



How Hard is Your Tech Dollar Working? The Real Return on Your Investment

by

David Bilinsky, BSc, LLB, MBA

Chicago, Illinois

Thursday, April 20, 2006 –

8:30-9:30 am

So you've just heard about some legal software that is revolutionizing the practice of law and you want to learn more. The cost of the software is significant but the vendor explains how quickly you can recover your investment in the software and use it to turn a great profit. It almost sounds too good to be true. How can you be sure the vendor's ROI analysis works for you? These experts will explain the value of ROI analysis and provide useful techniques to help you measure technology ROI in a way that is meaningful to YOUR bottom line, minus the sales pitch spin.

Table of Contents:

How Hard is Your Tech Dollar Working? The Real Return on Your Investment ... 3

I. Introduction – Why calculate returns?..... 3

II. ROI – Definitions, Ways and Means 4

 A. Time Value of Money 4

 B. Net Present Value 4

 C. Net Present Value Example..... 6

 D. Payback:..... 7

 E. Discounted Payback: 8

 F. IRR (Internal Rate of Return) 8

 G. ROI (Return on Investment)..... 9

 H. Break-even Analysis 9

 I. Total Cost of Ownership..... 10

 J. Total Cost of Ownership Example 11

III. How can you measure ROI from a Case Management Product..... 14

 A. Personal ROI:..... 14

 B. Time-recording return:..... 16

 C. Telephone answering return: 17

 D. Document Assembly return: 18

 E. The Library Return: 19

 F. Bookkeeping Return:..... 19

IV. Conclusion 20

V. Bio 21

How Hard is Your Tech Dollar Working? The Real Return on Your Investment

I. Introduction – Why calculate returns?

Today just prior to starting to write this paper, I read online how Bombardier just cancelled their development of the "C" class 110-130 seat commuter commercial airliner. The stated reason was that they could not engineer the plane so that it would offer operational savings that were significant enough to appeal to the airlines. The problem is that the number of seats had to be increased to near 130 to offer a proper cost per seat mile return, and that placed the airplane into full competition with smaller planes produced by Boeing and Airbus. They could not make the plane make enough money when it only had 100 seats. The significant part of this story is that the plane (and its engines) never left the drawing board!

Most lawyers purchase software with the expectation that it will fit their practice and allow them to work better, faster or cheaper. Oftentimes this is the underlying sales pitch that was held out by the developers to entice you to purchase the product. To be fair, in many cases the implementation of the product probably does lead to productivity gains, particularly where the law firm is attentive to training issues, to the inevitable learning curve and disruption that is bound to occur in any change process and focuses on the eventual longer-term benefits.

However, I am of the opinion that anecdotal or seat-of-the-pants evidence of positive benefits arising from software implementation in a law firm is simply not good enough. Lawyers have been treating the practice of law as a business for some time now, and most businesses (particularly if they wish to become larger ones) are steadfast in demanding hard demonstrable returns in any investment that they make – whether that investment is in technology, in marketing or in

human resources. Accordingly the purpose of this paper is to explain ROI analysis and start showing how law firm managing partners, administrators, practice group leaders and IT staff can forecast potential benefits prior to, as well as measure demonstrate quantitative returns after, investing in technology, to supplement the typical qualitative feedback.

II. ROI – Definitions, Ways and Means

ROI – Return on Investment, is one financial method for determining the return on your investment dollar. ROI is also a 'catch phrase' that means the process of using any number of financial tools to measure an investment. In this section we explore different definitions and ways of determining a financial payback or return on your investment in technology.

A. *Time Value of Money*

The time value of money is based on the fact that a dollar today is worth more than a dollar tomorrow...or next year. In other words, the longer you must wait for a financial return, the larger that return must be to make the wait worthwhile.

