

**WINNER PAPER OF THE
1999 JUSTICE ACHIEVEMENT AWARD
HONOURABLE MENTION**

**“THE FOUR JUSTICE MODELS:
ORGANISED CREATIVITY IN
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION”**

By Eric Tin Keng Seng
Singapore Subordinate Courts

The Justice Achievement Award was established in 1988 to recognise outstanding achievement and meritorious projects which enhance the administration of justice. Open to judiciaries worldwide, it is organised annually by the National Association for Court Management, with membership of more than 2,000 court management professionals from all levels and types of courts in the United States, Australia, Canada, and other countries.

Out of 25 project nominations, the Singapore Subordinate Courts' entry won the 1999 Justice Achievement Award Honourable Mention, making the Singapore Judiciary the only judiciary outside the US judiciaries to win one of the Honourable Mention this year. The Honourable Mention is for the project: *“The Four Justice Models: Organised Creativity In Judicial Administration”*.

This winning paper sets out the target groups under each justice model, the core work team involved, and outlined the significant justice initiatives under each justice model. Relevant literature on the justice initiatives was provided with the paper. The paper then concludes by an evaluation of the effects of the justice initiatives on the Singapore community.

THE FOUR JUSTICE MODELS: ORGANISED CREATIVITY IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

Eric Tin Keng Seng*

“The key question isn’t ‘what fosters creativity?’ But it is why in God’s name isn’t everyone creative? Where was the human potential lost? How was it crippled? I think therefore a good question might be not why do people create? But why do people not create or innovate? We have got to abandon that sense of amazement in the face of creativity, as if it were a miracle if anybody created anything.”

Abraham Maslow

I. Introduction

1. The Singapore Judiciary comprises the Supreme Court and the Subordinate Courts. The Subordinate Courts as constituted by statute consist of District Courts, Magistrate’s Courts, the Coroner’s Court, the Juvenile Court and the Small Claims Tribunals. 95 %¹ of all cases in Singapore are dealt with in these courts. The Subordinate Courts also handle a case profile much wider in range and scope than the Supreme Court. It is in these courts that the Rule of Law has practical meaning for most people. The high caseload and variety of case types therefore

* LLB (Hons) (NUS). The writer is a Magistrate for the Republic of Singapore, and a Deputy Registrar of the Singapore Subordinate Courts. This paper was submitted for nomination for the annual Justice Achievement Award, which is a competition open to judiciaries worldwide. The Justice Achievement Award was established in 1988 to recognise outstanding achievement and meritorious projects which enhance the administration of justice. The competition was organised by the National Association for Court Management (NACM), with membership of more than 2,000 court management professionals from all levels and types of courts in the United States, Australia, Canada, and other countries. Singapore Subordinate Courts was the only judiciary outside the American judiciaries which won an Honourable Mention this year. The Honourable Mention plaque for the Subordinate Courts was received by Mr Eric Tin at the 14th NACM annual conference in San Jose, California on 6 July 1999.

¹ All the statistics stated in this paper are provided by the Subordinate Courts’ Research and Statistics Unit.

necessitate these courts to be managed as well as, if not better than, a large multi-national corporation in terms of efficiency, productivity and quality of the justice deliverables. The critical difference, however, is that the courts, as an Organ of State, has a Constitutional function to discharge and is vested with properly defined statutory jurisdictions, duties and roles. The courts are a public institution and the repository of public trust and confidence. The administration of justice, which is the courts' core business, is non-delegable, non-negotiable and immutable.

