



AN OVERVIEW of the Statistical Reporting Process

The obligation for Ohio trial and appellate courts to report caseload statistics to the Supreme Court of Ohio Case Management Section is established by Rule 37 of the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio.

The requirement to submit regular caseload reports is fixed upon each individual judge for the cases assigned to him or her. An exception to this requirement exists in multi-judge municipal and county courts where certain activities are permitted to occur in particular sessions of court in which cases are not assigned to individual judges, but instead are grouped by subject category and presided over by a rotation among the several judges of the court.

The reporting obligations established under Sup. R. 37 are as follows:

Court of Appeals

The presiding judge of each court of appeals district must submit quarterly a presiding judge report that describes the status of all cases pending in that district. In addition, each individual judge must submit quarterly an appellate judge report that provides further details on case terminations, as well as the cases assigned to the judge for authoring the district's opinions.

Courts of Common Pleas

Judges with responsibility over general, domestic relations, and juvenile subject-matter jurisdiction must submit monthly a report describing the number of new cases assigned to them, the number of cases pending at the beginning and end of the month, and the number of cases terminated for reporting purposes over the course of the month. If a judge is responsible for more than one category of subject-matter jurisdiction in his or her court, the judge must submit a report for each such category. For example, a judge with responsibility over domestic relations and juvenile cases must submit two reports: one for domestic relations cases and one for juvenile cases.

Judges with responsibility over probate matters must submit quarterly a report describing the number of cases filed and closed over the quarter, as well as additional statistics.

Municipal and County Courts

As noted above, an exception to the ordinary requirement for judges to submit regular reports of the cases assigned to them exists for multi-judge municipal and county courts. Notwithstanding that exception, all municipal and county court judges must submit monthly an individual judge report describing the number of new cases assigned to them, the number of cases pending at the beginning and end of the month, and the number of cases terminated for reporting purposes over the course of the month.

In addition to the individual judge report, each municipal and county court administrative judge must submit monthly a report including the work performed on felony and small claims cases (which are not individually assigned) and the work performed during particular sessions of court on all other case types.

General Notes Concerning Caseload Statistics

The caseload statistics reported to the Supreme Court are summary in nature and consist only of counts of cases. The Supreme Court does not collect lists of individual cases that constitute the counts reported.

The actual report forms and instructions are available on the Supreme Court website. The instructions include detailed information concerning the proper manner of classifying cases by type, how a “case” is defined and how to properly report incoming cases and terminations.

Regarding terminations, it is essential to understand that not all termination categories are dispositive in nature. Some termination categories simply render a case inactive for reporting purposes until such time as a condition in the case changes. An example is a criminal defendant who fails to appear for trial. The court, as long as it reasonably believes the defendant will not be apprehended in the immediate future, may terminate the case for reporting purposes. The court reactivates the case for reporting purposes at such time when that defendant is arrested. This aspect of counting terminations is important to bear in mind when evaluating a court’s case management performance against a time standard for disposing of cases.

Occasionally, a court will discover errors in its case counts following a physical case inventory or during an update to its case management system. Courts may submit amended reports at any time, and the changed data is entered into the Supreme Court’s caseload statistics system immediately. Accordingly, the caseload statistics reported in a particular static report, such as this document, may change in the future following such amendments.

In order to promote accurate and uniform statewide reporting, the staff of the Supreme Court Case Management Section conducts regular training for court staff responsible for preparing monthly and quarterly reports.

Describing Data Using Median and Mean

In this document, sets of data are sometimes described using means and medians. Mean and median are measures of central tendency, or what value is “typical” across a set of data. The mean is calculated by dividing the sum of the values in a set of data by the number of values in that set. The resulting value is commonly referred to as the “average.” The median is determined by sorting the values in a set of data from lowest to highest value and identifying the data point in the middle of the range. It is the midpoint of the data at which half the items are higher and half are lower (the 50th percentile). The median is a particularly useful measure of typicality because unlike the mean, medians are not subject to the skewing effect of outliers (data points at an extreme margin on the range of values).

Statewide Statistics, Population Data, and Change from Prior Editions

Except where noted in the body of this summary, all data shown are statewide figures. Population data are from the 2010 U.S. Census.

