

Q8 What do you consider to be a fair annual case quota - assuming proration is restricted to total work stoppages due to IT issues and approved leave (including jury duty) - with additional proration under a good-cause exception at the discretion of management?

Answered: 318 Skipped: 60

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	125 - two decisions a week is about what can be done to adequately address both speed and quality. Anything required over 2 cases per week has potential to decrease quality and increase errors, due to the speed required to stay on pace,	9/19/2024 12:31 PM
2	I find the current system to be fair, with both a case track and issues track for the more experienced attorneys who generally receive more complex cases.	9/19/2024 11:42 AM
3	the current quota we have	9/18/2024 1:02 PM
4	not sure, i've only been here a little over a year	9/18/2024 11:33 AM
5	I don't quite understand the question, but I believe that 6 cases per pay period is a fair quota with proration as it is now - for work stoppage, approved leave, and board-wide training.	9/18/2024 8:08 AM
6	148	9/17/2024 6:07 PM
7	The current standard is fair, as long as issues AND cases are both accepted.	9/17/2024 6:01 PM
8	So far, the yearly equivalent of three cases per week. However, the system of credit per number of issues seems like a good idea.	9/17/2024 12:20 PM
9	5-6 cases per pay period	9/17/2024 12:03 PM
10	125	9/17/2024 11:52 AM
11	It should be lower.	9/17/2024 11:51 AM
12	i think what we have is fine	9/17/2024 11:44 AM
13	I feel that the current quota is fair, but no higher.	9/17/2024 11:41 AM
14	Current levels	9/17/2024 11:40 AM
15	3 cases a week is a fair quota	9/17/2024 11:37 AM
16	If no proration for leave or holidays, and no issue track, then 100 cases.	9/17/2024 11:37 AM
17	I think the current case quota with proration is fair.	9/17/2024 11:34 AM
18	Same as current FY23	9/17/2024 11:30 AM
19	2 decisions (not remands)/ wk	9/17/2024 11:29 AM
20	156 was fair, not 169	9/17/2024 11:23 AM
21	One that is reasonable and people can meet without hating their job	9/17/2024 11:21 AM
22	The current quota is manageable	9/17/2024 10:28 AM
23	130	9/17/2024 10:19 AM
24	2 cases per week; these cases are getting extremely complicated	9/17/2024 9:44 AM
25	the current annual case quota is fair	9/17/2024 9:34 AM
26	2.5 cases per week	9/17/2024 8:26 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

27	I think the current quota is satisfactory. Under the Legacy system it often was too high and it is still sometimes a pain when juggling Legacy and AMA cases, but AMA cases do seem to be less bulky overall. (I am a GS14 and get the more complex cases and usually the bulkiest ones on my miniteam, including up to 2500 documents (Legacy))	9/17/2024 8:07 AM
28	I am currently part-time; I would consider 70 cases a fair quota	9/17/2024 7:52 AM
29	I am fine with the present quota but would like to see something that better reflects time spent on a case	9/17/2024 7:35 AM
30	140	9/17/2024 7:33 AM
31	130	9/17/2024 7:32 AM
32	135	9/17/2024 7:10 AM
33	Nothing more than what it has been these past few years. Whatever it was during the pandemic.	9/17/2024 7:08 AM
34	I think the current annual case quota is fair.	9/17/2024 6:35 AM
35	Unknown, have not personally worked one full fiscal year to be able to have made an opinion.	9/17/2024 12:49 AM
36	130-156 cases a year or 2.5 - 3 cases per week	9/16/2024 11:05 PM
37	52	9/16/2024 10:31 PM
38	Honestly I don't know. The amount of evidence in individual cases and difficulty level can be so variable.	9/16/2024 7:03 PM
39	The current issues and cases quota are fair	9/16/2024 4:52 PM
40	125	9/16/2024 4:25 PM
41	The current policy has produced a record number of decisions. We are humans, we do have a breaking point and you will find out what that is if you keep tightening up the screws.	9/16/2024 4:13 PM
42	less than 3 cases per week	9/16/2024 3:56 PM
43	156	9/16/2024 3:55 PM
44	I believe the quota system should be staggered based on an attorney's experience, GS level, and time with the Board. For example a new attorney with the Board should have a lower quota, especially because they're in the beginning phases of learning a niche area of law.	9/16/2024 3:50 PM
45	156, 3 per week.	9/16/2024 3:46 PM
46	The current number of cases (156 for satisfactory plus the normal for exceptional)	9/16/2024 2:59 PM
47	Creating a quato based on cases without considering complexity is inherently unfair. The number of documents, procedural history, and type of issue on appeal all factor into the complexity of the case and there has been no quantified means of determining the complexity. Until, this happens, you can't fairly determine a quota.	9/16/2024 2:52 PM
48	125	9/16/2024 2:33 PM
49	The present annual case quota is very fair.	9/16/2024 2:27 PM
50	I don't know.	9/16/2024 2:22 PM
51	Between 135 and 140; especially for GS 14 attorneys who have more difficult cases to review.	9/16/2024 2:09 PM
52	125 (2.5 per week for 50-week yr)	9/16/2024 1:53 PM
53	112	9/16/2024 1:49 PM
54	140	9/16/2024 1:22 PM
55	the current case quota in effect	9/16/2024 12:49 PM
56	No idea. But I'm against stopping to offer proration for Board-wide activities. Those trainings are key.	9/16/2024 12:33 PM
57	6 cases per pay period. The current standard	9/16/2024 12:25 PM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