B. *Net Present Value*

NPV is the total of the expected cash flows in current dollars (adjusted for the time-value of money by using a future discount rate for cash flows over 1 year away) from a capital investment. The discount rate is your risk-free return and allows you to see the additional return you receive in your investment as compared to the 'risk-free' return. For example, let us assume that you take \$100 today and invest it in a project so that it pays off \$125 in one year's time. Is that investment worthwhile? Assume that your discount rate – the amount that you could have earned by putting that money into a Treasury Bill - was 7%. We have:

Future Value = \$125

R = .07 (the risk-free return)

$C_1 = 100$ (the original investment)

PV is the Present Value of your investment (in this case the present-day value of FV)

NPV = PV – required investment.

What is your PV? You have to take your future value and discount it for the fact that if you had put the \$100 into T-Bills, they would be worth \$107 one year from now. The formula for PV is as follows:

$PV = [C_1 / (1 + r)^n]$ where n is the number of compounding periods

In our case, the PV = $125 / (1.07) = \$116.82$ (since n =1)

Your NPV = PV – required investment

NPV = $116.82 - 100 = \$16.82$.

This investment results in a positive net increase of \$16.82 in terms of today's dollars (this is your Net Present Value of your investment).

So why do a NPV analysis? If you have alternatives in which you can invest, particularly if these investments pay off over different time periods, you need a method to be able to compare apples to apples – and NPV is it. It brings all investments back to today's dollars – and makes the choice of choosing between different investments easy – you simply choose the one with the greatest NPV!

C. Net Present Value Example

So let us return to our technology investment for the firm. The first step in any ROI type analysis is to estimate the future cash flows resulting from a capital investment. This takes us to the net profit per file. Assume that you have a technology investment that will decrease the cost of a certain type of file by \$50/file (such as a document automation project) (or, to put this positively, it results in an increase of the profit on the file by \$50). You handle 100 such files/year. The expected cash flow from this investment in each year would be +\$5000.

Recall that Net Present Value (NPV) = PV – required investment.

$$\text{NPV} = [C_1 / (1 + r)^n] - C_0$$

If the investment results in payments over several periods, we must sum the discounted cash flows resulting from those periods. Here is the formula for determining the NPV from cash flows over several time periods t.

$$\text{NPV} = C_0 + \text{PV} = C_0 + \sum [C_t / (1 + r_t)^t]$$

In our example, the capital investment would be \$7,500 (software, hardware, training and implementation). Let us assume that this project would be expected to produce cash flows for 5 years and the firm's discount rate is 10% (the risk-free return). Accordingly, your NPV would be as follows:

$$\text{NPV} = -7500 + [5000/(1.1)] + [5000/(1.1)^2] + [5000/(1.1)^3] + [5000/(1.1)^4] + [5000/(1.1)^5]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NPV} &= -7500 + 4545.45 + 4123.23 + 3756.57 + 3415.07 + 3104.61 \\ &= \$11,459.93 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the document automation project results in a net positive return of \$11,459.93 over the 5-year period, in today's dollars. Assuming there are no other competing investments, the firm should make the investment as there is a positive net return to the firm resulting from the investment.

Now let us look at other competing methods of looking at the financial return from an investment.

D. Payback:

Payback is looking at how long it takes for a firm to recover their investment in any project. Usually there is some cutoff date or horizon (say 6 months or 5 years) within which the investment cost must be recovered to make the investment worthwhile.

Using our NPV example above, let us calculate the payback period, where C_1 is the cash return the first year after the investment and so on:

Year	C_0	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	Total:
0	-7500						-7500
1	-7500	5000					-2500
2	-7500	5000	5000				2500
3	-7500	5000	5000	5000			7500
4	-7500	5000	5000	5000	5000		12500
5	-7500	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	17500

The payback period is 2 years. However, there are a number of problems with payback – first, it gives equal weight to all cash flows in all periods – there is no adjustment for the time value of money. Two, all cash flows after the cutoff period are ignored. In our example, if the cutoff period was one year, this project would be rejected notwithstanding that it produces an overall net gain to the firm.

