

Global Measures of Court Performance - Brief Version

January 2016

By Ingo Keilitz, Laurie Glanfield and Dan Hall

Introduction

The International Consortium for Court Excellence's goal in developing the *International Framework for Court Excellence* (IFCE) was a useful reference framework of values, principles, concepts, and tools; a guide that courts worldwide could use to assess and to improve the administration of justice. The IFCE provides a model quality management methodology for continuous evaluation and improvement that is specifically designed for courts and tribunals. Performance measurement and performance management are integral components of the IFCE.

A foundation stone of excellent court planning and performance is the maintenance of accurate, comprehensive and reliable information and databases. It is essential not only to assessing the performance of a court but also assessing whether its strategies or activities for improvement are having a positive effect.¹

Global Measures of Court Performance (Global Measures), provides an additional tool as part of the IFCE. This document is a concise summary of the forthcoming second edition of the full version of the Global Measures accessible at the IFCE website at <http://www.courtexcellence.com/>.

The Global Measures defines performance measurement and management as the process and the discipline of monitoring, analysing, and using organizational performance data on a regular (ideally in real or near-real time) and continuous basis for the purpose of improvements in organizational efficiency and effectiveness, in transparency and accountability, and in increasing public trust and confidence in the courts.

Box 1. Performance Measurement Is Good Management

Does the discipline of performance measurement and management really make a difference? Does it work? Yes, is the answer, based both on our common understanding and on recent compelling empirical evidence. The maxims “you can't manage what you can't measure” and “what gets measured gets done” have acquired the status of received wisdom. The way we measure our success drives the very success we have. Our common understanding that performance measurement is simply good management has empirical support. For the past decade, an economist-led, international group of researchers has studied

¹ International Framework for Court Excellence at page 28. www.courtexcellence.com/resources.

the performance of more than 10,000 private and public sector organizations in 20 countries using rigorous econometric methods. They found that good management works and that, in particular, performance measurement is the critical ingredient of good management practice. Specifically, they concluded that three essential management practices -- measuring results, setting targets, and establishing incentives - are strongly correlated with improved organizational performance measured in terms of productivity, return on capital assets, growth, and organizational survival, and that these essential practices make a difference in a country's performance and can address even the most complex global problems.

Bringing these essential management practices to justice institutions and justice systems that need them promises to improve delivery of justice services measurably and dramatically. As noted by three of the researchers, Nicholas Bloom of Stanford University, Raffaella Sadun of the Harvard Business School, and John Van Reenen of the London Schools of Economics and Political Science, a "call for 'better management' may not seem like a cutting-edge idea, but given the potential large effects on incomes, productivity, and delivery of critically needed services worldwide, it may actually be a radical one."²

The Global Measures is a set of eleven key court performance measures that courts and tribunals, as well as their external stakeholders can use to measure and manage progress toward excellence, accountability, and positive impact (see Box 2 below). The eleven measures of performance of the Global Measures are drawn from a range of internationally accepted performance measures for trial and appellate courts.

Box 2. The Eleven Performance Measures of the Global Measures in Brief

Global Measures describes eleven focused, clear, and actionable core court performance measures aligned with the values and areas of court excellence of the IFCE. It deconstructs the key question "How are we performing?" by giving detailed enabling answers to four practical follow-up questions:

- Why should we measure court performance?
- What should we measure?
- How should we measure it?
- How can we use the results to achieve court excellence?

1. **Court User Satisfaction:** The percentage of court users who believe that the court provides procedural justice, i.e., accessible, fair, accurate, timely, knowledgeable, and courteous service.

2. **Access Fees:** A measure of accessibility defined as the average court fees paid per civil case.

3. **Case Clearance Rate:** The number of finalized (outgoing) cases expressed as a percentage of registered/filed (incoming) cases.

4. **On-Time Case Processing:** The percentage of cases resolved or otherwise finalized within established timeframes.

5. **Pre-Trial Custody:** The average elapsed time criminal defendants are in custody awaiting trial.

² The World Management Survey www.worldmanagementsurvey.com, accessed January 23, 2014. Bloom, Nicholas, Raffaella Sadun, and John Van Reenen (2012). "Does Management Really Work?" *Harvard Business Review*, November 2012.

