

Self-Assessment Scoring Guidelines

This document describes the rationale underlying the self-assessment scoring system and explains how to implement it, either by using the provided Excel Spreadsheet or with hand calculations.

The seven Areas of Court Excellence consist of a total of 84 criteria statements, of which 77 are “general statements” and 7 are “effectiveness statements”. The 3rd Edition of the Framework has a simplified method, and combines the Questionnaire and the Checklist of the 2nd Edition into one holistic Checklist. In doing so, the Checklist in the 3rd Edition aims to measure the effectiveness of a court’s measures by having the respondents answer an “effectiveness statement” at the end of each Area of Court Excellence.

Statement Values

For the “general statements”, a score between “0” and “5” should be accorded to each statement. The scoring guideline for the “general statements” is set out below.

Table 1 Scoring Guidelines (General statements)

Don't know	(See the explanation in the next section.)	0
None	There is no approach and no deployment at all.	0
Reactive	An approach exists but it is reactive with little or no evidence of planning or implementation.	1
Defined	The direction for a planned and prevention-based approach is set. There is evidence of the approach being implemented in a few areas.	2
Integrated	A sound and effective approach is in place with evidence of prevention activities. The approach is aligned with basic organisational needs and there is evidence of implementation in some key areas.	3
Refined	A proven and well-defined approach with evidence of refinement through learning and improvement which is well integrated with organisational needs. Tangible evidence of implementation in all key areas.	4
Innovative	An exceptionally well-defined approach, which is fully integrated with organisational needs. Tangible evidence of both implementation and consistent practice at all levels and across all areas within and outside the court.	5

For the “effectiveness statements”, respondents are asked to evaluate how well the court has performed in each of the seven Areas of Court Excellence. Because each statement measures the effectiveness of an entire Area of Court Excellence, the scoring system gives each of these statements twice the value of a “general statement”. Accordingly, a score between “0” and “10” (in multiples of 2) should be accorded to each statement. The scoring guideline for the “effectiveness statements” is set out below.

Table 2 Scoring Guidelines (Effectiveness statements)

Don't know	(See the explanation in next section.)	0
None	No results; no improvement trends; and no targets met.	0
Limited	Poor results; some improvement trends in a few indicators; and limited publication of initiatives.	2
Fair	Performance nears benchmarks in some areas; some improvement trends; and results reported for some key indicators.	4
Good	Good performance levels (average or better) against benchmarks; improvement trends in most key indicators; and results are reported for most key indicators.	6
Very good	Very good performance levels against benchmarks in most key indicators; improvement trends are sustained in most areas; and results are reported for all key indicators.	8
Excellent	Excellent performance levels against benchmarks in all key indicators; exceptional improvement trends in all areas; and results are reported for all indicators.	10

‘Don't Know’ Response

In addition to the six evaluative response options, the Checklist in the 3rd Edition has a seventh response option for the “general statements” and “effectiveness statements” – “Don't Know”. This option is provided to address situations where respondents are simply not aware of whether the court has addressed the criteria statement(s). In such situations, none of the six options available in the first and second editions of the Framework was an accurate reflection of their lack of knowledge, and respondents might have resorted to guesswork or provided a nil response, which would have led to an inaccurate result at the end of the self-assessment exercise

Accordingly, where respondents of the Checklist do not know the answer to a particular criteria statement (for example, where it relates to an area that is outside their job scope), they should choose the “Don't Know” option. This will ensure that the results collected accurately reflect the court's measures and efforts in its journey to excellence.

For statistical scoring purposes, the value to be assigned to the “Don't Know” option is “0”, the same as for a response of “None”. If a respondent skips a question (i.e., provides no answer), it should be treated as a “Don't Know” response and given a value of “0”.

Courts should collate the “None” and the “Don't Know” responses separately. The reasons behind a respondent choosing the “None” versus “Don't Know” option are different and suggest different issues to be addressed by the court. For example, if there is a high percentage of “Don't Know” responses amongst

a particular demographic of court staff, it may suggest that communication of a particular court policy to that demographic has to be improved upon. Alternatively, it may be a reflection of a feature of some court systems where the administrative role is separate from the judicial role. In contrast, a high percentage of “None” responses may indicate that measures adopted by the court in a certain area are lacking.

Implementing the Scoring Framework

The 3rd Edition includes an Excel spreadsheet to assist courts in collating responses to the Checklist and calculating their scores for each of the seven Areas of Court Excellence, as well as their overall scores.

To use the Excel spreadsheet, the values of each respondent’s answers to the self-assessment checklist are entered into the worksheet titled “Entry Form”. This worksheet permits entry of up to 100 respondents. Once this has been done, the Excel spreadsheet automatically collates the responses, performs the necessary calculations, and produces a printable report in the worksheet titled “Report.”

The remainder of this section explains how the Excel spreadsheet works and how to replicate the calculations by hand, if needed.

Typically, multiple respondents will independently answer the self-assessment questionnaire. Thus, to obtain the court’s overall score, the first step is to obtain an average rating for each statement across all respondents. To do this, you must assign a value to each respondent’s answers in accordance with the values in Table A (general statements) and Table B (effectiveness statements). If a respondent skipped a question (i.e., provided no answer), it should be treated as a “Don’t Know” response.

Note: if you are using the Excel sheet, you will enter “99” rather than “0” into the Entry Form for “Don’t Know” responses, although the underlying program values these responses as “0” in calculating the court’s score.

The assigned values are then summed across all respondents for each statement, and the sum is divided by the total number of respondents. Respondents who answered “Don’t Know” (and those who did not answer the question and, as such, are treated as if they responded “Don’t Know”) should be included in the count of respondents.

Table A	
Use for answers to all statements except 1.10, 2.14, 3.13, 4.16, 5.10, 6.12, and 7.9	
Text Answer	Value
Don't Know	0 (99 in Excel)
None	0
Reactive	1
Defined	2
Integrated	3
Refined	4
Innovative	5

Table B	
Use for answers to statements 1.10, 2.14, 3.13, 4.16, 5.10, 6.12, and 7.9	
Text Answer	Value
Don't Know	0 (99 in Excel)
None	0
Limited	2
Fair	4
Good	6
Very good	8
Excellent	10

The second step is to sum the averages obtained in Step 1 across the statements within each of the seven areas to obtain your points for the area.

The third step is to divide the courts' points for each area by the maximum number of points for the area to get the area percentage score (0%-100%).

The table below shows the maximum available points for each area.

Categories		Maximum Total Points
1	Court Leadership	55
2	Strategic Court Management	75
3	Court Workforce	70
4	Court Infrastructure, Proceedings and Processes	85
5	Court User Engagement	55
6	Affordable and Accessible Court Services	65
7	Public Trust and Confidence	50

Next, take the average of the area percentages by adding them together and dividing by 7.

Finally, take this average and multiply it by 10 (if you averaged the percentages as whole numbers) or 1000 (if you averaged the percentages as decimals) to calculate the final overall score, which is out of 1000 points.

Please refer to the scoring worksheet for additional guidance.

