

# THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO

## JUDICIAL SERVICES DIVISION CASE MANAGEMENT SECTION

---

### **Delaware County Court of Common Pleas Case Management and Operational Review**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Judge Everett Krueger, Judge W. Duncan Whitney, and Judge Kenneth Spicer submitted a joint proposal to Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor in which they requested that the Supreme Court of Ohio consider the addition of a judgeship to the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas. As part of the Court's consideration of that request, Chief Justice O'Connor asked the Case Management Section to complete a case management and operational review. This report will serve to not only provide information to the local court regarding its case management and business processes, but will also provide information to Chief Justice O'Connor for her consideration in the request for an additional judgeship.

Thank you to Judge Krueger, Judge Whitney and Judge Spicer for their cooperation during the Case Management and Operational Review conducted by the Supreme Court of Ohio, Case Management Section, and many thanks to the staff of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas for their opinions regarding caseload management and court operations. The judges, magistrates, and staff are commended for their willingness to improve the Court's processes to better serve the community. Solutions recommended in this report are derived from standards promulgated by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and suggestions provided by staff.

#### **II. TRIAL COURT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS / COURTOOLS MEASURES**

The NCSC standards for performance evaluations of courts are rooted in the Trial Court Performance Standards (TCPS) promulgated by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in 1995.<sup>1</sup> Over 60 TCPS are organized in the following performance areas:

- 1) Access to justice.
- 2) Expedition and timeliness.
- 3) Equality, fairness, and integrity.
- 4) Independence and accountability.
- 5) Public trust and confidence.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Trial Court Performance Standards with Commentary* (National Center for State Courts and Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1990), and *Trial Court Performance Standards and Measurement System Implementation Manual* (Bureau of Justice Assistance Monograph NCJ 161567, July 1997).

In 2005, the NCSC developed the 10 CourTools which establish a framework for developing a balanced, evidence-based, perspective on trial court performance. For this review, the following CourTools Measures were conducted:

- 1) CourTools Measure 1, Access and Fairness Survey
- 2) CourTools Measure 2, Clearance Rates
- 3) CourTools Measure 3, Time to Disposition
- 4) CourTools Measure 4, Age of Active Pending Caseload
- 5) CourTools Measure 5, Trial Date Certainty
- 6) CourTools Measure 6, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files
- 7) CourTools Measure 9, Court Employee Satisfaction

The outcome of the CourTools implementation and their corresponding recommendations are discussed throughout this report. The full data set obtained by the CourTools implementation is included in the Appendix to this report.

### **III. REVIEW PROCESS**

A case management review (CMR) is an examination of how a court manages its cases and its overall caseload. The CMR involves an assessment of the court's case management policies and procedures in relation to its structure, resources, operations, and environment.<sup>2</sup>

The Court's performance was evaluated in light of the TCPS, CourTools, the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio, and the fundamentals of caseflow management. Reference to the TCPS, CourTools, and the Rules of Superintendence will be noted throughout the report. Recommendations are presented as they fall within the five trial court performance areas.

During the CMR, interviews were conducted with the judges and the staff of the Court; an extensive file review was completed; and, surveys of Court employees and users were administered. This document serves as the final case management and operational review report and recommendations. For clarity, the report is divided into two parts – the General and Domestic Relations Divisions Recommendations and the Juvenile and Probate Divisions Recommendations.

#### **General and Domestic Relations Divisions Recommendations**

### **IV. ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

1. As part of the CMR, the CourTools measures were used to evaluate the essential core functions of the Court. CourTools Measure 1 focuses on court users and their experiences with the court in terms of the court's accessibility and its treatment of customers in terms of fairness, equality and respect. The Court's scores for this measure were all over 80,

---

<sup>2</sup> Mahoney, Barry, *How to Conduct a Caseflow Management Review: A Guide for Practitioners* (National Center for State Courts, 1994), p. vii.

indicating the court is “doing a good job.” The Court’s lowest score was in response to the statement, “The court’s website was useful.” (Score: 83.5)<sup>3</sup> While the Court should be commended for offering forms on its website and a selection of frequently asked questions for court users, the Court could further expand pro se litigants’ access by providing a link to the Uniform Domestic Relations Forms and information about the local bar’s clinic hours and location.

2. During the review, it was observed that adult prisoners are escorted through the courthouse using the public entrance and elevators. The Court should strive to ensure the safe and secure transport of prisoners. While the current building at 91 North Sandusky presents several logistical challenges, the Court should consider adhering to the following security standards where practicable:
  - a. Prisoners should be transported into and within the court facility through areas that are not accessible to the public. When a separate entrance is not available and public hallways must be utilized, prisoners should be handcuffed behind the back or handcuffed with use of “belly chains” to limit hand movement and always secured by leg restraints;<sup>4</sup>
  - b. During the transport of prisoners, personnel in direct contact with the prisoners should not carry firearms. However, an armed court security officer should be present;<sup>5</sup> and
  - c. Once within a court facility, prisoners should be held in a secure holding area equipped with video monitoring, where practicable, while awaiting court hearings and during any recess.<sup>6</sup>
  - d. The Court engaged the services of the Supreme Court of Ohio, Office of Court Security in 2005 to conduct a security survey. In light of the above recommendations, the Court may wish to consult with that office to develop strategies to ensure the safe and secure transport of prisoners.
  
3. The Court does not currently employ additional safety measures in magistrate courtrooms when handling domestic violence issues or protection orders. The Court should evaluate its safety and security policies when domestic violence or civil stalking / protection issues are present so that victims feel safe during court proceedings. For example, when possible, the Court should ensure a Victim’s Advocate is present and require that alleged perpetrators remain in the courtroom for at least 15 minutes before being permitted to leave.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Court Security Standards (CSS) 8(A).

<sup>5</sup> CSS 8(B).

<sup>6</sup> CSS 8(C).

<sup>7</sup> *Full Faith and Credit: Guide for Effective Issuance and Enforcement of Protection Orders* (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2005), p. 75.

4. The Court does not currently screen cases for early assignment to differentiated case management (DCM) tracks. Case differentiation is particularly valuable as a means to distinguish among cases according to the time and court resources needed.
  - a. The Court should consider exploring different ways to triage self-represented litigant cases based on their complexity and needed services. Scheduling all cases involving self-represented cases on specific days makes it easier for pro bono attorneys, Court staff, and other volunteers to provide assistance before, during, and after the hearing. Having such assistance available helps alleviate bottlenecks and delay in the courtroom and helps ensure that cases do not disappear into limbo.<sup>8</sup>
  - b. The Court should also consider developing separate tracks for divorce cases. Uncontested cases without children or any substantial property can be disposed promptly and efficiently. Cases with contested issues relating to children need the Court's attention to ensure that the best interests of the children are recognized. In addition to a "standard" track with contested property issues, the Court may find a need for a separate track for cases with particularly complicated equitable distribution questions.<sup>9</sup>

## V. EXPEDITION AND TIMELINESS

### Delay

Article I, §16, of the Ohio Constitution provides: "All courts shall be open, and every person....shall have justice administered without denial or delay." Professor Ernest Friesen, a nationally recognized educator in court management, argues that caseflow management is the heart of court management. "Justice is lost with the passage of time...time destroys the purposes of courts."<sup>10</sup> It is for this reason that we analyze a court's case processing methods to increase services and efficiencies.

1. As part of this review, the CourTools measures were implemented. Together, CourTools Measure 2 - Clearance Rate, Measure 3 - Time to Disposition, and Measure 4 - Age of Active Pending Caseload, provide a clear picture of a court's case management abilities. The data indicate that the Court needs improvement in three areas:<sup>11</sup>
  - a. The Court disposed of 64 percent of its criminal cases within the applicable time standard of 180 days. The Court should exercise early and continued involvement in the management of cases. The Court may wish to schedule fewer trial days

<sup>8</sup> D. Saunders, R. Zorza, P. Casey, *Access Brief: Self Help Services* (National Center for State Courts, Center on Court Access to Justice for All), 2012.

<sup>9</sup> Steelman, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup> Friesen, Ernest C., *The Delay Problem and the Purposes of Courts* (National Center for State Courts, Institute for Court Management), Videotape, 1991.

<sup>11</sup> Appendix, p. 26-35.

during the week to open the Court’s calendar for scheduling criminal cases ready for disposition by plea or other non-trial means.

- b. Less than half of Domestic Violence cases were disposed within the 30-day time standard. Because families may have multiple actions, including divorce, delinquency, custody, child abuse, orders of protection, and drug abuse, pending at the same time within a court system, there should be coordination of court records to permit a flow of information among courts. Early case identification and prompt response must be provided – for example, through expedited docketing, pretrial supervision of offenders, case coordination, early identification of unfounded allegations, and early services to victims and families.<sup>12</sup>
  - c. The Court experienced a four-month period where its clearance rate for Other Torts was significantly below 100 percent. Low clearance rates mean the Court is not keeping up with the pace of incoming cases. The Court should examine its case management order for these cases and distribute caseload reports for judicial staff to monitor active cases.
2. In an effort to diminish delay in the domestic relations docket the Court may consider developing standards to implement Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE). ENE is a confidential alternative dispute resolution technique designed for faster settlement of cases and is intended to provide services to parents who are involved in a court case because they disagree on custody, visitation/access or parenting plans for their minor children. Evaluators give candid and credible opinions about likely trial outcomes, which provide an impetus for settlements. If the parties do not settle, the evaluators help them and the court manage the litigation, including possible referrals to mediation or other procedures. The average time expended per case using ENE is less than six hours, compared with forty-five hours for a standard custody evaluation.<sup>13</sup>
  3. The Court should explore the use of parenting coordinators. Parenting coordination is a dispute resolution practice used to manage ongoing issues in high-conflict child custody and visitation cases by a professional psychologist or a lawyer assigned by the court. The use of a parenting coordinator may reduce the need for the parties to appear before the court and may be more cost effective for the litigants. In a recent study of custody disputes in the District of Columbia using a parenting coordination program, staff reported that a persistent focus on the best interests of children helped parents and caregivers overcome the barriers to involvement in the program and enabled caregivers to shift their priorities to the well-being of their children. Stakeholders agreed that the program’s individualized services allowed program staff to create supportive relationships, identify service needs, and to develop and implement pragmatic solutions in many cases. Analysis of court activities revealed several significant associations between parenting coordination and decreased use of court resources.<sup>14</sup> Stark County is one such court in Ohio using parenting coordination

---

<sup>12</sup> Steelman, p. 52.

<sup>13</sup> Lande, John, *The Movement Toward Early Case Handling in Courts and Private Dispute Resolution* (2008), p. 103.

<sup>14</sup> The Parenting Coordination (PC) Project Implementation and Outcomes Study Report, American Psychological Association (2010), p. 3 – 4.

services. The Case Management Section of the Supreme Court can assist the Court in the development of a parenting coordination program.

## **VI. EQUALITY, FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY**

### **Mediation**

1. The Court has not adopted a uniform approach to mediation. In fact, the scheduling order for Judge Krueger mandates a mediation date three weeks prior to the trial date, while Judge Whitney's scheduling order is silent on the issue of mediation. As resources permit, the Court may wish to consider offering Court Mediation Services similar to the juvenile division. Courts that provide mediation can serve their communities more effectively in several ways:
  - a. Mediation increases the satisfaction of parties and their attorneys with the court process;
  - b. Mediation can move up the time of settlement;
  - c. If set early in the case, mediation can reduce resolution costs; and
  - d. The planning function of mediation eases processing of cases that do not reach settlement.<sup>15</sup>

### **Court Management**

2. The Court does not have one court administrator. Currently, duties that would ordinarily fall under the auspices of court administration are handled by several employees for each judge who must also juggle non-administrative responsibilities. The Court should consider hiring a court manager or court administrator to unify both judges' administrative procedures. Basic functions of a court administrator might include human resources management, fiscal administration, caseload management, and technology management. Sample job descriptions can be found in the Appendix.<sup>16</sup>
3. Currently, the Court employs two jury managers – one for each judge. Each jury manager is responsible for maintaining a list of potential jurors, pulling panels, sending summonses and notifying jurors whether they will be needed on a particular date for trial. Despite the fact that both jury managers operate out of the same office location, no uniform policies exist to address issues such as call-in procedures and treatment of jurors who fail to appear. Essentially, the two operate two separate offices for jury management. Of the Court's cases disposed in 2012, 5 civil cases (0.3 percent) went to a jury trial and 19 criminal cases (2.6 percent) resulted in a jury trial. Given the small percentage of cases that go to trial, the Court should consider consolidating its jury management operation.

