

PD. ABX-728

148806

RESULTS REPORT FOR YEAR 1998

DEC 1998

AUTHOR: AOJS

Administration of Justice Support

Contract 263-0243-00-C-5134-00

AMIDEAST

A

**Administration of Justice Support Project  
Results Report for 1998**

**Strategic Context and Background of the Project:**

Programming in the areas of judicial reform and democracy in Egypt is relatively recent. While the USAID has been involved in institutional development and policy work in sectors such as agriculture and public health for a quarter of a century, it is just beginning its institutional partnership with the courts, with the Parliament, and with organizations in civil society.

The Project arose from the findings of the Egyptian Judicial Conference in 1986. The Conference attendees determined that the growing backlog of cases in the national court system was, to a significant degree, the result of inadequate court management and administration. The Conference attendees recommended improved management, improved administration, re-engineering and caseflow management automation.

Slow progress on this agenda over the following decade and a growing backlogs in the court caseloads, led the Government of Egypt to solicit USAID assistance. This led to the initiation of the Administration of Justice Support Project. The court leadership, working level judges, the Ministry of Justice, the legal community, the general public, the national media, and the national political leadership of Egypt perceived the need for radical improvements in court management.

The Administration of Justice Support Project began in March of 1996 with the special objective to provide an improved civil legal system in Egypt by achieving two principal intermediate results. The first is improved efficiency in two pilot court systems and the second is the improvement of judges' knowledge and application of Egyptian civil law. Mobilization began in September 1996 and the Project's end date is the 30<sup>th</sup> of December 2000. America-Mideast Educational and Training Services, Inc. (AMIDEAST) has been implementing the project in three different locations: North Cairo Court of First Instance, Ismailia Court of First Instance, and the National Center for Judicial Studies. Policy elements of the project are implemented in consultation with the senior-most levels of the Ministry of Justice.

### **Summary and Introduction:**

The Administration of Justice Project submits the results for 1998 with this report. This report includes the findings for the six categories outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan submitted at the end of 1997. The findings are outlined in the performance data table and further explained with detailed conclusions taken from staff interviews and observations.

There has been noticeable improvement in the lawyer's attitude regarding court operations. A reduction in case processing times has occurred. The Project staff has trained judges and court staff on new systems, both automated and non-automated. The judges and staff of the North Cairo Court have received education on computer applications. However, their access to legal research will begin in the next year. The Project staff has provided extensive coursework to increase judicial knowledge in substantive legal topics. The staff has also provided the National Center for Judicial Studies with enhancements to both curriculum and infrastructure.

Following the findings and conclusions, the Project staff has submitted a list of recommendations that they have gained through lessons they have learned. This will aid in future monitoring and evaluation reports. The report concludes with annexes that will better clarify the report's findings.

**PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE**

<b>EGYPT</b>		<b>Approved: November, 1997</b>	
<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE C: IMPROVED CIVIL LEGAL SYSTEM</b>			
<b>Indicator: Documented pilot court system tested and accepted for replication by Ministry of Justice</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure: MOJ acceptance with minor Modifications</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)	N/A	N/A
	1998	N/A	N/A
	1999	N/A	N/A
<b>Source: MOJ record.</b>	1997	N/A	N/A
	1998	N/A	N/A
	1999	N/A	N/A
<b>Comments: One-time End of Project measurement</b>	2000	N/A	N/A
	2001(T)	YES	
<b>Indicator: Measurable improvement in lawyers' perceptions toward court operations</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure: % increase in lawyer confidence in Pilot Court Efficiency</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997 (B)		44%
	1998	46%	52%
	1999	50%	
<b>Source: Annual survey of civil lawyers practicing in Pilot Courts.</b>	2000	55%	
	2001 (T)	60%	
<b>Comments: Baseline determined by Jan. 1998 survey. Annual surveys to be conducted thereafter</b>			
<b>Result No. C.1: Improved Efficiency of Two Pilot Court Systems</b>			
<b>Indicator: Reduction in case processing time</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 1: Average number of months from case Filing to Final Decision for all Civil cases</b>			
	1997 (B)		22.4
	1998	21.6	12.8
<b>Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS staff.</b>	1999	18.3	
	2000	16.6	
	2001(T)	13.3	
<b>Comments: Data used is extrapolated from the average times between individual events</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 2: Average number of days from case Filing to disposition – cases sent to Expert Office</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997 (B)		1084
	1998	1050	1113.8
	1999	900	
<b>Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS.</b>	2000	800	
	2001(T)	640	
<b>Comments: Data used is extrapolated from the average times between individual events. N.B. Out of total no. of civil cases, 30% are to the Experts Office.</b>			

Unit of Measure 3: Average number of days from case	Year	Planned	Actual
Filing to disposition – cases not sent to Expert Office	1997 (B)		496
Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS.	1998	475	255.15
Comments: Data used is extrapolated from the average times between individual events.	1999	400	
	2000	365	
	2001(T)	290	
<b>Result No. C.1.1: Improved Administration of Two Court Systems</b>			
<b>Indicator: Reduction in time consumed by various administrative procedures</b>			
Unit of Measure 1: Number of days consumed in filing	Year	Planned	Actual
Process to first hearing.	1997 (B)		69
Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS staff.	1998	65	45.4
	1999	60	
Comments: Data is extrapolated from average time Between individual events	2000	55	
	2001 (T)	50	
Unit of Measure 2: Days consumed in Service process,	Year	Planned	Actual
From filing to acknowledgement of service.	1997 (B)		21
Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS staff.	1998	20	18.7
	1999	18	
Comments: Data is extrapolated from average time Between individual events	2000	16	
	2001 (T)	15	
Unit of Measure 3: Days consumed in Expert process, from .	Year	Planned	Actual
Expert referral to receipt of final expert opinion.	1997 (B)		492
Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS staff.	1998	440	660
	1999	350	
Comments: Data is extrapolated from average time Between individual events	2000	325	
	2001 (T)	300	
Unit of Measure 4: Days consumed in Opinion process from date	Year	Planned	Actual
Of last hearing to publication of court opinion.	1997 (B)		44.5
Source: Independent verification of pilot court records by AOJS.	1998	40	35
Comments: Data is extrapolated from average time Between actual events.	1999	30	
	2000	25	
	2001(T)	21	