6. **Court File Integrity:** The percentage of case files and records that meet standards of accuracy, completeness, currency and accessibility.
7. **Case Backlog:** The percentage of cases in the court system longer (“older”) than established timeframes.
8. **Trial Date Certainty:** The proportion of important case processing events (trials) that are held when first scheduled.
9. **Employee Engagement:** The percentage of judicial officers and court staff who indicate that they are productively engaged in the mission and work of the court (a proxy for judicial and staff engagement).
10. **Compliance with Court Orders:** Recovery of criminal and civil court fees as a proportion of fees imposed (a measure of compliance with law and of efficiency).
11. **Cost Per Case:** Money expenditures per case (net cost per finalization).

The International Consortium for Court Excellence intends that the Global Measures will provide courts with a suite of high-level performance measures that reflect the court’s performance, facilitate the identification of areas for improvement, and provide for the measurement and management of improvement initiatives. In providing this level of performance accountability and transparency other justice agencies and stakeholders that interact with the courts will be able to refer to these measures in developing their own strategies for improving their own performance, policies and resource allocation. From a public policy perspective, the publication by the courts of their performance by means of these measures will enable policy makers, researchers and others to have access to reliable information reflecting true court performance.

The Global Measures are generally actionable by all courts and tribunals at various levels of governance – a court division, a single court or jurisdiction, an entire court system, or even at a national or global level - in the same manner as the IFCE can be adapted to suit local needs and preferences. Specific courts or court systems may prefer to include other measures or to adapt the measures. This would be particularly appropriate for internal measurements intended to assist in improving finer aspects of management, administration and staff participation.

Box 3. The Right Measures, Delivery, and Use

Developing the right performance measures for an individual justice institution or an entire country’s justice system, and making sure that they are used effectively, can be translated operationally into three (overlapping and interdependent) key requirements and corresponding phases of development:

The Right Measures - Identifying and developing the right performance measures. The right measures are measures that matter and count what counts, i.e., measures that are aligned with agreed-upon success factors. The connection between well-known health indicators like blood pressure, cholesterol level, and blood glucose and our health and wellbeing is self-evident to most informed people. We know that these measures mean something vital and something very important to us.

The Right Delivery and Distribution of Performance Data - Ensuring that the right measures are

delivered to the right people, at the right time, and in the right way, i.e., in an easy to understand way. Increasingly, this is done by information technology – including performance dashboards, business intelligence and data visualization applications – that let users view critical performance information at a glance, and move easily through successive layers of strategic, tactical and operational information on a self-help, on-demand basis, allowing them to spot patterns, anomalies, proportions, and relationships that they otherwise would miss.

The Right Use - Adopting, implementing, and integrating the measures of performance, as well as the delivery system and distribution system (e.g., performance “scorecards” or “dashboard”), with key management processes and operations, including budgeting and finance, resource and workload allocation, strategic planning, organizational management, and staff development.

The first two requirements, and phases in the development, depend on effective design and capacity building. The right measures are not chosen haphazardly. And they certainly are not indicators of everything. The right measures are aligned with the Judiciary’s values, strategic goals and objectives. They are logically and factually sound and correspond accurately to the concept that is the object of the measurement. This minimizes the risks of a measure distorting the social outcome it is intended to measure.

The third requirement/phase of right use is the key to effective implementation and institutionalization of performance measurement. You can’t just throw an innovative performance measurement and management system “over the wall” to executives, managers and staff to adopt and to implement. Even well conceived, well-designed systems are unlikely to get implemented unless they are woven into the very fabric of a court’s management practices and processes. For a judiciary, the right use of performance measurement will not happen until a judiciary makes innovations such as assigning new responsibilities, instituting specific policies, creating governance structures, and starting processes, procedures and practices to ensure adoption, implementation and institutionalization of a performance measurement and management system.

Generally, courts will need to maintain data at a more disaggregated level in order to calculate the particular global measure. The full version of the Global Measures provides information about disaggregation or breakouts for all of the eleven core measures (e.g., by case type, court location, and court division). With access to this more detailed data courts will, through further investigation, be able to identify and to understand performance levels and trends.

The measures identified in the Global Measures are core performance measures that are strategic, not just operational or tactical. They are:

- Aligned with a court’s values and strategic goals;
- Outcome oriented;
- Applied consistently across the court;
- Generally, an aggregate of other subordinate measures in a hierarchy;
- Drivers of success as they are incentives for improvement; and
- Easily understood by the court and its stakeholders.