### **Case Files**

4. A reliable and accurate case file system is fundamental to the effectiveness of day-to-day court operations and fairness of judicial decisions. The maintenance of case records directly

<sup>15</sup> Planning Mediation: A Desk Book for Common Pleas Judges (The Ohio State University College of Law) 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Appendix, p. 44.

affects the timeliness and integrity of case processing.<sup>17</sup> During the CMR reviewers assessed randomly selected open and closed files for completeness and accuracy of contents. Across all 123 case files that were inspected, the majority of files were found to have their contents and docket sheets in alignment and all key documents present in the file.<sup>18</sup> Staff should be commended for following procedures to address and prevent inaccuracies in the electronic case management system and to ensure that all physical documents are secured in the case file and docketed.

5. In some instances, the Court requires parties to provide their own copy of an entry. While the original copy is signed by a judge, the copies are stamped with the judge's signature. If the Court continues to use a stamp in place of the judge's signature for copies, the Court should have a strict policy outlining which staff has the authority to use the stamp and under what specific circumstances. Making this information easily available to all staff and court users protects the judge from unauthorized use of his signature and assures court users that documents containing the judge's stamped signature are in fact legitimate.<sup>19</sup>

## **VII. INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

1. Both Courts use CourtView case management software. While Court staff reported that there is some potential to share data between the two courts, the capabilities are limited. The Court should consider allowing access to both Courts' non-confidential data that would assist staff in coordinating case schedules, attorney assignments and conflicts, and other functions that would promote efficiency between the two courts.
2. For each new case, the Court creates a duplicate file, maintained by the judges' staff separate from the clerk's file. The creation of this duplicate file is a drain on limited resources which can easily be avoided. When asked why the duplicate file was created, judges and staff indicated that there was some concern regarding the accuracy and timeliness of the clerk's file. Those issues were not found during the implementation of CourTools Measure 6. The Court should consider using only the official Court file as maintained by the clerk's office instead of creating a separate file. If necessary, the Court should develop a solution that will allow judges and magistrates notes to be maintained confidentially.
3. The Court does not disseminate caseload reports for judicial staff. The judge, magistrates, and staff members from all departments should determine the types of reports that would be most useful to them.
4. The Court should consider the creation and wide dissemination of the following caseload statistical reports:
  - a. Cases submitted for determination pending decision;

---

<sup>17</sup> CourTools Measure 6.

<sup>18</sup> Appendix, p. 37.

<sup>19</sup> In developing a policy for the use of a judge's signature stamp, the court should consider all relevant case law on the topic.

- b. New case filings;
- c. Case terminations;
- d. Pending caseload;
- e. Cases pending beyond time guidelines;
- f. Number of months cases are pending beyond time guidelines;
- g. Continuance entry tracking;
- h. Clearance rates (CourTools Measure 2);
- i. Time to disposition (CourTools Measure 3);
- j. Age of active pending caseload (CourTools Measure 4);
- k. Trial date certainty (CourTools Measure 5);
- l. Backlog rates;
- m. Pending motions lists; and
- n. Review of objections to magistrates' decisions.

## VIII. PUBLIC TRUST AND CONFIDENCE

### Local Rules

1. Local rules should be reviewed or developed, published, and consistently enforced in accordance with Sup.R. 5. The Court should consider the development of an assessment committee and a review schedule to ensure that all local rules are current. It should also consider the development of local rules to address the following topics:
  - a. Appointment of Counsel – The Court should notify every party that they have the right to be represented by counsel, and as provided in R.C. §2151.352, the right to appointed counsel, if indigent. In accordance with Sup.R. 8, the Court's local rule for appointed counsel should provide a procedure for selecting appointees from a list of persons qualified to serve in the capacity as designated by the court or division. The procedure should ensure an equitable distribution of appointments and provide for a periodic review of the appointments.

### Human Resources

2. During the CMR, some Court staff indicated that they participate in an annual performance evaluation, while other staff reported that they do not receive any type of performance review. Notably, the results of CourTools Measure 9 – Court Employee Satisfaction revealed a considerably low score in response to the statement, “In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development.” (Score: 62.5)<sup>20</sup> The Court should implement a review process for all employees. A process built on multiple assessors that is easy to administer, prepare, read and understand that also includes a provision for employee input or appeal is ideal.

---

<sup>20</sup> Appendix, p. 40.

3. CourTools Measure 9 revealed employees are most dissatisfied with their working conditions and environment. (Score: 57.5)<sup>21</sup> Court leaders should facilitate a forum for employees to provide suggestions for improvement in their work environment. Leaders should strive to accommodate suggestions and provide feedback to employees.

### **Judicial Leadership and Vision**

Judicial leadership is integral in high performing courts. The significance of leadership as a critical foundation for caseflow management success is reinforced by its recognized importance in the more generic management literature. It is a central theme in effective overall court management.<sup>22</sup> In recent years, courts and other government entities have been faced with an ongoing mandate to “do more with less.” Leaders in effective courts have had to undertake strategic planning to set strategic priorities based on a vision of the court’s mission.<sup>23</sup>

4. The results of the CourTools Measure 9 indicate Court employees are not satisfied with the current level of communication. In responses, which were converted to a 100-point scale, the Court scored below 70 on the following statements:<sup>24</sup>
  - a. My working conditions and environment enable me to do my job well. (57.5)
  - b. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development. (62.5)
  - c. The court and its leaders are dedicated to continuous improvement. (65.0)
  - d. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good. (65.0)
  - e. My court’s leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner. (65.0)
  - f. The court is respected in the community (65.0)
  - g. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes. (67.5)

The Court should develop a committee of Court leadership and staff members to explore ways to improve communication and elevate the working conditions and morale of the staff. Suggestions for improving court-wide morale include increased communication from Court leadership, employee recognition events, and team-building activities.

---

<sup>21</sup> Appendix, p. 41.  
<sup>22</sup> Steelman, at p. 62.  
<sup>23</sup> Steelman, at p. 64.  
<sup>24</sup> Appendix, p. 41.

5. The Court should create a committee of judges, magistrates, and staff to review and update its current strategic plan. Such a review would entail the assessment of the Court's current state and the update of its mission and vision statements as well as the strategic plan itself. This process will provide the Court and staff with direction and purpose and will also provide an opportunity to cultivate an atmosphere of teamwork and innovation.

## **Juvenile and Probate Divisions**

### **IX. ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

1. While the Court scored well overall in responses to the Court User Survey (CourTools Measure 1), the lowest score (of 80.0) was received on the question concerning the usefulness of the Court’s website.<sup>25</sup> The Court has made significant improvements to the probate division’s website. The juvenile division should consider mirroring this same format and include a link to Frequently Asked Questions on both websites.<sup>26</sup>
2. The Court should be recognized for its Guardian Visiting Program, Bunny Making Program, and its use of volunteers. These programs provide valuable assistance to the Court and the families who are involved.
3. The Supreme Court of Ohio, Office of Court Security conducted a security survey of the juvenile/probate division’s facilities in 2006 and assisted in the design phase of the Court’s new building in 2009. Now that construction of the new building is complete, the Court should engage the services of the Office of Court Security to conduct a survey of the Court’s safety and security.

### **X. EXPEDITION AND TIMELINESS**

#### **Delay**

Article I, §16, of the Ohio Constitution provides: “All courts shall be open, and every person....shall have justice administered without denial or delay.” Professor Ernest Friesen, a nationally recognized educator in court management, argues that caseload management is the heart of court management. “Justice is lost with the passage of time...time destroys the purposes of courts.”<sup>27</sup> It is for this reason that we analyze a court’s case processing methods to increase services and efficiencies.

1. As part of this review, the CourTools measures were implemented. Together, CourTools Measure 2 - Clearance Rate, Measure 3 - Time to Disposition, and Measure 4 - Age of Active Pending Caseload, provide a clear picture of a court’s case management abilities. The data indicate that the Court is performing well, disposing of nearly all juvenile cases within the established time standards. Clearance rates for the last six months of 2013 ranged from 87 to 147 percent. At the time of this analysis, nearly all juvenile cases had been pending for less than the applicable time standard. Due to the nature of how probate cases are reported as opened and closed, CourTools Measures 2 – 4 were not implemented for the analysis of those cases.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Appendix, p. 25.

<sup>26</sup> The Juvenile Division is currently updating its website and is expected to complete the project by Spring 2014.

<sup>27</sup> Friesen, Ernest C., *The Delay Problem and the Purposes of Courts* (National Center for State Courts, Institute for Court Management), Videotape, 1991.

<sup>28</sup> Appendix, p. 26-36.

2. probate division staff indicated that it is often difficult to find a file because files are often taken to the county records center for scanning. As resources permit, the Court should scan files on-site as they are opened or as new filings on existing cases are taken in.<sup>29</sup>

## **XI. EQUALITY, FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY**

1. The Court currently uses Ncourt to provide notice to litigants directly from the courtroom. Court staff indicated this technology could be used to provide a checklist of established goals to juveniles in treatment court. The Court should work with the magistrates to develop a consistent checklist of goals and explore Ncourt’s ability to produce such a form.
2. A reliable and accurate case file system is fundamental to the effectiveness of day-to-day court operations and fairness of judicial decisions. The maintenance of case records directly affects the timeliness and integrity of case processing.<sup>30</sup> During the CMR reviewers assessed randomly selected open and closed files for completeness and accuracy of contents. Across all 87 case files that were inspected, 84 percent of files were found to have their contents and docket sheets in alignment. Expected key documents were present in 92 percent of those files.<sup>31</sup> Staff should review procedures to address and prevent inaccuracies in the electronic case management system and to ensure that all physical documents are secured in the case file and docketed.
3. Treatment team staff in the juvenile division indicated that they need detailed case plans to help identify what issues that should be addressed with a child regarding treatment services. Court staff should work together to develop a detailed case plan template.

## **XII. INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

1. As indicated in the General and Domestic Relations section of the report, both Courts use CourtView case management software. While Court staff reported that there is some potential to share data between the two courts, the capabilities are limited. In the juvenile division, Court staff indicated the system often produces inaccurate case numbers due to some confusion with the general and domestic relations divisions’ case numbers. The Court should consider allowing access to both Courts’ non-confidential data that would assist staff in coordinating case schedules, attorney assignments and conflicts, and other functions that would promote efficiency between the two courts.
2. During interviews with Court staff reviewers noted that the Court may not be using the case management system (CMS) to its fullest potential. For example, the juvenile probation department does not use the “Pre-dispositional Investigation” feature offered through the CMS to update information, view historical information, view victim information, or look for trends in types of offenses. Instead, the report is typed in Word. Staff indicated a lack of

---

<sup>29</sup> The Court indicates that it plans to purchase scanners and begin on-site scanning in 2014.

<sup>30</sup> CourTools Measure 6.

<sup>31</sup> Appendix, p.38.

training is to blame for the Court's reluctance to utilize many of the helpful day-to-day features of the CMS. The Court should consider offering ongoing CMS training to all staff which will improve the Court's efficiency, accuracy, and consistency among all departments.<sup>32</sup>

3. Reviewers also noted several other areas where the CMS could benefit the Court:
  - a. The Court should discontinue the use of paper calendars and the practice of handwriting addresses on envelopes. Instead, the Court should utilize the CMS to manage the Court's calendar and print envelopes.
  - b. The Court should utilize the CMS to run the incarceration report.<sup>33</sup>
4. The Court disseminates some case management reports, however some staff reported not receiving any reports at all. Staff from all departments should meet to determine the types of reports that would be most useful to them. The Court should run weekly statistical reports for management's use as well as for the judge and staff. Relevant case management reports should be generated in accordance with the CourTools Measures.
5. The Court should consider the creation and wide dissemination of the following caseload statistical reports:
  - a. Cases submitted for determination pending decision;
  - b. New case filings;
  - c. Case terminations;
  - d. Pending caseload;
  - e. Cases pending beyond time guidelines;
  - f. Number of months cases are pending beyond time guidelines;
  - g. Continuance entry tracking;
  - h. Clearance rates (CourTools Measure 2);
  - i. Time to disposition (CourTools Measure 3);
  - j. Age of active pending caseload (CourTools Measure 4);
  - k. Trial date certainty (CourTools Measure 5);
  - l. Backlog rates;
  - m. Pending motions lists; and
  - n. Review of objections to magistrates' decisions.