Indicator: Number of court procedures re-engineered and simplified			
Unit of Measure 1: No. of procedural steps in filing process	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)	N/A	0
Source: Project records.	1998	4	6
Comments: Zero baseline – New project	1999	3	
	2000	1	
	2001(T)	ALL (8)	
Unit of Measure 2: No. of procedural steps in Service process	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)	N/A	0
Source: Project records.	1998	3	1
Comments: Zero baseline – New project	1999	8	
	2000	1	
	2001(T)	ALL (12)	
Unit of Measure 3: Percentage of cases referred to expert office	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		29.4%
Source: Project records	1998	25%	15%
Comments: Data from North Cairo only. No Baseline Data will be drawn from Ismailia court until beginning of Ismailia implementation (approx. PY3)	1999	20%	
	2000	17%	
	2001(T)	15%	
Unit of Measure 4: Number of procedural steps in the Expert Office simplified.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)*		0
	1998*	2	1
Source: Project records	1999*	6	
Comments: Relates to internal processes Within the Expert office itself. Zero Baseline – New proj.	2000	2	
	2001(T)	2	
Unit of Measure 5: Number of procedural steps simplified in the Court related to the Expert process.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)*		0
Source: Project records	1998*	2	1
Comments: Relates to internal processes within the court Resulting from Expert process. Zero baseline – New proj.	1999*	8	
	2000	2	
	2001(T)	ALL (10)	
*NOTE: North Cairo data only during PY 1-3			

Unit of Measure 6: Number of procedural steps simplified in the Opinion Process.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
	1998	0	0
Source: Project records.	1999	4	
Comments: Zero baseline – New Project	2000	6	
	2001(T)	ALL (10)	
Unit of measure 7: Number of Court hearings conducted Per case	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)*		10
Source: Project records	1998*	9	7
Comments: Relates to total number of hearings in court During life of the case. *NOTE: North Cairo data only During PY 1-3	1999*	8	
	2000	7	
	2001(T)	6	
Unit of measure 8 : Average of continuances granted per case	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)*		9.4
Source: Project records	1998*	8	6.1
	1999*	7	
Comments: Relates to the number of times court activity Postponed by Court. *NOTE: North Cairo data only During PY 1-3	2000	6	
	2001(T)	5	
Unit of Measure 9 : No.of administrative.duties assigned to judges.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		16
Source: Project records	1998	16	15
Comments:	1999	10	
	2000	8	
	2001(T)	4	
<b>Indicator: Number of judges and staff trained on new systems</b>			
Unit of measure 1: Number of judges trained on Computer systems	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	30	80
Comments: New project – Zero baseline	1999	36	
	2000	18	
	2001 (T)	ALL (84)	

<b>Unit of measure 2: Number of judges trained on</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Non-Computer systems	1997(B)	20	0
	1998	80	0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1999	100	
<b>Comments: New Project – Zero Baseline</b>	2000	80	
	2001(T)	ALL (280)	
<b>Unit of measure 3: Number of staff trained on</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Computer systems	1997(B)		0
	1998	60	0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1999	110	
<b>Comments: New Project – Zero Baseline</b>	2000	63	
	2001(T)	ALL (233)	
<b>Unit of measure 4: Number of staff trained on</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Non-Computer systems	1997(B)		0
	1998	30	30
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1999	50	
<b>Comments: New Project – Zero Baseline</b>	2000	50	
	2001(T)	ALL	
<b>Indicator: Increase in number of judges' home PCs installed.</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 1: PCs distributed to judges homes</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Source: Project records	1997(B)		0
	1998	0	0
<b>Comments: New Project – Zero baseline</b>	1999	30	
	2000	36	
	2001(T)	18	
<b>Result No. C.1.2: Increased Access to Legal Information in Two Pilot Court Systems</b>			
<b>Indicator: Increased percentage of Judges and court staff with access to legal system.</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 1: Number of Judges and court staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Trained on databases.	1997(B)		0
	1998	0	0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1999	66	
<b>Comments: New Project – Zero baseline</b>	2000	18	
	2001(T)		

Unit of Measure 2: Number of Judges and court staff Provided access to databases.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	30	0
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	36	
	2000	18	
	2001(T)		
<b>Result No. C.2: Judges More Knowledgeable of Egyptian Civil Law</b>			
Indicator: Average percentage increase between pre-and post-course scores			
Unit of Measure : Annual average differences in pre-and post-test scores	Year	Planned	Actual
	1998	15%	
Source: NCJS Records	1999	15%	29.9%
	2000	15%	
	2001(T)	15%	
Comments: NOTE: The nature of pre and post-testing (participants and programs change yearly) is such that each year is a stand-alone, zero-based item. Accordingly, the data herein is per annum only. Final average of all testing will be shown as the fifth-year result			
<b>Result No. C.2.1 Enhanced Educational Infrastructure at NCJS</b>			
Indicator: Increased number of educational mission-related administrative systems			
Unit of Measure 1: Number of standard forms added	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	8	0
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	10	
	2000	10	
	2001(T)	8	
Unit of Measure 2: Number of automated systems added	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	2	2
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	N/a	
	2000	N/a	
	2001(T)	N/a	