E. Discounted Payback:

Discounted payback takes into account the future cash flows taking into account the time value of money. It still has the difficulties of not including any cash flows after the cutoff period, but it is an improvement over a straight payback calculation. Here in our table we have discounted the cash flows from future years in order that the table reflects net present values:

Year	C ₀	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃	C ₄	C ₅	Total:
0	-7500						-7500
1	-7500	4545.45					-2954.55
2	-7500	4545.45	4132.23				1177.68
3	-7500	4545.45	4132.23	3756.57			4934.25
4	-7500	4545.45	4132.23	3756.57	3415.07		8349.32
5	-7500	4545.45	4132.23	3756.57	3415.07	3104.61	11453.93

Here the payback period is still 2 years but at least you have a better insight into the future cash flows resulting from the investment.

F. IRR (Internal Rate of Return)

Calculating the Internal Rate of Return requires finding the discount rate that makes the NPV = 0 for a project. The capital investment decision can be expressed as follows: accept an investment project if the IRR is greater than the opportunity cost of capital. The opportunity cost of capital is the rate of return that could be obtained by simply investing in financial securities. The idea of IRR is to see if you are making any money from your investment as compared to simply placing the money in the bank.

There are difficulties associated with IRR. Without going into details, IRR can be inaccurate if the NPV of the project does not decline smoothly with the discount rate (i.e. the future cash flows are not consistent). It can also be inaccurate to rank projects of different scale or in projects that offer different patterns of cash flow over time. It is suggested that for law firms, NPV will give a more accurate measure as compared to calculating IRR.

G. *ROI (Return on Investment)*

While ROI has become the 'term of art' in financial circles when it comes to determining if you have received a return on your investment, it is really the wrong term when it comes to determining a return on your technology investment and analysis – I would prefer to do an NPV analysis to get at the present-value dollar benefit of an investment. ROI analysis provides you (by using the usual formula) the average annual income before depreciation / original cost. It does not factor in the time value of money and as such is inferior to NPV analysis. It is really used to evaluate financial securities and is not a capital budgeting tool. However, if you understand ROI to represent the *process* of going about and determining the financial viability of undertaking a capital investment – fine. Just don't confuse it with the tool that stock analysts use. And learn to use NPV instead!

H. *Break-even Analysis*

This method takes the revenues and costs of a project under different assumptions about sales. In other words, it asks the question of how bad "sales" can be before the project loses money. It uses present value analysis to value the inflows and outflows.

In our example, we would have to sort out the variable costs (the costs that depend on the change in the number of clients served) and the fixed costs (overhead) and seek to determine the level of clients that must be served to have the project break-even.

Let's go back to our document automation example. We stated that the project increased profit by reducing costs by \$50/file. Let us break this down further and assume that those costs are \$30 (overhead) and \$20 (variable).

Unit Sales	Revenues	Initial Investment	Variable Costs	Fixed Costs	Total
0	0	-7500	0	-300	-7800
50	5000	-7500	-1000	-300	-3800
100	10000	-7500	-2000	-300	200

In this analysis, break-even is somewhere around 97 units.

I. Total Cost of Ownership

TCO – or Total cost of Ownership – is a measure of all the costs, direct and indirect, associated with the life cycle of an asset, from acquisition all the way to disposal. It can be useful in a number of circumstances, for example in comparing which printer or copier to purchase (by looking at not only the initial capital costs but also by factoring in the consumables such as toner and ink over the expected life cycle and determining the actual cost per page for the equipment) all the way to determining whether to switch from a 'fat client' or full PC based computing to a 'thin client' or stripped-down, centrally-managed computing structure, or switching to a different operating system or word processing platform (by factoring in all the expected direct and indirect costs of the different options).

J. Total Cost of Ownership Example

Let us take two examples of a TCO analysis. The first is the comparison of a ink-jet printer vs. a laser printer. We will compare the:

HP Officejet 5610 All-in-One Printer, Copier, Scanner, Fax which is currently listed on Amazon.com for \$149.99, which is rated for service and reliability for 13+ years by PC Magazine, with the HP LaserJet 9050dn which is listed on Amazon.com for \$3,833.87. The 9050 is a heavy-duty workhorse and is rated for a monthly duty cycle of 300,000 pages, while the 5610 is rated for a monthly volume of 1,500 pages.

