

BEXAR COUNTY

Judicial Services

BEXAR COUNTY JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

CRIMINAL DISTRICT COURTS 3rd QUARTER FY 2016-17 (April, 2017 – June, 2017)

JUDICIAL SYSTEM WORKLOAD AND EFFICIENCY MEASURES

Brief Summary:

This report reflects District Court workload and efficiency measures for FY 2016-2017 between the months of April through June (Quarter 3). The report only includes criminal district courts in the Bexar County judicial system:

144th Criminal District Court: Lorina Rummel
175th Criminal District Court: Judge Catherine Torres-Stahl*
186th Criminal District Court: Judge Jefferson Moore
187th Criminal District Court: Judge Steven Hilbig
226th Criminal District Court: Judge Sid L. Harle
227th Criminal District Court: Judge Kevin O'Connell
290th Criminal District Court: Judge Melisa Skinner
379th Criminal District Court: Judge Ron Rangel
399th Criminal District Court: Judge Frank J. Castro*
437th Criminal District Court: Judge Lori Valenzuela

* Judges assumed office of Jan 1, 2017.

This report focuses on the following six measures and shows how the individual courts performed relative to each other and the court-wide average.


Measure 1: Cost per Disposition
Measure 2: Jail Bed Days
Measure 3: Clearance Rate
Measure 4: Disposition Rate
Measure 5: Time to Disposition
Measure 6: Age of Active Cases Pending

Measure 1: Cost per Disposition

Definition: The net cost of disposing of a single case.

Analysis and Interpretation: The following graph and table show a court by court comparison of Cost per Disposition and Cost per Court Appointment for Indigent Defense based on 3rd Quarter FY 2016-17 data. Courts are listed in order from lowest to highest net cost per disposition. Indigent defense is included in the net cost per disposition. Of the total expenses for the court system, **56.5** percent are indigent defense costs. The second graph represents the average net cost (revenue collected versus cost) per court appointed attorney assignment. The final graph shows the average cost per disposition for the District Court over the past eight quarters.



Differences in the net cost per disposition are mostly explained by the differences in the revenue collection and in the number of dispositions of the type that generate fees. For example, the defendant in case dismissal is not accessed fees.



3rd Qtr. FY 2016-17 Cost per Disposition

Court Number	Judge	Operating Expenses	Ct. Appointed Atty. Costs	Total Expenses	Indigent Defense Revenues	Court Fine Revenues	Court Costs Revenues	Total County Revenues	Net Cost/ (Savings)	Number of Dispositions	Net Cost (Savings) per Disposition
144	Rummel	\$ 132,927	\$ 187,836	\$ 320,763	\$ 1,975	\$ 42,813	\$ 22,145	\$ 66,933	\$ 253,829	449	\$ 565
175	Torres-Stahl	\$ 132,244	\$ 134,500	\$ 266,744	\$ 265	\$ 37,012	\$ 14,699	\$ 51,976	\$ 214,768	431	\$ 498
186	Moore	\$ 136,357	\$ 199,852	\$ 336,208	\$ 1,048	\$ 43,125	\$ 18,512	\$ 62,684	\$ 273,524	532	\$ 514
187	Hilbig	\$ 133,831	\$ 190,344	\$ 324,175	\$ 1,724	\$ 42,275	\$ 18,971	\$ 62,969	\$ 261,206	522	\$ 500
226	Harle	\$ 138,350	\$ 139,764	\$ 278,114	\$ 2,883	\$ 37,615	\$ 14,290	\$ 54,788	\$ 223,326	383	\$ 583
227	O'Connell	\$ 146,293	\$ 173,992	\$ 320,286	\$ 892	\$ 44,391	\$ 19,171	\$ 64,453	\$ 255,832	393	\$ 651
290	Skinner	\$ 139,308	\$ 213,167	\$ 352,475	\$ 462	\$ 32,009	\$ 13,965	\$ 46,436	\$ 306,039	388	\$ 789
379	Rangel	\$ 132,894	\$ 193,887	\$ 326,781	\$ 743	\$ 49,947	\$ 20,820	\$ 71,510	\$ 255,271	491	\$ 520
399	Castro	\$ 127,784	\$ 178,400	\$ 306,184	\$ 641	\$ 34,859	\$ 13,299	\$ 48,799	\$ 257,385	488	\$ 527
437	Valenzuela	\$ 132,939	\$ 144,461	\$ 277,400	\$ 2,018	\$ 36,549	\$ 15,651	\$ 54,217	\$ 223,182	377	\$ 592
	Admin*	\$ 721,532			N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total:		\$1,352,926	\$1,756,203	\$3,109,129	\$12,650	\$400,594	\$171,523	\$584,766	\$2,524,362	4454	\$ 566.76



