



LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

CLIA Committee Meeting | October 19, 2015 | Agenda
Aspen Room, Little America, Flagstaff

2:15 – New Member Orientation

2:45

- 1) History/Purpose
- 2) Programs
- 3) Expectations
- 4) Strategic Agenda
- 5) List of Acronyms

Kent
Handouts:
New Member
Binder

3:00 Call to Order & Administrative Business

Welcome and Introductions

- 1) Welcome to New CLIA Members
 - a. Hon Thomas Robinson
 - b. Valerie Winters
 - c. Steve Ramsbacher
- 2) Proxies (if any)

Review of Minutes: June 25, 2015 meeting

- 1) Changes, corrections, questions
- 2) Motion to approve

Notes from the Chair

Kent

Handouts:
-Minutes for June
25, 2015
meeting

3:15 ESD/Staff Updates

- 1) ACS, ACM & ACE Program Updates
 - a. Active Membership as of 10-1-15
- 2) Curriculum revision: ACS-HR Management
- 3) Programs Completed – Evaluations
 - a. ACS – Transition to Role of Supervisor webinar, July 7, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 15 participants, 4.66 overall rating.
 - b. ASC – Supervisory Ethics webinar, July 9, 2015, Faculty: Tony Cornay, 7 participants, 4.83 overall rating.
 - c. ACE – Court Community Communication, July 15-17, 2015, Faculty: Aaron Nash, Shelly Bacon, 24 participants, 4.32 overall rating.
 - d. ACM – Court Performance Standards-CourTools, August 12-14, 2015, Faculty: Don Jacobson, Amy Wood, Christie Weigand, 37 participants. 4.46 overall rating.
 - e. ACS – Transition to Role of Supervisor, August 20, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 12 participants, 4.77 overall rating.
 - f. ACE – AZ Plus Capstone, August 25-26, Faculty: Kent Batty, Don Jacobson, Dennis Gauthier, Karen Westover, 37 participants, 4.39 overall rating.
 - g. ACS – Supervisor’s Role in Effective Caseload Management, September 2, 2015, Faculty: Summer Dalton, Josh Halversen, 21 participants. 4.67 overall rating
 - h. ACS – Human Resources Management, September 3, 2015, Faculty: Tony Olivier, Jodi Kellerhals, 27 participants, 4.48

Kent

Tony

Handouts:
Program
Evaluations

New Faculty:
Christie Weigand

	overall rating	
	i. ACS – Transition to Role of Supervisor webinar, September 22, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 8 participants, 4.85 overall rating	New Faculty: Jodi Kellerhals
	j. ACS – Supervisory Ethics webinar, September 22, 2015, Faculty: Renu Sapra, 18 participants, 4.85 overall rating	
	k. ACE – High Performance Court Framework, September 30-October 2, Faculty: Don Jacobson, Hon. Roxanne Song Ong, 32 participants, 4.71 overall rating.	
4)	Upcoming Programs	
	a. Court Leadership Conference, October 20 & 21, Flagstaff, by invitation only.	
	b. ACM – Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts, November 17-19, 2015, Faculty: Hon. Louraine Arkfeld, ret., Kent Batty, Gabe Goltz, enrollment by invitation only.	
	c. ACM – Issues of Caseflow Management, December 15-17, 2015, Faculty: Phil Knox, Amy Wood, registration opened October 15.	
	d. ACM AZ Plus – ADR/Specialty Courts, December 17, 2015, Faculty: Heather Seets, registration opened October 15.	New Faculty: Ray Billotte
	e. ACE – Leadership, January 20-22, 2016, Faculty: Kent Batty, Kip Anderson, Ray Billotte, registration opens November 20.	
5)	Update: E-Materials Pilot	Jennifer
6)	Marketing Update	
	a) LJ Administrators Association, August 27, 2015	Tony
7)	ACS Readmission to Program Policy (rewording)	
3:45	Break	
3:55	<i>CLIA Committee General</i>	Kent
	1) Update: Orientation and Basic Training for Small Court Leadership	Don
	2) Update: Leadership Institute Webpage (LinkedIn)	Jeff/Gabe
	3) ACM/ACE course offerings in Tucson	Kent
	4) Leadership seminar for PJ/CA teams	
	5) CLIA Committee Meeting Schedule for 2016 – to be determined	
	a. February	
	b. June	
	c. October	
4:55	<i>Call to Public</i>	Kent
4:55	<i>Review of Action Items:</i>	Kent/Tony
5:00	<i>Adjourn</i>	Kent

ACS

Transition to Role of Supervisor - Webinar

July 7, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
16	16	15	12	4.66

FACULTY: Jennifer Wildeman

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No (5)
- The sound was not always great.
- I liked the White Board exercise because it was interactive. I did not like how people were able to write over each other's phrases. This made them difficult to read.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- Perfectly timed.
- Nothing.
- Discussion of scenarios - the interaction and idea-sharing was helpful.
- Transitioning from regular staff to supervisor.
- Was all good!
- Handling what comes with the title of supervisor. Being able to discuss more the challenges and what works to handle them.
- Going over the stages.
- Making the transition from co-worker to supervisor.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- None (5)
- The intro portion.
- Example situations.