2. Since 1992, significant developments have taken place in these courts, due largely to the visionary and dynamic leadership of The Honourable the Chief Justice Yong Pung How, and the innovative and able management of the Senior District Judge Richard Magnus. The initiation of annual operational workplans was a key element in the reorganisation of the Subordinate Courts. The inaugural workplan in 1992 successfully eradicated backlogs and delays that plagued the courts for decades. The next two workplans in 1993 and 1994 established case management and performance measurement. The 1995 workplan institutionalised a set of timeless core justice values to guide the courts in the administration of justice, while the 1996 workplan stressed on expedition and timeliness in justice delivery.
3. The 1997 workplan took on a strategic dimension: the envisioning of a world class judiciary. A Justice Statement, which encapsulates the mission statement, objectives and goals, timeless justice values and essential judicial principles of the Subordinate Courts, was endorsed and launched by judges of the Subordinate Courts as a framework of ideals for the realisation of the vision. The Justice Statement also broadly classifies the range and scope of work in these Courts into Four Justice Models: the Civil Justice model, Criminal Justice model, Juvenile Justice model, and Family Justice model. Within each of these justice models, various reform initiatives have been undertaken to fulfill the stated objectives and goals.
4. At the Opening of the Legal Year in January 1999, Chief Justice Yong concluded that the Subordinate Courts have realised their vision of becoming world class. In April 1999, the technical advisors of the Latin America and Caribbean Region of the World Bank recommended the Subordinate Courts as *“a useful modernisation experience for developing*

and developed countries pursuing judicial improvement programmes”². As this submission will show later, public trust and confidence in the Subordinate Courts’ administration of justice, both locally and internationally, is very high. This submission will examine how the definition of Four Justice Models has helped to creatively organised the Subordinate Courts’ justice initiatives effectively, thereby enhanced public access to justice and modernised the administration of justice in Singapore.

II. The Existing Process And Specific Problem

5. Before 1992, the Subordinate Courts moved at a relatively slow pace, where long waiting periods and delays were the norm. This was due largely to the accumulation of a huge backlog of cases over a few decades prior to Singapore’s independence in 1965. The inefficiencies in the justice system burdened the economic competitiveness of the nation, as swift and certain legal protection is a condition precedent to investor confidence in the nation. As Singapore rapidly developed into a regional and international commercial hub, the justice system had to keep pace with the swift transactional developments. At the same time, it was necessary to ensure that the local community maintains high levels of public trust and confidence in the justice system, which is integral to securing the observance of the rule of law, necessary for a democratic society.
6. Singapore has the common law judicial system. In main due to the legal tradition of an adversarial system of justice, the pace of legal proceedings was then dictated largely by counsel and litigants, and not by the courts. It was normal in the late 1980s, for trial dates to be given about one to two years in advance, as court calendars were loosely managed. In the Subordinate Courts, the waiting period for both criminal and civil cases was about two years in 1991. Accused persons can thus remain in remand for a not insignificant period of time. Those serving the Subordinate Courts were contented with minimal changes to the justice system and processes, and were in fact generally resistant to change. There was also lack of planning in the administration of the courts as well as in human and other material resource allocation. Very few justice initiatives were pioneered by the courts. Nor was there co-ordination in justice-related

² These comments were provided by Mr Waleed Malik, Public Sector Management Specialist (Latin America and Caribbean Region) of The World Bank.

programmes. To put simply, developments in the Subordinate Courts occurred in a haphazard manner with an uncoordinated pace until 1992.

7. Between 1992 to 1997, before the Four Justice Models were introduced along with the Justice Statement, although there were many justice initiatives under various workplans, they did not fit into any paradigm for better management and supervision. The Four Justice Models, each with different aims, are devised because experience has taught us that the adversarial system of adjudication is not necessarily suited to all circumstances. Different cases require different approaches. The initiation of annual workplans had also introduced modern concepts of management into the realm of judicial administration. The concept of the Four Justice Models, for instance, was consistent with the contemporary management philosophy of protecting stakeholders' or constituents' interests. Who are the courts' stakeholders and constituents? This brings us to the question of target group.

III. Target Group

8. The target group of a justice system must be the court users. This can be defined as those who come before the courts to seek protection, redress and remedies, as well as those who do not have a direct interest in the outcome of the case but whose participation in the administration of justice is relevant and necessary. Within the broad rubric of the Four Justice Models, having regard to the types of cases that enter the justice system, the courts deal with civil cases up to a certain monetary limit, most criminal cases save those prescribed by the law to be tried in the Supreme Court, all family-related cases and disputes, and all juvenile matters.
9. Under the Civil Justice model, the key court users are the counsel for the litigating parties, the litigants themselves, the witnesses, and members of the public. Under the Criminal Justice model, there is the accused person or offender, the defence counsel, the prosecuting and law enforcement agencies, the witnesses, and the victim of crime. For the Family Justice model, the principal users include estranged or divorcing couples, their children, their relatives and family support network, as well as representatives from welfare and voluntary agencies. Users in the Juvenile Justice model includes the delinquent juvenile, the parents and guardians of the juvenile, and the network of friends and support of the juvenile, the

prosecuting and law enforcement agencies, as well as voluntary and welfare bodies.