---

<sup>32</sup> At the time of this review, the Court had recently converted to CourtView. The Court indicates that ongoing training is available. This training should continue to be offered at frequent intervals to assist staff with the transition.

<sup>33</sup> The Court indicates these recommendations have been implemented.

### **XIII. PUBLIC TRUST AND CONFIDENCE**

#### **Judicial Leadership and Vision**

Judicial leadership is integral in high performing courts. The significance of leadership as a critical foundation for caseload management success is reinforced by its recognized importance in the more generic management literature. It is a central theme in effective overall court management.<sup>34</sup> In recent years, courts and other government entities have been faced with an ongoing mandate to “do more with less.” Leaders in effective courts have had to undertake strategic planning to set strategic priorities based on a vision of the court’s mission.<sup>35</sup>

1. As part of the review, CourTools Measure 9 was implemented. An in-depth analysis of the findings is included in the Appendix to this report.<sup>36</sup> The results of the survey indicate the Court needs to improve communication and supervision. In staff responses, which were converted to a 100-point scale, the Court scored below 70 on the following statements related to communication and supervision:
  - a. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development. (62.2)
  - b. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes. (63.7)
  - c. When I do my job well, I am likely to be recognized and thanked by my supervisor. (65.2)
  - d. My meetings with my supervisor are useful and meaningful. (65.9)
  - e. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good. (68.9)
  - f. My court’s leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner. (69.2)
  
2. The Court should develop a committee of Court leadership and staff members to explore ways to improve communication and elevate the working conditions and morale of the staff. Suggestions for improving court-wide morale include increased communication from Court leadership, employee recognition events, and team-building activities.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Steelman, at p. 62.

<sup>35</sup> Steelman, at p. 64.

<sup>36</sup> Appendix, p. 42.

<sup>37</sup> The Court indicates that it conducts a monthly meeting with all staff, holds weekly or bi-weekly departmental staff meetings, hosts a monthly employee recognition event, and provides an annual all-staff retreat. Given the Court’s low scores regarding communication from managers, supervisors, and Court leaders, the Court should evaluate the quality and effectiveness of its communication at these meetings and events. The Court may wish to consider using an outside facilitator to guide a discussion that would tease out areas where communication could be improved from the staff members’ perspective.

#### **XIV. NEW JUDGESHIP PROPOSAL AND ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE DIVISIONAL CONFIGURATION**

The court of common pleas in Delaware County has two divisions: (1) a general division having jurisdiction over civil, criminal, and domestic relations cases, and (2) a probate/juvenile division having jurisdiction over probate and juvenile cases. Currently, the general division has two judgeships and the probate/juvenile division has one judgeship. In its initial written proposal, the Court appears to have proposed the addition of two judgeships, one to the general division and one to the probate/juvenile division. The Court further suggested that the second judgeship added to the probate/juvenile division have jurisdiction only over juvenile matters.

After analyzing the Court's initial written proposal and engaging in subsequent discussions with representatives from the Court, the nature of the potential solutions and options that might be pursued have been clarified. One of the options that has been discussed is the suggestion that rather than adding a judgeship to the general division, the Court might instead seek to sever domestic relations jurisdiction from the general division (leaving the currently-existing two general division judgeships to hear only civil and criminal cases) and create a standalone domestic relations division consisting of one judgeship (a new judgeship) which would have exclusive jurisdiction over all divorce, dissolution of marriage, legal separation, and annulment cases that come before the court, including any post-decree proceedings.

In addition, the judge of the standalone domestic relations division would also have exclusive jurisdiction over all cases involving questions of paternity, custody, visitation, child support, and the allocation of parental rights and responsibilities for the care of children regardless of whether those matters arise in post-decree proceedings or involve children born between unmarried persons. For purposes of this report, this form of modified jurisdiction for a standalone domestic relations division will be referred to as "*expanded domestic relations*" jurisdiction. Under this standalone expanded domestic relations division structure, the sole—and currently existing—judgeship in the probate/juvenile division would have exclusive jurisdiction over all probate matters as well as cases involving alleged delinquent and unruly juveniles, certain specified criminal cases involving adults, and all cases involving abused, neglected, or dependent children.

The proposed creation of a standalone expanded domestic relations division would require the addition of one judgeship to the common pleas court as a whole.

As a general principle, the staff of the Supreme Court support combining domestic relations caseloads with cases involving the status of children born between unmarried persons in terms of matters surrounding paternity, custody, visitation, support, and the allocation of parental rights and responsibilities. The case management processes and child-centered decision making framework surrounding the goal of securing stable and effective outcomes for children are the same regardless of whether those children are at issue in a divorce case or between unmarried persons. Having these matters heard within a single division of a common pleas court fosters consistency and serves the important goal of achieving efficiency in the court's delivery of services.

The Court's current caseloads support the creation of a standalone domestic relations division with expanded domestic relations jurisdiction.

Shown below in Table 1 are the number of incoming cases, per judge, in 2012 under the five main categories of case types heard in Ohio's common pleas courts, broken down by divisional configuration. For example, among the 28 counties which have a standalone general division ("CP1" courts), the average incoming caseload per judge in 2012 was 739 civil cases and 347 criminal cases. Note that statewide data for all divisional configurations for 2013 was not available at the time of the development of this analysis.

**Table 1, Incoming Cases Per Judge in 2012,  
by Type of Divisional Configuration, Statewide**

Divisional Configuration	Number of Counties	CASE TYPES				
		Domestic Relations	Civil	Criminal	Juvenile	Probate
General only (CP1)	28		739	347		
General and Domestic Relations (CP2)	53	379	389	215		
Domestic Relations only (DR1)	19	2,453				
Domestic Relations and Juvenile (DR2)	6	1,340			3,474	
Probate only (P1)	15					3,282
Probate and Juvenile (P2)	62				1,569	477
Domestic Relations, Probate, and Juvenile (P3)	4	338			907	252
Juvenile only (J1)	11				5,653	

Using the caseload figures shown above in Table 1, shown below in Table 2 are the number of incoming cases per judge in 2013 in Delaware County, broken down by the Court's current divisional configuration. The table also displays the applicable statewide comparison statistics.

**Table 2, Incoming Cases Per Judge Comparisons  
by Divisional Configuration**

Division	Judges	Case Type	Delaware County		Statewide Per Judge
			Total	Per Judge	(for the division type)
CP2	2 judges	Domestic Relations	1,249	625	379
		Civil	1,270	635	389
		Criminal	789	395	215
P2	1 judge	Juvenile	2,522	2,522	1,569
		Probate	830	830	477

The volume of civil and criminal cases heard in the general division of the Court support the proposal to sever domestic relations jurisdiction from that division and have the general division continue to consist of two judgeships. In 2013, the Court reported 635 incoming civil cases per judge and 395 incoming criminal cases per judge. As shown in Table 1 and 2, above,

these per judge figures are generally comparable to the 739 civil and 347 criminal cases per judge reported on average across Ohio's 28 counties with standalone general divisions.

The Court's single-judge probate/juvenile division reported 2,522 incoming juvenile cases and 830 incoming probate cases in 2013. These figures are significantly higher than the per-judge averages reported across the state's full set of 62 probate/juvenile divisions (with 1,569 incoming juvenile cases per judge, and 477 incoming probate cases per judge). The Court's juvenile incoming caseload in 2013 exceeded the 2012 statewide average for probate/juvenile divisions by nearly 1,000 cases.

Delaware County's incoming per-judge domestic relations caseload in 2013 was 625 cases. If that caseload was managed by one judge in a standalone domestic relations court, it would translate to 1,249 cases per judge, which is considerably less than the statewide standalone domestic relations divisions' per judge average caseload in 2012 of 2,345 cases. Accordingly, the domestic relations caseload in Delaware County is likely not sufficient in size to support a traditional standalone domestic relations division. However, a standalone domestic relations division consisting of a single judgeship having expanded domestic relations jurisdiction would be supportable. This arrangement would also decrease the overall caseload of the combined probate/juvenile division because a sizable portion of that division's caseload would be shifted to the division hearing expanded domestic relations jurisdiction.

Shown in Table 3, below, are the number of incoming cases per judge in 2013 in Delaware County, broken down within the proposed alternative divisional configuration in which a single judge would hear an expanded domestic relations jurisdiction docket and a single judge would hear all probate matters and the remaining docket of juvenile cases. The incoming (expanded) caseload of 2,034 cases in the standalone domestic relations division is closer in volume to the 2,453 incoming cases per judge in Ohio's standalone domestic relations divisions. Moreover, the caseload of 1,655 juvenile cases in the modified probate/juvenile division is comparable to the 1,569 incoming juvenile cases per judge in Ohio's probate/juvenile courts.

**Table 3, Incoming Cases Per Judge Comparisons  
by Proposed Alternative Divisional Configuration**

Division	Judges	Case Type	Delaware County		Statewide Per Judge
			Total	Per Judge	(for the division type)
CP1	2 judges	Civil	1,270	635	739
		Criminal	789	395	347
DR+	1 judge	Expanded DR	2,034	2,034	not available
P2-	1 judge	Juvenile (subset)	1,655	1,655	not available
		Probate	830	830	not available

Under R.C. 2301.03, the domestic relations divisions of several counties' common pleas courts are accorded expanded domestic relations jurisdiction. A review of those courts' particular domestic relations and juvenile caseloads does not provide a sufficient level of clarity leading to the identification of a typical caseload size for an expanded domestic relations division

court. Accordingly, for purposes of this analysis and divisional configuration recommendation, a set of precise comparison statistics is not available.

**Delaware County Court of Common Pleas  
Caseload Statistics and CourTools Performance Measures**

---

### Incoming Caseloads

Shown below in Tables 1 through 4 are the total number of incoming cases reported by the Court over each of the last ten full calendar years. Total incoming cases include new filings plus reactivations and transfers in.

Among the Court's general division docket, the number of incoming cases rose steadily between 2004 and 2010. Much of the overall increase is attributable to the Court's Foreclosure caseload, which rose from 513 filings in 2004 to a ten-year high of 1,112 cases in 2008 (a 117 percent increase over those four years). However, the Court's Foreclosure filings have declined considerably since 2008, with 637 incoming cases in 2013 representing a 40-percent drop from 2008. See Table 1.

Between 2004 and 2010, the Court's general civil docket (excluding Foreclosures) also saw sizable year-over-year increases. Similar to the Foreclosure docket, the filings seen over last few years have declined. In 2013, there were a total of 440 Other Civil filings, down 40 percent from the ten-year high of 733 filings in 2010.

The Court's Criminal caseloads have remained largely stable over the last ten years with relatively slight fluctuations from year to year, averaging out at 731 filings per year. A ten-year high of 851 filings was seen in 2011. The 789 filings in 2013, although the second-highest annual volume over the last ten years, are not sizably larger than the ten-year average.

**Table 1, Incoming Caseloads – General Division Cases, 2004 through 2013**

<b>Case Type</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Administrative Appeals	12	5	11	9	14	4	11	3	17	3
Complex Litigation	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Foreclosures	513	580	859	1,102	1,112	1,089	1,071	1,082	924	637
Other Civil	401	410	427	533	657	699	733	587	524	440
Other Torts	104	141	132	123	128	128	149	133	114	117
Product Liability	3	2	0	3	0	6	1	4	2	4
Professional Tort	9	6	5	4	4	3	10	9	7	5
Workers Compensation	40	53	47	61	51	45	48	49	59	64
Criminal	664	713	628	738	735	723	761	851	716	789
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,747</b>	<b>1,910</b>	<b>2,110</b>	<b>2,574</b>	<b>2,702</b>	<b>2,697</b>	<b>2,784</b>	<b>2,718</b>	<b>2,364</b>	<b>2,059</b>

The Court's domestic relations caseloads have experienced notable growth over the last ten years. In 2006, the Court saw a ten-year low of 819 filings. For the last four years running, over 1,000 filings were seen by the Court. The 1,249 incoming cases in 2013 represent a 53 percent increase over 2006. See Table 2.