58	I would reduce the annual quota to 2 cases per week (104) at least until all the issues with Caseflow are fixed. The continuous IT problems and the lack of proration for these issues is a huge problem particularly for attorneys assigned complex cases with numerous documents. It can take anywhere from 30 seconds to several minutes to download a document and in cases where you have over 500 documents that time adds up and we do not get prorated for it. If these issues are not going to be resolved the quota should be adjusted for the time lost due to perpetual issues with Caseflow and IDT	9/16/2024 12:09 PM
59	95 cases/175 issues	9/16/2024 12:05 PM
60	What we have now (and since 2020) has been attainable and fair.	9/16/2024 11:55 AM
61	156 with an issue track	9/16/2024 11:51 AM
62	145	9/16/2024 11:47 AM
63	I may not be understanding this correctly, but if proration is not offered for leave taken, I don't think any case quota is fair. If that is already included in proration and just not mentioned here, I find equal to the current year, or less, to be fair. Any additional cases added to the quota simply reduces our ability to focus on the cases and provide the detail that these Veterans deserve to have their cases decided with.	9/16/2024 11:43 AM
64	I think for me the current quota is challenging but do-able	9/16/2024 11:33 AM
65	The current standards seem achievable, but when I have fallen behind it has been due to high issue cases and the variability of case assignment, so if they are removing the issues-track, it makes sense to find a way to weight cases more equitably.	9/16/2024 11:32 AM
66	The current quota is fair.	9/16/2024 10:56 AM
67	156 without including proration.	9/16/2024 10:52 AM
68	The current quota is fair. I am usually always busy with my case work and am hoping to take on other duties as my efficiency improves.	9/16/2024 10:48 AM
69	130	9/16/2024 10:44 AM
70	140	9/16/2024 10:42 AM
71	I think that six cases per pay period is acceptable, but there needs to be reasonable accommodation for issues as recognized by Madame Chairman Mason	9/16/2024 10:37 AM
72	This not hard. Divide the total number of cases management wants to produce by the number of attorneys to get the quota. The quota has been at 156 for years even though the number of attorneys has increased exponentially. Simple math tells me that the quota should go down as the number of attorneys goes up at the Board.	9/16/2024 10:31 AM
73	156 would be fine if the judges are required to spread out the cases fairly.	9/16/2024 10:31 AM
74	95	9/16/2024 10:29 AM
75	2.5 cases / week. that is what I signed up for. They unilaterally changed it.	9/16/2024 10:29 AM
76	144-147. Those of us who have been here for quite some time know that the ability to meet the quota is skewed by the younger attorneys who work many extra hours to achieve promotions etc. I did the same when I joined the Board and was happy to overproduce unpaid on behalf of my motivational supervisors. Realistically, if we're talking 40 hours weekly, this is a reasonable quota range assuming the above and also diligence in keeping on top of the caselaw, etc., and a commitment to completely reviewing the file (no top sheeting, which I've seen a lot of lately when cases are assigned from another team or as a Court remand).	9/16/2024 10:21 AM
77	5 cases per 2 week pay period. I'm not sure how that calculates to an annual number.	9/16/2024 10:17 AM
78	I have no idea. I think a good-cause exception with current management sounds like an awful idea though. There is clearly lots of inconsistency between DVCs, etc.	9/16/2024 10:13 AM
79	Current quota of 156 is fine, but needs to either be couple with a separate issue-based quota alternative or another way to account for multi-issue/complex cases.	9/16/2024 10:09 AM
80	I have not had a problem with the quota so cannot say	9/16/2024 10:09 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