10. Having classified the target group, the initiatives under each justice model can then take into account the needs and expectations of each of these categories of court users. As the courts are also a public service provider, the court users are the courts' "clients", and their "customer satisfaction" in terms of the quality of justice dispensed and the level of court services provided, can be a litmus of the success of the justice system. But who within the judiciary should determine what are the justice initiatives that can best serve the court users? The answer lies in having an effective core work team.

IV. Work Team

11. The senior management of the Subordinate Courts, which includes the Senior District Judge, the senior judges, the Registrar, and the Principal Court Administrator, forms the core work team. The role of each team player will now be discussed.
12. The **Senior District Judge** is the Chief Executive Officer of the Subordinate Courts, and the overall project director for all the initiatives under the Four Justice Models. He is responsible for outlining the strategic vision for each of the workplan and specifying the structural, organisational, and procedural changes, setting operational goals, unit responsibilities, the action steps and time frames for goal implementation. In essence, he conceptualises the strategic plan of a longer time horizon. The strategic plan is then submitted for the approval of the Chief Justice, the Head of the Singapore Judiciary, before it is translated into operational workplan for implementation.
13. The **senior judges**, are the "Group Managers (operational)" of the Subordinate Courts. Under this Group Management scheme, first conceived in 1993 for more streamlined case management, these senior judge-managers are responsible for the distribution of cases to the judges within their groups and the monitoring of the progress of these cases. The senior judge-managers also serve as useful feedback channels on the caseload, case profile and general workload experienced by their respective groups. The data generated by the senior judges can be used to

plan suitable initiatives in anticipation of emerging problems and to proffer appropriate solutions for immediate problems.

14. The **Registrar** of the Subordinate Courts is the “Chief Operating Officer”, responsible for overseeing the actual and implementation of the various initiatives in the justice models. The Registrar is a legally trained administrator. He has to prepare and promulgate the plans by better defining the year’s operational goals, action steps, individual responsibilities, specific timeframes, and performance indicators. He then has to allocate tasks and communicate the specific plans to those assigned with them. Thereafter, he must periodically monitor the status of the assigned tasks, and provide directions for their completion whenever required.

15. The **Principal Director of Administration**, the Principal Court Administrator and not legally trained, supports the Senior District Judge and the Registrar by providing a non-legal perspective to the proposed initiatives. He doubles up as the Chief Financial Officer. He can advise on matters pertaining to the allocation of personnel and logistics resources, budgeting and financial considerations, for better delivery of the justice initiatives. In the Subordinate Courts, this office bearer is also designated the organisation’s “Chief Information Officer”, responsible for recommending how information technology can be strategically leveraged in the courts.

V. Project Details

16. Over the last seven years, many justice initiatives have been implemented and they can be classified under each of the Four Justice Models. For the purposes of this submission, only the more significant ones will be highlighted. Where appropriate, printed literature is provided to elaborate on the initiative to provide a more complete picture.