**Table 2, Incoming Caseloads – Domestic Relations Cases, 2003 through 2013**

Case Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
All Others	22	24	34	34	45	87	75	111	69	63
Change of Custody	66	53	53	58	43	49	57	40	51	65
Domestic Violence	68	61	37	38	56	80	82	117	90	118
Marriage Dissolutions w/Children	90	96	102	109	123	145	139	164	151	118
Marriage Dissolutions w/o Children	135	134	127	136	137	138	175	165	137	116
Marriage Terminations w/Children	182	174	186	171	235	184	199	215	182	201
Marriage Terminations w/o Children	112	101	90	122	105	122	96	119	103	114
Parentage	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Support - Enforce or Modify	296	224	172	229	148	165	171	337	310	419
U.I.F.S.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Visitation - Enforce or Modify	16	13	17	5	18	14	15	32	51	34
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>984</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>1,144</b>	<b>1,249</b>

Among the Court's juvenile caseloads, there have been slight to moderate declines over the last ten years, especially in Abuse, Neglect or Dependency cases, Delinquency and Unruly cases, and especially in juvenile Traffic cases which have decreased by 21 percent from the ten-year high of 1,072 filings in 2004 to 846 filings in 2013. See Table 3.

**Table 3, Incoming Caseloads – Juvenile Cases, 2003 through 2013**

Case Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Abuse, Neglect or Dependency	163	116	181	150	131	107	54	57	53	62
Adult Cases	48	85	89	55	105	95	115	33	131	77
All Others	6	2	0	1	2	1	11	6	12	43
Custody/Visitation	175	157	123	138	133	127	161	209	167	159
Delinquency	661	581	684	635	730	691	856	570	646	520
Motion for Permanent Custody	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	2
Parentage	44	30	29	55	64	49	58	114	109	117
Support - Enforce or Modify	563	562	567	568	508	530	511	374	435	485
Traffic	1,072	1,067	1,038	908	813	907	837	891	822	846
U.I.F.S.A.	13	17	16	12	17	27	21	25	23	24
Unruly	109	152	210	192	264	298	177	107	124	105
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,854</b>	<b>2,769</b>	<b>2,937</b>	<b>2,714</b>	<b>2,767</b>	<b>2,837</b>	<b>2,802</b>	<b>2,386</b>	<b>2,522</b>	<b>2,440</b>

The Court's probate caseloads have experienced moderate long-term growth. Decedents' Estates, which constitute the largest block of cases, have risen slightly from year to year beginning in 2006, with a ten-year high of 543 filings in 2013. Filings for Guardianships, with a notable spike in 2011, have remained generally stable. Adoption cases had been trending down but rose significantly in 2013 with 42 incoming cases, compared with 10 in 2012. See Table 4.

**Table 4, Incoming Caseloads – Probate Cases, 2003 through 2013**

<b>Case Type</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Adoptions	68	57	52	64	57	30	39	17	10	42
Birth (Correction or Delayed Reg.)	2	8	7	15	7	11	7	2	0	10
Change of Name	78	78	53	77	69	78	92	51	0	95
Civil Actions	21	23	18	6	19	21	24	21	3	28
Conservatorships	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	1
Decedents' Estates	415	418	415	427	426	460	487	490	514	543
Guardianships of Incompetents	41	28	52	51	63	63	57	50	39	48
Guardianships of Minors	35	35	37	65	43	45	51	180	38	50
Mental Illness and Mental Retardation	3	4	1	4	7	4	3	0	0	0
Minors' Settlements	26	25	21	26	12	12	21	3	2	8
Testamentary Trusts	9	13	7	9	7	7	10	6	0	5
Wrongful Death	0	0	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>830</b>

## Background on the CourTools

In 1987, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the United States Department of Justice, initiated the Trial Court Performance Standards Project in order to develop a common language for describing, classifying, and measuring the performance of trial courts. Their work culminated in the publication of the Trial Court Performance Standards (TCPS) in 1990. Included in those standards was an extensive battery of 68 performance measures. Faced with the practical challenges of implementing the multitude of performance measures prescribed in the TCPS, the staff of the NCSC worked with state court representatives to develop a streamlined set of measures that evaluate the essential core functions of a court. The result was the completion in 2005 of ten performance measures constituting the CourTools.

The CourTools measures provide a balanced and comprehensive, yet workable, empirical perspective on court operations. When implemented, they give the judiciary, its justice partners, and the public direct evidence into how well a court is functioning. The CourTools provide an effective framework for courts to establish performance baselines, diagnose existing problems, and plan for specific improvements.

## Scope of CourTools Implementation

The scope of this project provided for implementation of the following CourTools measures:

- Measure 1, Access and Fairness
- Measure 2, Clearance Rates
- Measure 3, Time to Disposition
- Measure 4, Age of Active Pending Caseload
- Measure 5, Trial Date Certainty

- Measure 6, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files
- Measure 8, Effective Use of Jurors
- Measure 9, Court Employee Satisfaction

Measures 1 and 9 involves surveying court users and court staff. Measures 2, 3, 4, and 5 are directly related to caseload management. The data required to implement them can typically be found within case management system databases. The Court's regular statistical reports filed with the Supreme Court pursuant to Sup.R. 37 provide the data required to calculate Measure 2, Clearance Rates. The data required to calculate Measures 3, 4, and 5 (Time to Disposition, Age of Active Pending Caseload, and Trial Date Certainty, respectively), if not contained in a court's regular compliment of internal management reports, are available through either a manual inspection of a sampling of case files or through data extracted from a court's case management system. A manual file review process is resource intensive and reliant on and the quality of the representative sample.

For this project, the review team provided the Court's staff with a set of data extraction requirements. In October, 2013, the review team was provided a set of spreadsheets containing the requested data extracts. Staff from each judge's office had an opportunity to review and assess the quality of the extracted data prior to its provision to the review team. The nature of the extracts permitted the implementation of CourTools Measure 3 and 4 across all divisions of the Court within the major case type categories. Following the initial drafting of the Measure 3 and Measure 4 results analyses, the staff in the Court's probate/juvenile division was able to identify instances in which the extracted data was erroneous. Subsequent restatements of the data were supplied by the Court and incorporated into these final analyses.

The data obtained for Measure 5 was set aside due to the complexity of the extracted data and apparent potential inconsistencies between them and the requirements specified for this measure. Supreme Court staff are available to continue working with the Court on implementing Measure 5 and how it, and the other caseload-management related CourTools measures, might be integrated as standard reports in the Court's case management system. Measure 6 involves manually examining a court's case files in order to assess their overall quality. Lastly, Measure 8 requires the tracking of selected metrics concerning the summoning and use of jurors.

### **CourTools Measure 1, Access and Fairness**

CourTools Measure 1 focuses on court users and their experiences with the court in terms of the court's accessibility and its treatment of customers in terms of fairness, equality, and respect. Many assume that "winning" and "losing" is what matters most to citizens when dealing with the courts. Yet research consistently shows public trust and confidence is shaped more by a person's perceptions of how they are treated in court, and whether the court makes decisions fairly. This measure provides a tool for surveying court users including attorneys and parties to litigation.

Using the survey instrument designed by the NCSC, the review team surveyed people exiting the county courthouse and the county administration facility housing the probate and

juvenile court after confirming they were in the buildings doing business with the Court. Court users were asked to respond to a series of questions relating to access to justice and the fairness of the judicial process. Responses were made using a five-level Likert scale.

Employing a 100-point scale to present survey results is useful particularly for displaying the results within the familiar and intuitive 100-point scale. In order to convert the survey results for each survey item to a 100-point scale, the following calculations are made: the number of persons who responded “Strongly Disagree” was multiplied by 20, the number of persons who responded “Disagree” was multiplied by 40, the number of persons who responded “Neither Agree nor Disagree” was multiplied by 60, the number of persons who responded “Agree” was multiplied by 80, and the number of persons who responded “Strongly Agree” was multiplied by 100. The sum of those products was then divided by the number of responses. The resulting value represents a score on a 100-point scale. Using a shorthand analytic framework suggested by NCSC staff, result scores greater than 80 on this scale indicate the court is “doing a good job.” Result scores over 70 but under 80 indicate the court is “doing okay.” Result scores under 70 indicate the court “needs improvement.”

For the general and domestic relations division court users, a total of 22 individuals responded to the survey. For the probate and juvenile division court users, a total of 30 individuals responded to the survey. The responders each confirmed they had experience with the court and its services.

### ***Access to Justice Findings – General and Domestic Relations Division***

The largest section of the survey (10 of the total 15 questions) contained questions concerning access to justice. These questions focused on the respondent’s overall experience while in the courthouse that day. Responders to these questions were not necessarily parties to a legal matter. Table 5, below, shows the survey results for those statements concerning access to justice.

**Table 5, Court User Survey, Access to Justice Questions –  
General and Domestic Relations Division Court Users**

<b>Statement Concerning Access to Justice</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
Finding the courthouse was easy.	91.8	22	5%	0%	0%	23%	73%
The forms I needed were clear and easy to understand.	87.1	17	0%	6%	6%	35%	53%
I felt safe in the courthouse.	94.5	22	0%	0%	5%	18%	77%
The court makes reasonable efforts to remove physical and language barriers to service.	90.6	17	0%	0%	6%	35%	59%
I was able to get my court business done in a reasonable time.	90.9	22	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%
Court staff paid attention to my needs.	88.6	21	5%	0%	5%	29%	62%
I was treated with courtesy and respect.	93.6	22	0%	0%	5%	23%	73%
I easily found the courtroom or office I needed.	94.5	22	0%	0%	5%	18%	77%
The Court's website was useful.	83.5	17	0%	6%	24%	18%	53%
The court's hours of operation made it easy for me to do business.	90.9	22	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%
<b>Overall Access to Justice Score</b>	<b>90.6</b>						

As shown above, the Court scored very well on this portion of the survey. The lowest score (of 83.5) was received in response to the statement concerning whether the users found the Court's website useful. The highest scores (of 94.5) were received in response to the statement concerning the users feeling safe in the courthouse and having easily found the office or courtroom they needed.

Shown below in Table 6 are the responses obtained from users of the probate and juvenile division of the Court.

**Table 6, Court User Survey, Access to Justice Questions –  
Probate and Juvenile Division Court Users**

<b>Statement Concerning Access to Justice</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
Finding the courthouse was easy.	88.7	30	3%	7%	0%	23%	67%
The forms I needed were clear and easy to understand.	87.4	27	4%	0%	0%	48%	48%
I felt safe in the courthouse.	95.3	30	3%	0%	0%	10%	87%
The court makes reasonable efforts to remove physical and language barriers to service.	88.7	23	4%	0%	0%	39%	57%
I was able to get my court business done in a reasonable time.	84.3	28	4%	11%	4%	25%	57%
Court staff paid attention to my needs.	87.3	30	3%	0%	7%	37%	53%
I was treated with courtesy and respect.	90.0	30	3%	0%	0%	37%	60%
I easily found the courtroom or office I needed.	88.7	30	3%	0%	3%	37%	57%
The Court's website was useful.	80.0	17	0%	0%	29%	41%	29%
The court's hours of operation made it easy for me to do business.	86.0	30	3%	7%	3%	30%	57%
<b>Overall Access to Justice Score</b>	<b>87.6</b>						

As shown above, the Court scored well on this portion of the survey when it was presented to users of the probate and juvenile division. The lowest score (of 80.0) was received on the question concerning the usefulness of the Court's website. The highest score (of 95.3) was received in response to the statement concerning the users feeling safe in the courthouse.

### ***Fairness Findings***

The second portion of the survey was specifically directed towards people who were party to a legal matter and appeared before a judge or magistrate. Similar to the first section, responses were made using a five-level Likert scale, and for purposes of this analysis, converted to scores on a 100-point scale. Table 7, below, shows the survey results for those statements concerning fairness.

**Table 7, Court User Survey, Fairness Questions –  
General and Domestic Relations Division Court Users**

Statement Concerning Fairness	Score	Number of Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The way my cases was handled was fair.	92.7	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%
The judge listened to my side of the story before they made a decision.	93.3	9	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%
The judge had the information necessary to make good decisions about my case.	94.0	10	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%
I was treated the same as everyone else.	93.3	12	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%
As I leave the court, I know what to do next about my case.	91.7	12	0%	0%	0%	42%	58%
<b>Overall Fairness Score</b>	<b>93.0</b>						

As shown above, the Court scored very well on this portion of the survey. Admittedly, the sample size is relatively small. Nevertheless, it bears noting that the responders either agreed or strongly agreed with each of these five survey statements.

Shown in Table 8, below, are the responses to the fairness-related portion of the survey from users of the probate and juvenile division. Here again, the Court scored very well in terms of the perceptions of its users feeling like they were treated fairly.