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Dealing with conflict.
- Not sure.
- I am just learning what courses are available, so don't really know.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Good overview/intro
- Thank you for facilitating a strong, positive session!
- Great Job!
- Great job presenting! Thank you!
- I think this could easily be longer to give the participants more time to have an active discussion.

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.60
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.73
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.60
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.46
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.46
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.73
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.73
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.80
How would the rate this session overall?	4.66

ACS
Supervisory Ethics- Webinar
July 9, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
8	7	6	3	4.83

FACULTY: Tony Cornay

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No(2)

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- Favoritism
- Discussion - what would we do in certain situations

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- N/A

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Not Sure.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Great job
- Thank you (2)

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	5.00
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.83
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	5.00
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.66
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.83
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	5.00
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.83
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.83
How would the rate this session overall?	4.83

ACE Court Community Communications July 15 - 17, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
24	24	23	17	4.32

FACULTY: Shelly Bacon, Aaron Nash

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (8)
- The frequent breaks were appreciated

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None (4)
- It seems like everything was given appropriate time. I appreciate the flexibility of the instructors to meet the needs of this class.
- Perhaps some additional explanation of more esoteric concepts, e.g. ex parte
- Role play & videos – be nice to have some bloopers

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (3)
- End of Day 2
- Get rid of Activity 6B
- Website development
- Discussion on social media – Unit 5
- Video with Prof. Elliot Slotnick was too long, too monotone, and too boring. I think I stopped actively listening about halfway through it
- Professor's video in first day

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Survey development & data analysis
- Online newsletter development
- Communication w/ community/citizens – not so centered on dealing with media and CIO's

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Just the right amount of activities – not too much. Aaron was a great presenter. Very knowledgeable & informative & very, very funny! His personality really enhanced the content.
- Aaron made this class both informative (with his knowledge and experience) and entertaining. He was able to keep everyone's attention.
- I liked spending more time w/ table discussing topics during group activities
- The videos were a really nice addition to the training
- Great job Aaron & Shelly – the content of the training was dry, but you were able to make it more interactive
- Aaron did an awesome job
- Great timing of breaks this time – thanks! Great training overall – thank you!
- Some of test questions not clear or worded in an understandable/logical manner?
- Just my suggestions – this course might be incorporated into “Purposes & Responsibilities”
- Enjoyed pace of course. Enjoyed curriculum.
- As always appreciative of everyone
- Please bring back the audience response system for review (unit reviews) and the test(s).
- Aaron did a phenomenal job bringing real time example(s) to the subject matter
- Faculty were great. Aaron had good input from his experience
- Thank you!

Reponse Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.26
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.48
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.43
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.74
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.17
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.83
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.39
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.09
How would the rate this session overall?	4.32

ACM

Court Performance Standards: CourTools

August 12 - 14, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
38	37	37	21	4.46

FACULTY: Don Jacobson, Amy Wood, Christi Weigand

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (12)
- The room was very cold but I am usually cold so it may have been comfortable for others
- Bottom chair cushions are becoming flat and hard
- Many of those utilizing electronic devices were distracting
- Participants playing games on their phones during sessions

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None - (6)
- Court Culture and Change Management - this section was the most closely related to my job so I found this the most interesting overall
- Reviews (4)
- Unit 2
- Specialty Courts & Performance Measures
- The areas presented by Ms. Wood and Ms. Weigand could have used more illustrations of their subjects - Mr. Jacobson used a variety of illustrations in different settings that allowed me to understand the issues in a pragmatic way
- Unit 5 - Measuring Court Performance - the activity was great and should remain - it would be nice to have more data to place into the report so we see the bigger picture and have it make sense - some of us who don't work with court reporting and hands on so this would be helpful
- Group breakout sessions
- Implementation of Strategies based on results of measurements