81	140	9/16/2024 10:06 AM
82	104 (4 per pay period)	9/16/2024 10:05 AM
83	145	9/16/2024 10:05 AM
84	the same quota as the past few years. perhaps fewer. just because the board keeps meeting its goals, doesn't mean they need to keep moving the goal post every year	9/16/2024 10:03 AM
85	104	9/16/2024 10:00 AM
86	I don't know if is more or less, or the same, as now. I definitely do not think we should get less proration.	9/16/2024 10:00 AM
87	130	9/16/2024 9:57 AM
88	without an issue track, 2 cases per week. With an issue track, 3 cases per week.	9/16/2024 9:51 AM
89	Current standard of 3 a week with proration is fair	9/16/2024 9:48 AM
90	Are they considering removing proration for leave/training, like in the old days and we all had the same quota? That would be life-changing and miserable. There was nothing worse than doing an extra week of work just to take off a week for vacation. The current goals seem reasonable, the vast majority of attorneys are able to make it.	9/16/2024 9:47 AM
91	Assuming no issue quota, 2.5 per week.	9/16/2024 9:45 AM
92	What I was promised in my interview, 156 cases or x # of issues.	9/16/2024 9:42 AM
93	I can comfortably write 2 high quality 3-10 issues decisions in a week. I can comfortably write ~1 high quality 10+ issue decision per week.	9/16/2024 9:42 AM
94	150 cases subject to proration	9/16/2024 9:41 AM
95	130	9/16/2024 9:40 AM
96	The current amount is fair but the idea of assigning two credits for 10-19 issues and 3 credits for 20+ issues is a great idea and would make everything more fair	9/16/2024 9:38 AM
97	I really hope we stay at the current case quota. I think it's a fair workload, and I appreciate that it averages out to exactly 3 cases per week.	9/16/2024 9:37 AM
98	126	9/16/2024 9:37 AM
99	If prorations are restricted in such a manner, I believe a case quota of about 140 would be more fair. This would also allow me to more accurately do my job of thoroughly reviewing case files.	9/16/2024 9:34 AM
100	2.5 cases per week, assuming there is no longer an issue track for senior attorneys.	9/16/2024 9:30 AM
101	156	9/16/2024 9:29 AM
102	The current is fine	9/16/2024 9:27 AM
103	10% LESS	9/16/2024 9:26 AM
104	The current quota feels fair, I wouldn't want it any higher as a new hire..	9/16/2024 9:26 AM
105	whatever it is now is fine for me	9/16/2024 9:23 AM
106	As it currently is: the equivalent of 3 cases per week after applicable prorations. Anything higher than that will defeat the Board's mission, a comprehensive and thorough review of the Veteran's claims for accurate decisions. The Board is doing great with its numbers. Why the insistence in changing the winning formula?	9/16/2024 9:22 AM
107	140	9/16/2024 9:21 AM
108	3 cases a week. NOT 3.25. It become inherently unfair because production is dependent on a Judge rather than an attorney.	9/16/2024 9:19 AM
109	4.5 or 5	9/16/2024 9:13 AM
110	Case quotas are arbitrary absent additional credit for larger cases. Operating under the	9/16/2024 9:09 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

proposed guidelines, a "fair" quota is somewhere between 75 and 125 cases.