<b>Unit of Measure 3: Number of polices/procedures added</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	8	10
<b>Comments:</b>	1999	10	
New Project – Zero baseline	2000	10	
	2001(T)	8	
<b>Unit of Measure 4: Number of manuals developed</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	1	4
<b>Comments:</b>	1999	1	
New Project – Zero baseline	2000	1	
	2001(T)	1	
<b>Indicator: Increased Number of trained faculty members</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 1: Number of Judges</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	20	57
<b>Comments:</b>	1999	40	
New Project – Zero baseline	2000	40	
	2001(T)	40	
<b>Unit of Measure 2: Number of case managers</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	5	0
<b>Comments:</b>	1999	10	
New Project – Zero baseline	2000	10	
	2001(T)	10	
<b>Unit of Measure 3: Number of new judge orientation faculty</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	5	36
<b>Comments:</b>	1999	5	
New Project – Zero baseline	2000	5	
	2001(T)	5	

Unit of Measure 4: Number of Mentor Judges	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	0	0
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	10	
	2000	10	
	2001(T)	10	
<b>Result No. C.2.2 Enhanced Curriculum at NCJS</b>			
<b>Indicator: Increased Number of new courses implemented</b>			
Unit of Measure 1: Number of Civil Law courses	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	2	7
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	4	
	2000	4	
	2001(T)	4	
Unit of Measure 2: Number of Administrative Management Courses	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	4	9
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	5	
	2000	4	
	2001(T)	4	
Unit of Measure 3: Number of Staff Courses	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	2	0
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	4	
	2000	4	
	2001(T)	4	
Unit of Measure 4: Number of Computer Courses	Year	Planned	Actual
	1997(B)		0
Source: Project records	1998	5	5
Comments: New Project – Zero baseline	1999	7	
	2000	9	
	2001(T)	9	

<b>Indicator: Increased Number of Evaluation Instruments</b>			
<b>Unit of Measure 1: Number of Course-related Instruments</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	4	5
<b>Comments:</b> New Project – Zero baseline	1999	7	
	2000	7	
	2001(T)	10	
<b>Unit of Measure 2: Number of Faculty-related Instruments</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	2	4
<b>Comments:</b> New Project – Zero baseline	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001(T)	2	
<b>Unit of Measure 3: Number of Participant-related Instruments</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	2	3
<b>Comments:</b> New Project – Zero baseline	1999	2	
	2000	2	
	2001(T)	2	
<b>Unit of Measure 4: Number of Overall Program Instruments</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1997(B)		0
<b>Source: Project records</b>	1998	2	2
<b>Comments:</b> New Project – Zero baseline	1999	3	
	2000	4	
	2001(T)	4	

## Recommendations Through Lessons Learned:

The Project staff has made some recommendations through lessons it has learned to help strengthen future monitoring and evaluation reports.

1. Clarifying certain terms  
For example, what defines a system or a procedure?
2. Redefining several of the units of measure  
For example, the unit of measure indicating judges and staff access to legal databases is defined as their access to computers. Another example is "Average number of hearings during the life of the case" should read, "Average number of postponements or continuances during the life of the case."
3. Eliminating several units of measure to sharpen the focus of various indicators. This includes the measuring of the case managers and mentor judges under the indicator, "Increase in number of trained faculty members."
4. Re-calibrating the planned and actual numbers to better reveal how the Project is at work. This would help in units of measure that have outdone the planned outcomes for one year and need the future years to reflect that.
5. Introducing new units of measure to better explain other areas of the Project not fully covered in the current document. This would include a comprehensive section that better captures the Computer Automation Team's work as a distinct part of the Project. Please refer to the annex entitled, "Indicator: Number of case management functions" to see this. These functions total seven and are defined as case information, party information, event information, index information, financial transaction, management information, and typing pool information.  
In addition, several units of measure could be added to help capture the exact number of judges trained. There were more judges trained than are listed in the report under the current units of measure.
6. Continuing to integrate the Monitoring and Evaluation report factors in the various reports that Project staff submit.

## **Findings and Conclusions:**

### **Special Objective C: Improved Civil Legal System**

Indicator: Documented pilot court system tested and accepted for replication by the Egyptian Ministry of Justice.

Unit of Measure 1: MOJ acceptance with minor modifications

Number planned for 1998: 0

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Indicator: Measurable improvement in lawyer's confidence in pilot court efficiency

Unit of Measure: percent increase in lawyer confidence in pilot court efficiency

Number planned for 1998: 46%

Number achieved in 1998: 52%

Reason for result:

The data in the Lawyer's Survey will undergo further analysis to fully explain the improvement in lawyer's confidence. However, the raw data is included with this report and can be compared to the data given in 1997. There was a noticeable increase in the lawyer's approval of the case microfilming process as well as the litigant's acknowledgement of service. There was a very high approval rating of the filing system relocation as well. This could indicate the Project's influence on the Filing and Service Departments.

Result Number C.1: Improved efficiency of two pilot court systems

Indicator: Reduction in case processing time

Introduction:

The Court Administration Team used Professor Ernie Friesen's statistical analysis as the baseline for case processing time in the North Cairo Court of First Instance. For this year's evaluation, the Court Administration Team used the statistical analysis provided in David Steelman's work. While many of the following units of measure show a positive trend, the Team cautions that the mix of case types in the statistical samples and other factors may not present an accurate picture of the Court's caseload status. It must be understood that the reasons for each unit of measure given are conjecture and, at this time, unverifiable. The nature of measuring the level of success in any caseflow management program improvement is that it takes months and often years for the results of change to be measurable.

After further case sampling and monitoring, the project can more clearly determine the reasons for the numbers. Implementation of a successful caseflow management improvement program will include the disposing of the older, pending cases

(backlog) which will, in turn, result in the anomalous outcome of an increase in the average number of months from case filing to final decision for civil cases. This situation will continue until the older pending cases are disposed of.

Unit of Measure 1: Average number of months from case filing to final decision for all civil cases

Number planned for 1998: 21.6 (650 days)

Number achieved for 1998: 12.8 (384.29 days)

Reason for result:

The difference in the above two figures could relate to a number of factors. One major reason could be that judges are referring fewer cases to the Expert Office. Cases sent to the Expert Office take longer due to the time for report completion and its return to the Court. A more likely explanation is that the latest data sample did not include as many referrals to the Expert Office as the earlier sample.