*Cost of Administration prorated equally across all trial courts



Measure 2: Jail Bed Days

Definition: The number of jail bed days consumed.

Analysis and Interpretation: The first chart below shows a court by court comparison of Jail Bed Days for the 3rd Quarter FY 2016-17 from least to the greatest number of jail bed days. The second chart displays the total number of jail bed days consumed court wide for each of the last eight quarters. The third chart shows the average length of stay for custodies by District Court for the 3rd Quarter FY 2016-17. The final chart displays the average length of stay for the past eight quarters for the entire court.





*****Note: The number of Jail Bed Days was calculated from the new Jail Track Report, which is based on the new highest charge logic. Hence, the values listed here are not comparable to values from previous quarters. The new Jail Track report is not generated on Saturdays and Sundays. Hence, it does not include the totals for the weekends of April, May and June, along with missing data for 1 day.***

The differences from previous quarters in total jail bed days are primarily attributed to the re-assignment of unindicted and “no court” cases to two separate categories (“Awaiting Indictment” and “No Court Assigned,” respectively). Previously, for unindicted cases, the pre-hearing court was counted. Cases with no court assigned were either not counted at all, or were sometimes assigned to a previous case’s court. Additionally, in determining the highest charge, sentenced cases are no longer counted above pending cases. Under the new highest charge logic, a sentenced case, irrespective of the offense level, does not trump a pending case when it comes to determining the highest charge.



The average length of stay only measures the time spent for the highest charge for a defendant in that court.

For the District Courts, the average length of stay is broken down by the length of time spent for at-large indictments (measured as the time from date of booking to date of release) and the length of time spent for on-sight indictments (measured as the time from date of indictment to date of release).

On-sight indictments refer to those scenarios in which the indictment occurs after the booking date. At-large indictments refer to those instances when the indictment occurs prior to the booking date.



The graph below lists the average length of stay as a composite measure of the average length of stay for the at-large indictments and for on-sight indictments. The quarterly comparisons graph also lists this same measure.



****Note: The Average Length of Stay for this quarter and last quarter were computed from SAS data based on new highest charge logic. Hence, the values listed here are not comparable to values from previous quarters.**


Measure 3: Clearance Rates




Definition: The number of disposed cases as a percentage of the number of incoming cases.




Analysis and Interpretation: The clearance rate is a measure of incoming cases a court receives compared to cases disposed monthly. A clearance rate of 100% represents a court that is disposing of the same number of incoming cases. A clearance rate above 100% represents a court that is disposing of more incoming cases than it is receiving. A clearance rate below 100% represents a court that is disposing of fewer incoming cases than it is receiving. This measure can be used to determine whether or not a backlog may occur. *Note: Due to new reporting requirements by the Office of Court Administration, certain types of dismissals (such as, Dismissed – Defendant Deceased, Dismissed – Reduced to Class C, Dismissed and Reduced) are not included in the number of dispositions.*




Several graphs are displayed below.