**Table 8, Court User Survey, Fairness Questions –  
Probate and Juvenile Division Court Users**

Statement Concerning Fairness	Score	Number of Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The way my cases was handled was fair.	87.3	11	0%	9%	9%	18%	64%
The judge listened to my side of the story before they made a decision.	92.7	11	0%	0%	9%	18%	73%
The judge had the information necessary to make good decisions about my case.	89.1	11	0%	9%	0%	27%	64%
I was treated the same as everyone else.	92.7	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%
As I leave the court, I know what to do next about my case.	92.0	10	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%
<b>Overall Fairness Score</b>	<b>90.8</b>						

## CourTools Measure 2, Clearance Rates

Clearance rates measure a court's ability to keep up with its incoming caseload. If cases are not disposed of in a timely manner and at a rate equaling or exceeding the rate of incoming cases, a backlog of cases awaiting disposition will grow and a backlog significantly increases the likelihood that cases will age unnecessarily. Because they serve as a prospective measure of a court's potential at any point in time for developing a backlog, clearance rates are best monitored regularly over a fairly short overall time-frame.

Clearance rates are calculated by dividing the total number of final dispositions by the total number of incoming cases over a discrete time period. A series of those periods (typically months) reveal a court's performance and likelihood for developing a backlog in the near future. A clearance rate of 100 percent means that the court is precisely keeping current by terminating as many cases as it is receiving. A pattern of being below 100 percent indicates a backlog is likely to arise.

Due to the nature of clearance rates being measures that predict a future state (namely a potential growth in the pending caseload when a recent and regular pattern of rates under 100 percent are demonstrated) the court's clearance rates have been calculated using monthly data available from the court for January through June of 2013.

Shown below in Table 9 are the court's monthly clearance rates for the second half of 2013. Due to the nature of how probate cases are reported as opened and closed, clearance rates are not as easily calculated and have been omitted from this analysis.

**Table 9, Clearance Rates in 2013**

	<b>Jul-13</b>	<b>Aug-13</b>	<b>Sep-13</b>	<b>Oct-13</b>	<b>Nov-13</b>	<b>Dec-13</b>
<b>Domestic Relations Cases</b>						
Change of Custody	83%	78%	300%	133%	275%	29%
Domestic Violence	133%	75%	130%	133%	60%	129%
Marriage Dissolutions w/Children	69%	156%	50%	80%	130%	133%
Marriage Dissolutions w/o Children	71%	100%	73%	167%	91%	167%
Marriage Terminations w/Children	120%	89%	113%	105%	117%	115%
Marriage Terminations w/o Children	50%	13%	78%	100%	70%	122%
Support - Enforce or Modify	105%	85%	64%	114%	65%	95%
Visitation - Enforce or Modify	400%	150%	300%	300%	100%	100%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>123%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>107%</b>
<b>General Division Cases</b>						
<b>CRIMINAL</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>127%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>152%</b>
Foreclosures	128%	143%	128%	106%	93%	179%
Other Civil	70%	86%	77%	133%	136%	130%
Other Torts	121%	163%	91%	167%	80%	100%
<b>OVERALL CIVIL</b>	<b>105%</b>	<b>122%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>119%</b>	<b>105%</b>	<b>144%</b>
<b>Juvenile Cases</b>						
Abuse, Neglect or Dependency	500%	171%	100%	100%	150%	31%
Custody/Visitation	200%	70%	188%	85%	125%	112%
Delinquency	113%	136%	88%	88%	119%	189%
Parentage	46%	36%	113%	200%	283%	33%
Support - Enforce or Modify	107%	97%	76%	87%	129%	210%
Traffic	68%	125%	85%	119%	59%	163%
Unruly	83%	108%	117%	100%	60%	70%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>113%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>102%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>147%</b>

As noted above, the important feature to identify in clearance rates are patterns of rates more often than not being under 100 percent. When that happens—and the rate of new cases coming in is generally stable—the court will necessarily be increasing the size of its pending

caseload because it is not keeping up with the pace of incoming cases. What can then be expected to follow suit is a rise in the number of cases pending over time guidelines.

When caseloads are generally smaller, the month-to-month variability in clearance rates can be dramatic. This can be seen with the Court's Abuse, Neglect or Dependency docket where the clearance rate has ranged between 31 percent and 500 percent.

### **CourTools Measure 3, Time to Disposition**

This measure, along with Measure 2, Clearance Rates, and Measure 4, Age of Active Pending Caseload, is a fundamental caseload management tool. It compares a court's performance with local, state, or national guidelines for timely case processing by calculating the percentage of cases disposed or otherwise resolved within established time frames.

Using the data extracts provided by the Court, Measure 3 was implemented by examining data on all cases filed in 2012 which had been disposed by the Court by October, 2013. The measurement being obtained was the number of days between the filing of the case and the date of the disposition. Any aggregate periods of time in which the cases were stayed and thus outside of the court's control were discounted from the calculated case age.

Shown below in Table 10 are the findings within the three major case categories in the general division: Criminal, Civil (Non-Foreclosures), and Foreclosures. As shown, the data indicate that the Court disposed of 64 percent of its Criminal cases within the applicable time standard of 180 days. A total of 95 percent of its Criminal cases were disposed within 360 days.

For simplicity of displaying the findings, the various non-Foreclosures civil case types were collapsed into a single group. The time standards for civil cases run generally between 12 and 24 months. As shown in these findings, the Court disposed of 90 percent of its caseload within 360 days and 100 percent within approximately 18 months. The data revealed similarly successful case management with the Court's Foreclosure cases, where 95 percent were disposed of within the 12-month time standard.

**Table 10, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
General Division Cases – Criminal and Civil**

Age in Days	Criminal			Civil (Non-Foreclosures)			Foreclosures		
	<i>Time Standard: 180 days</i>			<i>Time Standard: 360 to 720 days</i>			<i>Time Standard: 360 days</i>		
	Number of		Cumulative	Number of		Cumulative	Number of		Cumulative
Cases	Percentage	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	Percentage	
Less than 30	14	3%	3%	60	11%	11%	17	2%	2%
31 to 60	33	6%	9%	50	9%	20%	60	8%	10%
61 to 90	42	8%	16%	67	12%	31%	68	9%	19%
91 to 120	89	16%	33%	57	10%	42%	74	10%	29%
121 to 150	100	18%	51%	39	7%	48%	100	13%	42%
151 to 180	74	14%	64%	51	9%	58%	111	15%	57%
181 to 210	59	11%	75%	27	5%	62%	78	10%	67%
211 to 240	36	7%	82%	31	6%	68%	58	8%	75%
241 to 270	27	5%	87%	36	6%	74%	37	5%	79%
271 to 300	23	4%	91%	34	6%	80%	47	6%	86%
301 to 330	17	3%	94%	32	6%	86%	46	6%	92%
331 to 360	8	1%	95%	25	4%	90%	22	3%	95%
361 to 390	8	1%	97%	19	3%	94%	18	2%	97%
391 to 420	3	1%	97%	12	2%	96%	7	1%	98%
421 to 450	3	1%	98%	10	2%	98%	8	1%	99%
451 to 480	2	0.4%	98%	6	1%	99%	2	0.3%	99%
481 to 510	7	1%	100%	1	0.2%	99%	2	0.3%	99%
511 to 540	1	0.2%	100%	3	1%	99%	1	0.1%	100%
541 to 570	1	0.2%	100%	2	0.4%	100%	1	0.1%	100%
571 to 600	-	-	-	0	0%	100%	1	0.1%	100%
More than 600	-	-	-	1	0.2%	100%	1	0.1%	100%
TOTAL	547			563			759		

Shown in Table 11a and Table 11b, below, are the findings concerning time to disposition in the Court's domestic relations case types (Marriage Terminations with Children, Marriage Terminations without Children, Marriage Dissolutions, and Domestic Violence). The data extracts supplied by the Court for domestic relations cases did not contain any post-decree case types. As shown in these tables, the Court disposed of 98 percent of its Marriage Terminations with Children within the 18-month time standard and 94 percent of its Marriage Terminations without Children within one month beyond the 12-month time standard. For its Dissolution cases, the court disposed of 94 percent of the cases within one month beyond the three-month time standard.

**Table 11a, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
Domestic Relations Cases – Marriage Terminations**

Age of Case (Days)	Marriage Terminations (with Children)			Marriage Terminations (without children)		
	<i>Time Standard: 540 days</i>			<i>Time Standard: 360 days</i>		
	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 30	3	2%	2%	5	6%	6%
31 to 60	5	4%	6%	8	9%	15%
61 to 90	8	6%	12%	9	10%	26%
91 to 120	16	12%	25%	8	9%	35%
121 to 150	8	6%	31%	8	9%	44%
151 to 180	10	8%	38%	4	5%	49%
181 to 210	11	8%	47%	13	15%	64%
211 to 240	7	5%	52%	4	5%	69%
241 to 270	8	6%	58%	6	7%	76%
271 to 300	7	5%	64%	4	5%	80%
301 to 330	6	5%	68%	3	3%	84%
331 to 360	8	6%	75%	4	5%	<b>88%</b>
361 to 390	7	5%	80%	5	6%	94%
391 to 420	8	6%	86%	2	2%	97%
421 to 450	4	3%	89%	2	2%	99%
451 to 480	4	3%	92%	1	1%	100%
481 to 510	1	1%	93%	-	-	
511 to 540	6	5%	<b>98%</b>	-	-	
541 to 570	1	1%	98%	-	-	
571 to 600	1	1%	100%	-	-	
601 to 630	1	1%	100%	-	-	
More and 630	-	-		-	-	
TOTAL	130			86		

**Table 11b, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
Domestic Relations Cases – Dissolutions**

<b>Dissolutions</b>			
<i>Time Standard: 90 days</i>			
<b>Age of Case</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentage</b>
Less than 30	67	24%	24%
31 to 60	153	55%	79%
61 to 90	32	11%	<b>90%</b>
91 to 120	9	3%	94%
121 to 150	2	1%	94%
151 to 180	3	1%	95%
181 to 210	5	2%	97%
211 to 240	1	0.4%	97%
241 to 270	0	0%	97%
271 to 300	1	0.4%	98%
301 to 330	1	0.4%	98%
331 to 360	1	0.4%	99%
361 to 390	0	0%	99%
391 to 420	1	0.4%	99%
421 to 450	1	0.4%	99%
451 to 480	1	0.4%	100%
481 to 510	-	-	100%
511 to 540	1	0.4%	100%
TOTAL	279		

Contained in Tables 12a and 12b below are the findings regarding the Court's time to disposition of its selected major juvenile case types. As shown, the Court disposed of 98 percent of its Abuse, Neglect or Dependency cases within the Supreme Court's 90-day time standard. See Table 12a. The data supplied by the Court for its Delinquency and Unruly cases did not distinguish between the two categories, which have 180-day and 90-day time standards, respectively. An analysis of the combined categories shows that the Court disposed of 99 percent of these cases within 180 days. See Table 12b. The Court disposed of 96 percent of its Traffic cases within the 90-day time standard. See Table 12c.

**Table 12a, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
Juvenile Cases – Abuse, Neglect, or Dependency Cases**

<b>AND</b>			
<i>Time Standard: 90 days</i>			
<b>Age of Case</b>	<b>Number of</b>		<b>Cumulative</b>
	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30	10	17%	17%
31 to 60	8	14%	31%
61 to 90	40	68%	<b>98%</b>
91 to 120	1	2%	100%
TOTAL	59		

**Table 12b, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
Juvenile Cases – Delinquency and Unruly Cases**

<b>Delinquency/Unruly</b>			
<i>Time Standards: 90 and 180 days</i>			
<b>Age of Case</b>	<b>Number of</b>		<b>Cumulative</b>
	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30	185	45%	45%
31 to 60	83	20%	65%
61 to 90	48	12%	77%
91 to 120	41	10%	87%
121 to 150	33	8%	95%
151 to 180	15	4%	<b>99%</b>
181 to 210	3	1%	99%
211 to 240	1	0.2%	99.5%
241 to 270	1	0.2%	99.8%
271 to 300	-	-	99.8%
301 to 330	1	0.2%	100%
TOTAL	411		

**Table 12c, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings –  
Juvenile Cases – Traffic Cases**

<b>Traffic</b>			
<i>Time Standard: 90 days</i>			
<b>Age of Case</b>	<b>Number of</b>		<b>Cumulative</b>
	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30	599	76%	76%
31 to 60	114	14%	90%
61 to 90	45	6%	<b>96%</b>
91 to 120	16	2%	98%
121 to 150	10	1%	99%
151 to 180	5	1%	99%
181 to 210	1	0.1%	99.6%
211 to 240	3	0.4%	100%
TOTAL	793		

Table 13, below, displays the findings concerning the Court’s probate caseload among three selected major case type categories. Although the Supreme Court does not promulgate time standards for probate cases, the age of the cases at their disposition can still be measured. For this analysis, the cases were considered disposed when the petition or application had been acted upon by the Court (e.g., when the guardian was appointed).