The 5610 will print in color, but for this analysis we will stick to B&W printing only. A black cartridge is \$19.99 (HP56 – 19 ml) and has a stated yield of 450 pages. This yields a cost per page for ink only of 0.044333.

The 9050 will only print in B&W and HP says the print cartridge is good for 30,000 pages and costs \$188.81. This yields a cost per page for toner only of 0.006294.

Which unit is the better choice? Let us test this under three assumptions:

Scenario #1 – 500 pages/month for 10 years (about 23 pages/day)

HP 5610:

Initial capital cost for the 5610: \$149.99.

Total paper throughput: $500 \times 12 \times 10 = 60,000$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $60,000 / 450 = 134$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $134 \times \$19.99 = \$2,678.66$

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$149.99 + \$2,678.66 = \$2,828.65$

HP 9050:

Initial capital cost for the 9050: \$3,833.87

Total paper throughput: $500 \times 12 \times 10 = 60,000$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $60,000 / 30,000 = 2$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $2 \times \$188.81 = \377.62

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$3,833.87 + \$377.62 = \$4,211.49$

In this scenario, it is cost-effective to purchase the HP 5610

Scenario #2 – 806 pages/month for 10 years (about 37 pages/day)

HP 5610:

Initial capital cost for the 5610: \$149.99.

Total paper throughput: $806 \times 12 \times 10 = 96,720$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $96,720 / 450 = 215$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $215 \times \$19.99 = \$4,297.85$

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$149.99 + \$4,297.85 = \$4,447.84$

HP 9050:

Initial capital cost for the 9050: \$3,833.87

Total paper throughput: $806 \times 12 \times 10 = 96,720$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $96,720 / 30,000 = 4$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $4 \times \$188.81 = \755.24

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$3,833.87 + \$1,132.86 = \$4,589.11$

In this scenario, the 5610 and the 9050 are about the same TCO.

Scenario #3 – 5000 pages/month for 10 years (about 226 pages/day)

HP 5610:

Initial capital cost for the 5610: \$149.99.

Total paper throughput: $5000 \times 12 \times 10 = 600,000$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $600,000 / 450 = 1334$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $1334 \times \$19.99 = \$26,666.66$

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$149.99 + \$26,666.66 = \$26,816.65$

HP 9050:

Initial capital cost for the 9050: $\$3,833.87$

Total paper throughput: $5000 \times 12 \times 10 = 600,000$ pages

Number of ink cartridges needed: $600,000 / 30,000 = 20$ cartridges

Cost of cartridges: $20 \times \$188.81 = \$3,776.20$

Total Cost of Ownership: $\$3,833.87 + \$3,776.20 = \$7,610.07$

Obviously, the HP 9050 is much more cost-effective under these assumptions.

There are some things that are not captured by TCO analysis. For one, this is a long-term analysis – if your business involves frequent changes to adapt to changing conditions, then other considerations such as aligning your technology with your need for frequent change may outweigh a long-term TCO analysis. For example, it hardly seems worthwhile to invest in an expensive telephony system if you foresee a significant probability that you may be either merging with another firm or growing dramatically in size, unless the telephony solution also allows for expansion or resale.

In our example, we didn't build in administration time, IT support, anticipated downtime, training, lost opportunity costs (where someone assumes an unofficial support role for the technology but their real duties lie elsewhere) etc. A rigorous TCO analysis will seek to explore these hidden costs and build them into the calculations.

The usefulness of TCO, aside from driving down through the 'first' cost of a piece of technology to the real cost including the consumables involved in its operation, is to flush out all 'hidden' costs and allowing all concerned to gain an appreciation

of how costs can be impacted at different levels in the organization – from administration, to IT, HR and the actual users of the asset.

