

INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR COURT EXCELLENCE

THE AUSTRALASIAN INSTITUTE
OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
WWW.AIJA.ORG.AU

THE FEDERAL
JUDICIAL CENTER
WWW.FJC.GOV

THE NATIONAL CENTER
FOR STATE COURTS
WWW.NCSCONLINE.ORG

THE STATE COURTS
OF SINGAPORE
WWW.STATECOURTS.GOV.SG

Framework Users –

Your feedback is requested

The Executive Committee is committed to ensuring the Framework and the associated tools, including the ICCE website, are as beneficial as possible for Consortium members and users. Please send any feedback about the Framework and how we can improve the website by email to Liz Richardson at the ICCE Secretariat.

Want to know more about the Framework?

Interested in holding an IFCE Regional Forum in your region? These workshops give an:

- explanation of the Framework;
- overview of the self-assessment questionnaire;
- overview of how to interpret and analyse the results of an assessment; and
- an explanation of how to develop an action plan for improvement.

Please contact the ICCE Secretariat for further information.

ICCE Secretariat
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration
Ground Floor, 555 Lonsdale St
Melbourne VIC 3000
Phone: +61 3 9600 1311
ICCE Officer Liz Richardson
Liz.Richardson@monash.edu

International Consortium for Court Excellence Newsletter Issue 8 – January 2017

What is the Framework?

The *International Framework for Court Excellence* (IFCE) is a resource for assessing the performance of a court against seven detailed areas of excellence and provides guidance to courts intending to improve their performance. The IFCE was first developed in 2008 by the International Consortium for Court Excellence (ICCE), consisting of organisations from Europe, Asia, Australia, and the United States. A Second Edition was published in 2013 along with a shortened version of the IFCE in *Thinking of Implementing the Framework for Court Excellence*. The IFCE uses the term 'court' for all bodies that are part of a country's formal judicial system including courts and tribunals of general, limited or specialised jurisdiction, as well as secular or religious courts.

In this issue:

Consortium news

- Read about the latest Consortium news including a membership update and new resources that have been added to the ICCE website - page 2.

International updates

Read about developments in:

- Namibia – International Framework for Court Excellence Programme for the High Court of Namibia and the Office of the Judiciary, 29 August to 2 September 2016 - page 3.

Feature article

- Chief Justice Brian Preston and Registrar Joanne Gray, Land and Environment Court of New South Wales, 'Achieving Court Excellence: The need for a collaborative approach' – pages 4-8.

Regional forum reports

- Read about the activities of the Singapore Judicial College in educating international judiciaries about the IFCE - page 9.
- Information about the Innovation and Excellence Conference to be held by the Supreme Court of Victoria in Melbourne, March 27-28 2017 – page 10.

Other news, conferences and contacts - page 11.

Consortium news

Membership update

There are currently 33 members of the Consortium and interest continues to grow. The latest member to join the Consortium is the Batulicin District Court in Indonesia.

The Batulicin District Court is a first level court located in the capital of Tanah Bumbu, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. Its primary duty and authority is to examine, decide and resolve criminal and civil cases at first level. The Court mission is to realize justice that is simple, fast, low cost and transparent. The Court started to implement the International Framework for Court Excellence in 2014, and joined the Consortium in October 2016 as an Implementing Member. Its report on implementation of the Framework can be accessed [here](#) and is located in the Resources from the Courts section of the ICCE website.

There are three categories of membership open to judicial institutions to reflect the different ways in which courts and tribunals and affiliated institutions utilise the Framework:

- Implementing Members.
- Associate Members.
- Affiliated Judicial Institutions.

Implementing Members: are courts and tribunals who are advanced in their implementation of the Framework. Applicants are required to demonstrate significant use of the Framework as outlined in the Membership Policy. They must have an active interest in the Framework, assist the Consortium in fulfilling its objectives; share information, experiences and ideas with the Consortium and promote use of the Framework.

Associate Members: are courts or tribunals who are less advanced in their implementation of the Framework. They may have implemented the Framework in a limited way, or are beginning their implementation of the Framework or have firm plans to implement the Framework. They must also have an active interest in the Framework, assist the Consortium in fulfilling its objectives; share information, experiences and ideas with the Consortium and promote use of the Framework.