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (6)
- Implementation (2) - those that work in the court should be aware of these tools, however, I did not meet anyone who has the authority to actually administer or implement
- Exercises
- Take away some of the very brief units to extend time in other areas - shorter units seem to be redundant and done just to fill time
- Unit 5 and Unit 7
- Review of materials

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Supervisory – Supervising Staff – Effective Oral & Written Communication

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Loved it!
- Don's enthusiasm and activism were spot on – I should have spoken up more as my thoughts and beliefs are aligned with his
- Very good training!
- Thank you – I enjoyed it
- Don needs to speak slower
- Amy Wood was the most dynamic instructor and had the ability to maintain interest very well – due to her ability she should be the instructor 1st thing in the morning and after lunch
- Don always does a fantastic job! Very engaging!
- Would have been beneficial to show actual report and interpretation / explanation
- I am not sure how I feel about the faculty using electronic devices – I feel that Christi didn't present as well because she was carrying around the iPad and it may have made her less engaging
- I liked that everyone was required to report out on the last exercise

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.46
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.49
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.41
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.81
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.57
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.73
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.59
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.19
How would the rate this session overall?	4.46

ACS

Transition to Role of Supervisor - Webinar

August 20, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
12	12	9	8	4.77

FACULTY: Jennifer Wildeman

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No. This webinar is a great way for us that are further from the Phoenix area to participate without have to drive.
- No (5)
- Love that it was a webinar

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- Maybe provide more situations and how they were resolved.
- Maybe a little more focus on the issues that might arise in the transitioning regarding friend and supervisor role.
- Leadership website.
- Time was adequate
- More white board time
- It does seem that a lot was packed into the 1 and 45min session that could have used more time such as the supervisor qualities and challenges.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- N/A (4)

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- N/A (3)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Great Class! Thank you.
- It was a great course and very informative.
- I enjoyed the voting/polling. It was nice to see others feel the same or have experienced the same things.
- N/A

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.44
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.88
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.44
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.33
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.55
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.88
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.77
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.77
How would the rate this session overall?	4.77

**ACE AZ Plus Executive Capstone
Independence and Interdependencies
August 25, 2015**

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
37	37	36	14	4.50

FACULTY: Don Jacobson

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (9) – good facility
- Learning environment was great

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None (5) – time spent was appropriate
- More scenarios/suggestions on developing those necessary relationships and also tips on knowing **where** the line in the sand is

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (5)

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Investigations on how to conduct and process an interview
- Emotional and social intelligence

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Thank you
- Don did a good job – held our attention and got through the presentation quickly and without stalling – thanks!
- Don Jacobson is always a great speaker – support staff perfect (as always)
- Excellent instructor
- Thank you Don – we appreciated your presentation
- Great job Don! Covering course material “on the fly” isn’t easy!
- Would be nice to have materials in electronic format

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.47
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.64
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.50
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.53
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.43
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.72
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.62
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.49
How would you rate this session overall?	4.50

**ACE AZ Plus Executive Capstone
Facilities
August 26, 2015**

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
37	37	37	14	4.11

FACULTY: Dennis Gauthier

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (6)
- Audio equipment worked well – I was able to hear the presentation, information and comments

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- The portion after the first exercise –
- Exercise (2)
- Focus on unplanned expenses related to remodel, planning to relocate various departments, to always keep the future of the court in mind – don't create for just the here and now – stress that some remodels require reconsideration of how to do business to make the most of the new project

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None
- The beginning
- Some detailed discussion on HVAC, height of ramps, etc., - in reality with most construction projects, courts/cities have consultants to figure it all out with only general feedback from staff

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Very informative and helpful – all references to judges were “he” – it would be nice to include “she” or “he/she”
- Thank you Dennis – “Keys to a Successful Project” was a great teaching tool – “awareness and observation” – priceless! ☺
- Great resource – thank you
- Overall good class – material “dry” at times but still good
- Dennis seemed very nervous at first but got much better as the class went on – really liked the exercise – thanks!