III. How can you measure ROI from a Case Management Product

OK, so how can you start determining ROI for a case management product? In the following scenarios, I am focusing on a single lawyer who bills out at a nominal \$250 hour who implements case or practice management software as part of a firm-wide effort. Let us look at different ways of measuring ROI for this lawyer:

A. *Personal ROI:*

Some firms do not track billable time of their lawyers. There are various reasons put forward – here are the three most common ones I run into:

- (1) "We work on a contingency file basis so the hours put into the file don't matter",
- (2) "All that counts is the amount that you bring in every month anyway", and
- (3) "Tracking billable hours just takes away from the time that I can put into files"

I suspect that these really boil down to: "I don't want to be bothered". This is just fine so long as you realize that trying to improve a lawyer's financial performance¹ really comes down to two measures:

¹ There are other ways to improve the financial performance of a firm or a practice group. But this example looks at bringing these measures down to the level of an individual lawyer. There is a third measure – that involves measuring profitability, but that requires internal file costing measures that in my experience have not as yet been widely adopted by law firms.

- (1) Effective hourly rate (EHR), and
- (2) Total billings.

Here's why. Measure your effective hourly rate on a file by taking your fees billed and dividing it by the total hours put into a client's file (NOT the fees billed but rather all time, billed or not). When you measure the EHR for all your files and rank order the results from largest to smallest, you can see which clients and files generate high \$\$ for the same effort and which are low contributors. This is a quality indicator – indicating which files and clients are high-value clients.

Now take total billings for a lawyer by file by month – this is a quantity indicator – and the usual metric used by lawyers. When you look at total billings, you have an indication of which files generate large bottom line results.

Now – to work smarter and not harder – concentrate on your clients who are at the top of the list for both EHR *and* total billings.

How can practice management software help you here?

Practice management software can track all your time – and provide you with an accumulated total of time by timekeeper and by file. Provided that you have all your timekeepers logging all their time on their files, you can determine the EHR for all files. Your accounting software should be able to provide you with total billings by lawyer by month, broken down on a file by file basis. Now you are equipped to determine the files and clients that generate an EHR that is higher than your nominal hourly billing rate and which also generate high volume billings – guaranteeing that your ROI on your own time is as high as possible.

Let's take an example. If your EHR is \$225/ hour and your nominal billing rate is \$250/hour and you bill out an average of 5.5 billable hours/day, your baseline billings are:

$5.5 \times 225 \times 231$ (average number of workdays/year) = \$285,862.50.

Let us assume that after implementing practice management software and conducting the kind of analysis discussed above, that your EHR now goes to \$275/hour. Your baseline billings are now:

$5.5 \times 275 \times 231 = \$349,387.50$, an increase of \$63,525.00.

Let us assume that the investment for the case management software was \$5000 and that it took a further \$1000 in time and resources to do the EHR study. This indicates that your investment was \$6000 to achieve these results.

Your one-year ROI on this investment is:

$(63,525 - 6000) / 5000 * 100 = 959\%$! Obviously results vary and this is a hypothetical example – but it demonstrates that the potential returns from a low-cost product such as practice management software can be very large.

B. Time-recording return:

OK, you have just poured \$X into acquiring a Practice Management product. How can you measure your ROI on this investment? Let us assume that your costs are \$5000 per timekeeper for acquisition, implementation and training for the product. Let us also assume that you have implemented timekeeping using the Practice Management product and that all other office functions remain the same as before the implementation of the practice management product. Let us also assume that as a result of making the recording of billable time easier (concurrent with task completion), that all timekeepers will record an average increase of .2 billable hours/day (that is that they are not working any harder, but that the software has allowed for the capture of more billable time). Let us also

assume that your average billable rate is \$250/hour. Your increase in billings for each timekeeper is $.2 \times 250 \times 231$ billable days/year = \$11,550.00. Your one-year ROI² on the practice management product from just the increase in time recording assuming a 10% discount rate is 110% ($=[(11550/1.1)-5000]/5000$).