Unit of Measure 2: Average months taken from case filing to final decision in cases sent to the Expert Office

Number planned for 1998: 35 months (1050 days)

Number achieved in 1998: 37.13 months (1113.8 days)

Reason for result:

The increase in time cases take in the Expert Office relates to a myriad set of factors intrinsic to the Expert Office. The cases that the judges refer to the Expert Office could be more complicated in nature than in the past. Judges could feel more confident in deciding a greater number of cases without an experts opinion than before. The more difficult cases take the experts longer to complete their opinions and thus they remain open longer. Another factor relates to the order that the cases arrive at the Expert Office. Judges are barred from causing cases to be worked on out of turn. Cases are assigned to an expert in the order they are received and are not worked out sequence. This is a complex issue in a servers' caseload may be in front of many less complex cases which now wait until the complex case is completed. This adds delay to the less complex case that could be avoided if they were assigned to other experts.

The project has developed a set of recommendations to improve the efficiency of the Expert Office without having to change Egyptian law. One suggestion is to have a group of experts located at the North Cairo Court. These experts would be able to process the easier cases referred by the judges faster. Another suggestion relates to the transport of cases to and from the Expert Office, which can take months. The expedition of case transport will serve to shorten the total time cases sit at the Expert Office. In the future, the Court Administration Team expects to see this total number decrease as the North Cairo Court administration implements these suggestions and adds its own ideas for change. The project will assist the Court in monitoring activity in this regard to provide a better understanding of what specifically contributes to delay in the experts' process.

Unit of Measure 3: Average number of months from case filing to final decision in cases not sent to the Expert Office

Number planned for 1998: 15.83 months (475 days)

Number achieved in 1998: 8.5 months (255.15 days)

Reason for result:

As state above, the drastic decline in length of time from filing to final decision could relate to several factors. The Court has begun to understand the importance of getting cases closed. The four judges' panels have worked to clear backlogged cases. A major factor could be that judges are deciding more issues in cases on their own without sending them to the Expert Office. Another factor could be that the judges are receiving cases that don't need to be sent to the experts. Other non-judicial factors such as a time decrease in other aspects of the case process could be influencing the time cases spend at the experts.

Result Number C.1.1: Improved Administration of the two court systems

Indicator: Reduction in time consumed by various administrative procedures

Unit of Measure 1: Days consumed from beginning of filing process to first hearing

Number planned for 1998: 60 days

Number achieved in 1998: 45.4 days

Reason for result:

Again, this factor saw a drastic decline from expected results. The Court Administration Team will need to monitor future data to better understand the reasons behind this decline.

Unit of Measure 2: Days consumed in the service process from filing to acknowledgement of service

Number planned for 1998: 20 days

Number achieved in 1998: 18.7 days

Reason for result:

The unexpected results could come from several areas and will need further study to clarify. However, there is a general sense that the Service Department is sending out its summons with more efficiency. If true, this could be the result of the increasing amount of attention being focused on this element of the caseflow process. The litigants could be acknowledging their summons more quickly. The key issue in the service of process procedure is when the litigant receives the summons. It appears that the date recorded for

serving the litigant is not the date the litigant actually first sees it. Rather, it could be the date the server delivers the summons to the local police station. The police, in turn, notify the litigant, which can be long after the date of service in the case. The Team will be monitoring this situation to determine what is behind the change.

Unit of Measurement 3: Days consumed in expert process from referral to final expert opinion

Number planned for 1998: 440 days

Number achieved in 1998: 660 days

Reason for result:

The Expert Office process takes the greatest time to complete of all the case processes. As stated above, more difficult cases remain longer with the experts. The Court Administration Team has a list of suggestions that it will provide to the North Cairo Court administration. These suggestions, if implemented, should contribute to a decrease in the length of time cases spends at the Expert Office. As the project continues, the Team will monitor the result of the suggestions the North Cairo Court implements and the result of suggestions the North Cairo Court recommends to be implemented by the Expert Office.

Unit of Measure 4: Days consumed in the opinion process from first date of last hearing to publication of court opinion

Number planned for 1998: 40 days

Number achieved in 1998: 35 days

Reason for result:

The decrease is greater than expected. However, the Project's impact on this decrease was negligible. The impact of the Project's re-engineering of the typing pool will not be felt until 1999. The trend remains positive, but the next report will see if the extent of the decline will be just as marked.

Addendum to the information from North Cairo Court on case processing:

The Court Administration Team has done extensive work in the North Cairo Court. During this stage in the Project, the Team was not planning to concentrate any energy on the second pilot court in Ismailia. However, the Ismailia Court administration asked to be included and has actively begun monitoring data and installing procedural improvements. The Ismailia Court judges have also begun to attend the computer training. David Steelman has analyzed the Ismailia Court with the same indicators as he did in the North Cairo Court. While not a formal part of the current study, the Ismailia Court data will be given here as an addendum.

Indicator: Reduction in case processing time at the Ismailia Court

Unit of Measure 1: Average number of months from case filing to final decision for all cases

Number achieved for 1998: 7 months (214 days)

Unit of Measure 2: Average number of months from case filing to final decision for cases sent to the Expert Office

Number achieved in 1998: 25.7 months

Unit of Measure 3: Average number of months from case filing to the final decision in cases not sent to the experts

Result Number C.1.1: Improved Administration of the two court systems

Indicator: Reduction in time consumed by various administrative procedures

Unit of Measure 1: Days consumed from beginning of filing process to first hearing

Number achieved in 1998: 29.6 days

Unit of Measure 2: Days consumed in the service process from filing to acknowledgement of service

Number achieved in 1998: 7 days

Unit of Measure 3: Days consumed in expert process from referral to final expert opinion

Number achieved in 1998: 1284 days

Unit of Measure 4: Days consumed in the opinion process from date of last hearing to publication of court opinion

Number achieved in 1998: 56 days

Indicator: Increase in number of court procedures re-engineered and simplified

Unit of Measure 1: Number of procedural steps simplified and re-engineered in the filing process

Number planned for 1998: 4

Number achieved in 1998: 6

Reason for result:

The filing process was a chaotic one. A litigant would enter the North Cairo Court and not know where to go. Once he began the filing process, he would be shuttled from floor to floor and from building to building in order to complete the process. Normally, this process would take a litigant at least two hours to complete and comprised ten steps. The Court Administration Team went to work to re-engineer this process and make the Court more accessible to litigants.