Affiliated Judicial Institutions: are institutions that provide active support and assistance to judges, courts and court systems but do not have direct

responsibility for implementing the Framework in courts or court systems. They support the goals of the Consortium and implementation of the Framework and seek to assist and support the promotion of the Framework.

Judicial institutions wishing to become members must complete the application form and provide the Consortium with sufficient details supporting their application. The Executive Committee will consider each application based on the information provided. Full details about the membership policy and requirements for membership applications can be found on the Consortium website (link below) or contact the ICCE Secretariat for further information:

<http://www.courtexcellence.com/Members/Membership-Policy.aspx>

New Resources

Additional tools to support the International Framework for Court Excellence are now available on the Consortium website to use when conducting the IFCE Self-Assessment Questionnaire:

- A PDF version of the full IFCE Questionnaire
- A downloadable Excel version of the full questionnaire
- A PDF for the simplified checklist contained in the Thinking of Implementing the International Framework for Court Excellence
- A downloadable Excel version of the simplified checklist.

See the ICCE website under Self-Assessment: <http://www.courtexcellence.com/Resources/Self-assessment.aspx>

International updates

Namibia

International Framework for Court Excellence Programme for the High Court of Namibia and the Office of the Judiciary, 29 August to 2 September 2016

The High Court of Namibia is a member of the International Consortium for Court Excellence, and seeks to actively apply the Framework in their judiciary for continuous improvement. Senior Judges and Court Administrators from the High Court have participated in programmes on judicial governance and events on court excellence, such as the International Conference on Court Excellence in Singapore in January 2016.

The High Court together with the Office of the Judiciary of Namibia sought to more actively apply the IFCE in their judiciary, and collaborated with the State Courts of Singapore to conduct a programme on the IFCE. Over the course of one week, District Judge Seah Chi-Ling, Ms Chan Wai Yin, Senior Director of the Criminal Justice Division, and Mr Phang Tsang Wing, Senior Assistant Director of Organisational Excellence and Performance Management, conducted this programme, which took place in Windhoek, Namibia.

The objective of this programme was to introduce the IFCE to their judiciary and to assist them in using the IFCE self-assessment tool. The 32 participants included the Organisational Leaders, namely, Judge President Petrus Damaseb and Deputy Judge President Hosea Angula of the High Court, Permanent Secretary Rolanda van Wyk and Deputy Permanent Secretaries of the Office of the Judiciary, and the Chief Registrar Elsie Schickerling. Other participants included High Court Judges and Court Administrators.

Participants were introduced to the seven areas of court excellence through a series of sharing from the State Courts officers, and participated in hands-on exercises to use the IFCE self-assessment tool. The use of the self-assessment tool allowed the High Court of Namibia to recognise the strengths and areas for improvement to their court policies and processes, and enabled them to prioritise suitable improvement plans in the short-term and long-term.

The IFCE Programme successfully concluded with a video-conference dialogue with the Deputy Presiding Judge of the State Courts/Registrar Ms Jennifer Marie and members of the Leadership Team of the State Courts. This provided an opportunity for an exchange on a broader range of issues on court processes between the two judiciaries.



Photo: Courtesy Call on the High Court of Namibia and the Office of the Judiciary



Photo: Participants from the High Court of Namibia and the Office of the Judiciary with the delegation from the State Courts of Singapore

Feature Article

Achieving Court Excellence: The need for a collaborative approach*

The Hon. Justice Brian J Preston, Chief Judge and Ms Joanne Gray, Registrar, Land and Environment Court of New South Wales



The Hon. Justice Brian J Preston. Photo © Ted Sealey



Ms Joanne Gray

The path to court excellence through collaboration

The International Framework for Court Excellence ('the Framework') provides a methodology for continuous evaluation and improvement. A court first identifies how it performs in each of the seven areas of court excellence; secondly, proposes initiatives to address shortfalls and improve its performance; thirdly, ascertains what resources are required to achieve the initiatives; and fourthly, determines where those resources might be available.