C. Telephone answering return:

One of the biggest factors for me in using Amicus Attorney is the ability to record all my communications – fax, email, telephone – directly in the CommCenter module of Amicus Attorney. In this way, I can reference all communications on a file directly in Amicus Attorney (usually while making small talk with the caller while I click and call up a file in Amicus Attorney) and avoid having to go on a hunt and search about the office looking for a file in order to talk intelligently to a client or lawyer about a file. Let us assume that you spend an average of .5 of an hour/day going out of your office and looking for files in order to return a telephone call. Let us also assume that this .5 hour is not 'billable' since you are not actually doing any work for the client during these searches. What is your ROI on this savings? Again, let us assume that your billable hourly rate is \$250 and you work an average of 231 billable days/year.

Your increased billable time is $.5 \times 250 \times 231 = \$28,875$ / year just by avoiding the search for files!

Let us assume that the firm had to undergo substantial hardware, software and training costs of \$5000 per timekeeper (computers, network upgrades, software purchases etc) to implement the practice management product. Your payback period from acquiring the software is still $5000/28875 \times 365 = 64$ days when considering the effect on the increase of your EHR.

² A true ROI would try to measure the total net present value of the benefits of the technology over time divided by the investment, expressed as a percentage. Here for ease of calculation, we are ignoring all benefits aside from the first year following implementation. However, over 10 years, the ROI of this investment would be close to 7000%.

D. Document Assembly return:

Every law firm needs to produce documents – from retainer agreements and letters to documents related to their area of practice. There is a cost associated with the production of every document. Let us take a retainer agreement as an example. A lawyer would meet with a client and dictate a memo to his/her secretary to produce a retainer agreement and covering letter for a client. Then the lawyer would review the documents before mailing. Lawyer's time; .2 /hr minimum. The secretary would produce the required documents and forwards them to the lawyer for review and mail them to the client. Secretarial time: .3 minimum. Let us assume that the lawyer bills out at \$250/hr and the secretary is valued at \$45/hr. Total time to produce and mail the retainer agreement and letter is: $.2 \times 250 + .3 \times 45 = \63.50 . Now let us assume that the lawyer is on a contingency agreement – where this cost comes out of the lawyer's pocket rather than the client's.

Now let us assume that the lawyer uses Amicus Attorney or another practice management product with document assembly capabilities. In the initial meeting with the client, the lawyer determines that they will take on the client. The client's co-ordinates (ie contact information) has already been taken by a secretary and input into Amicus to make the initial appointment and determine if there is a potential conflict with the client. Accordingly, the lawyer goes to Amicus, clicks on 'generate a document' and selects a retainer agreement and covering letter – and less than .1/hour later, Amicus Attorney merges the client co-ordinate information into the retainer and covering letter precedent and out pops the documents onto the printer. Time saved: $.1 \times 250 + .3 \times 45 = \38.50 . Now considering that a personal injury lawyer will open approximately 200 files/year, the total savings to the firm are: $\$38.50 \times 200 = \$7,700.00$. ROI from implementing automatic *simple* document assembly: $(7,700 - 5000)/5000 * 100 = 54\%$.

E. The Library Return:

Amicus Attorney has a simple knowledge management module called the library. This module allows you to store away quick knowledge bites of information that you are required to know in order to practice competently, but which change and you need to keep on top of the latest information. Again, this is a module that I have come to use over and over again to answer such questions as "How can an affidavit be sworn outside of the jurisdiction for use in our state courts?" or "What are the limitation periods for different types of claims?".

Assume for the moment that you would spend at least .3/hour finding the answers to these types of questions at least 3 times/week. Let us also assume that you would spend .1 hour to create the answer in The Library for approximately 200 different questions.

Your investment to create these answers would be $200 \times .1 \times 250/\text{hr} = \5000 (to take your answers and enter them into The Library). Now let us assume that the time saved in referencing these questions and answers would be $3 \times .3 \times 50 \times 250 = \$11,250$.

Your one-year ROI on this aspect would be $(11,250 - 5000)/5000 \times 100 = 125\%$.