Civil Justice Model: Effective and Fair Dispute Resolution

“In civil justice, the aim is effective and fair dispute resolution. While the law provides a basic structure within which commerce and industry operate, the courts play a crucial role by maintaining this structure. Our civil justice system should have the following basic principles. It should be just in the results it delivers. It should be fair and be seen to be fair. Cases should be dealt with speedily. Procedures and cost should be proportionate

to the nature of the issues involved. It should be effective and responsive. There should be a varied menu of dispute resolution processes along with adjudication. This is to meet each litigant's individual needs by providing customised solutions to a diverse array of problems.”³

A. *Court-based Mediation*

Court-based mediation was first introduced in 1995 to provide an alternative means of dispute resolution for civil disputes in the Subordinate Courts. All civil cases currently undergo mediation by District Judges. Court-based mediation is provided in the form of settlement conferences before Settlement Judges before the civil cases proceed to trial. The service is provided free of charge. The Primary Dispute Resolution Centre (PDRC), where court-based mediation is carried out, also adopts a pre-action dispute “dissolution” process within an all-embracing dispute management framework. In addition, the PDRC is responsible for overseeing the various mediation schemes that interface with other justice models. The settlement rates of matters dealt with at the PDRC are very high. From 1995 to end 1998, of 11,446 cases mediated, 10,696 cases were settled by mediation, achieving a settlement rate of 93%. The use of court-based mediation has contributed significantly in the reduction of very high litigation costs, saving the parties considerable sums of money. It has also enabled the courtroom, and the judicial and support resources, to be allocated for other hearings and matters, ensuring the excellent waiting times for trials which actually proceed to trial.

B. *Mediation-Arbitration (Med-Arb)*

While the majority of cases continue through mediation, in a small proportion of cases, the parties are able to agree on substantially most of the issues but are unable to agree on the rest. To deal with these cases, Mediation-Arbitration was introduced in March 1997. Med-Arb is a dispute resolution process which combines some of the features of both mediation and arbitration. Most Med-Arb proceedings call for a third party to first mediate on as many issues as possible and then, by consent of the parties, to arbitrate those that remain. The Med-Arb proceedings are conducted by the District Judges and Magistrates. The benefits are that there is minimal legal costs

³ Keynote Address of Chief Justice Yong Pung How at the Introduction of the Subordinate Courts' Seventh Workplan 1997/1998.

involved, and the matter can be resolved within a shorter time. From 1998 to February 1999, a total of 72 cases were referred for Med-Arb and all of them were settled.

C. Differentiated Civil Case Management

Individual and group management of civil cases was first introduced in 1992 primarily to expedite the disposal of the backlog. When the backlog was cleared, a case management system to prevent creeping backlogs became necessary. Differentiated Case Management was accordingly introduced in 1995 and became fully operational by 1996. Time standards for the disposition of cases are set with reference to factors such as the number and complexity of issues involved. Different cases are assigned different management tracks based on the timeline concept of caseflow management. The system has contributed to the enhanced justice delivery standards, and has enabled waiting periods for trials to be reduced to two to three weeks from set down (ie. from the time the parties are ready for trial).

Criminal Justice Model: Protecting the Public

“As for the criminal justice system, its primary purpose is to prevent crime. We are committed to protecting the public from crime. It would be intolerable that anyone should have their lives blighted by the fear that they or a member of their family might become a victim of crime. For the guilty, justice must be swift, sure and severe. For the victim and the public, they must feel vindicated and safe. In the same vein, it is important for society and for individual victims that those who break the law are suitably punished. Wrongdoing must be adequately censured and deterred. If punishment is not imposed, or if it is generally perceived as too lenient, the victim will be left with a sense of injustice and grievance. Over time, public confidence will surely erode. Of course, this does not mean that we have neglected due process. Our criminal justice system combines the best of the due process and crime control models.”⁴

⁴ Keynote Address of Chief Justice Yong Pung How at the Introduction of the Subordinate Courts' Seventh Workplan 1997/1998.

A. *Night Courts*

The majority of cases dealt with by the Subordinate Courts are criminal cases and statutory offences. Some of the courts have been administratively designated special courts for better caseload management and for enhanced access to justice. For instance, there are the Night Courts, Centralised Sentencing Court, Traffic Court, Filter/Holding Court, and the Criminal Magistrate's and District Mentions Court. Night Courts were first introduced in 1991 to expedite the disposition of the high volume of departmental/regulatory summonses (these include summonses for traffic, environmental health, companies, and income tax matters). This makes it convenient for the offenders in these minor offences, who may otherwise have to apply for leave from work to attend court in the day. It also makes available the judges and court support staff to be deployed in the day to deal with the more serious cases. The courtrooms are also fully utilised for other hearings, both in the day and in the night. Two Night Courts have been operating every Monday to Friday between 6 pm to 9 pm. All District Judges and Magistrates from the Senior District Judge to the most junior magistrate are rostered to perform Night Court duties. They are not exempted from their daily judicial duties and receive no additional remuneration. These courts deal with an average of 100,000 cases each year, and have become an integral part of the Singapore justice landscape. The Night Court is an illustration that the Subordinate Courts function as a flexible organisation with flexible working hours to enhance the public's access to justice.