- Thank you

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.05
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	3.97
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	3.86
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.08
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.22
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.59
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.24
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.11
How would you rate this session overall?	4.11

**ACE AZ Plus Executive Capstone
Security & COOP
August 26, 2015**

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
37	37	37	10	4.56

FACULTY: Karen Westover

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (3)

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None
- Bed bugs

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Thank you! (2)
- Karen did a good job – great info - thanks!
- I loved the videos!
- This was good and helpful

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.54
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.49
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.32
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.19
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.46
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.70
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.57
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.46
How would you rate this session overall?	4.56

***ACE Capstone
Session Overall Scores
August 25 - 26, 2015***

Conference	Number attended	Overall Rate of Session
Independence vs. Interdependence Faculty: Don Jacobson	37	4.50
Facilities Faculty: Dennis Gauthier	37	4.11
Security & COOP Faculty: Karen Westover	37	4.56
OVERALL RATING OF PROGRAM		4.39

ACS Supervisor's Role in Effective Caseflow Management September, 2, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
23	21	21	17	4.67

FACULTY: Josh Halversen, Alexis Allen

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (5)
- Everything was put together well – great facilities
- Caseflow and Identifying Problems

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None (2)
- Provide examples of each of the four kinds of reports so we could see them and refer to them as they were discussed
- All information was well presented
- It all fit and flowed appropriately
- Unit 4 – lots of data but didn't really dive into it

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (2)
- It all fit and flowed appropriately
- Unit 2 – the stakeholders took up too much time

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- More brainstorming on statistics
- More about supervising staff

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Thank you – it was a great class
- Thanks for the good activities – slide 51 needs to be updated – NACM has updated and renamed the core competencies
- Alexis was awesome!
- Encourage court management to send all staff – not just potential supervisors
- Great job presenting – both faculty were great
- All was very knowledgeable and will be helpful for me and my future
- Learned a lot of good information – thanks!
- I nominate both Josh and Alexis as best faculty – thanks for filling in at the last moment!
- Great job!

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.76
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.86
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.67
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.62
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.62
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.71
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.71
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.43
How would you rate this session overall?	4.67

**ACS Human Resources Management
September 3, 2015**

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
29	27	27	16	4.48

FACULTY: Tony Olivier, Jodi Kellerhals

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (7) – excellent facility
- Microphones not working
- Everything was very convenient

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None
- Detailed information about rights of unclassified employees
- FMLA – but I know this class was a condensed class
- More group discussions
- Some info on supervisor conduct
- Motivating employees
- More time on actual examples and not hypotheticals
- Progressive discipline and motivation
- FMLA, FISA, ADA
- Employee relationships – motivation /morale – transitioning to the role of supervisor

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (3)
- Some activities
- Hiring fundamentals
- Just reading from the slides and not actually explaining
- FMLA

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- A self-evaluation for supervisors to evaluate themselves to avoid high turnover
- Dealing with co-workers
- Conflict resolution – employee retention – improving supervisor / employee relations
- More county based training related to actual home courts so that I have exact policy and procedure instead of just federal and state policy

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Very helpful class

- Thank you! Great training – Tony was excellent
- Thank you for a great educational session – I learned a lot
- Class very knowledgeable and helpful
- Would like more group activities, real-life examples, videos
- Great job – thank you!

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.52
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.41
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.33
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.59
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.33
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.56
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.44
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.48
How would you rate this session overall?	4.48

ACS

Transition to Role of Supervisor - Webinar

September 22, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
8	8	7	5	4.85

FACULTY: Jennifer Wildeman

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No. It was helpful to logon 30 minutes prior to class in case problems were encountered.
- This was my first time attending a webinar, so I had problems logging in, but the host was very helpful.
- Was able to do class just hard seeing I sit by the front desk so I could hear all at the window and standing by me.
- No (2)
- Well we had to do ours in court while people were having pre-trials and it was hard to concentrate.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- none.(3)
- was all good

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- n/a (4)

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- n/a (2)
- would like to attend any or all training
- Dealing with difficult people

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- It was a great class. Thanks.
- Great job!

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	5.00
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.85
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.57
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.71
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.71
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.85
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.57
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.71
How would the rate this session overall?	4.85

ACS Supervisory Ethics - Webinar September 22, 2015

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
18	18	15	10	4.80

FACULTY: Renu Sapra

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No (8).
- Love webinars.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- n/a (6)
- Response time.
- Liked the scenarios.

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- n/a (7).

ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- How to deal with difficult employees. Ideas on writing narratives for performance evaluations so it we do not repeat ourselves year after year.
- N/A (5)
- Dealing with difficult people

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- It was great to see so much participation and positive feedback for the participation. Information provided was great and it was interesting to see/hear different ethical opinions. One of the best webinars I have attended.
- N/A (2)
- Thank you
- Very good examples were used.
- I enjoyed this class especially going over the scenarios.

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.66
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.73
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.73
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.86
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.73
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.80
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.80
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented into your job?	4.86
How would the rate this session overall?	4.80

**ACE High Performance Court Framework
September 30 – October 2, 2015**

Number Registered	Number Attended	Number of Evaluations Received	Number Evaluations with Comments	Overall Rate of Session
33	32	29	19	4.71

FACULTY: Don Jacobson, Hon. Roxanne Song Ong (ret.)