An assumption underlying the Framework is that courts are sufficiently autonomous to dedicate their own time and resources to achieve the initiatives identified for attaining court excellence. This may be true for some courts. However, for a vast number of other courts, of which the Land and Environment Court of NSW ('the Court') is one, this is not the reality. Although the judicial and decision-making functions of the Court remain independent of the government, the funding is given by a government department in a controlled budget. This lack of financial self-sufficiency can present an impediment to achieving initiatives that require expenditure, specialist resources or the investment of large amounts of time.

To achieve its initiatives, a court that operates in this manner must look beyond its internal resources and engage with the funding department as well as other stakeholder departments and organisations to secure the necessary resources.

The aim of this article is to highlight the need for those in leadership in courts to collaborate with government departments and external bodies to achieve the court's initiatives. We will use as a case study the Court's collaboration with government departments and other organisations to achieve initiatives for improvement and highlight the benefits of this collaboration.

Working collaboratively: The experience of the Land and Environment Court of NSW

The Court was the first court in the world to implement fully the Framework¹. Through the implementation of the Framework, the Court identified a number of areas where improvement was required in order to achieve the outcomes of each area of court excellence. The Court developed an action plan that set out the initiatives to achieve improvement in those areas.

(a) Utilising the Court's own resources

A number of actions could be achieved using resources available within the Court.

The Court identified the need to, and had the internal resources to be able to, formulate, implement and review plans, policies and practice notes. The Court formulated a Statement of Purpose and policies to guide the conduct of court members, including conduct for commissioners (non-judicial court members), annual performance appraisals for commissioners, delays in reserved judgments, case

* This article is based on the paper of the same title presented by the authors to the "Judiciary of the Future" International Conference on Court Excellence, 28 January 2016, The Fullerton Hotel, Singapore.

¹ The Court's experience is recorded in Justice Brian J Preston, 'Implementing the International Framework for Court Excellence: The Experience of the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales', paper presented to the Asia Pacific Courts Conference, 4-6 October 2010, Singapore, available at http://www.leg.justice.nsw.gov.au/Pages/publications/speeches_papers.aspx

management, conciliation conferences, site inspections, and identity theft protection. Where practice and procedure was not well articulated, the Court adopted practice notes for different types of proceedings. To better articulate the process for electronic filing of documents, the Registrar published new guidelines for filing documents electronically.

The Court improved its performance in management of human resources by implementing the policies on the conduct of court members, publishing a handbook for commissioners, and commencing a performance review process for registry personnel. To facilitate continuing education, the Court produces a judicial newsletter summarising recent legislation and judicial decisions of relevance to the Court's jurisdiction. To measure user satisfaction, the registry introduced yearly court surveys, which were developed and managed by the Registrar and distributed by registry staff.

(b) Working with the Department of Justice

Fundamental to the operation of the Court is the support of the NSW Department of Justice ('the Department'), which is responsible for the administration of the Court and its resources. Registry staff are employees of the Department. The budget for the Court is allocated from the Department's budget. The Department provides the administrative support required for payroll, recruitment, asset management, financial services and information technology services. Within the Department, the Court Services division provides library services, court security through the Office of the Sheriff of NSW, and transcription services through the Reporting Services Branch.

The Court identified opportunities to implement initiatives that aligned with the priorities of the Department. First, problems were identified with the layout of the registry office and public counter area, and the lack of signage within the Court building. The Court, not having sufficient funds itself, sought assistance from the Department, which was committed to improving court facilities generally. The Department proposed and implemented a capital works expenditure plan to refurbish the registry and upgrade signage in the building.

Second, the Court identified that its presentation of information through its website could be improved in various ways, including by making the information available in video, audio or diagrammatic form. Although the Court had personnel to draft the information content, it needed IT resources to improve the website. In 2012, the Department implemented a project for improving website design across the Department. The Court was able to tap into this project and develop and publish comprehensive and detailed information on the Court and its work. In developing the website content, the Court

collaborated with LawAccess, a branch of the Department that provides legal information to the public through its website and by phone. In 2015, the Court was again able to take advantage of the Department's upgrading of websites to improve further the Court's website, including updating information, restructuring the website, and making the site accessible to those on mobile devices and to those with disabilities through a read text feature.