B. *Filter / Holding Court*

The Filter / Holding Court was established to ensure the optimal usage of judicial time and court resources. More cases than it can handle are fixed for hearing in this court. An average of ten to fifteen simple criminal cases and regulatory offences are fixed in this court for hearing every day. These cases are managed by the judge in the Filter Court, and cases which proceed to trial are heard by him and filtered to courts which become available due to "cracked-trials" (accused pleading guilty on the day or in the course of the trial). This has enabled more cases to be fixed for hearing early, and to be disposed of expeditiously.

C. *ATOMS*

In 1996, the Subordinate Courts commissioned the Automated Traffic Offence Management System (ATOMS). This enables traffic offenders to plead guilty electronically and pay the fines at the fifty ATOMS kiosks located islandwide which operate twenty-four hours a day. More such kiosks are being added islandwide. The guilty plea will be received and confirmed by a magistrate the next morning. Persons who wish to mitigate or claim trial will appear in court. Offenders may also use ATOMS to pay composition fines offered by the prosecuting department, prior to their requirement to appear in court. ATOMS operates as a “virtual court”. It is the first of its kind in the world where an offender may plead guilty by electronic means. From November 1996 to end 1998, a total of 14,096 persons pleaded guilty at ATOMS kiosks. ATOMS has enhanced access to justice for the public by allowing the offender to deal with the matter at anytime at a place most convenient to him. It has also resulted in decrease in the work volumes at the Night Courts and Traffic Court. In addition, It has reduced the judicial and support manpower, which would have been used to deal with these cases if the offenders had to appear in Court.

D. *Bail Video-Link Court*

The Bail Video-link Court, set up in 1996, enables accused persons to “appear” in court for subsequent mentions, pleas, and bail applications while they remain in the remand prison. During first mentions, the accused will still be physically produced in court. The Bail Video-link facility reduces the security risk and saves costs and time involved in transporting accused persons between the court and the remand prison. There are various procedural safeguards, such as a dedicated telephone line between the defence counsel in court and the accused in the remand facility, together with a facsimile machine and a live document camera, which ensure that the accused has total and confidential communication with his counsel. The remand facility is designed such that there is total privacy and confidentiality in the proceedings, and the prison wardens are kept out of the room when the proceedings take place. The accused has the option at any time to appear in person in court. If he decides to plead guilty, he will be produced in court. There are also legislative safeguards governing the use of the video-link process for the accused.

E. Witness Video-Link Court

The Witness Video-link Court, also established in 1996, is equipped with video-link facilities so that victims of sexual offences and child witnesses can testify in preliminary inquiries and trials from a remote location, without their physical presence in court. Such witnesses are seated in a private room, which need not be annexed to the court, and a counsellor will be on hand to assist if the need arises. This greatly reduces the trauma of the vulnerable witnesses who have to testify in public prosecutions of criminal cases. Volunteers from a Court Support Group also assist these vulnerable witnesses by providing them non-evidentiary practical and emotional preparation and support on an individual basis under a Vulnerable Witness Support Programme. This Programme and the Witness Video-link Court have together afforded greater protection to the vulnerable witnesses, hence enabling them to give evidence freely and independently.

