Judicial Branch Travel and Education

	2021-23	2023-25	
Total Budget	<u>Biennium</u>	<u>Biennium</u>	Increase
Travel (SC)	\$171,787	\$189,900	\$18,113
Travel (DC)	\$1,201,405	\$1,628,100	\$426,695
Professional Development (SC)	\$347,403	\$360,000	\$12,597
Professional Development (DC)	\$178,698	\$374,580	\$195,882
Total Travel and pro development	\$1,899,293	\$2,552,580	\$653,287
0.4.45.4.4.4.4.4.4			
Out-of-state budget			
Travel (SC)	\$22,500	\$42,500	\$20,000
Travel (DC)	\$33,000	\$297,500	\$264,500
Professional Development (SC)	\$15,000	\$17,000	\$2,000
Professional Development (DC)	\$22,000	\$119,000	\$97,000
Total out-of state education	\$92,500	\$476,000	\$383,500
Other travel/professional			
Travel (SC)	\$149,287	\$147,400	(\$1,887)
Travel (DC)	\$1,168,405	\$1,330,600	\$162,195
Professional Development (SC)*	\$332,403	\$343,000	200 20 200
Professional Development (DC)	\$156,698	\$255,580	\$10,597
Total out-of state education	\$1,806,793	\$2,076,580	\$98,882
The state of the s	42,000,733	\$2,070,360	\$269,787
*Other professional development includes:			
NCSC dues	\$234,403	\$240,000	\$5,597

Remaining costs are primarily in-state travel, professional dues and licenses and in-state training and education.

SALARY GRADE	JOB CLASSIFICATION	EXEMPTION	MONT SALAR RANGE MINIM MAXIM	RY E IUM	ANNU SALAI RANG MINII MAXI	RY E MUM
7	*Electronic Court Recorder	Non-Exempt	2,923	4,267	35,076	51,204
9	Law Library Assistant	Non-Exempt	3,516	5,157	42,192	
10	Account Technician Administrative Assistant-State Court Administrator Administrative Assistant-Clerk of Supreme Court Administrative Assistant-Central Legal Calendar Control Clerk Deputy Clerk of District Court Deputy Supreme Court Clerk District Court Administrative Assistant Electronic Court Recorder/Transcriptionist Juvenile Court Administrative Assistant	Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt	3,922 5,760			-
11	Court Services Coordinator Executive Administrative Assistant Judicial Assistant Lead Electronic Court Recorder/Transcriptionist Senior Deputy Supreme Court Clerk Technical Support Specialist	Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt	4,226 6,220		50,712	74,640
12	Assistant Law Librarian Citizen Access Paralegal District Court Paralegal Deputy Clerk of District Court Supervisor Executive Judicial Assistant Network Analyst Payroll and Benefits Specialist Technology Coordinator I	Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt	4,531 6,685		54,372	80,220
13	Business Analyst I *Court Reporter *Lead District Court Paralegal Network Analyst II Programmer Analyst I Technology Coordinator II	Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Exempt Non-Exempt	pt 4,703 6,949 56, Exempt Exempt Exempt pt		56,436	83,388
14	Juvenile Court Officer I *Lead Court Reporter Programmer Analyst II Technology Coordinator III	Non-Exempt Non-Exempt Exempt Non-Exempt	5,143	7,628	61,716	91,536
15	Accountant Analyst Business Analyst II Education and Special Projects Coordinator Network Analyst III	Exempt Exempt Non-Exempt Non-Exempt	5,447	8,105	8,105 65,364	
	Business Analyst III Juvenile Court Officer II Program Manager Programmer Analyst III	Exempt Non-Exempt Exempt Exempt	5,753	8,576	69,036	102,912
17	Clerk of District Court I	Exempt	6,060	9,052	72,720	108,624