Third, the Court identified a need to extend and upgrade the availability of the Court's electronic filing and online court system to all areas of the Court's jurisdiction. Whilst the Court was the first court in Australia to introduce online filing and online court directions hearings in 2001, this technology was not integrated with the case management system. The Court worked with the Department's project teams to deliver an integrated system of JusticeLink, Online Court and Online Registry.

Fourth, to maintain safe facilities for court staff, users and the public, the Court reviewed its security arrangements and identified areas of concern. The Court worked with the Office of the Sheriff of NSW to identify improvements in security arrangements and with the Department's Asset Management Branch to improve the security of the building. The Registrar worked with the training and development team within the Department on a protocol or manual on security arrangements, as well as a course on identifying and responding to security risks.

(c) Working with other courts

The Court has achieved success by implementing initiatives for improvement through its collaboration with other courts in NSW.

First, one of the practical difficulties of the Court is that it has only a central registry in Sydney, yet it services all of NSW and sits regionally throughout NSW. To improve geographical accessibility, the Court has arranged with the Local Court to use its court rooms throughout NSW and for parties to file documents in a local court registry.

Second, there are occasions where it is not suitable for a hearing to be held in the Court's courtrooms in Sydney, such as where there are security risks and weapons screening is required, the parties are numerous, or the expected public audience is sizeable. The Court has an arrangement with the Supreme Court of NSW to use their court rooms on such occasions. The Court also has an agency arrangement with the Supreme Court for the Supreme Court registry to accept documents for filing in the Court to increase accessibility.

The Court and the Supreme Court have also cooperated to seek change to court legislation to achieve efficiencies in resolving cases. To avoid the cost and inconvenience to parties when two or more related proceedings are brought in different jurisdictions, the relevant court legislation was changed to enable the transfer of proceedings between the two jurisdictions, and to give the transferee court all the powers of the court from whom the proceedings have been transferred.² The Court legislation was also changed to enable judges of the Supreme Court to act as judges of the Court, and vice versa,³ increasing the judicial resources available. Similar opportunities exist for sharing of registry staff between the two courts.

The Court has also been able to achieve continual improvement in its practice and procedure and in the accessibility of its judgments through participation in inter-court committees. These committees include the Uniform Rules Committee, which considers proposals to change the rules that govern courts in NSW, and the Caselaw governance committee, which oversees the Caselaw NSW website that publishes judgments given by NSW courts.

(d) Working with the Judicial Commission

The Judicial Commission of NSW is an independent statutory corporation responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against judicial officers, providing training and education to judicial officers, and conducting research on trends in law and justice. The Court has partnered with the Judicial Commission on a number of initiatives.

First, the Court introduced a handbook for Commissioners providing guidance on the Court, its jurisdiction and operation. The handbook was drafted by court personnel but the Judicial Commission publishes it in both hard copy and as an accessible, searchable electronic resource.

Second, the Court worked with the Judicial Commission to formulate a policy for continuing professional development that requires judicial officers and commissioners to complete 30 hours of education each year, and to implement the continuing education programme. The Judicial Commission assists the Court in the continual evaluation, both quantitative and qualitative, of the education programme to ensure that it meets its objectives and the needs of Court members. The Commission's experience and expertise in providing education to judicial officers in NSW means that the education provided is of a higher standard than if the Court had worked alone.

Third, the Court partnered with the Judicial Commission to design and introduce the world's first

sentencing database for environmental offences.⁴ This initiative yields many benefits to the criminal justice system, including improving quality of sentencing, consistency and predictability of sentencing outcomes, and transparency of decision-making.⁵

Fourth, the Court worked with the Judicial Commission, which deals with complaints against judicial officers in NSW, to formulate a policy and implement a system for dealing with complaints against Commissioners.