**Table 13, Time to Disposition, Summary Findings – Probate Cases**

Age of Case (Days)	Adoptions			Estates			Guardianships		
	<i>No Time Standard</i>			<i>No Time Standard</i>			<i>No Time Standard</i>		
	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 30	3	10%	10%	127	32%	32%	8	31%	31%
31 to 60	1	3%	13%	23	6%	38%	6	23%	54%
61 to 90	3	10%	23%	20	5%	43%	2	7.7%	62%
91 to 120	4	13%	37%	29	7%	51%	0	0%	62%
121 to 150	3	10%	47%	13	3%	54%	0	0%	62%
151 to 180	2	7%	53%	22	6%	60%	0	0%	62%
181 to 210	3	10%	63%	24	6%	66%	0	0%	62%
211 to 240	1	3%	67%	17	4%	70%	0	0%	62%
241 to 270	3	10%	77%	24	6%	76%	1	3.8%	65%
271 to 300	2	7%	83%	18	5%	81%	2	7.7%	73%
301 to 330	2	7%	90%	18	5%	85%	1	3.8%	77%
331 to 360	1	3%	93%	15	4%	89%	0	0%	77%
361 to 390	2	7%	100%	9	2%	91%	2	7.7%	85%
391 to 420	-	-	-	8	2%	93%	0	0%	85%
421 to 450	-	-	-	10	3%	96%	3	11.5%	96%
451 to 480	-	-	-	4	1%	97%	0	0%	96%
481 to 510	-	-	-	5	1%	98%	0	0%	96%
511 to 540	-	-	-	4	1%	99%	1	3.8%	100%
541 to 570	-	-	-	2	1%	100%	-	-	-
571 to 600	-	-	-	1	0.3%	100%	-	-	-
601 to 630	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
More and 630	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	30			393			26		

As shown above, most Adoption cases (93 percent) were disposed within one year; 77 percent were disposed within 270 days. In the Court’s Estate cases, most of the cases (93 percent) were disposed within 420 days. For Guardianships (for both adults and minors), most of the cases (96 percent) were disposed within 450 days.

#### **CourTools Measure 4, Age of Active Pending Caseload**

This CourTools measure gauges the age of a court’s active caseload. Knowing the age of the active pending caseload is an important measure of a court’s case management practices especially in helping courts understand how their cases are aging as they approach applicable time standards. Where Measure 3, Time to Disposition, describes a court’s historical performance, this measure describes the aging of a court’s current caseload at a precise moment in time.

Using the data extracts provided by the Court, Measure 4 was implemented by examining data on all cases pending active on October 21, 2013. The measurement obtained was the number of days between the filing of the case and the date of the measurement. Any aggregate periods of time in which the cases were stayed and thus outside of the court's control were discounted from the calculated case age. Table 14, below, contains the findings.

**Table 14, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings –  
General Division Cases – Criminal and Civil**

Age of Case	Criminal			Civil (Non-Foreclosures)			Foreclosures		
	<i>Time Standard: 180 days</i>			<i>Time Standard: 360 to 720 days</i>			<i>Time Standard: 360 days</i>		
	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 30 Days	82	34%	34%	64	16%	16%	41	18%	18%
31 to 60	38	16%	49%	36	9%	25%	35	15%	32%
61 to 90	39	16%	65%	37	9%	34%	24	10%	43%
91 to 120	26	11%	76%	34	8%	42%	30	13%	56%
121 to 150	15	6%	82%	36	9%	51%	31	13%	69%
151 to 180	13	5%	<b>88%</b>	36	9%	60%	13	6%	74%
181 to 210	8	3%	91%	15	4%	64%	12	5%	79%
211 to 240	11	5%	95%	17	4%	68%	13	6%	85%
241 to 270	5	2%	98%	22	5%	73%	6	3%	88%
271 to 300	2	1%	98%	7	2%	75%	11	5%	92%
301 to 330	2	1%	99%	10	2%	78%	4	2%	94%
331 to 360	2	1%	100%	12	3%	80%	3	1%	<b>95%</b>
361 to 390	-	-	-	13	3%	84%	2	1%	96%
391 to 420	-	-	-	10	2%	86%	2	1%	97%
421 to 450	-	-	-	11	3%	89%	1	0.4%	97%
451 to 480	-	-	-	9	2%	91%	1	0.4%	98%
481 to 510	-	-	-	3	1%	92%	2	1%	99%
511 to 540	-	-	-	5	1%	93%	0	0%	99%
1.5 to 2 Years	-	-	-	14	3%	<b>97%</b>	2	1%	100%
2 to 2.5 Years	-	-	-	12	3%	100%	1	0.4%	100%
2.5 to 3 Years	-	-	-	1	0.2%	100%	-	-	-
3 to 3.5 Years	-	-	-	1	0.2%	100%	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>243</b>			<b>405</b>			<b>234</b>		

As shown above in Table 14, 88 percent of the Court's Criminal caseload had been pending for 180 days or less. No case had been pending for longer than one year. Among the Court's Civil (Non-Foreclosure) caseload—where the time standards run for up to 24 months—80 percent of the Court's cases had been pending for less than 12 months. Notably, 28 of the 405 (7 percent) cases had been pending for longer than 18 months. Most of the Court's pending Foreclosure docket (95 percent of the cases) had been pending for less than the 12-month time standard.

Tables 15a and 15b, below, display the findings concerning the age of the Court's pending domestic relations caseload.

**Table 15a, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings – Domestic Relations Cases – Marriage Terminations**

Age of Case	Marriage Terminations (with Children)			Marriage Terminations (without children)		
	Time Standard: 540 days			Time Standard: 360 days		
	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 30 Days	16	13%	13%	10	19%	19%
31 to 60	10	8%	21%	7	13%	32%
61 to 90	18	15%	36%	6	11%	43%
91 to 120	9	7%	43%	5	9%	53%
121 to 150	8	7%	50%	5	9%	62%
151 to 180	9	7%	57%	6	11%	74%
181 to 210	9	7%	65%	3	6%	79%
211 to 240	6	5%	70%	3	6%	85%
241 to 270	5	4%	74%	1	2%	87%
271 to 300	4	3%	77%	2	4%	91%
301 to 330	5	4%	81%	1	2%	92%
331 to 360	4	3%	84%	2	4%	96%
1 to 1.5 Years	12	10%	94%	2	4%	100%
1.5 to 2 Years	4	3%	98%	-	-	-
2 to 2.5 Years	3	2%	100%	-	-	-
TOTAL	122			53		

**Table 15b, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings – Domestic Relations Cases – Marriage Dissolutions**

Age of Case	Dissolutions		
	Time Standard: 90 days		
	Number of Cases	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 30 Days	19	66%	66%
31 to 60	8	28%	93%
61 to 90	1	3%	97%
91 to 120	1	3%	100%
TOTAL	29		

As shown in Table 15a, above, 94 percent of the Court's Marriage Terminations with Children caseload had been pending for no more than 540 days. Three-quarters of the caseload had been pending for less than nine months. Among the Court's Marriage Terminations without Children, 96 percent of the cases had been pending for 360 days or less.

Tables 16a, 16b, and 16c, below, display the findings for CourTools Measure 4 for the Court's juvenile caseloads. As seen in Table 16a, the data provided by the Court revealed 11 Abuse, Neglect, or Dependency cases pending on October 21, 2013 and all of them (100 percent) had been pending for 90 days or fewer.

**Table 16a, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings – Juvenile Cases – Abuse, Neglect, or Dependency Cases**

Age of Case	AND		
	<i>Time Standard: 90 days</i>		
	Number of		Cumulative
	Cases	Percentage	Percentage
Less than 30 Days	4	36%	36%
31 to 60	6	55%	91%
61 to 90	1	9%	100%
Total	11		

As shown below in Table 16b, nearly all (99 percent) of the Court's pending Delinquency and Unruly cases had been pending for 210 days or fewer. Nearly three quarters (74 percent) had been pending for 90 days or fewer.

**Table 16b, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings – Juvenile Cases – Delinquency Cases**

Age of Case	Delinquency/Unruly		
	<i>Time Standards: 90 and 180 days</i>		
	Number of		Cumulative
	Cases	Percentage	Percentage
Less than 30 Days	41	43%	43%
31 to 60	17	18%	61%
61 to 90	12	13%	74%
91 to 120	5	5%	79%
121 to 150	7	7%	86%
151 to 180	5	5%	92%
181 to 210	7	7%	99%
211 to 240	-	-	99%
241 to 270	-	-	99%
271 to 300	-	-	99%
301 to 330	1	1%	100%
Total	95		

Most (95 percent) of the court's pending juvenile traffic caseload was found to have been pending for 90 days or fewer. See Table 16c, below.

**Table 16c, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Summary Findings – Juvenile Cases – Traffic Cases**

Age of Case	Traffic		
	<i>Time Standard: 90 days</i>		
	Number of		Cumulative
	Cases	Percentage	Percentage
Less than 30 Days	23	58%	58%
31 to 60	11	28%	85%
61 to 90	4	10%	95%
91 to 120	2	5%	100%
TOTAL	40		

## CourTools Measure 6, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files

A reliable and accurate case file system is fundamental to the effectiveness of day-to-day court operations. The maintenance of case records directly affects the timeliness, fairness, and integrity of case processing. This CourTools measure assesses the overall quality of a court's files in terms of the organization and completeness of the file as well as the correlation between the file contents and the documents reflected on the court's docket sheet record for the case.

A collection of 210 randomly-selected open and closed case files were obtained and reviewed in order to assess their overall quality. This included measuring whether the file contained selected key documents that should be present; namely, (1) the complaint or other originating instrument, (2) proof of service of process being perfected or otherwise attempted, where applicable depending on the age of the case, and (2) if disposed, the presence of the final judgment entry disposing of the case.

The contents of the file jackets were also compared to the list of records contained in the court's electronic docket sheet in order to assess the court's recordkeeping practices in terms of making sure all documents in the file were reflected on the docket sheet and vice versa.

The file review team recognized that the docket sheets may have contained records which would not be directly reflective of a hard-copy document in the file jackets and that the nature of some hard-copy documents in the file jackets would not have a correlated record in the docket sheets and conducted its review accordingly. The results of the file reviews are shown below in Table 17a and Table 17b.

**Table 17a, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files –  
General and Domestic Relations Division**

Case Status and Type	Files Reviewed	File Contents and Docket Sheet in Alignment		Key Documents Present in File	
		Files	%	Files	%
<b>Closed Cases</b>					
Civil	10	10	100%	10	100%
Criminal	20	17	85%	20	100%
Divorces with Children	20	19	95%	20	100%
Divorces without Children	10	10	100%	10	100%
Miscellaneous	10	7	70%	8	80%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>97%</b>
<b>Open Cases</b>					
Civil	7	7	100%	7	100%
Criminal	14	13	93%	14	100%
Divorces with Children	13	13	100%	13	100%
Divorces without Children	10	10	100%	10	100%
Miscellaneous	9	7	78%	8	89%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>ALL FILES</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>98%</b>

**Table 17b, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files –  
Probate and Juvenile Division**

Case Status and Type	Files Reviewed	File Contents and Docket Sheet in Alignment		Key Documents Present in File	
		Files	%	Files	%
<b>Closed Cases</b>					
Adoptions	5	3	60%	4	80%
Abuse, Neglect, or Dependency	9	8	89%	7	78%
Delinquency and Unruly	10	7	70%	10	100%
Decedents' Estates	5	5	100%	5	100%
Guardianships	9	8	89%	9	100%
Miscellaneous	5	4	80%	4	80%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>Open Cases</b>					
Adoptions	4	4	100%	4	100%
Abuse, Neglect, or Dependency	10	10	100%	10	100%
Delinquency and Unruly	10	9	90%	10	100%
Decedents' Estates	5	5	100%	5	100%
Guardianships	10	5	50%	7	70%
Miscellaneous	5	5	100%	5	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>ALL FILES</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>92%</b>

As shown above, among the Court's general and domestic relations division files, 92 percent of the files reviewed had their contents in alignment with the docket sheets. Expected key documents were present in 98 percent of the files. Among the Court's probate and juvenile division files, 84 percent were found to be in alignment with the docket sheets and 92 percent were found to contain all expected key documents.