111	115	9/16/2024 9:08 AM
112	So, it sounds like there's a proposal to further restrict proration? If that's the case, then a "fair" annual quota should be substantially lower than it is now. 100 cases.	9/16/2024 9:08 AM
113	Not sure.	9/16/2024 9:06 AM
114	130	9/16/2024 9:05 AM
115	125 to 135	9/16/2024 9:02 AM
116	140. This leaves a small buffer for all the AMA cases that we have to keep un-docketing and dealing with all the new admin issues that go with AMA cases.	9/16/2024 8:59 AM
117	It's my understanding that the Board exceeded its production goal this year and morale appears to be stabilizing. Why change anything, including quotas and reasons for proration?	9/16/2024 8:58 AM
118	?	9/16/2024 8:57 AM
119	140	9/16/2024 8:56 AM
120	I usually do the issues track, so not sure about case #'s but the current demands are doable.	9/16/2024 8:55 AM
121	I feel like too much emphasis is placed by management on the annual quota, which results in some very perverse incentives. I'd encourage the Board to move entirely away from the quota, or at the very least diminish its relative importance and start to consider alternative measures. We have been "captured" in a sense by a benchmark that fails to fully capture what we should do.	9/16/2024 8:55 AM
122	156	9/16/2024 8:54 AM
123	i don't see why we cant just stick with 3 per week, 156 per yr	9/16/2024 8:52 AM
124	The current quota. That plus incentives has allowed the Board to reach its goals early. Don't punish attorneys for doing well.	9/16/2024 8:51 AM
125	150- If the proration does not include time for trainings. 156 if it does.	9/16/2024 8:44 AM
126	the current quota is fine	9/16/2024 8:44 AM
127	the current number has been very achievable for me.	9/16/2024 8:43 AM
128	For quality decisions that are not rushed and are well thought out I would suggest the quota be 2.5 a week. Especially with the Pact Act and how active this current CAVC is- things are changing constantly and there is a lot of considerations that attorneys have to make into account when drafting decisions. The AMA and PACT Act have only become more complex and these cases are taking more time.	9/16/2024 8:42 AM
129	125 cases	9/16/2024 8:39 AM
130	~2 cases per week, or about 100 cases per year.	9/16/2024 8:38 AM
131	The current quota is more than fair as it is adjusted based on leave, training, and other matters.	9/16/2024 8:38 AM
132	Keep it the same.	9/16/2024 8:37 AM
133	I am a new attorney, so it is difficult to judge. However, the case quota should take into account the difficulty and number of issues.	9/16/2024 8:35 AM
134	Proration should not be restricted as stated, ever. It is unfair and it creates a toxic work environment where people are not able to take their earned leave without also falling behind in production. It would effectively result in a penalty for doing anything that is not working... such as taking leave or attending trainings. IF proration is restricted as above , then 1 case per pay period or less would be "fair."	9/16/2024 8:35 AM
135	145	9/16/2024 8:33 AM
136	120	9/16/2024 8:32 AM
137	I think 3 cases per 40 hour week is fair.	9/16/2024 8:31 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

138	not really sure	9/16/2024 8:29 AM
139	na?	9/16/2024 8:29 AM
140	I think the current quota is fair	9/16/2024 8:28 AM
141	156	9/16/2024 8:27 AM
142	150	9/16/2024 8:26 AM
143	130 cases	9/16/2024 8:23 AM
144	3/wk for GS-11; 3/wk for GS-12; 2/wk for GS-13; 2/wk for GS-14	9/16/2024 8:20 AM
145	The current is fair	9/16/2024 8:19 AM
146	I think the current case goal is fair and attainable by most attorneys.	9/16/2024 8:18 AM
147	150 cases	9/16/2024 8:18 AM
148	120	9/16/2024 8:17 AM
149	130	9/16/2024 8:15 AM
150	150	9/16/2024 8:15 AM
151	156	9/16/2024 8:05 AM
152	140	9/16/2024 8:04 AM
153	same as current	9/16/2024 8:01 AM
154	I think the current 3 cases/week is a fair annual case quota assuming proration is restricted to total work stoppages due to IT issues and approved leave etc.	9/16/2024 8:00 AM
155	I think the current quota is fair; however, the current pro-ration available is not.	9/16/2024 7:53 AM
156	I think the current set up makes the most sense -- issues and case goals.	9/16/2024 7:52 AM
157	6 cases per pay period	9/16/2024 7:51 AM
158	150 cases	9/16/2024 7:50 AM
159	2.5 cases a week	9/16/2024 7:49 AM
160	Less than it is now, if they are mostly high-issue and complex cases.	9/16/2024 7:48 AM
161	Unsure.	9/16/2024 7:45 AM
162	Current issue quota is a lot more fair than taking it away entirely.	9/16/2024 7:44 AM
163	150	9/16/2024 7:43 AM
164	i have no idea, I have only been at the Board for a little over a year.	9/16/2024 7:41 AM
165	I think the current goal is fair - I just think VLJs are stretched to the limit and need a break.	9/16/2024 7:41 AM
166	125	9/16/2024 7:39 AM
167	Are they getting rid of mandatory trainings? If not, those should still be prorated.	9/16/2024 7:37 AM
168	145	9/16/2024 7:36 AM
169	145	9/16/2024 7:29 AM
170	135	9/16/2024 7:28 AM
171	I'm comfortable with where things are currently set	9/16/2024 7:28 AM
172	150	9/16/2024 7:27 AM
173	What it is now.	9/16/2024 7:25 AM
174	156	9/16/2024 7:24 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