(e) Working with other departments and organisations

(i) Department of Environment

As explained earlier, the Court has developed a principled approach to sentencing for environmental crime⁶ and the sentencing database. Amongst the benefits of the Court's work in these regards is a bespoke approach to sentencing, particularly in the selection of appropriate sentencing options.

Initially, this principled and bespoke approach to sentencing was best able to be applied to pollution offences, as the pollution legislation permits a wide range of sentencing options.⁷ The Court's experience in sentencing for pollution offences was soon recognised by other regulatory agencies (including the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage), which investigated how they could apply this approach within their jurisdiction. These investigations included discussions with the Court. As a result, legislation protecting wildlife and regulating development was amended to expand the range of factors to be considered in sentencing and the available sentencing options.⁸

(ii) The NSW Valuer General

The Court has jurisdiction to determine proceedings concerning the valuation of land (the land value is used for rating and taxing purposes) and compensation payable for the compulsory acquisition of land for public purposes. To improve the way in which the Court exercises this jurisdiction, the Court sought for the government to appoint, as acting commissioners of the Court, persons with special

⁴ Justice Brian J Preston and Hugh Donnelly, *Achieving Consistency and Transparency in Sentencing for Environmental Offences*, Research Monograph No 32 (Judicial Commission of NSW, 2008) also published as Justice Brian J Preston and Hugh Donnelly, 'The Establishment of an Environmental Crime Sentencing Database in New South Wales' (2008) 32 *Criminal Law Journal* 214.

⁵ Justice Brian J Preston, 'A Judge's Perspective on Using Sentencing Databases' (2010) 3 *Journal of Court Innovation* 247 (also published in (2010) 9 *The Judicial Review* 421).

⁶ See generally Justice Brian J Preston 'Principled sentencing for environmental offences – Part 1: Purposes of sentencing' (2007) 31 *Criminal Law Journal* 91 and Justice Brian J Preston, 'Principled Sentencing for environmental offences – Part 2: Sentencing considerations and options' (2007) 31 *Criminal Law Journal* 142.

⁷ *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* Part 8.3.

⁸ *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, Division 3 of Part 15; *Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995*, Division 3 of Part 9B; and *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, s 126(2A).

² *Civil Procedure Act 2005* (NSW), ss 149A-149E (civil proceedings) and *Land and Environment Court Act 1979*, ss 72 and 73 (criminal proceedings).

³ *Land and Environment Court Act 1979*, s 11A and *Supreme Court Act 1970* (NSW), s 37B.

knowledge of and experience in the law and practice of land valuation. The use of land valuers facilitates use of conciliation, improves the quality of adjudication by the land valuers employing their expertise, and improves consistency, and thereby predictability, of decision-making.

The Court works with the key stakeholders in this jurisdiction, including the Valuer-General, in developing and reviewing the Court's practice notes on the valuation of land and compensation for the compulsory acquisition of land. The Court has collaborated with the Valuer-General to improve the information available to the public and court users on valuation of land, including special sections on its website.

(iii) Department of Primary Industries

In 2009, the former Mining Warden's Court was abolished and the Court was given the exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine proceedings under mining legislation. To successfully manage the introduction of this jurisdiction, the Court collaborated with the regulatory agencies and stakeholders involved with mining to make the transition from the Mining Warden's Court as smooth as possible, including organising stakeholder and public meetings in Sydney and key mining locations (such as the opal-mining town of Lightning Ridge). The Court established a special Mining Court Users Group comprising representatives from mining-related organisations and mining lawyers. The Court established special sections on its website dealing with mining. The Court worked with the relevant mining regulatory agencies to identify and provide links to mineral and petroleum titles and land access arrangements. The Court arranged for the decisions of the former Mining Warden's Court, for the last forty years, to be transcribed, published and uploaded to the Court's website. This was the first time that those decisions had been made publicly available. The Court continues to publish and upload to the Court's website all mining decisions of the Court.