### **CourTools Measure 8, Effective Use of Jurors**

This measure centers on a court's practices and efficiency in summoning and using jurors. The scope of our analysis for purposes of this review centers on the first aspect of this measure which examines a court's *juror yield*, which is the number of citizens selected for jury service who are qualified and available to serve, expressed as a percentage of the total number of prospective jurors summoned. In order to implement this measure, the review team initiated a data collection process by which the Court's jury managers recorded certain information regarding the Court's July 1, 2013 jury draw.

Shown below in Table 18 is the findings concerning the Court's juror yield measurement. For its petit juries, the Court summoned a total of 1,400 citizens of Delaware County (consisting of 14 panels of potentially 100 persons each). A total of 591 persons were determined to be unavailable to serve. The largest block of whom (452 persons) were designated as exempt from service. A total of 809 citizens were found to be qualified and available to serve, producing jury yield of 58 percent. According to the NCSC, courts should strive to achieve at a minimum a 50 percent juror yield. This finding suggests the Court is efficiently using its available resources for summoning potential jurors.

**Table 18, Juror Yield**

<b>Juror Yield Metrics</b>	<b>Petit Juries</b>	<b>Grand Jury</b>
<b>Summonses Sent</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total Not Available</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>58</b>
Failed to Appear	38	0
Undeliverable	37	11
Disqualified	64	10
Exempt	452	37
Excused	0	0
<b>Total Qualified and Available</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Juror Yield</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>

### **CourTools Measure 9, Court Employee Satisfaction**

This CourTools measure is based on the premise that court performance is directly affected by the level of commitment and loyalty that employees have to the court. The court employee satisfaction survey can be an important tool to learn whether court staff members have the materials, motivation, direction, sense of mission, and commitment to perform their work with a consistently high level of quality. Learning how a court's employees view their workplace is a critical way for a court to improve its service to the public by facilitating organizational development and change, assessing teamwork and management styles, and enhancing job satisfaction.

The measure is an opinion survey of all court employees which seeks their views on the quality of their work environment and the relations between staff members and the management leadership of a court. The survey instrument was carefully designed in its wording and meaning by the NCSC. In order to ensure the collection of candid responses, no records were created or maintained detailing how each individual person responded.

Within the general and domestic relations division, a total of 18 staff persons were provided access to an online survey instrument. Eight persons responded to the survey, yielding a notably low response rate of 44 percent. The full set of survey items in the order they appeared in the survey are shown below in Table 18, along with the distribution of the responses received from all eight responders. Included are scores for each item representing the average response using the familiar and intuitive 100-point scale described above in connection with CourTools Measure 1.

**Table 18, Overall Scores and Distribution of Responses –  
General and Domestic Relations Division**

Survey Statement	Score	Strongly		Neither Agree nor		Strongly Agree
		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	
1. My work unit looks for ways to improve processes and procedures.	77.5	0	1	0	6	1
2. I am kept informed about matters that affect me in my workplace.	70.0	1	1	1	3	2
3. As I gain experience, I am given responsibility for new and exciting challenges at work.	75.0	0	2	0	4	2
4. The court is respected in the community.	65.0	1	1	2	3	1
5. The people I work with can be relied upon when I need help.	77.5	1	0	2	1	4
6. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	75.0	0	0	3	4	1
7. I understand how my job contributes to the overall mission of the court.	87.5	0	0	0	5	3
8. I am treated with respect.	77.5	1	1	1	0	5
9. When I do my job well, I am likely to be recognized and thanked by my supervisor.	75.0	2	0	0	2	4
10. My working conditions and environment enable me to do my job well.	57.5	2	1	1	4	0
11. I feel valued by my supervisor based on my knowledge and contribution to my department, unit, or division.	75.0	2	0	0	2	4
12. My court's leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner.	65.0	1	2	1	2	2
13. I enjoy coming to work.	77.5	0	1	1	4	2
14. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.	72.5	1	1	1	2	3
15. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes.	67.5	1	1	2	2	2
16. My meetings with my supervisor are useful and meaningful.	70.0	1	1	2	1	3
17. When appropriate, I am encouraged to use my own judgment in getting the job done.	77.5	1	0	1	3	3
18. I have the resources (materials, equipment, supplies, etc.) necessary to do my job well.	75.0	0	1	1	5	1
19. On my job, I know exactly what is expected of me.	85.0	0	0	1	4	3
20. I am proud that I work in the court.	80.0	1	1	0	1	5
21. The court uses my time and talent well.	70.0	2	0	0	4	2
22. I get the training I need to do the job well.	85.0	0	0	1	4	3
23. I know what it means for me to be successful on the job.	87.5	0	0	0	5	3
24. My supervisor is available when I have questions or need help.	80.0	0	1	1	3	3
25. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good.	65.0	2	1	0	3	2
26. My co-workers work well together.	70.0	1	1	2	1	3
27. I have opportunities to express my opinion about how things are done in my department, unit, or division.	70.0	1	1	0	5	1
28. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development.	62.5	2	1	0	4	1
29. The court and its leaders are dedicated to continuous improvement.	65.0	1	1	2	3	1
30. I am treated with respect by the public.	85.0	0	0	2	2	4
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>74.1</b>					

Shown below in Table 19 are the scores for each survey statement, sorted from highest to lowest.

**Table 19, Scores Sorted from Highest to Lowest –  
General and Domestic Relations Division**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b>Score</b>
<i>Areas in which the Court is "Doing a Good Job" (Score Over 80)</i>	
7. I understand how my job contributes to the overall mission of the court.	87.5
23. I know what it means for me to be successful on the job.	87.5
19. On my job, I know exactly what is expected of me.	85.0
22. I get the training I need to do the job well.	85.0
30. I am treated with respect by the public.	85.0
<i>Areas in which the Court is "Doing OK" (Score of 70-80)</i>	
20. I am proud that I work in the court.	80.0
24. My supervisor is available when I have questions or need help.	80.0
1. My work unit looks for ways to improve processes and procedures.	77.5
5. The people I work with can be relied upon when I need help.	77.5
8. I am treated with respect.	77.5
13. I enjoy coming to work.	77.5
17. When appropriate, I am encouraged to use my own judgment in getting the job done.	77.5
3. As I gain experience, I am given responsibility for new and exciting challenges at work.	75.0
6. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	75.0
9. When I do my job well, I am likely to be recognized and thanked by my supervisor.	75.0
11. I feel valued by my supervisor based on my knowledge and contribution to my department, unit, or division.	75.0
18. I have the resources (materials, equipment, supplies, etc.) necessary to do my job well.	75.0
14. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.	72.5
2. I am kept informed about matters that affect me in my workplace.	70.0
16. My meetings with my supervisor are useful and meaningful.	70.0
21. The court uses my time and talent well.	70.0
26. My co-workers work well together.	70.0
27. I have opportunities to express my opinion about how things are done in my department, unit, or division.	70.0
<i>Areas that "Need Improvement" (Score Under 70)</i>	
15. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes.	67.5
4. The court is respected in the community.	65.0
12. My court's leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner.	65.0
25. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good.	65.0
29. The court and its leaders are dedicated to continuous improvement.	65.0
28. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development.	62.5
10. My working conditions and environment enable me to do my job well.	57.5

Within the probate and juvenile division, a total of 41 staff persons were provided access to an online survey instrument. A total of 27 persons responded to the survey, yielding a response rate of 61 percent. The full set of survey items in the order they appeared in the survey are shown below in Table 20, along with the distribution of the responses received from all eight responders. Included are scores for each item representing the average response using the familiar and intuitive 100-point scale described above in connection with CourTools Measure 1.

**Table 20, Overall Scores and Distribution of Responses –  
Probate and Juvenile Division**

Survey Statement	Score	Strongly		Neither		Strongly	
		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
1. My work unit looks for ways to improve processes and procedures.	73.3	2	2	4	14	5	
2. I am kept informed about matters that affect me in my workplace.	71.1	1	5	2	16	3	
3. As I gain experience, I am given responsibility for new and exciting challenges at work.	66.7	1	5	9	8	4	
4. The court is respected in the community.	80.7	1	1	2	15	8	
5. The people I work with can be relied upon when I need help.	81.5	0	1	4	14	8	
6. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	78.5	0	1	7	12	7	
7. I understand how my job contributes to the overall mission of the court.	90.4	0	0	0	13	14	
8. I am treated with respect.	75.6	2	2	2	15	6	
9. When I do my job well, I am likely to be recognized and thanked by my supervisor.	65.2	5	2	5	11	4	
10. My working conditions and environment enable me to do my job well.	77.0	1	3	1	16	6	
11. I feel valued by my supervisor based on my knowledge and contribution to my department, unit, or division.	70.4	5	0	4	12	6	
12. My court's leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner.	69.6	4	2	3	13	5	
13. I enjoy coming to work.	77.0	1	1	4	16	5	
14. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.	72.6	1	0	11	11	4	
15. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes.	63.7	4	3	6	12	2	
16. My meetings with my supervisor are useful and meaningful.	65.9	4	2	6	12	3	
17. When appropriate, I am encouraged to use my own judgment in getting the job done.	79.3	1	2	1	16	7	
18. I have the resources (materials, equipment, supplies, etc.) necessary to do my job well.	84.4	0	0	1	19	7	
19. On my job, I know exactly what is expected of me.	81.5	0	2	1	17	7	
20. I am proud that I work in the court.	85.2	0	1	0	17	9	
21. The court uses my time and talent well.	74.8	1	1	5	17	3	
22. I get the training I need to do the job well.	76.3	0	1	9	11	6	
23. I know what it means for me to be successful on the job.	81.5	0	0	4	17	6	
24. My supervisor is available when I have questions or need help.	72.6	3	1	4	14	5	
25. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good.	68.9	4	1	6	11	5	
26. My co-workers work well together.	67.4	2	4	7	10	4	
27. I have opportunities to express my opinion about how things are done in my department, unit, or division.	70.4	3	1	6	13	4	
28. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development.	62.2	6	4	4	7	6	
29. The court and its leaders are dedicated to continuous improvement.	73.3	1	0	9	14	3	
30. I am treated with respect by the public.	83.0	1	0	1	17	8	
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>74.7</b>						

Shown below in Table 21 are the scores for each survey statement, sorted from highest to lowest.

**Table 21, Scores Sorted from Highest to Lowest –  
Probate and Juvenile Division**

Survey Statement	Score
<i>Areas in which the Court is "Doing a Good Job" (Score Over 80)</i>	
7. I understand how my job contributes to the overall mission of the court.	90.4
20. I am proud that I work in the court.	85.2
18. I have the resources (materials, equipment, supplies, etc.) necessary to do my job well.	84.4
30. I am treated with respect by the public.	83.0
5. The people I work with can be relied upon when I need help.	81.5
19. On my job, I know exactly what is expected of me.	81.5
23. I know what it means for me to be successful on the job.	81.5
4. The court is respected in the community.	80.7
<i>Areas in which the Court is "Doing OK" (Score of 70-80)</i>	
17. When appropriate, I am encouraged to use my own judgment in getting the job done.	79.3
6. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	78.5
10. My working conditions and environment enable me to do my job well.	77.0
13. I enjoy coming to work.	77.0
22. I get the training I need to do the job well.	76.3
8. I am treated with respect.	75.6
21. The court uses my time and talent well.	74.8
1. My work unit looks for ways to improve processes and procedures.	73.3
29. The court and its leaders are dedicated to continuous improvement.	73.3
14. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.	72.6
24. My supervisor is available when I have questions or need help.	72.6
2. I am kept informed about matters that affect me in my workplace.	71.1
11. I feel valued by my supervisor based on my knowledge and contribution to my department, unit, or division.	70.4
27. I have opportunities to express my opinion about how things are done in my department, unit, or division.	70.4
<i>Areas that "Need Improvement" (Score Under 70)</i>	
12. My court's leaders communicate important information to me in a timely manner.	69.6
25. Communication within my department, unit, or division is good.	68.9
26. My co-workers work well together.	67.4
3. As I gain experience, I am given responsibility for new and exciting challenges at work.	66.7
16. My meetings with my supervisor are useful and meaningful.	65.9
9. When I do my job well, I am likely to be recognized and thanked by my supervisor.	65.2
15. Managers and supervisors follow up on employee suggestions for improvements in services and work processes.	63.7
28. In the last 6 months, a supervisor/manager has talked with me about my performance/career development.	62.2

## Franklin County Court of Common Pleas General Division

### EXEMPT JOB DESCRIPTION

**JOB TITLE:** Executive Director of the Court      **REPORTS TO:** Common Pleas Judges  
**ORIGINATED BY:** Karen Casey      **DATE:** July 2003  
**PROGRAM:** Office of the Director      **LOCATION:** 369 S. High Street – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

---

**A) GENERAL SUMMARY AND PURPOSE:**

Responsible for overall administration and management of Court operations as directed by the Judges. Responsible for developing and implementing policies and procedures for all Court operations, to ensure compliance with applicable rules, statutes, and accreditation standards. Oversees, directs and coordinates the administrative activities of the Finance and Purchasing Department, Information and Technology Department, Human Resources and Training Department, Adult Probation Department, Work Release/Home Incarceration Program, Community Based Correctional Facility, Jury Commission, and Case Assignment. Displays sound budgetary, managerial, and operational practices. Establishes and maintains open communication with governmental, community, professional, and private organizations which impact the Court's operations.