DID ANY ASPECT OF THE FACILITY OR ACCOMODATIONS DETRACT FROM THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

- No / None (6) – love the facility
- Facilities are perfect, as usual
- The room was a bit cold even bringing a sweater
- Too hot at times – only one clock on one wall

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED MORE TIME?

- No / None (4)
- All was very paced

WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM DO YOU THINK COULD HAVE USED LESS TIME?

- No / None (3)
- This could be done in a day and a half
- Great exercises – last one a little long (2)
- The presentations took 3 hours leaving no time for Unit 7 – groups should have been given a 10 minute time limit

WHAT ADDITIONAL COURSES OR TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE OFFERED IN THE FUTURE?

- Self- improvement – loved Gabe’s implicit bias, leadership, communications – I’m working on classed called “Come to Learn. Go Forth to Serve” and “Fill the Gaps – Becoming your Best Self.” I have taught a class on the link between happiness and excellence
- Emotional intelligence
- Real life challenges from class participants and how the challenges were overcome

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Good reminders: Don’t burn bridges; take the time to cultivate relationships; if something is not great then make it great; canary in the coalmine; create a culture of expectation; anticipate change – thank you Don and Judge Song Ong!

- Very helpful, useful and well-delivered – thank you!
- All the ICM classes are excellent – this class was even more so due to the excellence of the faculty ☺
- Great training! Thanks! Always leave these with a renewed sense of purpose and appreciation for our work
- Excellent! Instructors were great! (3)
- This was a very good course and I look forward to applying all that I learned
- I liked the electronic format
- Judge Song Ong and Don were great instructors – I appreciate their time and sharing their knowledge
- Great exercises / presentations – very beneficial
- Excellent presenters – enjoy listening to their experiences to relate to my organization Don and Judge Song Ong did awesome!
- Great class – very helpful in putting everything together
- Wonderful interactive course
- I liked the way introductions were done in this session
- I was continuously distracted by one “professional” at our table constantly on the phone / tablet – I observed her on 3 occasions playing a word game – she even proceeded to continually text while our table presented our budget exercise! Extremely surprised by the rudeness and disregard for the rest of our table. Great class!

Response Key: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor

How would you rate the content of this session?	4.69
How would you rate the presenters of this session?	4.72
How would you rate the delivery format of this session?	4.72
How would you rate the logistics (registration, parking, signage) for this session?	4.72
How would you rate the materials for this session?	4.59
How would you rate the staff support for this session?	4.76
To what degree do you believe the session learning objectives were met?	4.69
Please indicate how likely you are to apply the information presented in your job?	4.62
How would you rate this session overall?	4.71

CLIA Committee
October 19, 2015
Handout notes

Agenda Item: ESD/Staff Updates #1

Leadership Institute Program Active Membership

<u>6-15-15</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Inactive</u>	<u>Total</u>
ACE	29	43	72
ACM	75	59	134
ACS	121	2	123
<u>Totals</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>329</u>

Leadership Institute Program Active Membership

<u>10-1-15</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Inactive</u>	<u>Total</u>
ACE	40	16	56
ACM	76	63	139
<u>ACS</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>151</u>
Totals	262	84	346

Agenda Item ESD/Staff Updates #7

ACS Readmission Policy

Any Arizona Court Supervisor Program participant, readmitted to the program, must complete all work within the three-year period from the date of their original enrollment into the program. If all program requirements are not completed within that three-year period the participant must reapply for admission and complete all requirements, again. Any exceptions to this policy must be approved by the chair of the CLIA committee and the Education Programs Unit manager.

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

State Courts Building, Room 230

1501 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Minutes of the

June 25, 2015 Committee Meeting

Committee Members Present:	
Kent Batty, Chair	Court Administrator, Superior Court in Pima County
Don Jacobson, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Court
Julie Binter (telephonic)	Organizational Development Consultant, Arizona State University
Maria L. Felix (telephonic)	Presiding Judge, Tucson Justice Court
Gregory Greene (telephonic)	Chief Probation Officer, La Paz County Adult /Juvenile Probation
Charles W. Gurtler (telephonic)	Presiding Judge, Superior Court in Mohave County
James Hazel	Presiding Magistrate, Apache Junction City Court
Michael K. Jeanes	Clerk of Court, Clerk of Superior Court in Maricopa County
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation
Committee Members Absent:	
Margaret Downie	Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals, Division I
Pamela Gates	Judge, Superior Court in Maricopa County
Phil Hanley	Director of Financial Operations, Superior Court in Maricopa County
Emily R. Johnston	Public Member
Eric Meaux	Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation
Leo Mendez	Deputy Director, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
CLIA Staff Present:	
Jeff Schrade	Director, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Gabe Goltz	Program Manager, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Jennifer Wildeman	Specialist V, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Anthony Cornay	Specialist VII, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Harriet Ramsbacher	Administrative Assistant, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Vikki Cipolla-Murillo	Specialist I, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Guests:	