175	The status quo	9/16/2024 7:18 AM
176	i think the current number is fair, with issues to balance it out	9/16/2024 7:18 AM
177	140	9/16/2024 7:13 AM
178	169	9/16/2024 7:11 AM
179	130	9/16/2024 7:08 AM
180	150	9/16/2024 6:59 AM
181	The quota implemented in 2017, which I believe was 2.4 weekly.	9/16/2024 6:58 AM
182	If there was no more proration for leave or holidays, I would say 125 for FS, 140 for Exc.	9/16/2024 6:49 AM
183	120	9/16/2024 6:46 AM
184	150	9/16/2024 6:20 AM
185	Three cases per week for GS-11 and GS-12 attorneys, two and a half cases per week for GS-13 and GS-14 attorneys.	9/16/2024 6:17 AM
186	I do not feel any changes should be made to the present case quota standards. The Secretary's projections are being met, cases are being handled efficiently. If it is not broke, stop messing with it!	9/16/2024 5:16 AM
187	175	9/16/2024 4:14 AM
188	I think that requiring 3 cases or 10 issues per week is fair, and we have been breaking production records under those requirements, by the way.	9/16/2024 12:25 AM
189	i don't know	9/15/2024 11:30 PM
190	130	9/15/2024 10:19 PM
191	100 cases	9/15/2024 8:47 PM
192	150	9/15/2024 3:24 PM
193	136	9/15/2024 3:05 PM
194	If the issues track remains, 156 cases is manageable, if the issue track is removed, 125 cases to account for larger issue cases.	9/15/2024 2:57 PM
195	Current quota is manageable under the conditions described here.	9/15/2024 2:22 PM
196	Please see the recommendation above.	9/15/2024 1:00 PM
197	I believe my leave should result in proration, period. If leave would not count, the quota should be no more than 130	9/15/2024 12:45 PM
198	129 or 2.5 per week	9/15/2024 12:25 PM
199	the current one is fine	9/15/2024 11:49 AM
200	132	9/15/2024 10:45 AM
201	The current quota	9/15/2024 10:31 AM
202	I think the current quota is fair.	9/15/2024 9:36 AM
203	The current case quota is perfect.	9/15/2024 8:27 AM
204	140	9/15/2024 7:49 AM
205	145	9/15/2024 12:17 AM
206	150	9/14/2024 9:36 PM
207	The current quota or slightly lower if proration continues to be given for trainings.	9/14/2024 7:55 PM
208	I think cases are getting more difficult as we move into AMA and out of legacy, since it is harder to remand now. We have to decide cases, we might have remanded in legacy. Therefore	9/14/2024 5:58 PM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

the cases should be reduced from the current 156 per year, just for that reason to be fair to I'd say 150.