Family Justice Model: Protecting Family Obligations

“In family justice, our commitment is towards protecting family obligations. The Family Court will have an integrated approach in terms of counselling, mediation and adjudication. It will continue to work with community resources, in partnership with social and community-based organisations whose focus are in primary and secondary prevention areas. This approach avoids overlap and duplication. Each focuses on what it does best. We have already seen the Family Court extend its services beyond addressing immediate legal issues. Through counselling and mediation, it has been able to promote post-separation dispute resolution, prevent unnecessary and costly litigation and protect children from the results of ongoing conflict and family dysfunction. Beyond this, major consequences of separation and re-parenting will also have to be addressed. This is because family life is never static. Preventive strategies to help the transition to new family forms and minimise the likelihood of further family breakdown will have to be devised.”⁵

⁵ Keynote Address of Chief Justice Yong Pung How at the Introduction of the Subordinate Courts' Seventh Workplan 1997/1998.

A. *FAMCARE Centre*

The Family Court provides counselling services for adults in divorce cases, for parents and children in custody and access matters, and for family members in family violence cases. The FAMCARE Centre is manned by clinically experienced counsellors with relevant training. The Centre has grown from a counselling service provider into an outreach agency that provides public education on issues relating to family disputes. The counsellors also provide advice on the drawing up of Parenting Plans, which will contain proposals of divorcing couples on arrangements covering child support payments, accommodation, custody and access, and guardianship issues. All services provided are free of charge.

B. *Family Protection Unit*

The Family Protection Unit was established to assist family violence victims and to provide a safe environment for those who use the Family Court's facilities. The Unit works with relevant service providers to provide a comprehensive package of referral services to the victims for counselling, emotional support, medical and police assistance and shelter homes. Hospitals also participate in a scheme where victims of family violence are examined and treated immediately in the hospitals, and medical reports are furnished to the courts within a very short time.

C. *Family Legal Clinics*

The courts have also arranged free Legal Clinics by volunteer lawyers. These services are provided free of charge two nights a week, at the Family Court's premises. The courts provide the necessary support and other staff for this programme.

D. *Family Medical Clinics*

The courts are working with volunteer doctors to provide immediate medical attention and medical reports in family violence cases. The medical clinics are to be established at the courts' premises. This programme will enable victims of family violence to have a one-stop facility at the Family Court's premises to be examined and have protection orders issued immediately.

E. Mediation Services

Mediation is provided free by the Family Court for divorce and ancillary matters, family violence matters, spousal and child support applications, with an aim to consensual, non-confrontational settlement of family-related disputes. This is a prime example of rendering value-added services with no cost. The results of mediation in these matters have been very encouraging. From 1 April 1996 to end 1998, the mediation and counselling services of the Family Court, which extend to evening after office hours, have resulted in 99.9% of divorce cases being uncontested. Only 13 cases or 0.13% cases were contested.

Juvenile Justice Model: Restorative Justice

“The complexity of juvenile crime today requires a multi-prong approach. It has to incorporate elements of deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation. A balance will have to be struck between the need for rehabilitation and accountability for the offending behaviour. Restorative justice seeks to achieve this. We recognise that we can never rely alone on laws and punishment to meet the challenge of juvenile crime. Preventive measures are needed just as much. Effective family support and control can help to keep our juveniles out of crime in the first place and equip them to lead a law-abiding life. Already, this is being done by Government through the Inter-Ministry Committee on Dysfunctional Families, Juvenile Delinquency and Drug Abuse. Similarly, on the Court’s part, there is a communitarian approach to the treatment of juvenile offenders. Through family conferencing, boot camps, peer group advisors, family care conferencing, we enlist the support and assistance of the community in reforming and rehabilitating the juvenile offender. We will build upon this approach through a blend of measures focusing not just on the offender but the victim and the community as well.”⁶

⁶ Keynote Address of Chief Justice Yong Pung How at the Introduction of the Subordinate Courts’ Seventh Workplan 1997/1998.

To deal with the changing profile of offences and offenders, the Juvenile Court has in place a blend of restorative programmes which incorporate corrective treatment, counselling, and instruction in useful skills, to rehabilitate and reform these juvenile offenders. The underlying philosophy under the Juvenile Justice model is to restore the juvenile back into society as a useful citizen and community member. Under this philosophy, a whole array of programmes is in place.