(iv) Department of Planning

The NSW government has established an electronic planning system (ePlanning), including a planning portal which provides electronically the laws, legal instruments, policies and consents. During the design process for ePlanning, the Court identified the need for it to upgrade its IT capabilities so as to be able to interface with the ePlanning system and participate fully and effectively in this electronic age of planning. The Court sought the assistance of the ePlanning team to review the capabilities of the Court and collaborate with the Department's IT team who were working on upgrading the Court's IT system. By the

Court facilitating the two teams, the Court is better placed to take advantage of the latest IT functionalities.

The NSW government introduced, in 2011, a new planning regime governing small scale residential development, such as single dwelling houses and dual occupancies. The government wanted to ensure that appeals for small scale residential development were dealt with quickly and cheaply. The government consulted with the Court about the best means to achieve this goal. Working together, a new dispute resolution process, involving mandatory conciliation and arbitration, was developed and implemented for small scale residential development.⁹ The Court prepared a special practice note and special sections on the Court's website providing information about the conciliation-arbitration process. In collaboration with the Department of Planning, the Court prepared helpful information and materials about residential development appeals for publication on the Court's website and the Department of Planning's website.

The collaboration between the Court and the Department of Planning allowed the new regime for small scale residential development to be implemented successfully and efficiently. The success of the process has prompted the government and the Court to examine if, where and how the process could be applied to other types of disputes. One example is the application of the conciliation-arbitration process for small scale title disputes under mining legislation.¹⁰

(v) Australasian Legal Information Institute (AustLII)

The Court identified that it needed to improve in the evaluation of public trust and confidence in the Court. One way this could be assessed was by looking at how often and in what way were the decisions of the Court being referred to and used.

The Court identified the Australasian Legal Information Institute (AustLII) as a resource partner who could assist. AustLII is a free-access online case law, legislation and research resource for legal information in Australia and other countries. The Court commissioned AustLII to use AustLII's databases to generate statistical data concerning the frequency and nature of citation of the Court's decisions by other courts or tribunals and by academic journals that are publicly electronically accessible. The data have been collected on an annual accrual basis from 2010 onwards, are available on the Court's website and are analysed in the Court's Annual Reviews to evaluate access to and use of the Court's decisions. This provides insight into the relevancy of the Court's work and public trust and confidence in the Court.

⁹ *Land and Environment Court Act 1979*, s 34AA.

¹⁰ *Land and Environment Court Act 1979*, s 41A.

(f) Working with professional partners

To promote public trust and confidence in the Court and its processes, the Court's action plan highlighted the need for court personnel to participate in the education of legal practitioners on the Court's jurisdiction, processes and decisions. It has done so by partnering with a number of professional organisations, including the Law Society of NSW, the NSW Bar Association and the Environmental Planning and Law Association of NSW. Members of the Court present regularly at courses or seminars offered by these organisations, providing contemporary information about court practice and procedure or updates on planning and environmental law.

The Court has also partnered with organisations such as the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand, the Australian Institute of Architects and the Australian Property Institute in order to improve the quality and reliability of expert evidence given in proceedings before the Court. Members of the Court present at training courses and seminars for expert witnesses hosted by these organisations.

The Court's partnership with these organisations is mutually beneficial. Whilst the organisations and training delegates receive the benefit of the skill and experience of a member of the Court, the Court also benefits from the recipients of the training being better equipped when they represent parties or give evidence in the Court.

Regular meetings of the Court's User Group also allows the Court to maintain ongoing relationships with the professional partners represented by the members of the group, and serves to provide feedback on Court practice and procedure. Through the Court Users Group various ad hoc committees have been established to review practice and procedure within certain areas of the Court's jurisdiction, including the introduction of new practice notes. The involvement of practitioners and court users in introducing new practice notes enables the Court to address the concerns of those stakeholders, gives them ownership of any changes to practice and procedure through their participation, and therefore achieves public trust and confidence.

Attaining excellence through collaboration

A court's success in its path of improvement depends not only on being able to identify and utilise its internal resources, but also on its ability to collaborate with other organisations that can share their resources to achieve the court's initiatives for improvement. There are at least four benefits of such collaboration.

First, collaboration provides more resources to enable more of a court's goals and initiatives for improvement to be achieved than the court would be able to achieve if it relied only on its own resources.