One of the first steps the Team engineered was to install information signs in the lobbies of the Court buildings. There are two main buildings, the Main building for criminal cases and the Annex for civil cases. These signs direct the litigants as to where they need to go in order to file a case and where the Court sessions are being held. The signs impressed the Court of Appeals administration so much that they installed their own.

The Court Administration Team then worked to have all the civil case filing procedures brought down to the first floor of the Annex and the document stamp process was brought from the Main building to the new building. The microfilming administrative process came down to the ground floor from the second. What appear to be two small steps in the case initiation process are quite large ones. On a normal day, three hundred litigants would be making their way up to the second floor to pay to have their documents microfilmed and then continue the filing process downstairs and out of the building. Now these litigants remain on the ground floor and away from other unrelated activities on upper floors.

Another step that was re-engineered was the separation of the cashier function for civil cases from criminal cases. This has reduced further congestion in the filing area. The Court administration has also developed a unified, simple list of case assessment fees.

The Court Administration Team has also reassessed office location in the building in order to achieve a more coherent and logical workflow. The recommended changes have been implemented. Along with the payment process, most other procedures in civil and criminal cases are kept apart thus, decreasing confusion. At each step, the Team has

worked actively with the North Cairo Court administration to re-engineer and simplify the filing process and have smoothed the process considerably.

Unit of Measure 2: Number of procedural steps simplified and re-engineered in the service process

Number planned for 1998: 3

Number achieved in 1998: 1

Reason for result:

An outside consulting company, Mustafa Shawki and Company, provided a management survey of the North Cairo Court's Service Department. The consultant's activity may have provided the management of the Service Department with a sense that the Court is expecting a better, more efficient service of process. Discussions with the judges' experimental panels almost always include the issue of more timely serving of summons. This focus coupled with the activities below should bring about needed change in the Service Department.

The North Cairo Court has already appointed a "follow-up" judge to oversee the activities of the Service Department. This appointment is the first management step re-engineered by the Court Administration Team. This judge will not only monitor, but help in implementing any changes that the North Cairo Court administration agrees to put in place.

The company has suggested several other re-engineering procedures that the Court can implement without having to change the law. These short-term modifications, if the North Cairo Court implements them, will re-activate existing structures and make the Service Department more effective in its job. The Team will be meeting with the North Cairo Court administration to urge implementations of viable suggestions.

Following are some suggestions that the North Cairo Court could implement. Currently, each Partial Court within the North Cairo Court district have servers assigned who are responsible for serving summons for the North Cairo Court when the litigants reside in the Partial Court district. The Partial Court judges are in a better position to, and can monitor the servers' activity at the directive of the chief justice of North Cairo Court of the First Instance.

Another one is the use of the incentive system to reward good work. Supervisors should play a vital role in defining work objectives and publicly rewarding servers whom efficiently and effectively complete their duties. Another suggestion is for management to use central lists of the status of all service requests. Still another suggestion is to provide bus and taxi passes to the servers for their official travel. The present travel reimbursement is not fair or objective. At least one other ministry uses this method quite successfully.

Other more long-term changes such as improving the employee promotion systems will take more planning. The Team will work with the Court administration to plan these future changes. However, things are well on their way in re-engineering the Service Department.

Unit of Measure 3: Percent of cases referred to the Expert Office

Number planned for 1998: 25%  
Number achieved in 1998: 15%

Reason for result:

The Court Administration Team is pleased with this result. However, for reasons stated at the beginning of this document, more time is necessary for the Project's efforts in this regard to be truly evaluated.

Unit of Measure 4: Number of procedural steps simplified in the Expert Office

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 1

Reason for result:

The Court Administration Team has many suggestions to help improve the work of the Expert Office. One such improvement was the addition of a follow-up judge for the Expert Office who will provide guidance and put pressure on the Expert Office to be more efficient. He will follow up to make sure that referrals are being sent to the Expert Office in a timely manner and that their reports are completed and returned within a reasonable time period. As time progresses, the administration will implement the suggestions that will work within its milieu. The Team has worked diligently to provide suggestions that can use existing structures more effectively.

Another suggestion that will erase a silent step in the Expert Office process will be the implementation of a regular courier between the Expert Office and the North Cairo Court. Cases sit for long periods of time at both locations waiting for delivery. This adds unnecessary delay to a case. By implementing a frequent courier schedule, cases will travel quickly from point to point and experts can begin work on them and return them to the Court as soon as possible.

The Team has suggested a number of management improvements be made including ones such as performance incentives. The hope is that better management and work incentives will bring about a more responsive Expert Staff. Future evaluations will show whether these alterations were implemented and the results.

Unit of Measure 5: Number of procedural steps simplified in the Court related to the expert process

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 1

Reason for result:

As indicated above, the Team has been busy working with the North Cairo Court administration on implementing change in its relationship to the Expert Office. They have made several suggestions and look forward to their implementation in the future. The main suggestion is to have an in-house expert panel to work on less complex case

issues that need expert opinions, but do not need a lot of effort by an expert. The Team hopes to see this implemented perhaps on a trial basis with an experimental panel. Once the Team evaluates how this works, it can expand its use. This will add a procedure, but decrease case time.