Call to Order, Administrative Business

Mr. Kent Batty called the meeting to order at 9:32 am at the AZ Supreme State Courts Building in Phoenix, Arizona.

The February 5, 2015, minutes were reviewed and approved as read. *MOTION 2015-02 approved.*

Notes From the Chair:

Executive leadership training / senior leadership training has stalled due to budget concerns as well as the inability to come up with the scope of the proposed program. There is still some work to do and they hope to get back on track this summer.

ESD/Staff Updates:

- 1) ACS/ACE/ACM Program Updates: Tony Cornay reviewed the program statistics for the ICM programs. There was a big decrease in the number of 'inactives' due to Education Services (ESD) staff enforcement of the policy decision made last fall by CLIA. Program registrar Vikki Cipolla-Murillo has been very active in ensuring that potential inactive participants are notified of their status in a timely manner so they have an opportunity to enroll in classes and maintain their active status. Staff is also excited about the increase in numbers of Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) participants. Mr. Batty suggested that now may be the time to revisit the process of letting people into individual classes when they are NOT part of the program. Mr. Cornay advised that it was discussed 2 years ago and the compromise was that if enrollment was less than 20, staff would allow ala carte membership. For example, if the subject of the class covers the primary job responsibilities, a participant would be allowed to take that specific class as an ala carte member. The consensus was to allow ala carte members if enrollment is 30 or under with no time frame, specifics to be determined. Ala carte participants can be enrolled via phone call or email from their supervisor with no separate application required. Mr. Goltz suggested that staff needs to make clear to ala carte members the benefits of paying the \$50 certification fee and becoming a member of the program. Once a class is completed, program member or not, the 7 year clock starts ticking.
- 2) Curriculum Revision - ACS Human Resources (HR) Management - Kim Cantoni, Tony Cornay and Jennifer Wildeman are revising the ACS HR curriculum. So far, the results are great.
- 3) Testing Pilot - Multiple Choice and Essay, Open Book Test -After a year-long pilot of the open book and essay assessment, the committee decided to end the testing pilot and allow open book and essay testing as part of the normal assessment process going forward.
- 4) Programs held:
 - a. ACS - Transition to Role of Supervisor webinar, February 17, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 5 participants, **4.80** overall rating
 - b. ACM - Managing Court Financial Resources, February 18-20, 2015, Faculty: Don Jacobson & Michael Jeanes, 39 participants, **4.62** overall rating

- c. ACS – Supervisory Ethics webinar, February 24, 2015, Faculty: Renu Sapra, 5 participants, **4.50** overall rating
- d. ACE – Essential Components, March 10-12, 2015, Faculty: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Kip Anderson, Ron Overholt, 21 participants, **4.62** overall rating
- e. ACS – HR Management, March, 18, 2015, Faculty: Kim Cantoni, Karen Moorehead, 19 participants, **4.79** overall rating
- f. ACS – Supervisor’s Role in Effective Caseflow Management, March 19, 2015, Faculty: Alexis Allen, Sharon Yates, 13 participants, **5.00** overall rating
- g. ACM – Technology Management, April 8-10, 2015, Faculty: Karl Heckart, Stewart Bruner, 36 participants, **3.97** overall rating
- h. ACS – Transition to Role of Supervisor webinar, April 16, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 8 participants, **4.75** overall rating
- i. ACS – Supervisory Ethics webinar, April 28, 2015, Faculty: Tony Cornay, 6 participants, **5.00** overall rating
- j. ACE – Education, Training and Development, May 6-8, 2015, Faculty: Jeff Schrade, Deb King, Tony Cornay, 24 participants, **4.57** overall rating
- k. ACS – Transition to Role of Supervisor webinar, May 13, 2015, Faculty: Jennifer Wildeman, 5 participants, **4.60** overall rating
- l. ACS – Supervisory Ethics webinar, May 26, 2015, Faculty: Renu Sapra, 9 participants, **4.77** overall rating
- m. ACE – Visioning and Strategic Planning, June 3-5, 2015, Faculty: Hon. Louraine Arkfeld, Don Jacobson, Kathy Schaben, 24 participants registered, **4.71** overall rating