1. The first graph shows the number of incoming cases, which indicates the incoming workload for the Quarter.
2. The second graph displays total number of cases that were disposed by each court, which indicate the amount of work that was produced for the quarter.
3. The third chart shows the clearance rate by court from the highest to the lowest.
4. The fourth chart displays the court-wide average clearance rate for the past eight quarters.
5. The fifth set of graphs display by court the Clearance Rates over the past nine months. The Court with the highest clearance rate is displayed first.
















***Note: Judge Castro assumed office on Jan 1, 2017.**





***Note: Judge Torres-Stahl assumed office on Jan 1, 2017.**





Measure 4: Disposition Rates

Definition: The number of disposed cases as a percentage of the Active Caseload.

Analysis and Interpretation: The disposition rate is a measure of cases disposed during the quarter compared to the average active caseload during the same quarter. This calculation includes the disposition of cases on the existing docket in addition to the other matters addressed by the Court. The first chart displays the number of active cases by court from the smallest to the largest. The second chart shows the court-wide docket size at the end of each of the last eight quarters. The third chart shows the disposition rate by court, from the highest to lowest. The final chart displays the court-wide active caseload and average disposition rate for the past eight quarters.





Measure 5: Time to Disposition

Definition: The percentage of cases disposed or otherwise resolved within established time frames. This is a comparison of data from *age of disposed cases* and only considers cases that are disposed, not the full docket.

The Criminal District Courts have implemented a Felony Case Plan (CASE) that sets the time standards for Bexar County. The applied time frame for this measure will use the Standard Track time frame, in which a case can be disposed of between 275 days and 285 days. The most similar range in the reported data is between 181 and 365 days, which will be used for this measure.

Analysis and Interpretation: For each case, the report calculates the time, in days, from filing of the case until the date the case was disposed. The case processing time standards published by the American Bar Association (ABA) and those published by the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) are utilized. The following charts display for each court the time periods required to dispose of their cases. The courts with the greatest number of dispositions are shown first.

Note: Although the time to disposition is measured only using active cases that have been disposed, the case time that elapsed when the defendant was a fugitive is included in this measure.

COSCA Case Processing Standards – Criminal Felony

COSCA Case Processing Standards	Criminal District Courts
100% within 180 Days	60% within 180 Days




ABA Case Processing Standards – Criminal Felony




ABA Case Processing Standards	Criminal District Courts
90 % within 90 Days	39% within 90 Days
98% within 180 Days	60% within 180 Days
100% within 365 Days	81% within 365 Days




National Center for State Courts Model Case Processing Standards – Criminal Felony

NCSC Case Processing Standards	Criminal District Courts
75 % within 90 Days	39% within 90 Days
90% within 180 Days	60% within 180 Days
98% within 365 Days	81% within 365 Days

Source: National Center for State Courts Web site,
www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CasManCPTSPub.pdf








**3rd Qtr. FY 2016-17
Time to Disposition
Judge Valenzuela**



**Total Cases
Disposed = 377**



Measure 6: Age of Active Cases Pending Cases

Definition: The age of active cases pending before the court is measured as the number of days from filing until the time of measurement.

Analysis and Interpretation: This measure illustrates how a court's time to disposition compares to ABA standards. The first chart displays the percent of active cases that are over a year old for each of the courts. The second chart shows the court-wide average percent of active cases over a year old for the past eight quarters. *Note: Fugitives are not included in the data. Cases include what district courts consider open felony cases.*



BEXAR COUNTY JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT
APPENDIX A
Explanation and Method of Collection for Different Measures

Measure 1: Cost per Disposition

Definition: The net cost of disposing of a single case.

Method: Cost per disposition is the net cost of the court divided by the number of dispositions. Net cost per disposition includes revenue collected and costs between April 2017 and June 2017 from each court. This measure allows the court to compare average cost per case to other courts. Other personnel associated with the cost of disposing of a case are budgeted within other respective County departments, such as the District Attorney’s Office, Bexar County Sheriff’s Office, and the District Clerk’s Office and are not included in the calculation for net Court cost per disposition.

Measure 2: Jail Bed Days

Definition: The number of jail bed days consumed.

