



Minnesota Judicial Branch Policy

Policy Source: Minnesota Judicial Council
Policy Number: 902.1
Category: Strategy and Performance
Title: Key Results and Measures Priority Measures for Implementation
Effective Date: November 14, 2024
Revision Date(s): July 21, 2006; August 25, 2006, September 18, 2009
August 19, 2010; June 24, 2011; April 15, 2014, July 19, 2018;
November 14, 2024 (revised under Policy 505.2)

Supersedes:

Key Results and Measures: Priority Measures for Implementation

Policy 902 – Core Judicial Branch Goals – states:

“...The State Court Administrator and the chief judges of the respective judicial districts and appellate courts will develop a plan for identifying key results, and collecting and reporting data that measure performance in meeting these results. ...”

This policy (902.1) contains the details for identifying and measuring key results for the six Core Judicial Branch Goals.

I. Goal 1: Access to Justice

Do participants perceive the courts to be accessible?

- *Conduct Access and Fairness Survey and report results by county.*

Data to report if court participants perceive the courts to be accessible is obtained from the Access and Fairness Survey. Courts should aim to achieve an average score of 4.1 or higher for each survey item. The Survey will be conducted every four years, alternating every two years with the Quality Court Workplace Survey.

II. Goal 2: Timeliness

Do the trial courts hear and decide cases in a timely manner?

- *Clearance rates reported by district, county and/or court house.*
- *Time to disposition reported by district, county and/or court house using timing objectives approved by the Judicial Council.*

- *Age of pending reported by district, county and/or court house using timing objectives approved by the Judicial Council.*
- *Length of time to permanency for children placed out-of-home reported by district, county and/or court house.*
- *Length of time to finalize adoption for children under the guardianship of the Commissioner of Human Services reported by district, county, and/or court house.*

Automated results for all five timeliness measures are available on an on-going basis to judges and court staff via reports on CourtNet. The Age of Pending Cases report is a point-in-time report updated each week. All others can be reported by month or year.

Does the Court of Appeals hear and decide cases in a timely manner?

- *Percent of dispositions using timing objectives approved by the Judicial Council.*

Automated results of this measure are available on an on-going basis from the case management system of the Minnesota Appellate Courts (MACS).

Does the Supreme Court hear and decide cases in a timely manner?

- *Percent of dispositions within time standards set by the Supreme Court.*

Results of this measure are manually prepared using data from the case management system of the Minnesota Appellate Courts (MACS).

III. Goal 3: Integrity and Accountability

Is the electronic record system accurate, complete and timely?

- *Review of the Data Quality program and results.*

Descriptions of the work of the Data Quality program are available by request on an on-going basis.

IV. Goal 4: Excellence

Do participants understand the orders given by the Court?

- *Conduct Access and Fairness Survey.*

Data to report if court participants perceive the courts to be accessible is obtained from the Access and Fairness Survey. Courts should aim to achieve an average score of 4.1 or higher for each survey item. The Survey will be conducted every four years, alternating every two years with the Quality Court Workplace Survey.

V. Goal 5: Fairness and Equity

Do participants perceive they were treated fairly, listened to and are they satisfied with the Court's decision?

- *Conduct Access and Fairness Survey.*

Data to report if court participants perceive the courts to be accessible is obtained from the Access and Fairness Survey. Courts should aim to achieve an average score of 4.1 or higher for each survey item. The Survey will be conducted every four years, alternating every two years with the Quality Court Workplace Survey.

Are jurors representative of our communities?

- *Race and gender breakdowns of jury pools compared to population data available by county using jury management system and Census data.*

Jury pool breakdowns are available in the jury management system on an on-going basis. Results are summarized by fiscal year or calendar year for analysis.

Does the Branch have sufficient race data to assist in analyzing whether persons are treated fairly regardless of race or ethnicity?

- *Race data collection rates reported by district, county and/or court house.*

Each judicial district shall maintain race data collection rates of at least 80% and striving for collection rates of at least 90% on the following case types: Major Criminal, Minor Criminal, Juvenile Delinquency, Juvenile Petty and Traffic, and Juvenile CHIPS. Race data collection rates are available on an on-going basis to judges and court staff via reports on CourtNet.

VI. Goal 6: Quality Court Workplace Environment

Do employees and judicial officers express satisfaction in their positions?

- *Conduct Court Employee Satisfaction Survey and report results by county or clusters of counties for small counties.*

Data to report satisfaction of employees and judicial officers is obtained from the Quality Court Workplace Survey. The Survey will be conducted every four years, alternating every two years with the Access & Fairness Survey.

What are our turn-over rates?

- *Percent of employees who leave the courts each year reported by district.*

Turn-over rates are calculated by the Human Resources & Development Division of the State Court Administrators Office using data from the Statewide Integrated Financial Tools (SWIFT) system which includes data about payroll, human resources and benefits. Results are generally summarized on an annual basis and reported by district and Branch employees located at the Minnesota Judicial Center.

VII. Reporting of Key Results and Measures

To ensure accountability of the branch, improve overall operations of the court, and enhance the public's trust and confidence in the judiciary, District and Appellate Courts should report, twice a year, progress toward meeting the six core Judicial Branch goals as well as action plans based on the results.

The Appellate Court reports should include appropriate Timeliness measures and the District Court reports should include measures for Timeliness, and Integrity and Accountability, and Fairness and Equity. When survey results are available, the reports should also include results for measures in Access to Justice, Excellence, Fairness and Equity, and Quality Court Workplace Environment. Written reports shall be submitted in the Spring of each year and oral reports shall be given in the Fall to the Judicial Council.

In addition to the reporting by District and Appellate Courts, the State Court Administrator's Office will produce an annual written report of statewide results for all six core goals. This report shall be given in the Fall to the Judicial Council.