A. *Family Conferencing*

Family Conferencing, based on the theory of “reintegrative shaming” and developed jointly by the Juvenile Court and psychiatrists, allows the offender to meet with his family, peers, teachers and the victim to discuss his offending behaviour. The main objective of this exercise is to impress upon the young offender the gravity of his misconduct so that his “pangs of conscience” can move him to reform himself. At the same time, the offender is made to provide reparation compensation to the victim. The Juvenile Court introduced Family Conferencing in 1994 and it has since then been entrenched as a core programme. A 1996 in-house study showed that only two per cent of the offenders who underwent Family Conference have re-offended.

B. *Family Care Conferencing*

The Family Care Conferencing is also another integral component of the Juvenile Court programmes. Its philosophy is similar to that of the Family Conferencing except that this measure is targeted for those juveniles beyond parental control and who may or may not have committed criminal offences. The target groups are families where a poor adolescent-parent relationship is leading to parents being unable to exercise parental control over the juvenile.

C. *Youth Family Care Programme*

The Juvenile Court manages the Youth Family Care programme, where volunteer families are matched with young persons placed on probation or statutory supervision to act as positive role models for them and their families. These volunteer families meet the assigned young person to befriend and encourage him for as long as the probation or statutory supervision order subsists or until the court otherwise orders.

D. Peer Advisors Scheme

Under this programme, students sit in court proceedings and take part in Chambers discussions with the Juvenile Court judge before a sentence is passed. The aim of the programme is to give the Juvenile Court a contemporary peer group perspective of the offending behaviour, as well as to expose students and teachers to the juvenile justice process. The programme commenced in June 1997. The feedback on the scheme has been very favourable.

E. Peer Mediation

In the 1997/1998 Subordinate Courts' Workplan, The Honourable the Chief Justice introduced Peer Mediation as part of the preventive and restorative measures to meet the challenges of juvenile crime. Peer Mediation encourages the use of non-adversarial conflict resolution. This acts as an effective alternative to violence and other forms of anti-social behaviour. In the Peer Mediation programme, the students receive special training to enable them to act as third party mediators between two or more of their peers, who are embroiled in conflict and who want to resolve the dispute constructively. Peer Mediation will be implemented in all secondary schools.

F. Teen Development Programme

This is a sixteen-week Before and After School Care programme for youths at risk. It is managed by a Family Service Centre and targets youths residing in a particular geographical area. The Juvenile Court may impose a term of the probation order to require the juvenile to participate in this programme. This is a non-residential programme aimed at teaching perseverance, self-control, respect, truth and honesty. It also serves as a platform to counsel the juvenile and the family.

G. Pre-Complaint Counselling

The Juvenile Court has also successfully used community resources in intervening in families with children beyond parental control. Under the Pre-Complaint Counselling programme, the court refers such Complaints, when they are laid before the court, to the Family Service Centres.

VI. Evaluation

17. The conceptualisation and implementation of justice initiatives within the framework of justice models involve the setting of realisable short term goals that cumulatively lead to the fulfillment of a specific objective, and gradually building up to an achievable strategic vision. What is required as a first step, is for the senior management to identify the pressing problems that may impede organisational efficiency, which it must resolve before further developments. The involvement of senior management at an early stage is crucial as leadership is integral to the process of effecting and leading fundamental changes in a system. Once the immediate problems are identified, the senior management should map out a range of alternative solutions to the problems, having regard to its limited personnel and material resources as allocated by the State.
18. Once the immediate problems are eliminated, the senior management must then institutionalise the initiative to prevent the problems from recurring. If State resources alone are insufficient to meet the needs, the judiciary should consider tapping the richer community resources by forming court support or good-will volunteer groups. While judicial and legal culture differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, the commonality of all judicial systems is that their decisions and actions usually stem from larger problems within the community, and these decisions and actions, which usually reflect community values, ultimately have a bearing on the community. The principle of community involvement in the justice process therefore makes good sense, as the judiciary and the community, metaphorically speaking, live a symbiotic existence.
19. Having institutionalised a system that ensures efficiency and speed in the justice process, the senior management must then look to various performance indicators to test the efficacy and integrity of the initiative. The performance measurement tools must be able to assess the initiative objectively and critically. They include:
 - a. Independently commissioned public perception surveys on the community's level of trust and confidence in the administration of justice;
 - b. Random opinion polls by the users of the initiative under the specific justice model;

- c. Periodic review and audit of the initiative by experts and external consultants;
- d. In-house statistical and research analysis based on available data generated; and
- e. Monitoring of the overall ranking of the judiciary by international survey agencies, paying particular attention to the category which the judiciary has or has not performed well.