The eleven core measures of the Global Measures are aligned with universally accepted judicial values and areas of court excellence identified by the IFCE and are seen as the key to the successful functioning of courts. Many terms and phrases

referring to these values, like accountability and transparency, have been used so frequently that they often lose their meaning. Global Measures helps to define these values clearly in terms of measures of results-based outputs and outcomes in ways that ensure that the values and the areas of court excellence become the foundation of all activity.

Courts should count what counts, and measure what matters. Figuratively and literally, performance does not count unless it is related to the things that really matter and are critical to the success of a court. The IFCE refers to these key success factors in terms of high-level goals and objectives expressed in terms of ten values and seven areas of court excellence. The eleven core court performance measures of the Global Measures are anchored in the core court values and areas of excellence. Together, they form the framework of a court’s accountability to the public and other stakeholders.

As noted above, effective, i.e., the “right” measures are aligned with agreed-upon success factors (see Box 3). The eleven measures of the Global Measures are strongly aligned with the key values and areas of excellence of the IFCE. A single measure is rarely a good indicator of success. Together, the eleven measures represent a limited and manageable set of core performance measures, a vital few instead of a trivial many metrics, that form a “balanced scorecard” of a court’s or court systems performance.

Tables 1 and 2 map the eleven core court performance measures against the core court values and areas of court excellence of the IFCE. The four types of ideograms, commonly referred to as Harvey Balls, are used in the tables to indicate the degree to which a particular measure aligns with or covers a particular value or areas of excellence of the IFCE. A completely filled ball indicates that the measure is highly relevant and aligns well with a value or area of excellence; a three-quarters filled ball means that the measure is relevant and largely aligns; a half-filled ball indicates moderate relevance and alignment; a quarter-filled ball indicates some relevance and alignment; and, finally, an empty ideogram signifies no relevance and alignment.

Ultimately, individual courts or justice systems must answer the fundamental questions of what to measure and how to measure it. Court policymakers and practitioners should do a similar mapping exercise to that illustrated in Table 1 and Table 2 that is unique to their circumstances and needs. While the Consortium for Court Excellence believes that the IFCE’s core values and areas of excellence have universal appeal and can serve as guides, it recognizes that high level goals and objectives are best formulated by the courts and justice systems themselves who must give meaning to the performance measured aligned with their own values and success factors. The full version of the Global Measures provides specific instructions for using these two tables to map against values and areas of performance identified by users.

Table 1. Alignment of the Ten Core Court Values and Eleven Core Court Performance

Measures of the IFCE

Performance Measures	Core Court Values									
	Equality	Fairness	Impartiality	Independence	Competence	Integrity	Transparency	Accessibility	Timeliness	Certainty
Court User Satisfaction	●	●	◐	◐	◐	●	●	◐	◐	◐
Access Fees	◐	◐	◐	○	○	◐	●	●	○	○
Case Clearance Rate	○	○	○	○	◐	○	●	◐	◐	◐
On-Time Case Processing	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	●	◐	●	◐
Pre-Trial Custody	◐	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	●	◐	◐	○
Court File Integrity	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	◐
Backlog	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	◐
Trial Date Certainty	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	●
Employee Engagement	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	◐
Collection of Fines and Fees	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	◐
Cost Per Case	○	○	○	◐	◐	◐	●	◐	○	○

Table 2. Alignment of the Seven Areas of Court Excellence and Eleven Core Court Performance Measures of the IFCE

Performance Measures	Areas of Court Excellence						
	Court Leadership and Management	Court Planning and Policies	Court Resources (Human, Material And Financial)	Court Proceedings and Processes	Client Needs and Satisfaction	Affordable and Accessible Court Services	Public Trust and Confidence
Court User Satisfaction	◐	◐	○	◐	●	●	◐
Fees Paid	◐	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	◐
Case Clearance Rate	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
On-Time Case Processing	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Pre-Trial Custody	◐	◐	○	◐	◐	◐	◐
Court File Integrity	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Backlog	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Trial Date Certainty	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Employee Engagement	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Collection of Fines and Fees	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	○	●
Cost Per Case	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐

Each of these measures will be instructive in itself but it is strongly recommended that trends in movement of these measures are monitored and recorded. Equally high-level measures will naturally reflect averages and may well hide quite significant data differences between particular types of cases or processes or in the case of surveys, groups or categories of individuals.