Another procedural change relates to the area of incentives. Incentives can do a lot to affect change in a system. Judges' performance is monitored by the Inspector's Office. If inspectors begin to focus on the appropriateness of referrals by a judge to the Expert Office, so will the judge. Which, in turn, provides the information considered for promotion purposes. If the appropriateness of referrals is a factor considered for promotions, judges may not be so inclined to send inappropriate cases to the Expert Office. This will re-engineer the procedure of sending cases to the Expert Office.

Unit of Measure 6: Number of procedural steps simplified in the opinion process

Number planned for 1998: 0

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

The opinion process is being re-engineered and at the end of the project will be completely streamlined. Currently, there are fourteen procedures that make up the opinion process. Six of these are at the typing pool level. The typing pool will be completely automated and relocated into better offices within the first quarter of 1999. Also, these six steps will be streamlined down to five as the typists will have the ability to correct and check their work their own PCs. Gradually, the typing pool will be taken out of the process as more and more judges' use their PCs to produce their own final judgements.

Unit of Measure 7: Number of Court hearings conducted per case

Number planned for 1998: 9.0

Number achieved in 1998: 7.0

Reason for result:

The number of court hearings held per case are actual events that take place. Each case has a first hearing and following hearings are scheduled as the case warrants. In the past, judges have allowed the litigants control the case's progress. The project is persuading judges to exercise more control in managing cases. The Expert Office and the litigants need to be made aware that the Court is serious about reducing the number of unnecessary hearings due to postponements for late expert reports and other reasons.

Unit of Measure 8: Average number of hearings during the life of the case

Number planned for 1998: 8.0

Number achieved for 1998: 6.1

Reason for result:

This number indicates the number of postponements in a case's life. While this number is a positive one, it is still too high. Judges routinely postpone cases because litigants request it or are not prepared. The Expert Office continually causes postponements of hearing schedules if its report is not ready. The Team hopes to have judges control the caseflow to a greater extent and exact more control over the Expert Office and Service Department. Further study will reveal if this has happened.

Unit of Measure 9: Number of administrative duties assigned to judges

Number planned for 1998: 16

Number achieved in 1998: 15

Reason for result:

In the past, judges' panels had to not only decide cases, but also monitor the myriad of administrative duties surrounding the Court's management. Many times this administrative work was neglected. Now, the North Cairo Court has assigned this work to a set of follow-up judges so that the judges' panels can focus all their energies on their casework.

Several of these judges and their work have been mentioned in other places in this report. However, it is necessary to further explain them here. A follow-up judge for the Service Department will work to follow-up on cases with service problems, monitor server activity, and initiate any penalties on errant servers. The follow-up judge for the Expert Office the status of referrals to the Expert Office, follow-up with the Expert Office on the status of unnecessarily long pending referrals, and initiate investigations of experts if complaints arise.

The follow-up judge for the Clerks' Office will monitor standards for the clerks' workflow and initiate corrective procedures as necessary. The judge for the Partial Courts will follow-up on cases sent for appeal to the Court of First Instance and make sure that they return in a timely manner as well as making sure that appeals are registered. The follow-up judge for building support will make better use of the North Cairo Court in such ways as making sure the facility is running smoothly at each level. This judge will make sure that the judges and staff as well as the litigants find the filing facility, typing pool, and courtrooms well equipped and being used effectively. In regards to the courtrooms, this judge will make sure that the double scheduling of the civil courtroom continues smoothly.

The final follow-up judge serves as the liaison for the project at the North Cairo Court. The judges' experimental panels work with the Court Administration Team now and works with follow-up judge as point of contact for minor issues. He also works with the other follow-up judges to assist the panels to provide a better judicial deliverable.

Indicator: Increase in number of judges and staff at the North Cairo trained on new systems

Unit of Measure 1: Number of judges trained on computer systems

Number planned for 1998: 30

Number achieved in 1998: 80

Unit of Measure 2: Number of judges trained on non-computer systems

Number planned for 1998: 80

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Unit of Measure 3: Number of staff trained on computer systems

Number planned for 1998: 60

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Unit of Measure 4: Number of staff trained on non-computer systems

Number planned for 1998: 30

Number achieved in 1998: 30 (at least)

Reason for the above results:

The North Cairo Court judges have had and will continue to have extensive computer education. The eighty judges who will receive personal computers will focus their education not only word-processing skills, but on Internet and online legal research. The staff will learn new skills for the typing pool in the upcoming year and there will be a marked increase in the number of staff trained on computer systems.

The North Cairo Court staff has received substantial retraining in non-computer systems such as those associated with the filing process. This will continue as more re-engineering work is done in other systems at the North Cairo Court. The judges received no non-computer systems training, but will begin to as they interact with the various re-engineering projects of the Court.

Indicator: Increase in number of judges' home PCs installed

Unit of Measure 1: PCs distributed to judges' homes

Number planned for 1998: 0

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

The project has procured all eighty computers and support equipment in this past year. The project has configured the computers and installed Arabic software. Training was begun during the last quarter of 1998 and will continue in 1999. During the first quarter of 1999, the judges will be given their computers.

Result Number C.1.2: Increased access to legal information in the two pilot court systems

Indicator: Increased percentage of judges and court staff with access to the legal system

Unit of Measure 1: Number of judges and court staff trained on databases

Number planned for 1998: 0

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Unit of Measure 2: Number of judges and court staff provided access to databases

Number planned for 1998: 30

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

The second unit of measure shows the number of judges and staff that have access to computers. As stated above, eighty judges at the North Cairo Court will receive their personal computers in the first quarter of 1999. The staff will begin to have increased access to computers once the typing pool is installed.

Result Number C.2: Judges more knowledge of Egyptian Civil Law

Indicator: Average percentage increase between pre- and post- course scores

Unit of Measure 1: Annual average differences in pre- and post- tests

Number planned for 1998: 15%

Number achieved in 1998: 29.94%

Reason for result:

The Judicial Training Team has provided three groups of judges with a Commercial Law Program. Six stand-alone courses comprise this program. As this program has developed, the Judicial Training Team has evaluated the program each time it was given. The third time was the program in its final stage of development. Therefore, the Judicial Training Team uses the pre- and post- test scores from this program given in Ismailia as the annual average.