20. All the initiatives outlined above have been well received and fully institutionalised as part of the Singapore justice system. Information on these initiatives have been published in the Singapore Judiciary's annual reports and public information leaflets, mentioned at international judiciary gatherings and now accessible on the Subordinate Courts' website on the Internet. The next question is, are these initiatives transferable to or replicable in other jurisdictions?

VII. Transfer or Replication Characteristics

21. The paradigm of dividing the justice process into Four Justice Models for better management and co-ordination of justice efforts is not difficult to follow. Most of the concepts and methodology underlying the above initiatives are capable of replication. The operational details of implementation are of course subject to the extent of leadership in the judiciary concerned to implement the changes, and the degree of resources available for these purposes. The Singapore Subordinate Courts welcome the sharing of relevant information with jurisdictions that intend to pursue justice improvement programmes, and transfer their institutional knowledge through videolink sessions or direct study visits from overseas counterparts.

VIII. Additional Process Analysis

22. The strength of the Four Justice Models lies in its clearly defined approach to problem solving, and yet within each model provides sufficient flexibility to introduce the appropriate initiatives, tailored to the specific needs of the court users.

23. In the local context, a 1997 Survey on the Attitudes and Perception of the Judiciary in Singapore was conducted by ACNielsen-SRS Pte Ltd among the local business community. In 1998, the Survey on Public Attitudes and Perception of the Judiciary of Singapore (1998 Survey) was conducted by Forbes Research Pte Ltd on the public at large on their perception of the Judiciary. Both surveys have shown that the business community and the public have high confidence in the Singapore Judiciary in terms of fairness, access to justice and transparency of process. The effect on the community of the aforementioned initiatives can be summarised as follows:

Civil Justice Model

- The 1998 Survey, which interviewed 1,519 respondents from the community at large, shows that 95% of the respondents felt that the Civil Justice system has met their expectations in providing effective and fair dispute resolution. An opinion poll conducted in 1999 on 93 lawyers shows that 95% of them felt that the outcome of the case, whether positive or negative for their client, was arrived at fairly, while 92% indicated that their clients are satisfied that they have been dealt with fairly at the PDRC.

Criminal Justice Model

- The findings of the 1998 Survey shows that 99% of the respondents to the survey questionnaire felt safe in Singapore. Of these respondents, 96% felt that the Judiciary had contributed to their sense of security in Singapore. When asked on the effectiveness of sentences given by the Courts as a deterrent for other potential offenders, 93% felt that it was effective. The Criminal Justice system had met 98% of the respondents' expectations in protecting the public.

Family Justice Model

- The 1998 Survey shows that 94% of the respondents felt that the Family Justice system has met their expectations in protecting family obligations.

Juvenile Justice Model

- The 1998 Survey shows that 92% of the respondents felt that the Juvenile Justice system has met their expectations in restoring the juvenile.

IX. CONCLUSION

24. Finally, it is worthy of note that the International Institute for Management Development's World Competitiveness Yearbook 1998 ranked Singapore fourth in the World in respect of the confidence level of the international business community in the administration of justice in the society. In terms of legal framework, which includes the entire set of laws and the way they are administered and adjudicated by the Judiciary, Singapore was ranked first in the World for the second year running. In 1997, another international survey body, the Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, rated Singapore best in the region for the quality of the Judiciary, the legislature and the police. In 1998, the Singapore Judiciary is ranked top in Asia. These positive results only serve to illustrate that the Subordinate Courts are always committed to excellence through bold and innovative judicial reform measures. The Four Justice Models, which demonstrates organised creativity in judicial administration, is a prime example of this firm commitment.