209	150	9/14/2024 4:26 PM
210	6 per pay period seems like a tough but fair standard to meet.	9/14/2024 3:19 PM
211	Two cases per week for the first 3-4 years at the Board. 2.5 per week after that.	9/14/2024 3:16 PM
212	130	9/14/2024 2:32 PM
213	130	9/14/2024 1:27 PM
214	I think the current quota is probably fair as long as they keep the issues component. If they abandon issues then the quota should be reduced (or assign 2 or more credits for large issue cases).	9/14/2024 12:53 PM
215	60. This year I was on the issue track and due to the complexity of my cases and the large amounts of issues in each of my cases, I only completed 50 cases this year.	9/14/2024 12:37 PM
216	It seems pretty ridiculous that sick leave would not be automatically prorated. 130 - 135 cases would probably be a fair annual case quota.	9/14/2024 11:50 AM
217	3 cases a week IF allowances are made for the higher issue cases.	9/14/2024 11:23 AM
218	assuming an equitable distribution of cases and accounting for more credit for higher issue cases, then I believe 5 cases per pay period is a reasonable quota.	9/14/2024 10:56 AM
219	During our most recent Grand Rounds, it was stressed that attorneys should be thoroughly examining the record to avoid errors. There has also been a lot of concern over the number of remands and JMRs coming back from CAVC. In a LOT of the cases that I review, I have found that documents are NOT OCR'd, so doing a relevant word search DOES NOT work, and means that I have to look through hundreds, sometimes thousands of pages of records to find medical notations and/ or further evidence concerning the claim. With that in mind, and if the Board truly wants to address the error rate and promote quality over quantity, then 2.5-2.7 cases/ week is fair. Any more than that, and the expectation is truly quantity AND quality, which has proven to be unsuccessful with the given numbers. If they want to decrease the remand, error, and JMR rates, then more time needs to be spent on the cases.	9/14/2024 10:56 AM
220	The current quota. To clarify above, while I had periods of not being "green", this was due to periods in which my judge did not sign any of my cases due to other commitments, vacation, or needing to sign cases from other attorneys	9/14/2024 10:19 AM
221	150 cases	9/14/2024 10:15 AM
222	130	9/14/2024 10:02 AM
223	5 cases/pay period	9/14/2024 9:39 AM
224	156 is okay, but there needs to be some way to differentiate between a simple one issue case with 100 or fewer documents and a 10+ issue case or a 1000+ document case. All cases are not equal. Some take significantly more time to write--no matter what your GS level is.	9/14/2024 9:19 AM
225	no more than 3 cases a week for the case track. Also, if I'm not green on the DOC, it's not because cases aren't written or turned in, but because my judge hasn't signed them all (and she's a fast signer who takes leave! and has hearings? Stop with this "signed" quota when the attorneys have NO CONTROL over when their submitted cases are signed!	9/14/2024 7:41 AM
226	If we are only given proration for work stoppage and leave, I think it would be fair to have the quota lowered by a few cases.	9/14/2024 7:10 AM
227	3 cases per week with 2 credits for cases with 10 to 19 issues and 3 credits for cases with 20 or more issues	9/14/2024 6:55 AM
228	2 cases per week or 4-5 per pay period	9/14/2024 6:29 AM
229	156	9/14/2024 5:45 AM
230	Something that has a clear metric behind it. 2.5 cases per week makes sense, allowing for 16 hours per case. It's a clear metric. It makes sense objectively, if not in practice. That being said, I don't think where we are has been unreasonable, except when I get a PACT Act case	9/14/2024 1:11 AM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

and it takes me 8 days to complete. The fact that we get DAILY emails about precedential court decisions that we are expected to read and understand and apply is obscene with our quota based system and GS-14 status. I don't get paid enough to be that informed, and write that many well developed cases. Honestly it's too much at a GS-15, but at least then we'd be at the top of the payscale.