Method: This information is retrieved from the Jail Track Management System and counts the total number of jail bed days used by court.

The average length of stay for inmates is calculated by totaling the number of jail bed days consumed from indictment to release and dividing by the number of inmates incarcerated. It only measures the time spent on the highest level of charge by a defendant in a particular court.

Measure 3: Clearance Rates

Definition: The number of disposed cases as a percentage of the number of incoming cases.

Method: Clearance rates are measured using two variables, incoming cases and the number of cases disposed monthly. Incoming cases include new cases filed during the month, cases appealed from lower courts, and other cases reaching docket (motions to revoke probation/deferred adjudication, cases reactivated, and all other cases). The number of outgoing cases includes all monthly dispositions. *Due to new reporting requirements by the Office of Court Administration, certain types of dismissals (such as, Dismissed – Defendant Deceased, Dismissed – Reduced to Class C, Dismissed and Reduced) are not included in the number of dispositions.*

Measure 4: Disposition Rates

Definition: The number of disposed cases as a percentage of the Active Caseload.

Method: Disposition rates are measured using two variables, active caseload and the number of cases disposed. The active caseload includes any cases assigned to the Court, but excludes those cases where the defendant has been declared a fugitive. The number of disposed cases includes all cases adjudicated less certain dismissals not allowed by OCA directive. *Due to new reporting requirements by the Office of Court Administration, the disposition rate is now a percentage of the active docket and not of the entire docket as previously reported.*

Measure 5: Time to Disposition

Definitions: The percentage of cases disposed or otherwise resolved within established time frames. This is a comparison of data from *age of disposed cases* and only considers cases that are disposed, not the full docket.

Method: For each case, the report calculates the time in days from filing of the case until the date the case was disposed. The case processing time standards published by the American Bar Association (ABA), the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) and the National Center for State Courts were used when establishing the benchmarks.

COSCA Case Processing Standards

- Felony – 100% within 180 days

ABA Case Processing Standards

- Felony
- 90% within 90 days
- 98% within 180 days
- 100% within 365 days

NCSC Model Case Processing Standards – Criminal

- Felony
- 75% within 90 days
- 90% within 180 days
- 98% within 365 days

*Source: National Center for State Courts Web site,
www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CasManCPTSPub.pdf.*

Measure 6: Age of Active Cases Pending Cases

Definition: The age of active cases pending before the court is measured as the number of days from filing until the time of measurement.

Method: For each case type being analyzed, the report calculates the time, in days, from filing of the case until the date established for the reporting period being examined (June 25, 2017 for 3rd Quarter).

BEXAR COUNTY JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT
APPENDIX B
Source Documents for Different Measures

Sources:

Measure(s)	Data Source	Date & Time of Source
Cost per Disposition	Bexar County Court Collection System Report: Felony	Apr 2017- June 2017
Cost per Disposition; Clearance Rate; Disposition Rate; Time to Disposition;	Bexar County Criminal Justice Information System: District Court Criminal Section Summary Report KJJ3250M April 2017 KJJ3250M May 2017 KJJ3250M June 2017	05/13/17, 09:35:00 06/10/17, 09:44:00 07/08/17, 14:18:00
Clearance Rate; Disposition Rate;	Bexar County Criminal Justice Information System: Disposition Report Summary KJJDSPRA April 2017 KJJDSPRA May 2017 KJJDSPRA June 2017	05/03/17, 17:31:00 06/03/17, 17:31:00 07/03/17, 17:31:00
Cost per Disposition	Lawson Financial System GL298 Commitment Analysis Report	Fiscal Year 2017 Period 7-9
Jail Bed Days	Bexar County Criminal Justice Information System: Jail Track Report	04/01/17-06/30/17
ALOS	Bexar County Criminal Justice Information System: Release Table	04/01/17-06/30/17
Age of Active Cases Pending	Pending Felony Cases –Weekly Run CJJCSWDW	06/25/17