Second, collaboration with different organisations affords different insights and information that enhances the quality and effectiveness of the court's initiatives for improvement of its performance. The involvement of different organisations adds value to what the court achieves. A court is able to make far greater achievements through its partnership with specialist organisations dedicated to the task of implementing particular reforms or with particular foci than if the court used its own funding and resources.

Third, the ability to develop relationships with other bodies and collaborate with them to share their resources to achieve these gains, in itself, achieves court excellence by fulfilling a number of areas of excellence. In part, this is recognised by the Framework, which sees such co-operation with stakeholders in the justice system as an essential element of court leadership and management.

Fourth, through collaboration, the government departments, regulatory authorities and organisations develop confidence in the court. This confidence arises from their contribution toward better system enablers for the court. Their confidence engenders public trust and confidence.

Achieving court excellence is therefore not the work of a court alone. To adapt the words of John Donne, no court is an island, entire of itself; every court is a piece in the justice system. Whilst the decision making functions of a court are independent, its success in achieving outcomes in each of the seven areas of excellence depends on collaboration with partners in the justice system.

Regional forums

Singapore

Report from District Judge Boon Heng Tan, Executive Director, Singapore Judicial College.

COURT EXCELLENCE WORKSHOPS FOR CAMBODIA, MYANMAR, LAO PDR AND VIETNAM (APRIL TO JUNE 2016)

The Singapore Judicial College conducted 4-day workshops, funded by the Singapore Cooperation Programme, on court excellence in Phnom Penh, Yangon, Hanoi and Vientiane from April to June 2016.

More than 130 judges, court administrators and officials from the respective Supreme Court, appeal courts, regional courts and military courts of these jurisdictions attended the training. The participants were introduced to:

- (i) the role and founding members of the International Consortium for Court Excellence (ICCE);
- (ii) the origins of the International Framework for Court Excellence (IFCE);
- (iii) the seven categories in the IFCE including the approaches that may be deployed to attain results;
- (iv) simulating a table-top self-assessment for the different courts represented using the IFCE checklist;
- (v) sharing and critique of the ratings accorded by each group;
- (vi) tabulating and analyzing the outcomes of the self-assessment of all seven categories;
- (vii) the mapping of an action plan to close the gaps by each court represented; and
- (viii) the presentation of, and interaction on, every project group's action plan.

The participants invariably found the IFCE extremely helpful for them to work on improving the performance of the courts. At the end of every workshop, we always take the opportunity to encourage the representatives of the courts to apply to be a member of the ICCE.

Photos: Top to bottom:

- 1. In Phnom Penh, Cambodia, from 26 – 29 Apr 2016
- 2. In Yangon, Myanmar, from 17 – 20 May 2016
- 3. In Hanoi, Vietnam, from 31 May – 3 Jun 2016
- 4. In Vientiane, Lao PDR, from 27 - 30 Jun 2016





The Supreme Court of Victoria, in collaboration with the Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration, is hosting the Innovation and Excellence in Courts Conference - 2017 in Melbourne, Australia on 27 and 28 March 2017.

In hosting the conference the Supreme Court is seeking to provide a setting that enables judicial officers, court administrators and other justice professionals to consider the operational dexterity of our organisations into the future and to better appreciate how well courts and tribunals are performing; while learning from the innovative efforts of those organisations that are presenting at the conference.

In offering some of its own achievements at the conference the Supreme Court is striving to honour the expectations of the International Consortium for Court Excellence that organisations pursuing excellence will share their experiences with other, like-minded organisations.

The Supreme Court is also keen to promote with other courts and tribunals the value that can be derived from excellence frameworks such as the International Framework for Court Excellence and to foster networking and benchmarking opportunities across a broad array of jurisdictions.

The Supreme Court is keen for its conference to have the feel and character associated with a courts environment, rather than being conducted in a large, commercial conference venue. Therefore, venues will include functioning courtrooms and Victoria's foremost law library.