231	140	9/13/2024 11:37 PM
232	2 cases / week FS, 4 cases / week exceptional. The quota is an imperfect measure of success.	9/13/2024 10:17 PM
233	no - wont be equal among judges teams	9/13/2024 10:03 PM
234	120	9/13/2024 9:53 PM
235	Current quota is fine	9/13/2024 9:39 PM
236	Status quo works for me.	9/13/2024 9:01 PM
237	3.0/week, but only if VLJs have a similar quota.	9/13/2024 8:41 PM
238	I am often spending half a day just sorting through the procedural posture of a continuously pursued claim that had higher level review, supplemental claim, came to the Board, was remanded, then higher level review, supplemental claim, came to the Board, was remanded, etc. Considering how much longer continuously pursued AMA cases can take to sort out, as well as navigating the PACT Act cases with TERAs, BPOT, etc., I think it is time to reduce the quota by 20 cases, unless credit will be given for large cases or multi-issue cases.	9/13/2024 8:38 PM
239	3 a week seems manageable if the number of issues per case are reasonable.	9/13/2024 8:31 PM
240	130	9/13/2024 8:02 PM
241	130 cases (2.5 a week)	9/13/2024 7:50 PM
242	150 cases	9/13/2024 7:41 PM
243	6 per pay period	9/13/2024 7:36 PM
244	6 cases per pay period	9/13/2024 7:26 PM
245	A quota of 130 cases feels fair.	9/13/2024 7:21 PM
246	145 cases. This allows time for larger cases.	9/13/2024 7:15 PM
247	I think 52 cases is fair if there higher-issue cases count for additional credits. However, I also think admin actions should be valued at .25 credits to make up for the disruption to our ability to fulfill the weekly requirements.	9/13/2024 7:03 PM
248	What the annual case quota would amount to with 2 cases a week.	9/13/2024 7:02 PM
249	156	9/13/2024 6:52 PM
250	125 cases	9/13/2024 6:51 PM
251	I think the current case quota is fair.	9/13/2024 6:50 PM
252	140	9/13/2024 6:39 PM
253	Actual quota is fine.	9/13/2024 6:35 PM
254	I asked once for good-cause and was told it's special circumstances and inapplicable to mine. It sounds like gambling with your entire career. Other than that, a fair case quota -- since the new focus is on quality-- would be 100 cases. And the Issues quota was previously raised, but now the average issues per case is lower. So a similar but lower Issues quota would be fair. I am not sure why they are trying to bargain in the OTHER direction from what the math shows is fair and reasonable to produce quality work.	9/13/2024 6:34 PM
255	I am assuming approved leave includes annual leave, sick leave, other leave, and holidays. If that assumption is correct, the only other proration on my DOC is for board-wide trainings. I think that was 12 hours for me. So if my assumptions are correct, I think the current annual quota is appropriate. In my opinion, the 12 hours for board-wide training are probably not enough to affect the annual quota.	9/13/2024 6:29 PM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

256	I don't know. If that means eliminating CLE and Board-wide training then then equals about 12 hours a year. I don't like the idea of having too many things left to management's discretion.	9/13/2024 6:28 PM
257	150 cases	9/13/2024 6:28 PM
258	10 hours.	9/13/2024 6:28 PM
259	150	9/13/2024 6:28 PM
260	150	9/13/2024 6:24 PM
261	125 cases. IT issues are often not Boardwide. Earlier in the year, I had one known IDT connection issue that could not be solved - only managed, but it didn't affect a significant number of people. I currently have an email issue that is known and requires I connect to email through Explorer to complete the action. In my work group, 3 of 7 people have this issue.	9/13/2024 6:05 PM
262	130	9/13/2024 5:57 PM
263	Leave the quota alone.	9/13/2024 5:56 PM
264	6 cases a pay period as is seems to be fair	9/13/2024 5:55 PM
265	One that 95% or more of Board attorneys who have been at the Board at least 2 years can meet (assuming no other extenuating circumstances)	9/13/2024 5:48 PM
266	78 cases a year, i.e. 3 cases a pay period. I actually think it should be whatever we can competently and ethically handle, even if lower than 3 cases a pay period.	9/13/2024 5:47 PM
267	I think the current case goal is more than enough. Ideally, it should be lessened and there should be more of an emphasis on quality rather than quantity at the Board.	9/13/2024 5:45 PM
268	This is a broad question that I don't know how to answer. With that said, based on management's proposal to remove the issue track, the current quota would be unfair and unrealistic.	9/13/2024 5:44 PM
269	130	9/13/2024 5:39 PM
270	120	9/13/2024 5:38 PM
271	120 cases	9/13/2024 5:38 PM
272	125	9/13/2024 5:33 PM
273	I don't feel the quota is unreasonable, provided it accounts for situations in which the number of issues equates to more than one case.	9/13/2024 5:32 PM
274	130 (5 per pp) would allow use to slow down and give a more thorough review of the record. It is not right that we sacrifice giving the Veteran a full and fair appeal due to being rushed to make performance standards. Having federal court experience, I find having an average of 1.6 days per case egregious for the Veterans we serve.	9/13/2024 5:32 PM
275	This is too much math for me - even taking an average of case output, it does not account for easy vs hard judges and faster and slower writers.	9/13/2024 5:27 PM
276	10-12 cases a month (2-3 cases a week)	9/13/2024 5:26 PM
277	130	9/13/2024 5:26 PM
278	So no proration for leave? If proration for leave is still counted, I have been fine with the case quota we had this year and last year, but I also wouldn't mind a lower case quota.	9/13/2024 5:25 PM
279	I think 7-10 cases less than the current quota would be fair. We don't usually report IT issues that only take 5 minutes to resolve, or having to restart our computers multiple times a day to get systems to work. But those add up over time. Also for jury duty, if you are on an AWS your daily jury duty hours are capped and do not cover your full day. The new DOCs also take much more time to double check that they are correct--and they often are not. The current quota was perfectly acceptable when we were awarded 40 hours at the end of every year for all of the miscellaneous issues we experience throughout the year and do not report because it would take more time to do so.	9/13/2024 5:25 PM
280	The same as it is right now.	9/13/2024 5:24 PM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