Understanding current levels and trends in performance over time and how the high-level measures reflect an aggregate of differing sub-measures will be invaluable to a court in identifying and addressing areas for improvement. It will also allow more

meaningful public reporting on performance.

The following descriptions are summaries of each of the eleven measures. For more detail and examples readers should refer to the full document Global Measures of Court Performance.

Measure 1. Court User Satisfaction

This is a measure of the percentage of court users who believe that the court provides procedural justice, i.e., accessible, fair, accurate, timely, knowledgeable, and courteous services. Research consistently shows the importance of people's personal perceptions of how they were treated by the court in assessing whether the court meets key values such as fair decisions, accessible court, procedural fairness, expeditious resolution of cases, no undue influence from outside sources and equal and courteous treatment of all court users. The perceptions and opinions of citizens who receive services increasingly are used as a major source of performance feedback by public agencies including courts.

Formula:

$$\text{Court User Satisfaction} = ((A + B)/(A + B + C + D - E)) \times 100$$

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Disagree D = Strongly Disagree E = Undecided or Unknown

Measure 2. Access Fees

This is a measure of the average court fees paid by litigants per civil case. It is an indicator of the court's and/or government's success in keeping court services accessible to litigants, not in terms of location, physical structures, procedures, and the responsiveness of personnel, but in terms of the costs of access to the court's services, proceedings and records. Those costs (namely, court fees) largely relate to civil cases and should be reasonable, fair, and affordable. Providing court service quality is held constant, lower court fees help keep courts accessible.

Requirements for calculating this measure include the following data elements: (a) the total amount of court fees paid by all civil litigants over a specified period of time; and (b) the total number of civil cases filed over that same period of time.

Formula:

$$\text{Access Fees} = A/B$$

A = Total court fees collected in the time period B = Total cases filed in time period

Measure 3. Case Clearance Rate

This is a measure of the number of outgoing cases expressed as a percentage of incoming cases. A court's case clearance rate is an indicator of whether or not a court or court system is keeping up with the demands for judicial services reflected in its incoming caseload. It is the number of outgoing (or completed) cases represented as a percentage of the number of registered/filed cases received by a court or court system for the same period. The measure can be maintained for the whole court caseload or for particular categories of cases. If a court is "clearing" (i.e., resolving or disposing) fewer cases than are registered or filed, a current inventory of pending cases or backlog of cases is inevitable.

Knowledge of clearance rates, especially by case types, can help pinpoint emerging problems of court delay and congestion and suggest where improvement efforts can have the greatest effect. Case clearance rate as a performance measure for courts and court systems is attractive for several reasons not the least of which is that it is simple, clear, and actionable – all reasonable criteria of an effective performance indicator. A case clearance rate of 100% is an unambiguous benchmark few would argue against.

Case Clearance Rate requires data about the number of incoming and outgoing cases disaggregated by case type during a given period of time.

Formula

$$\% \text{ Clearance} = (A + B + C) / (D + E) \times 100$$

A = Cases closed within time period B = Dispositions of reopened cases within time period C = Cases placed in suspended status in time period D = Cases opened within time period E = Cases reopened within time period

Measure 4. On-Time Case Processing

This is a measure of the percentage of cases disposed or otherwise resolved (closed) within established time reference points (e.g., 365 days for serious criminal cases) by case type in a specified time period (e.g., month, quarter or year).

Court systems should resolve cases expeditiously. Although virtually all litigants and other court users want their cases resolved as quickly as possible, adequate review of a case requires careful consideration by a court. Thus, on-time case processing is a balance between the time needed for review and the court's commitment to expedite the making of a decision.

By resolving cases within established time frames, the court enhances trust and confidence in the judicial process. As a court uses and develops the measure of On-Time Case Processing, it can begin to look at trends and the more finely grained picture of case type workflows.

On-Time Case Processing requires data on disposition against agreed time standards for all cases aggregated and may be disaggregated for each case type.

Formula

$$\% \text{ On-Time} = ((A + B)/C) \times 100$$

A = Cases closed within the reporting period that do not exceed the time reference points (e.g. 365 days) B = Cases suspended within the reporting period that do not exceed the time reference points C = All cases closed or suspended within the reporting period.