The six classes had separate pre- and post- test scores and their averages make up the total percentage. The percentages given show the difference in knowledge in the pre- and post- test scores. The six classes and their percentages are, "Commercial Papers" with 29.12%, "Bankruptcy" with 35.15%, "Commercial Contracts" with 22.22%, "Bank

Transaction” with 37.00%, “Trademarks” with 38.00%, and “Maritime Shipment Law” with 18.15%. The average number in the increase in knowledge was 29.94%.

#### Result Number C.2.1 Enhanced Educational Infrastructure at the National Center for Judicial Studies

Indicator: Increase in number of educational mission-related administrative systems

Unit of Measure 1: Number of standard forms added

Number planned for 1998: 8

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

Consultant Anthony Fisser has given the Project a preliminary report on streamlining the work at the National Center. His final report will contain ten new forms to be added to the Center’s administration. Although the Judicial Training Team has developed several forms for use in several of its new procedures, they are not general administrative forms and were not included in this unit of measure.

Unit of Measure 2: Number of automated systems added

Number planned for 1998: 2

Number achieved in 1998: 2

Reason for result:

The Project installed a local access network system (LAN) and an office automation system at the Center. The LAN allows judges and staff at the Center to communicate with each other as well as with other members of the legal community. This system will also allow for staff and judges to access legal research tools online.

The office automation system handles the daily word-processing needs for the Center. It permits the judges and staff to compose documents and other materials for such events as presentations. The office automation system has Word, Excel, and Power Point. The judges and staff have received training on these systems and are currently using them in their daily work. I was able to observe the staff at the Center at work on the computers while I visited. The staff seemed at ease with the computers and willing to use them.

Unit of Measure 3: Number of policies/ procedures added to the NCJS

Number planned for 1998: 8

Number achieved in 1998: 10

Reason for result:

The Judicial Training Team has aided the administration and staff at the NCJS with the addition of ten new procedures to help improve the educational infrastructure there. The new procedures are the request for proposal procedure, the bid evaluation

procedure, curricula development, and audio-visual procedures. They have also added logistical support procedures, an extensive evaluation procedure, computer implementation, the use of moderators, the use of public relations, and the use of focus groups. Each procedure plays a critical role in making the Center more effective as a teaching institution.

The Judicial Education Team has worked with the Center's administration to develop an effective and rigorous request for proposal procedure for course providers. The Judicial Training Team aided in the set up a list of course objectives and company requirements. The Team helped to produce the request for proposal from these objectives and requirements. This procedure has worked well in choosing course providers and has been taught to the Center's administration. The Team has transferred this procedure to the Center and it will be used in the future as it chooses other course providers.

Once the proposals are submitted, the administration at the Center needs to evaluate them. Before, personal perceptions played an unduly large role in choosing a provider. There was no set procedure in place that eliminated this. Now, the Judicial Training Team and three members of the NCJS staff work to evaluate the proposals. The AOJS staff has worked with the Center to develop a comprehensive evaluation form that covers course content and costs. The bid evaluation team works to weigh these factors in order of importance. The staff has begun to use this procedure instead of relying on personal perceptions. The Center's staff has found that this procedure greatly helps them to make a well thought out decision on a course provider.

The AOJS staff has spend a lot of time developing the course curricula it provides. The Team works with the instructors and the Center staff to match the Center's needs with the course objectives. Along with curricula development, the Judicial Training Team has developed the extensive use of course, instructor, and participant evaluations. These evaluations are given at different points in a course and are also focused on different groups. The Team has shown the Center administration the benefit these evaluations have on the future delivery of a course. The Center and many of the course providers did not use this procedure and now have adopted it for the future.

Another procedure the Center has implemented is the use of audio-visual equipment. The Training Team purchased this equipment for the Center as a part of the Procurement Plan. The Team put this equipment into the Center to help judges and staff with their presentations and meetings. The Center not only works to have these used in courses that that it provides, but also in its daily life. While I was visiting the Center, I was able to observe several judges making use of an overhead projector and a flip chart as they discussed a subject.

Although it may appear a small procedure to implement, the addition of understanding logistical support has helped the Center provide better training sessions and meetings. Seating arrangements, meeting length, and location all need attention when developing an activity. The Center now includes this procedure as it plans meetings, discussions, and training and teaching activities.

The use of computers has been previously mentioned. The Training Team and the judges at the Center have instituted computer use in office automation beyond word-processing as a major new policy. The trend toward increased automation will continue. Previously, the Center had only two computers for minimal word-processing. The

National Center will now have a much wider computing capability in the future and a well-trained staff to use it.

The Training Team has also introduced the use of moderators for various meetings and courses. In the meeting format, judges rarely used moderators to control the flow of discussion. Now, several judges have become adept in this form of communication and use it in the meetings they have. They have seen that it is an aid to better communication and that has helped in the courses they have taken. They plan to use it during future courses and meetings at the Center. The Team has also introduced the use of public relations for the Center. The Center now has a conduit through which to pass information on its activities and other work to the legal community and the public at large.

The Training Team has added one final procedure during the past year. This is the use of focus groups. The three forums held in the Project's first year were just the beginning of this. Now, the judges at the Center have used the focus group method for curricula development and judicial debate. Through the use of focus groups, the Center will be able to develop more effective procedures as well as learn what the different views are in the judicial community.

Unit of Measure 4: Number of manuals developed

Number planned for 1998: 1

Number achieved in 1998: 4

Reason for result:

Systems Research Egypt has written and handed over four computer manuals through the Project. The staff and judges at the Center can use these manuals as they work with their computers. The manuals were trainers' manual, trainees' manual, a technical support manual, and a maintenance manual. These manuals will help make the Center more self sufficient in caring for its computer needs.

