ideal staffing.

Benchmarks - "Whether the running WCI has shown a consistent 2-point deviation from 106 (over or under) in four consecutive quarters."

Conclusion: **The weighted caseload index for the recent four quarters indicates that the court is in need of extra judges in the King County Superior Court. However, the indicator has been greatly impacted by COVID-19 and need to be interpreted accordingly.**

Indicator B: Age Indicator of Pending Caseload

Table 2. Median Age (days) for All Pending Cases and Major Case Types										
	All Pending Cases		Criminal		Civil		Domestic		Juvenile Offender	
Quarter	Median age (days)	Same quarter change %	Median age (days)	Same quarter change %	Median age (days)	Same quarter change %	Median age (days)	Same quarter change %	Median age (days)	Same quarter change %
Q1/2022	183	-0.5%	257	+10.8%	161	-4.2%	157	+1.3%	140	-45.1%
Q2/2022	163	-14.2%	235	-12.6%	148	-9.2%	140	-0.7%	114	-55.1%
Q3/2022	162	-15.6%	232	-19.2%	145	-15.7%	138	-2.8%	122	-55.6%
Q4/2022	167	-12.3%	222	-19.6%	153	-11.6%	152	-3.2%	122	-49.2%
Q1/2023	159	-13.3%	198	-23.0%	164	-1.1%	151	-3.0%	81	-42.1%
Q2/2023	158	-3.1%	213	-9.4%	150	+1.4%	138	-1.4%	107	-6.1%
Q3/2023	166	+2.4%	216	-6.9%	156	+7.6%	145	+5.1%	106	-13.1%
Q4/2023	171	+2.4%	236	+6.3%	158	+3.3%	150	-1.3%	90	-26.2%
Q1/2024	166	+4.4%	227	+14.6%	150	-8.5%	153	+1.3%	89	+9.9%
Q2/2024	152	-3.8%	200	-6.1%	140	-6.7%	139	+0.7%	103	-3.7%
Q3/2024	155	-6.6%	203	-6.0%	146	-6.3%	144	-0.7%	105	-0.9%
Q4/2024	162	-5.3%	211	-10.6%	152	-3.8%	159	+6.0%	97	+7.8%
Q1/2025	158	-4.8%	199	-7.0%	144	-4.0%	158	+3.3%	111	+24.7%
Q2/2025	145	-4.6%	183	-8.5%	137	+3.6%	139	+0.0%	112	+8.7%
Q3/2025	155	0%	188	-11.3%	147	+0.7%	146	+1.4%	130	+23.8%

The "median" indicates age of the half of the cases (half longer and half shorter).

Explanation: The "median" age of pending cases is expected to show some fluctuation from quarter to quarter. This age indicator is used to measure how long the cases have been open since the filing date. A prolonged age for a significant time period may indicate the lack of judicial resource, as well as other factors.

Benchmarks - "Whether the median age of pending cases shows an increase of 10% or more for four consecutive quarters compared to the same quarter of the previous year."

Conclusion: <u>The age of pending cases for all cases had not shown a consistent trend in 4 consecutive quarters.</u>

Indicator C: Pro-tem Use Indicator Tem

Table 3: Average Daily Pro Tem Judge/Commissioner Use			
Quarter	**Pro Tem Commissioners (FTE)**	**Pro Tem Judges (FTE)**	**TOTAL (FTE)**
Q1/2022	1.7	0.3	2.0
Q2/2022	4.5	0.3	4.8
Q3/2022	4.2	0.3	4.5
Q4/2022	2.2	0.3	2.5
Q1/2023	3.2	0.2	3.4
Q2/2023	3.5	0.3	3.8
Q3/2023	2.4	0.3	2.7
Q4/2023	3.5	0.6	4.1
Q1/2024	4.1	0.1	4.2
Q2/2024	4.7	0.8	5.5
Q3/2024	3.1	0.2	3.3
Q4/2024	4.1	0.3	4.4
Q1/2025	3.3	0	3.3
Q2/2025	4.5	0.2	4.7
Q3/2025	3.2	0.2	3.4

Pro Tem Commissioners = Pro Tem hours for Ex Parte, Family Law and Mental Illness Calendars. Pro Tem Judges = Pro Tem hours for all other calendars. FTE is calculated based on the total hours reported (450 hours = 1 FTE in a quarter).

Explanation: The use of Pro Tems is necessary to cover the calendars due to temporary lack of judicial resources. However, the consistent utilization of a high volume of Pro Tems over a prolonged period should be a concern.

Benchmarks– "whether consistent use of more Pro Tems than are required to backfill for judicial vacancies or long term unplanned absences (i.e. exceeding two weeks) over a period of four consecutive quarters."

Conclusion: **In the three quarters of 2025, the average number of pro tem judges and commissioners used by KCSC was 3.3 , 4.7, and 3.4 FTEs per day. Of this, the majority was for commissioner's duties.**

Overall Conclusion: The protocol indicators show that the court is in need of additional judicial resources based on the protocol agreement. However, the COVID-19 has had undue impact to the protocol indicators. Further investigation and analysis are necessary when the court operation returns to normal.