SALARY GRADE	18 Clerk of District Court II Juvenile Court Supervisor Supervisor of Accounting 19 Family Law Mediation Program Administrator Guardianship Monitoring Program Manager 20 Deputy Court Administrator Director of Juvenile Court Services 21 Chief Deputy Clerk Citizen Access Coordinator Director of Education and Communication Director of Finance Director of Human Resources	EXEMPTION	MONTE SALAR RANGE MINIM MAXIM	Y UM	ANNUA SALARI RANGE MINIM MAXIM	UM
18	Juvenile Court Supervisor	Exempt Exempt Exempt	6,363	9,527	76,356	114,324
19		Exempt Exempt	6,671	10,002	80,052	120,024
20		Exempt Exempt	6,989	10,476	83,868	125,712
21	Citizen Access Coordinator Director of Education and Communication Director of Finance	Exempt	7,304	10,946	87,648	131,352
22	Supreme Court Law Librarian	Exempt	7,619	11,411	91,428	136,932
	*NON-CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES Asst State Court Administrator for Trial Courts Clerk of Supreme Court Court Administrator Law Clerks Judicial Referee State Court Administrator					

Non -Exempt - Employees are covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act and are entitled to receive comp time at a rate of one and one-half hours for each hour of overtime work.

<u>Exempt</u> - Employees are not covered by the overtime provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act and are not entitled to receive overtime compensation unless authorized by the supervisor at which time it would be at a rate of one hour for each hour worked over 40 in one week.

^{*}Pav Grade Exception - A pay grade exception is the assignment of a pay grade that is higher than that determined by the application of the Classification Matrix System. This may be done when a pay grade assigned to a class has not resolved significant problems in the recruiting or retention of qualified individuals for a class. Classes assigned a pay grade exception are subject to periodic review to verify the appropriateness of the assigned pay grade.

Understanding How the Court Uses Weighted Caseload Statistics

Since 1987, the North Dakota court system has utilized a weighted caseload method to determine when and where judges, court staff, and juvenile court staff are needed. Understood in its simplest form, a weighted caseload is a time and frequency study. To determine the base weights, all judges, clerk staff, and juvenile court officers in the state record their daily activities for a designated period of time. This data is then used to assign "weights" to various case types based on the average amount of time that is needed to process each activity in each type of case. The weight is then multiplied by the frequency of cases filed. A full weighted caseload study is conducted periodically to determine if base weights are still accurate. A partial caseload study is conducted to create or adjust a base weight if unique case types are created or substantial changes in process are made.

Each year, the court applies the base weights to case filing statistics from the prior year to determine how many judges or staff are needed and where they should be located. To determine judge or staff need, the number that is reached by multiplying the weighted caseloads and number of cases filed in a year is divided by the amount of judge or staff time currently available.

Historically, when determining the number of judge or staff needed and where they should be located, the court has used a rolling 2-year average to even out the effects of unique events that may cause caseloads to rise or fall substantially during a particular year. In 2021, the court began using a 3-year average to account for events that impact case filings for more than a year or have a disproportionate effect on one or more judicial districts.² Other factors considered in making decisions about the number and location of judges or staff include the long-term trend in case filings in the district and the particular counties where the cases are being filed, the existence of specialized court dockets in the district, the size of the district, the amount of travel required

¹ Full weighted caseload studies were conducted in 1987, 2003 and 2012. A full weighted caseload study was started in 2019 but discontinued due to the pandemic. Instead, the court contracted for a study of factors that impact case weights. The factors studied included self-representation, need for interpreters, number of participants in drug courts, and procedural differences between drug courts and domestic violence court.

² For example, the oil boom from 2009-2015, the Dakota Access Pipeline protests, and the Covid-19 Pandemic

between courthouses, the number of other judges or staff within the district, and the anticipated demographic changes within a geographic region.

In addition to the weighted caseload information, when determining the location for judges or staff, the court may also consider factors such as the perception of need by the judges, administrative staff and the local bar, overall caseload trends within the individual district and relative to other districts, effective assignment of judicial officers and use of current staff, effective use of technology, and the efficiencies of scale in multi-chambered courts.