The conference purpose is described as: *'A conference for judicial officers, tribunal members and court/tribunal administrators that considers the operational dexterity of our organisations into the future and provides real, practical examples of innovation and excellence that are transforming and reforming the service delivery of courts and tribunals in Australasia, and internationally'.*

Those who would gain the maximum value from the conference would be judicial officers, court and tribunal administrators, public administrators involved with courts and tribunals, practice managers, lawyers and academics.

Within the overall purpose a contrasting array of sessions will be conducted within the following specific topics of interest:

Operational Agility - will seek perspectives from the judiciary, government, professional court users and other sectors regarding the ability of courts and tribunals to succeed in an unpredictable future.

Transforming Service Delivery - will concentrate on real examples of innovation that are revolutionising, modernising and streamlining the way courts and tribunals are delivering their justice services.

Reforming Service Delivery - will focus on innovative changes and some of the latest developments within courts and tribunals that restructure and reinvent court processes with the aim of improving service delivery.

Excellence Frameworks - will look at how the effective application of excellence frameworks can help courts and tribunals in their pursuit of innovative improvement and excellence. Both the International Framework for Court Excellence and International Framework for Tribunal Excellence will be discussed.

Performance Management - will examine innovative use of key performance measures to drive performance improvement. A particular emphasis will be placed on the Global Measures of Court Performance which form an integral part of the International Framework for Court Excellence.

Further information about the conference, including registration details can be found on the conference website: www.courtinnovationconference.com.au

**Call for Papers closes
31 January 2017**

Other Conferences

- **Executive Leadership Programme for Court and Tribunal Administrators - A Joint Programme between the State Courts of Singapore and the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore Inaugural Run: 16 – 20 January 2017**

This five-day Executive Leadership Programme is organised by the State Courts of Singapore in collaboration with the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. The programme has been specially designed and contextualized for Court and Tribunal Administrators holding leadership positions. It aims to provide deeper insights into the complex issues governing the management of Courts and Tribunals and to equip the participants with key interdisciplinary leadership skills to run the Courts and Tribunals effectively and efficiently. Further information on the programme is available at www.lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/elpcta. For enquiries on this programme, please email: STATECOURTS_Registrar@statecourts.gov.sg

- **Innovation and Excellence in Courts Conference - Supreme Court of Victoria – Melbourne, Australia 27-28 March 2017**
See page 10 and www.courtinnovationconference.com.au for details.
- **Second International Conference on Non-Adversarial Justice: Integrating Theory and Practice – Sydney, Australia - Parkroyal Hotel 6-8 April 2017**
The AIJA is holding an international conference on Non-Adversarial Justice in Sydney on 6-8 April 2017. For more details see: www.NAJ2017.com.
- **Eighth International Association for Court Administration Conference - Washington DC, USA, Sunday, July 9 to Thursday, July 13, 2017** - to be held in conjunction with the National Association for Court Management and will be held at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City.
For more details, see: <http://www.iaca.ws/upcoming-conferences.html>

Next newsletter

Members wishing to submit articles for consideration for the June 2017 edition of the ICCE Newsletter can contact Liz Richardson by email: liz.richardson@monash.edu

Want to know more?

For enquiries about the Framework please contact the ICCE Secretariat:

ICCE Secretariat
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration
Ground Floor, 555 Lonsdale St
Melbourne VIC 3000
Phone: +61 3 9600 1311
ICCE Officer Liz Richardson
Liz.Richardson@monash.edu

Founding members of the ICCE



Gregory Reinhardt
ICCE Secretariat
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration
Ground Floor, 555 Lonsdale Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
+61 3 9600 1311
gregory.reinhardt@monash.edu

Laurence Glanfield
Deputy President
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration
l.glanfield@hotmail.com



Daniel J. Hall
Vice President, Court Consulting Services Division
National Center for State Courts
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 308-4300
djhall@ncsc.org

Beth Wiggins
Research Division
Federal Judicial Center
1 Columbus Circle, NE
Washington, DC 20002-8003
(202) 502-4160
bwiggins@fjc.gov



Jennifer Marie
Deputy Presiding Judge/Registrar
State Courts
State Courts Complex
1 Havelock Square
Singapore 059724 (65) 64325 5155
Jennifer_MARIE@statecourts.gov.sg