Measure 5. Pre-Trial Custody

This is a measure of the average elapsed time criminal defendants are held in custody awaiting trial.

Some performance measures are better than others. They bring people together for joint performance across institutional boundaries – the courts, law enforcement, jails, prosecution and defence services. Such measures can be used at the highest policy levels to measure progress toward an overarching purpose and shared strategic goal that the separate institutions are expected to achieve together.

Duration of pre-trial custody – expressed in terms of central tendencies (mean and median days) and ranges of length of pre-trial detention - is one such measure. As it is clear, focused and actionable across all justice system partners, and taps fundamental values such as equality and access to justice embodied by the IFCE, duration of pre-trial custody can be the rallying point of reform and improvement efforts that depend on justice system partners working together.

Similar to Measure 4, *On-Time Case Processing*, focuses on time elapsed between two case processing milestones: the date a defendant in a criminal case is detained and taken into custody and the date of his or her trial. This may be separately calculated for different categories of criminal defendants.

Applying this measure requires, first, an operational definition of a pre-trial detention day. Other requirements for taking this measure include: (a) the identification and definition of the criminal case types involving pre-trial detention; (b) the operational definition of the two case processing milestones, i.e., custody date and trial date; and (c) the number of elapsed days between those two milestones.

Formula

$$\text{Average Duration of Pre-Trial custody} = (A/B) \text{ days}$$

A = Total number of elapsed days spent by criminal defendants in pre-trial

custody within a specified time period (e.g., year) B = Total number of criminal defendants

Measure 6. Court File Integrity

This is a measure of the percentage of case files that meet established standards of accuracy, completeness and currency, and can also be retrieved in a timely manner (i.e. within established time guidelines). Accurate, complete, up-to-date, and readily available case files and records are critical to the effectiveness and efficiency of daily court operations. Court file integrity affects not only the decision-making process but also has direct impacts on the organizational effectiveness of a court.

This measure consists of three components: availability, accuracy and completeness. Each is assessed and calculated for a random sample of at least 50 cases of each case type. Availability or accessibility of the file is measured by individually documenting the amount of time it took to retrieve each randomly selected file. Accuracy of the case files is measured by the extent of agreement between the case file summary and the actual file contents. Does the case file summary of documents accurately reflect all the documents filed with the court and are the documents in the file accurately recorded on the summary? Finally, are all documents filed with the court contained within the case file? The case file may be hard copy or partly/entirely in digital form.

Each court will need to consider how best to undertake the administrative file review. The measure is obtained by dividing the number of files that fully comply by the number of files reviewed and is expressed as a percentage.

Formula

$$\% \text{ Court File Integrity} = (A/B) \times 100$$

A = Files that comply with availability, accuracy and completeness standards

B = Total number of files reviewed

Measure 7. Case Backlog

This is a measure of the proportion of active cases that exceed the on-time case processing time standards and reflects the court's backlog of cases. It measures all active pending cases filed/registered but not yet resolved or disposed. A complete and accurate inventory of active pending cases, as well as the number and age of the cases in the inventory, provides the necessary data for a quantitative assessment of a court's timely case processing performance.

A comparison of the backlogs in various case categories with the overall backlog (the average backlog across all case categories) will pinpoint where case processing problems may be and where improvement efforts may prove most useful.

The Case Backlog measure readily identifies the proportion of cases failing to meet time standards. Courts often publish this measure as the proportion of cases that actually meet the time standards and this is a more positive way of highlighting a court's performance. However, either way it is those cases that fail to meet the time standards (or backlog) that deserve a court's attention.

The measure requires data on the age of pending cases awaiting resolution or disposition expressed in terms of the number of elapsed calendar days between the date of filing or start of processing of the case and the current date.

Formula

$$\% \text{ Backlog cases outside time limits} = (A/B) \times 100$$

A= Total number of active pending cases outside the specified time period/standard B= Total number of active pending cases

Measure 8. Trial Date Certainty

This is a measure of the certainty with which important case processing events are held when scheduled, expressed as a proportion of trials that are held. Trial Date Certainty quantifies the court's success in holding important case processing events on the dates they are scheduled to be held, and provides a tool to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of various case management processes such as calendaring and continuance practices.