JUDICIAL OFFICER WEIGHTED CASELOAD STUDY BASED ON AVERAGE OF 2020 and 2021 CASE FILINGS

Based on Total Judicial Officers as of December 31, 2021

		Unit	1	Unit	Unit 2 Unit 3		Unit 3		Unit 4	
Case Type	Case Weight	NE	NEC	SE	EC	SC	SW	NW	NC	ALL
Criminal Major	181.29	576	789	534	1,974	2,004	298	641	803	7,618
Criminal Minor	26.48	2,675	1,922	2,377	3,529	4,053	1,580	2,582	1,786	20,504
Criminal Summary	0.37	9,505	9,293	13,570	14,12B	16,636	9,224	11,701	11,080	95,136
Civil Major	671.05	23	35	40	145	81	31	53	42	448
Civil Minor	54.86	675	983	936	1,792	1,388	414	705	797	7,689
Civil Summary	6. 65	894	1,508	1,124	2, 432	2,510	789	1,297	1,501	12,052
Family Major	152.14	181	260	278	707	541	212	245	412	2,834
Family Minor	53.63	222	263	252	519	478	118	235	301	2,385
Family Summary	46.44	27	63	34	100	77	22	34	37	393
Probate Major	228.76	40	41	85	95	96	30	S5	62	503
Probate Minor	32.02	94	161	216	339	233	81	152	139	1,414
Probate Summary	9.93	362	168	439	380	557	297	587	397	3,184
Juvenile Delinquency	106.60	67	117	44	274	156	21	30	29	736
Juvenile Dependency	239.18	118	178	69	218	191	64	92	182	1,111
Juvenile - Other	30.00	33	42	52	91	65	38	40 ∥	59	419
Total Filings		15,490	15,819	20,046	26,720	29,063	13,216	18,446	17,624	156,422
Weighted Filings		329,788	413,574	360,564	928, 326	834,244	218,220	372,342	430,127	3,887,185
Presiding judge time at 47.14 min/day		9,664	9,664	9,664	9,664	9,664	9,664	9,664	9,664	77,310
Total workload		339,452	423,238	370,227	937,989	843,908	227,884	382,006	439,791	3,964,494
Judge Year (Minutes) 205 Days		86,100	86,100	86,100	86,100	86,100	86,100	86,100	86,100	
Avg. Non-Case time for all judicial FTEs 54.29 min/day		11,130	11,130	11,130	11,130	11,130	11,130	11,130	11,130	
Adjusted Judge Year (judge year less non case time)		74,970	74,970	74,970	74,970	74,970	74,970	74,970	74,970	
Travel Adjustment		-10,250	-2,116	-11,070	-2,888	-5,426	-4,979	-4,774	-4,774	
Adjusted min available after travel and non-case		64,720	72,854	63,900	72,082	69,544	69,991	70,196	70,196	
Number of Judges & Refs total		6.00	5.00	7.00	11.00	12.00	4.00	6.00	6.00	57.00
Judge Minutes Available		388,320	364,270	447,300	792,897	834,524	279,962	421,173	421,173	3,949,620
Workload compared to Resources (in minutes)		-48,868	58,968	-77,073	145,092	9, 384	-52,079	-39,167	18,617	14,875
Weighted Case Filing Judicial Officer Need	Name of Street	5.24	5.81	5.79	13.01	12.13	3.26	5.44	6.27	56.96
Treatment Court Need		0.133	0.399	0.399	0.399	0.266		0.067	0.200	1.863
Total Judicial Officer Need		5.38	6.21	6.19	13.41	12.40	3.26	5.51	6.47	58.83
Current Total Judges/Referees		6.00	5.00	7.00	11.00	12.00	4.00	6.00	6.00	57.00
2020/2021 Excess (Shortage) of Judicial FTE		0.62	(1.21)	0.81	(2.41)	(0.40)	D.74	0.49	(0.47)	(1.83)
2020/21 Percent Access (Shortage) of Judicial FTE		10.4%	-24.2%	11.5%	-21.9%	-3.3%	18.6%	8.2%	-7.8%	-3.2%
2019/20 Excess (Shortage) of Judicial FTE		0.58	(3.45)	0.58	(2.27)	(0.51)	0.58	0.00	(3.92)	(3.48)

