Research Meeting & Communication Plan[1]:

    A. Items As of Last Meeting:
       1. Want to understand "where the action is and where it isn't"
       2. Want to better understand clean days

    B. Meeting Agenda
       1. Baseline service rate estimates
       2. County level analysis of busy-ness
       3. Clean day analysis

---

[1] Please save the document as RMC_Template_lastname_firstname_MM_DD_YY.pdf

C. Executive Summary
    a. Key Findings/Results
        1. I used a simple linear regression model to estimate mu_p and mu_t. The model seems to fit the data well ($R^2=0.97$) and yields estimates of 4.88 days per trial, and 6.25 pleas per day.
        2. I ranked the counties by busy-ness, and it appears that roughly 90% of the action (pleas, trials, GS days) happens in the top 28 (out of 46) counties.
        3. Most of our clean day restrictions don't affect the average number of pleas processed per day. However, our restriction that judges sentence at least 10 pleas on clean days greatly affects the average.

    b. Key Insights
        1. Focusing on busy counties could improve our estimates of mu_p and mu_t, since very little of the "action" happens there, I think we could make a strong case for dropping the most idle counties.
        2. Since most of our clean day restrictions don't actually affect the average number of pleas processed per day, I think it makes sense to drop these restrictions. They don't seem to do much and they are another thing we would have to justify.

D. Specific Questions to Discuss During the Meeting
    1. Thoughts on the regression model? On the one hand it seems too simple, and I'm afraid it might be introducing additional assumptions/restrictions, but I'm not sure if that's true. I think that it highlights our assumption that judges only work on pleas or trials and never idle on GS days.
    2. How should we proceed with the estimation of mu_p and mu_t?

E. Challenges Slowing Our Progress
    1. Estimation of mu_p and mu_t. As of our last meeting we were reconsidering the ad-hoc algorithm because it seemed to yield very large estimates for the plea processing rate. One of the problems seemed to be the censoring (we used the example of the Starbucks barista claiming that his productivity is limited by the demand, and that if demand was higher he could make 100 drinks).

F. Your Proposed Action Items Until Next Week
    1. Decide how to approach service rate estimation
    2. Alternatively, we could try to tackle the estimation of other parameters: probability of conviction at trial, estimated sentence length if convicted, defendant cost of trial, etc.

G. Miscellaneous
- a. Attached Documents[2]
  1. Slide Deck: Y   N
  2. Research Report: Y   N
  3. Updated Paper Draft: Y   N

- b. Other Issues/Items[3]
  1. N/A-

---

[2] For the documents you provided, please provide a 1-2 sentence description of the (new) substance.
[3] Please state anything we didn't cover above that you think we should discuss