This core performance measure is an indicator of the certainty, predictability, timeliness and efficiency of case processing. It is not a measure of every event schedules but trial date certainty is regarded as reflective of overall court practice and performance on meeting scheduled event times.

The measure requires data on cases disposed/resolved by case and trial type and the number of trial dates set for each case. It is possible to set specific performance targets that reflect the nature of different classes of cases. The data can be assessed against those targets or for caseload as a whole.

Formula

$$\% \text{ Cases with no more than Y trial settings} = (A/B) \times 100$$

Y = Number of prescribed or target trial settings (Y = 1 unless specific minimum target greater than 1 has been set) A = Number of cases with no more than the prescribed or target settings B = Total number of closed trial cases

Measure 9. Employee Engagement

This is a measure of the percentage of judicial officers and staff who indicate that they are productively engaged in the mission and work of the court. Engagement is defined as an emotional connection that a judicial officer or staff member feels for the court that causes him or her to make efforts on behalf of the court that exceed minimal obligations imposed.

The greatest asset of most public and private organizations is the talent, energies, enthusiasm and interest of its employees – that is, high employee engagement. Employee engagement correlates to individual, group and organizational performance in areas such as retention, turnover, productivity, customer service and loyalty. Successful courts have strong, vibrant workplaces in which judges, managers and court staff exhibit good working relationships. This measure is a tool for assessing judicial officers and staff opinion on whether they have the materials, motivation, direction, sense of mission, and commitment to do quality work.

This measure is a survey -- a self-administered anonymous questionnaire -- of the strength of the court's workforce and the quality of the relationships of its judicial officers and staff. The measure is calculated in terms of the percentage of respondents who agree or strongly agree with the items in the survey.

Formula

$$\text{Court Engagement Index} = ((A + B) / (A + B + C + D - E)) \times 100$$

A = Strongly Agree B = Agree C = Disagree D = Strongly Disagree
E = Undecided or Unknown

Measure 10. Compliance with Court Orders - Collection of Fines, Fees, and Other Monetary Penalties

This is a measure of the total amount of payments of monetary penalties (fines and fees) collected, expressed as a percentage of the total amount ordered by a court in a given period.

The integrity of the dispute resolution process is reflected in the degree to which parties adhere to awards and settlements arising out of them. Non-compliance may indicate miscommunication, misunderstanding, misrepresentation, or lack of respect for or confidence in the courts. While court orders establish a wide variety of sanctions, monetary penalties are clearly understood and easily measurable. Monetary penalties include such financial obligations as child support, civil damage awards, traffic fines, and criminal fines and fees, restitutions, reparations, and other remittances. Integrity and public trust in the dispute resolution process depend in part on how well court orders are complied with or enforced in cases of non-compliance.

This measure requires data on monetary orders made by value and payments received by value over a given period.

Formula

$$\text{Monetary Order Compliance} = A/B \times 100$$

A = Total monetary value of all payments collected within time period

B = Total monetary value of all monetary orders made within time period

Measure 11. Cost Per Case

This is a measure of the average cost of resolving a single case by court case type. This measure helps court managers forge a direct connection between how much is spent and what is accomplished.

Cost Per Case provides important insights into the management of a court's limited resources. Tracking changes in the cost per case over time allows for a meaningful evidence-based assessment of court policies and the impact of case management practices. This measure also may provide valuable and useful information for the courts during budget negotiations. Monitoring cost per case, from year to year, provides a practical means to evaluate existing case processing practices and to improve court operations across the whole court or for specific cases or court locations where costs differ.

It is necessary to ascertain total expenditures and then allocate those costs across case types. The key expenditure area for focus is judicial and staff costs which need to be allocated according to time spent on each case type. Once a fair allocation of these judicial and staff costs to particular case types has been determined this 'distribution' will form the principal basis of the total cost allocation.

This measure requires the following information measured over the chosen time period (annual or other): (1) judicial and staff costs (by "weight", complexity or otherwise) by case type; (2) all other expenditures either as actually incurred or by applying the same case type allocation as for (1); (3) total court expenditures; and (4) the number of cases by type disposed or resolved.

Formula

$$\text{Cost Per Case} = A/B$$

A = Total costs by case type

B = Total number of cases (of that type)

For Further Information and Resources

The IFCE website (www.courtexcellence.com) contains more information on court performance measures and links to a range of other useful resources. The website also contains contact details for feedback or comments.