Mr. Batty reported that Jennifer Wildeman has been teaching a lot of Transition to the Role of Supervisor webinars and getting great ratings. The demand is such that we are now offering this particular webinar monthly. Mr. Batty also noted that we continue to achieve an extraordinarily high level of ratings due to our great faculty who are blessed to understand the importance of examples and the ability to connect with participants through those examples and who speak to the material. It was noted that the March 2015 ACS Supervisor’s Role in Caseflow Management (CFM) class, taught by Alexis Allen and Sharon Yates, achieved the first ever 5.00 perfect rating for a face-to-face ACS program. This rating speaks to the complete recent revision of the CFM curriculum and explains why we are so excited about the revision of the ACS HR curriculum. Kathy Schaben, Michael Jeanes, Ron Overholt, and Tony Cornay are currently in the process of becoming certified to teach specific classes and all are doing well in their teaching assignments. A discussion was held regarding the revision of the ACM – Technology Management class. The NSCS has started a rotation of looking at all of the classes in the ICM program and revising them as well as updating the core modules.-Mr. Batty suggested that he and Mr. Jacobson take a look at the curriculum and try to determine where future revisions might be made. Faculty on the committee agreed that it is frustrating to not have complete control over the curriculum. Mr. Baumstark suggested speaking with Mr. Heckart as a starting point to let him know that CLIA is interested in figuring out a way to improve the curriculum. Mr. Batty wants to ensure that we incorporate an emphasis on a more local perspective so he is going to work with his technology people and talk it through with them as will Mr. Jacobson.

- 5) Upcoming Programs
 - a. ACE - Court Community Communication, July 15-17, 2015, Faculty: Shelly Bacon, Aaron Nash, 20 participants registered
 - b. ACM - Court Performance Standards-CourTools, August 12-14, 2015, Faculty: Don Jacobson, Amy Wood, Christie Weigand, 12 participants registered
 - c. ACE - AZ Plus Capstone, August 25-26, 2015, Faculty: Kent Batty, Don Jacobson, Dennis Gauthier, Kip Anderson, Karen Westover, invitation only (6 are currently enrolled with an expected total of 40)
 - d. ACS - Supervisor's Role in Effective Caseflow Management, September 2, 2015, Faculty: Josh Halverson, Summer Dalton, registration not yet open
 - e. ACS - HR Management, September 3, 2015, Faculty: Tony Olivier, Jodi Kellerhals, registration not yet open
 - f. ACE - High Performance Court Framework, September 30-October 2, Faculty: Don Jacobson, Hon. Roxanne Song Ong, registration not yet open
- 6) ACS - Migration to Skillsoft from Element K update - Mr. Batty reiterated the concern expressed last meeting that 2 of the computer based training programs found in Element K may in the future no longer be carried by the SkillSoft LMS. The topic areas were Strategic Planning and Effective Management. Discussion was held that stated the learning objectives for these two courses were covered in other areas of the program and that because most front line supervisors did not actually participate in those activities that replacement CBTs would not be needed in the future.
- 7) Marketing Update - Mr. Cornay reported on the status of an October 2014 action item regarding marketing the ICM programs. Since our last meeting in February, he staffed a booth at the Arizona Court Association Conference (ACA), spoke to the AZ court clerks association meeting in April; and last week Jeff Schrade went to the Superior Court Administrators Association meeting and handed out ACS applications. Mr. Cornay will also be attending a Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) Court Administrators meeting in August. Mr. Goltz also noted that staff has been very active is working with the Supreme Court's webmaster and Public Information Officer (PIO) Heather Murphy in getting ICM people on the webpage through photos of ICM graduates for example. It was recommended by Mr. Jeanes that Mr. Cornay go yearly to the clerks meeting and remind people these programs are ongoing and giving an overview of what the program does for courts and their employees.
- 8) Leadership Institute Forum Webpage - Mr. Cornay reviewed the "Leadership Institute Forum Page" handout. ESD is proposing to add a discussion forum to the ESD website on AZCourts.gov to give graduates from all three ICM programs a means to keep connected to the Leadership Institute and to form an active on-line community.-Discussion centered on the need for this forum, how it would be monitored, what would be the cost. Mr. Baumstark recommended a meeting with ESD Management and Executive Office to discuss this proposal in depth.