F. Bookkeeping Return:

What we have been doing is calculating some straightforward ROI numbers on different aspects of the investment into the case management product. This analysis has only gone into the simple returns on investment arising from the immediate implementation of practice management. There are many others – such as integrating your accounting system with your practice management product – thereby allowing you to 'post' your time and billing data directly into your accounting system. Most firms employ at least a part-time bookkeeper to do the postings. Assume that time and billing entries take 40% of their time and they

are paid \$35/hour with benefits (most good bookkeepers I know charge in this range) and that they come in 2 days/week. Your savings by implementing this aspect of practice management would be $8 \text{ hours} \times 2 \text{ days} \times .4 \times 35 \times 52 = \$11,648$. Again, your ROI would be:

$$(11,648 - 5000) \div 5000 = 133\%.$$

IV. Conclusion

There are several methods to determine if you are receiving a positive return on your technology investment. You can use Payback, Discounted Payback, ROI, Net Present Value or Total Cost of Ownership, among others. However, these tools should be used appropriately, and in particular should not distract from the original reason for adopting technology – and that is to implement your strategic business plan and build a bridge from today to your future.

Creating the agreement between your underlying strategy and the technology is always the first priority. Once you have your strategy and goals clearly in mind, then you can turn to ROI and similar tools to ensure that you select the best tool from an operational perspective (tactics). But as any general will tell you, the best tactics in the world are no substitute for having a proper strategic plan. ROI and other tools will not allow you to select the best strategy for your firm. It could be that you should be looking at developing new practice areas, in closing remote offices, in expanding your litigation practice into products liability contingency fee matter etc...the best ROI analysis will not assist you in these 'big picture' questions. However, once your strategic goals are selected, then ROI will assist you in determining whether you have selected the best technology for the job and that you are receiving the best return that you could from your investment.

V. Bio

Dave Bilinsky (daveb@lsbc.org)



David J. Bilinsky is the Practice Management Advisor and staff lawyer for the Law Society of British Columbia. He combines his law, math/computer science degrees and subsequent MBA in focusing on practice management issues emphasizing strategic planning, finance, productivity and career satisfaction issues for lawyers.

Dave is a prolific writer on practice management and has written for many publications including Law Office Computing, ABA's GP-Solo Magazine, The Journal of Legal Marketing, Law Practice Magazine, the Canadian Bar Association's The National Magazine and others. He is a regular columnist for the CBA (PracticeTalk), the TLABC (Technology), the LSBC (Practice Tips) and The Lawyers Weekly (Focus on Technology). Laura Calloway and Dave Bilinsky are the authors of the Profitability column in Law Practice Magazine.

Dave is the author of Amicus Attorney in One Hour for Lawyers (ABA) and he has contributed to several books including Barristers & Solicitors in Practice (Butterworths), Flying Solo, a Survival Guide for the Solo Lawyer, 3rd & 4th editions (ABA), Law Office Procedures Manual for Solos and Small Firms, 2nd & 3rd editions (ABA), Managing Your Law Firm (CLE-BC), Annual Review of Law and Practice (1998-2003) (CLE-BC). He is a contributing author and past member of the Editorial Advisory Board for Law Technology News, published by American Lawyer Media Inc and a current Editorial Board member and Finance Editor for Law Practice Management Magazine, published by the ABA.

Dave is a Fellow of the College of Law Practice Management and the immediate past Finance Chair of the Law Practice Management Section of the ABA. Dave is a past Co-Chair of ABA TECHSHOW, the founder and current chair of the Pacific Legal Technology Conference, a member of the Technology For Lawyers Conference Advisory Board and a member of three advisory boards for ABA TECHSHOW 2006. Dave is an international lecturer in legal technology, having presented in China, across the US and Canada (including the Yukon) and over the Internet for such organizations as the All-China Lawyers' Association, the American Bar Association (ABA), LEGALTECH (Toronto, NYC and LA), the Canadian Bar Association (Nationally, BC, Alberta and Ontario), Colorado Bar Association, Canadian Corporate Counsel Association, the Continuing Legal Educational Society of British Columbia, District of Columbia Bar, the Ontario Bar Association, SKLESI, the Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia, the Washington State Bar Association, and others.

© 2006 David J. Bilinsky.