Indicator: Increase in number of trained faculty members

Unit of Measure 1: Number of judges

Number planned for 1998: 20

Number achieved in 1998: 57

Unit of Measure 2: Number of case managers

Number planned for 1998: 5

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

This portion of the reporting was eliminated from the Project plan.

Unit of Measure 3: Number of new judge orientation faculty

Number planned for 1998: 5  
Number achieved in 1998: 36

Reason for result:

The Training Team trained 57 judges in its "Training of Trainers" program throughout the past year as mentioned in the first unit of measure. Out of these fifty-seven judges, thirty-six are qualified to replicate this course and be trainers for the new judges that will attend the Center in the upcoming year. This has been a major success of the project and shows that the Center is becoming more involved in the replication of the Training Team's efforts.

Unit of Measure 4: Number of mentor judges

Number planned for 1998: 0  
Number achieved in 1998: 0

Result number C.2.2: Enhanced curriculum at the NCJS

Indicator: Increase in number of new courses implemented

Unit of Measure 1: Number of Civil Law courses

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 7

List of courses:

The courses provided have been stated above as the Commercial Law Program. The courses are "Commercial Papers", "Bankruptcy", "Maritime Law", "Commercial Contracts", "Trademarks", and "Bank Transactions." They were given three times, once in Cairo, once in Port Said, and once in Ismailia. The Team also gave a course on "Anti-Dumping."

Unit of Measure 2: Number of administrative management courses

Number planned for 1998: 4  
Number achieved in 1998: 9

List of courses:

The Training Team has gone beyond the planned number of courses for the year. The Team and the Center gave eight courses. They were, "Leadership", "Time Management", "Managing People", "Team Building", "Group Dynamics", "Problem Identification and Problem Solving", "Decision Making", "Budgeting for Non-Budgeting People", and "Techniques in Ministerial Operations."

Unit of Measure 3: Number of staff courses

Number planned for 1998: 2

Number achieved in 1998: 0

Reason for result:

The Training Team gave two courses to the North Cairo Court staff during this time period. The Team educated one hundred and thirteen people of the North Cairo Supervisory level staff in a series of "Change Agent" courses as well as a preliminary "AOJS Orientation Seminar for the North Cairo Court Supervisory Staff." The design of these two training activities was developed in order to let the participant practice group discussions and exercises. Through these discussions and exercises, the groups provided actual and workable recommendations on how they would see the change process implemented and sustained at the North Cairo Court.

Unit of Measure 4: Number of computer courses given

Number planned for 1998: 5

Number achieved in 1998: 5

List of courses:

The Team implemented ten computer courses at the Center. The courses were Word (beginning and advanced), Windows, Typing Skills (beginning and advanced), Access (beginning and advanced), and Power Point. The next year will see an increase in the number of computer courses given.

Indicator: Increase in the number of evaluation instruments

Unit of Measure 1: Number of course-related instruments

Number planned for 1998: 4

Number achieved in 1998: 5

Reason for result:

The four course related evaluation methods introduced are setting the course objectives, pre-course meetings, during the course evaluations, post-course tests and evaluations, and post-course meetings with the course providers. The Judicial Training Team sets the objectives and works with the instructors to make certain that the objectives are solidly defined before the course takes place. During the course, students and instructors evaluate it as it progresses. At the end, the instructors evaluate the participants on the lessons taught. The participants evaluate the instruction. The Judicial Training Team meets with the course providers to go over the course successes and failures. The Judicial Training Team continually monitors the courses and keeps through records of lessons learned and future solutions.

Unit of Measure 2: Number of faculty related instruments

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 4

Reason for result:

The Judicial Training Team has continually evaluated the instructors who teach the courses given at the Center. The Team meets with the instructors before the course is given to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. The Team works to make sure that the instructors fit the course material and the course audience. During a course, the participants give daily evaluations on the courses. A part of these evaluations relates to the faculty presentation of the material. At the end of the course, another final evaluation is given. This evaluation is dedicated to all aspects of the instructors' work. It covers such areas as presentation, instructor's knowledge, and the use of audio-visuals. The Team meets at the end of a course to evaluate the effectiveness of instructors with both the instructors and the course providers.

Unit of Measure 3: Number of participant related instruments

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 3

Reason for result:

The Judicial Training Team saw the importance of evaluating the participant as a component of a course. The course could be excellent, the instructors could be above par, but if the participants learn nothing, then the course fails. Therefore, the Team instituted the extensive use of pre- and post-course tests to monitor participants' increase in knowledge. The Team also asked the instructors to evaluate each participant and give these evaluations to the Team for incorporation in the participants' training plans. The Training Team has also instituted the use of videotaping participants to better understand what works and what does not.

Unit of Measure 4: Number of overall program instruments

Number planned for 1998: 2  
Number achieved in 1998: 2

Reason for result:

The Course Program has two overall evaluation tools that monitor its progress. The first is the continual Judicial Training Team involvement in every aspect of the Course Program. The Team never leaves the program to encounter challenges on its own. The Team plays a very active role in making sure that the courses are effective and workable.

The judges at the Center play the partner and second overall program evaluation tool. The Judicial Training Team has a good working relationship with the administration at the Center. With constant interaction at that level, the Center's administration can advise and give on the spot evaluations that can serve to make the program better. The

active participation of these two partners allows for a comprehensive and continual evaluation of courses given and courses being developed.

**List of Annexes:**

1. Results of the 1998 Lawyer's Survey
2. Lawyer's Survey Questionnaire
3. Data table summary of David Steelman's statistical analysis
4. Diagram of normal caseflow
5. Diagram of caseflow sent to the Experts
6. The list of judges who will be teaching the New Judge Orientation in the upcoming year
7. Evaluation Score Sheet for Technical and Cost Proposals
8. Evaluation sheet for an instructor to evaluate a participant
9. "Training of Trainers" evaluation packet including all evaluations
10. "Decision Making" evaluation packet including all evaluations
11. Indicator: Number of case management functions