**B) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES / ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS:**

- Responsible for the administration of the following areas of the Court: Adult Probation, the Community Based Correctional Facility, Finance and Purchasing, Human Resources and Training, Information Technology, Work Release/Home Incarceration, the Assignment office, Court Reporters, Jury, Grand Jury and Magistrates.
- Develops and implements policy for the Court.
- Meets regularly with the Administrative Judge and/or other Judges to review and further define Court policy, identify and resolve operational problems in the court, finalize hiring and termination decisions, and to provide the Judges with both accurate and timely information on all aspects of court operations as necessary and/or required.
- Guides and oversees the implementation of the strategic business plan developed by the Court.
- Ensures that all departments function in compliance with the Court's Mission Statement and departmental Purpose Statements.
- Ensures that the Court maintains a bias-free atmosphere, which encourages and embraces the diversity of its workforce.
- Promotes a work environment that encourages professionalism, loyalty, enthusiasm, and staff safety.
- Oversees and coordinates the administration of the Finance and Purchasing Department, including the development and submission of the annual budget as well as the purchasing of supplies, services and equipment for all court operations.

- Monitors the Court's Fiscal operations to ensure compliance with accepted accounting procedures, sound business practices, statutes and contractual agreements.
- Provides planning for the establishment and maintenance of appropriate funding for the Court's operations through General Fund appropriations, grants, contracts and "In-Kind" services.
- Provides final signing authority for major capital expenditures or purchases of the Court.
- Oversees the budget for Indigent Representation and the processing of all Indigent Appointed Counsel applications.
- Oversees the provision of both hearing impaired and foreign language interpreters for defendants and jurors.
- Evaluates staffing and program needs throughout the Court and recommends adjustments and/or changes as needed.
- Participates in the development of performance standards for managers, supervisors, and staff, and insures that staff members are informed on a regular basis, of their individual status in meeting these performance standards.
- Provides supervision and management of Court Directors, emphasizing a team based management approach and meeting regularly with Court Directors to facilitate dialog regarding areas of operational concern, and to ensure timely communication of policy directives.
- Evaluates and documents the performance of direct reports. These employees include the members of the Executive Management Team, the Court Support Services Supervisor, and the Executive Administrative Assistant.
- Monitors the Court's personnel practices and procedures to ensure compliance with Federal, State and Local laws and regulations.
- Serves as a liaison with the Supreme Court; ensures that the Court is always adequately staffed with temporarily assigned Judges and Visiting Judges as well as oversees the scheduling and use of these Judges.
- Responsible for the development and implementation of all facets of a Disaster Control and Recovery Planning.
- Functions as Secretary for the monthly Judges' meetings and prepares minutes of the monthly meetings along with an action log for ongoing project management.
- Identifies legislation, issues/initiatives and trends that impact the operations of the court as well as proposes responses to these items.
- Oversees, directs and/or conducts project management for the court (specialized docket planning, case flow analysis, research studies, etc).
- Initiates the development of new programs.
- Serves as the Court's liaison to Public Facilities Management in the maintenance and day-to-day needs of the physical plant.
- Serves as a liaison for the court through participation in community organizations, agencies and boards.
- Provides administrative support to the Court in the Court's appointments to various boards including: Veterans Service Commission, Metropolitan Library, and Metropolitan Housing Authority.

**C) CONTACTS WITHIN/OUTSIDE THE COURT:**

	<u>WHOM</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>METHOD</u>
<b>Internal:</b>	Administrative Judge/Judges	As Needed	Review/Coordination	Telephone/Person
	Appeals & Probate Courts	As Needed	Coordinate	Telephone/Person
	Domestic & Juvenile Court	As Needed	Coordinate	Telephone/Person
	Staff	As Needed	Direct/Review	Telephone/Person
<b>External:</b>	County Commissioners Office	As Needed	Review/Coordination	Telephone/Person
	County & State Auditors	As Needed	Review/Coordination	Telephone/Person
	Franklin County Data Board	As Needed	Reporting	Telephone/Person
	Community Organizations	As Needed	Public Relations	Telephone/Person
	Columbus Bar Association	As Needed	Public Relations	Telephone/Person
	Other Courts (in Ohio and Franklin County)	As Needed	Information Exchange	Telephone/Person
	Supreme Court	As Needed	Review/Coordination	Telephone/Person
	Vendors	As Needed	Contract Provisions	Telephone/Person
	Franklin County Clerk of Courts	As Needed	Coordination	Telephone/Person
	Franklin County Public Facilities Mangmt	As Needed	Coordination	Telephone/Person

**D) KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED:**

EDUCATION:

Required Preferred

\_\_\_\_\_ HS Diploma or Equiv.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ HS Diploma Plus Some College  
 X  \_\_\_\_\_ BS Degree Bus. Admin or related  
 \_\_\_\_\_  X  Graduate Degree \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other Specialized Training \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ What kind?

EXPERIENCE:

Required Preferred

\_\_\_\_\_ None  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Months of \_\_\_\_\_  
 X  \_\_\_\_\_  5  Years of Exec. Level management  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Years of \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Years of \_\_\_\_\_

**E) SKILLS REQUIRED:**

<u> X </u> Personal Computer:	<u> X </u> Oral, written & interpersonal communication skills
<u> X </u> Microsoft Office	<u> X </u> Hold and Maintain <u>Ohio</u> Driver's License
<u> X </u> Database	with Good Driving Record
<u> X </u> Spread Sheet	<u> X </u> Excellent organizational skills
<u> X </u> Operate standard office equipment	<u> X </u> Prioritize work & deal with interruptions
<u> X </u> Conflict Resolution & Negotiation skills	<u> X </u> Problem solving skills

**F) OTHER JOB REQUIREMENTS:**

X  Work Overtime [  X  ] Routinely [ ] Occasionally [ ] Seasonal

- Act As An On-Call Contact Outside Regular Working Hours
- Accessibility Via A Beeper System
- Travel On Court and/or Personal Time      Frequency Regularly
- Furnish a Reliable, Personal Means of Transportation in Order to Accomplish Work Objectives
- Work at Various Locations
- Work a Nonstandard Work Week
- Work Evening or Night Shift Hours
- Provide Coverage for Other Positions, Shifts or Functions
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**DISCLAIMER:**

**THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN THIS JOB DESCRIPTION INDICATES THE GENERAL NATURE AND LEVEL OF WORK PERFORMED BY EMPLOYEES WITHIN THIS CLASSIFICATION. IT IS NOT DESIGNED TO CONTAIN OR TO BE INTERPRETED, AS A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY OF ALL DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED OF EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO THIS JOB.**

**TITLE: CUYAHOGA COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
COURT ADMINISTRATOR**

**DUTIES:**

This position provides leadership to all non-judicial employees of the Court in accomplishing the Court's goals and objectives within the Court's budget. Duties may include:

- Planning and Directing: Supervising and coordinating the Court's activities with the assistance of department supervisors (e.g., planning work on a long term basis, rearranging work schedules to respond to problems and to meet deadlines based on available staff and budget constraints)
- Organizing: Making significant changes to the organization structure, workflow and/or procedures to make the Court operate more efficiently (e.g., reorganizing the criminal records department, changing jury service to a one week term)
- Budgeting: Preparing a formal annual budget for supervisory and outside third party review (e.g., obtaining budget information from department heads, approving or disapproving subordinate inputs on the budget based on guidelines established by the incumbent's supervisor or funding available, formally justifying the budget to County Administrative Staff and Commissioners). Monitoring performance against the budget
- Instructing: Providing advice and instructions to subordinates in order to respond to questions. Developing and/or approving guidelines and/or procedures (developed by subordinate staff). Ensuring complete understanding of guidelines and procedures by subordinate staff by meeting with them to discuss problems
- Setting Standards: Establishing and/or approving policies, procedures and standards on how to perform work (e.g., how to respond to the public and other staff, how to operate as a court reporter). Maintaining quality control on all non-judicial areas of the Court's operations
- Reviewing: Performing an overall review for reasonableness on the staff's completed work. Performing annual reviews with the staff to compare their performance against their goals

May 22, 2002

Court Administrator

**TITLE: COURT ADMINISTRATOR**

- Training: Providing training or input on subordinate training needs (e.g., conducting informal training sessions with staff, approving subordinate training schedules, approving training programs developed by subordinates, identifying additional training needs)
- Counseling and Disciplining: Counseling and disciplining staff when appropriate (e.g., responding to sexual harassment allegations made within the work force, acting as an intermediary between departments and other justice agencies, taking necessary disciplinary actions such as suspending or terminating an employee, explaining sanctions at disciplinary hearings, developing personnel policy manual to address employee concerns)
- Appraising Performance: Ensuring that subordinates are productive through review of work and accomplishment of goals. Conducting formal performance evaluations of subordinate staff annually
- Other Personnel Functions: Performing various personnel functions (e.g., interviewing new hires, making recommendations on hiring and firing to the Administrative Judge, promoting subordinates when appropriate, approving vacations, approving other leaves of absences)
- Acting as a liaison with other government agencies and courts (e.g., monitoring pending legislation)
- Conducting research to identify new procedures and policies which will improve the Court's operations
- Performing a variety of other related duties as required (e.g., drafting contracts for products and services, serving as a secretary for judicial meetings, responding to judges)

#### **JOB REQUIREMENTS AND DIFFICULTY OF WORK**

This position requires an in-depth knowledge of the Court System in order to think proactively by recommending areas for improved operations. This job may involve the following:

- Ability to make recommendations and decisions in order to meet the Court's objectives (e.g., analyzing a problem in order to identify solutions, knowing how to obtain funding)

May 22, 2002

Court Administrator

**TITLE: COURT ADMINISTRATOR**

- Ability to motivate subordinate staff to complete work timely while maintaining quality
- Ability to communicate effectively to keep subordinates informed and to resolve conflicts
- Basic knowledge of accounting to prepare the budget and control costs
- Minimum of a Law Degree and a fellowship in the Institute of Court Management preferable

**RESPONSIBILITY**

This position is responsible for making daily operating decisions (e.g., personnel, budget, accounting, technology, control, research). Meetings are held with the supervisor occasionally to discuss goals set by the incumbent, priorities, problems and to exchange information. Incumbent primarily works on his/her own making recommendations to the supervisor when appropriate. Errors may result from making a wrong decision impacting personnel, the public or resources. This position supervises approximately 15 subordinate supervisors directly and approximately 500 subordinates indirectly.

**PERSONAL WORK RELATIONSHIPS**

Frequent contact is made with subordinates and judges to answer questions, obtain information and provide guidance. This position acts as a liaison in resolving employee problems and/or conflicts. Contracts are also made with other agencies through committees to exchange information.

**PSYICAL EFFORT AND WORK ENVIRONMENT**

This position requires working in a normal court environment with no unusual physical demands or exposure to hazardous situations.

May 22, 2002  
Court Administrator