Unless noted otherwise, in this edition of the Ohio Courts Statistical

Summary, the caseloads of the courts are presented in terms of their total incoming caseloads for the various years shown. Total incoming caseloads consist of new filings as well as reactivated cases (which had been previously placed on inactive reporting status) and reopened cases (which had been previously closed). Prior editions used nearly exclusively the new filings metric. By presenting the data in terms of total incoming caseloads, a more complete picture of the workload imposed on Ohio’s courts can be depicted and analyzed.

General Notes Concerning Performance Measures

When analyzing the work of Ohio courts and judges, the Case Management Section regularly evaluates two key performance measures readily available using caseload statistics reported by the courts: clearance rates and overage rates. Both measures can be applied to a court’s overall docket, individual case types, or groups of case types. The clearance rates and overage rates presented in this report represent the courts’ monthly averages across the years shown. For example, if the municipal and county courts are reported as demonstrating in 2014 a 3-percent overage rate for a particular case type, that figure represents the average overage rate across each of the 12 months in the year.

Clearance Rate

This measure identifies how well a court keeps up with its incoming caseload. It is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Clearance Rate} = \frac{\text{Total number of outgoing cases}}{\text{Total number of incoming cases}}$$

Clearance rates can be calculated over any time period, as long as the incoming and outgoing values apply to that same time period. Using the monthly caseload statistical reports submitted by judges, the total number of outgoing cases is determined using the reported “Total Terminations” values. The ratio of outgoing cases to incoming cases (produced using the above formula) is ordinarily multiplied by 100 and expressed as percentage. The target is a clearance rate of 100 percent.

A clearance rate of 100 percent means a court terminated over a given time period exactly as many cases as it took in during that same time period. If a court’s clearance rate is regularly less than 100 percent over an extended period of time, the court will develop a backlog because the pace of incoming cases exceeds the pace of outgoing cases.

While valuable, clearance rates alone do not accurately depict a court’s success in moving its entire docket forward in a timely fashion. A court may regularly demonstrate a 100 percent or greater clearance rate while simultaneously keeping a sizable number of cases from being disposed of within applicable time standards. Accordingly, clearance rates should be viewed alongside a measure that gauges the extent to which a court’s caseload is pending beyond time standards, such as the overage rate.

Overage Rate

This measure identifies the extent to which a court's pending caseload lags past applicable time standards, or, is overage. The overage rate is a measure of the size of a court's backlog. It is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Overage Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of cases pending beyond time guidelines}}{\text{Total number of cases pending}}$$

Using the monthly caseload statistical reports submitted by judges, the total number of active cases pending for longer than the time guideline (the reported "Cases Pending Beyond Time Guideline" value) is divided by the total number of active cases pending (the reported "Pending End of Period" value). The result is multiplied by 100 and expressed as a percentage.

While the application of clearance rates and overage rates affords a reasonable view of a court's case management performance, the numbers provide an incomplete assessment. The National Center for State Courts developed a set of 10 core court performance measures, packaged into a set of practical tools named CourTools, that provide a balanced perspective on a court's overall performance. Developed through the input of a wide range of court professionals, they are designed to assist courts in laying a solid foundation for self-evaluation and in charting a course for future improvement. The Case Management Section provides CourTools training for court personnel.

Future Plans

The current configuration of case types and termination categories has remained largely unchanged for 20 years. Changes in the law, changes in society, and changes in the Supreme Court's capacity to collect, analyze, evaluate and report caseload statistics present an opportunity for a careful re-evaluation of the overall caseload statistics reporting process.

In 2011 the Supreme Court established the Advisory Committee on Case Management. The advisory committee is conducting an extensive review of the Supreme Court's entire caseload statistical reporting process, from the data elements collected to the manner in which that data is transformed and communicated back to the courts.

In 2013, the Supreme Court adopted changes to Sup.R. 37 that establishes a new requirement that appellate courts and trial courts submit their statistics to the Supreme Court in electronic format, as and when the technical foundation for each court and division reporting category is developed and made available to the courts. The Case Management Section of the Supreme Court, responsible for collecting statistics from Ohio's judiciary, began implementing this new data collection process, called eStats, in July 2014. Incorporated into eStats are downloadable reports to help courts better understand how they are performing.

As the Supreme Court continues to move forward in these areas, it will tap into the depth of knowledge and experience shared by the Ohio judiciary, court professionals, and justice system partners to fully explore the best means for advancing Ohio's use of caseload statistics.

2014 STRUCTURE OF THE OHIO JUDICIAL SYSTEM