Total Judicial Officer Need Comparison

Year	NE	NEC	SE	EC	SC	SW	NW	NC	Total
2020/21	5.38	6.21	6.19	13.41	12.40	3.26	5.51	6.47	58.83
2019/20	5.42	6.45	6.42	13.27	12.51	3.42	6.00	6.98	60.47
201R/19	5.57	6.48	6.81	12.91	13.03	3.59	6.60	6.95	61.94
2017/18	5.59	6.39	7.07	12.79	13.60	3.76	6.51	7.22	62.94
2016/17	5.78	6.42	7.03	12.77	14.06	3.92	6.53	7.80	64.31
2015/16	6.27	6.17	7.15	12.28	14.11	4.27	7.42	8.25	65.92
2014/15	6.53	6,27	7.27	11.87	13.31	4.60	8.27	8.20	66.32

Treatment Courts:

reatment Courts:	
Northeast:	
Devils Lake - juvenile (started in March 2009)	0.133
Northeast Central:	
Grand Forks - adult (started in August 2008)	0.133
Grand Forks - domestic violence (started in August 2018)	0.133
Grand Forks - Juvenile (2000)	<u>0.133</u>
	0.399
Southeast:	
Jamestown/Vailey City - Juvenile (started October 2013)	0.133
Jamestown/Valley City - adult (Started August 2019)	0.133
Richland County - adult/DUI (Started in January 2019)	<u>0.133</u>
	0.39 9
East Central:	
Fargo - adult (started in 2003)	0.133
Fargo - adult (started in December 2007)	0.133
Fargo - Juvenile (2000)	0.133
	0.399
South Central:	
Bismarck - adult (started in 2001)	0.133
Bismarck - Juvenile (2002)	0.133
	0.266
North Central:	
Minot - adult (started in Jan 2009)	0.133
Minot - Juvenile (2007) (Combined with Williston Sept 2020)	0.067
	0.200
Northwest:	
Williston - Juvenile (Combined with Minot Sept 2020)	0.067
	0.067
Total treatment court need	1.863

Judicial officers as of December 31, 2021	NE	NEC	SE	EC	sc	SW	NW	NC	Total
Referees	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.00
Judges	6.00	5.00	7.00	9.00	10.00	4.00	6.00	5.00	52.00
Total	6.00	5.00	7.00	11.00	12.00	4.00	6.00	6.00	57.00

2021 Caseload per Judge

		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Statewide, 52 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	33,012		635				590
Criminal*	27,022		520				483
Total	60,034	52.0	1,155	5.0	4.0	56.0	1,072
vess sax com v		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Northeast, 6 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	2,721		454				454
Criminal*	2,948		491	20	0.0	6.0	491
Total	5,669	6.0	945	0.0	0.0	0.0	945
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Northeast Central, 5 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	3,749		750				750
Criminal*	2,897		579				579
Total	6,646	5.0	1,329	0.0	0.0	5.0	1,329
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
East Central, 9 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	7,041	300000000000000000000000000000000000000	782			1. 1.1.1.1	664
Criminal*	5,817		645				549
Total	12,858	9.0	1,429	2.0	1.6	10.6	1,213
		war barn - ar					
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Southeast, 7 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	3,510		501				501
Criminal*	2,424	7.0	346 848	0.0	0.0	7.0	346
Total	5,934	7.0	848	0.0	0.0	7.0	848
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
South Central, 10 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	6,372		637				549
Criminal*	5,951		595				513
Total	12,323	10.0	1,232	2.0	1.6	11.6	1,062
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Southwest, 4 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	2,084		521				521
Criminal*	1,748		437				437
Total	3,832	4.0	958	0.0	0.0	4.0	958
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
Northwest, 6 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	3,502	Juuges	584	Referees	@ 6076	Veteles	584
Criminal*	2,902		484				484
Total	6,404	6.0	1,067	0.0	0.0	6.0	1,067
	-,14		_,,,,,	2.2			-,
		Number of	Cases per	Number of	Referees	Judges &	Cases per
					Service of Control Control Advantage	220 PM	The second secon
North Central, 5 judges:	Filings	Judges	Judge	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	Judge/Referee
Civil	4,033	Judges	807	Referees	@ 80%	Referees	695
-		Judges 5.0		Referees	@ 80%	Referees	The state of the s

^{*} Excludes administrative traffic and administrative game and fish cases