281	I think our current standard is fair and allows adequate time for good work product as well as ongoing research and administrative tasks.	9/13/2024 5:23 PM
282	150	9/13/2024 5:22 PM
283	I believe anything higher than the current quota will result in extremely high rates of attorney attrition and difficulty hiring into these positions.	9/13/2024 5:21 PM
284	156 cases/year before proration	9/13/2024 5:20 PM
285	2.5 cases a week	9/13/2024 5:20 PM
286	115	9/13/2024 5:20 PM
287	2.75 cases per week	9/13/2024 5:20 PM
288	3 per week.	9/13/2024 5:20 PM
289	143	9/13/2024 5:19 PM
290	I don't know. Current quota is not unfair, per se. However, burnout from the type of work is a factor that is difficult to quantify.	9/13/2024 5:17 PM
291	156 seems fair if high-issue cases are double or triple counted. If high-issue cases are not double or triple counted, then the annual case quota should be reduced to around 130 (discounting about 2 cases per month).	9/13/2024 5:17 PM
292	144 cases/year	9/13/2024 5:16 PM
293	The current annual case quota is fine and should not be changed.	9/13/2024 5:15 PM
294	whatever it's at now	9/13/2024 5:15 PM
295	I do not want a case quota - I want an issues quota. I work extremely large multi-issue cases. The current issues quota is fine.	9/13/2024 5:14 PM
296	current level is a bit high, not sure how high	9/13/2024 5:14 PM
297	The current quota works.	9/13/2024 5:13 PM
298	I shall clarify as to the prior entries that I am never behind on submitted cases, but -- during the first trimester, I am often not green because my VLJ is swamped and does not issue enough of my drafts; that said, she always catches up by the end of the year, and I always end up with outstanding ratings. I am content with the current quota and don't consider it excessive, but I am on the case track and have always been on such a track.	9/13/2024 5:13 PM
299	140-150	9/13/2024 5:13 PM
300	150	9/13/2024 5:11 PM
301	120	9/13/2024 5:10 PM
302	156	9/13/2024 5:10 PM
303	2.5 per week	9/13/2024 5:09 PM
304	the current quotas are fine.	9/13/2024 5:09 PM
305	This is a difficult question to answer without knowing if issue tracking is going away. If issue tracking stays, then the current case number quota is fine. However, if cases with 17 issues are now going to count the same as a 1 issue SC tinnitus case, then the case quota should be lowered unless some other system is implemented in order to account for this discrepancy in case fairness..	9/13/2024 5:07 PM
306	130	9/13/2024 5:06 PM
307	Same as it currently is (assuming there is still a case vs. issues track).	9/13/2024 5:05 PM
308	I am fine with the 3 cases a week assuming you get more points for cases with more issues.	9/13/2024 5:04 PM
309	fine with current standards	9/13/2024 5:04 PM
310	I think we should keep everything the same as it was in FY 2024.	9/13/2024 5:04 PM

FY25 Attorney Performance Standards

311	150	9/13/2024 5:03 PM
312	I think the current amount is fair.	9/13/2024 5:03 PM
313	What is already is with changes made for cases with many issues counting as more than 1 case	9/13/2024 5:03 PM
314	I believe the current quota is fair (with proration)	9/13/2024 5:01 PM
315	???	9/13/2024 5:01 PM
316	125	9/13/2024 4:59 PM
317	130 cases	9/13/2024 4:04 PM
318	135 - this is because there's lots of latency that would not be captured by a total stoppage.	9/13/2024 1:32 PM