CLIA Committee General:

- 1) Concluding Discussion: Orientation and Basic Training for Small Court Leadership - Mr. Jacobson reported that since the February meeting two key members of the sub-committee (Elizabeth Evans and Mike Malone) have moved out of state so he is asking for volunteers from the CLIA committee or names of people who might be interested in

helping out. It still needs to be decided what is appropriate for the group to actually do and what approach to take: work on specific important tasks first or on more general management aspects. It also remains unresolved as to where the responsibility for this training lies - within CLIA or a combination of JSEC and one of the operational teams in Court Services Division or should this be part of ACA training? Mr. Jacobson feels that those are valid questions but he would like to work through the concept first.-The sub-committee is planning to meet in a couple of months to continue looking at the issue.

- 2) Budget Status Update - Mr. Baumstark said that it is a sign of the times that "only losing" \$9.6M could be considered a victory. \$6M will come out of this year's budget. We are fortunate to have good legislative staff who warned the Executive Office that a shortfall was coming. Mr. Baumstark noted there were cuts across all programs, probation being one of the hardest hit. There were no material cuts in Education Services but also no expansion. Mr. Batty concluded the discussion by saying that we got what we needed which was no drastic cuts to ESD education and training programs.
- 3) ACS: Readmission to Program - Mr. Cornay explained an issue came up as a result of ESD using CLIA approved 'active' and 'inactive' language. ESD is proposing to revise the language as stated on the handout "Agenda Item: CLIA Committee General #3 - ACS Readmission Policy." After discussion regarding various "out clauses" ESD staff was given the responsibility to revise the language for readmission to the ACS program.
- 4) Electronic Materials for ICM Courses - ESD staff reviewed their proposal to begin using e-materials in ICM classes as a way to keep up with technology and to give participants the flexibility to choose their preferred delivery method. A survey was sent out to all ICM participants and faculty asking if they wanted to receive course materials electronically or on paper. Surprisingly they got a 100% return, 40% liking the electronic option and 60% wanting to continue to receive paper course materials. Some of the comments included that they had no electronic device to bring to class or that devices would be a distraction. Faculty worried about not having access across the board. Ms. Wildeman explained that people who chose the electronic option would be sent the class PowerPoint electronically and then receive a folder in class with class materials, course overview, activities, some handouts, etc. She reiterated that this is not being proposed as a cost saving measure but is designed to give people a choice and to give them what they want. No paper will be taken away nor are we asking them to pay for paper copies of documents. Faculty would be included in the pre-class discussion about what will be provided electronically. Is there any anticipated impact to open book testing? Staff had already discussed this question and noted that users would potentially have the ability to Google an answer. Mr. Goltz suggested that given assessment questions come strictly from the course material he would find it odd that anyone might go to Google for answers. There are also some logistical details to still work out prior to implementation if given the committee's blessing to begin. Mr. Batty agreed that a pilot project could commence with the next ICM program.
- 5) 2014 Excellence in Education nominations - Nominees for this year's awards are coming from the nominations from 2014 programs due to the surprise unanimous decision to nominate retiring Deb King last year. After much discussion, the committee nominated Kim Cantoni and Tony Olivier for their great work as faculty for the

ACM and ACS Human Resources programs and the complete revision of the ACS curriculum. They will receive their award at the CLC awards luncheon in Flagstaff.

- 6) Appointments to CLIA Committee
 - a. Reappointments – Mr. Batty (chair), Mr. Jacobson (vice chair), Judge Downie, Judge Hazel
 - b. New Appointments – Hon. Thomas Robinson, Valerie Winters, and Steve Ramsbacher. We will welcome them at the next meeting on 10/15. A question arose as to whether we could couple our next CLIA meeting with the upcoming Court Leadership Conference in Flagstaff. There was some enthusiasm for this idea. ESD staff will check with the Executive Office to see if the CLC schedule and space will allow for the meeting to be added or if we should move the CLIA meeting to a later date. Mr. Batty noted that making one trip instead of two is always a good thing.

- 7) CLIA Committee Meeting Schedule for 2015 – Thursday, October 15, 2015

Call to the Public: None

Review of Action Items:

1. LI team is to continue to market the LI programs with the AZ Court Clerks Association yearly.
2. ESD leadership to meet with the Executive Office to explore the range and possibilities of the proposed LI web forum.
3. Continue to use the revised open book testing procedure and end the pilot phase.
4. Begin using e-materials for ICM classes as a pilot program.
5. Revise the language of the ACS Readmission Policy to reflect exceptional situations.
6. Look into having the next CLIA meeting at the CLC.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 11:52am.

Administrative Training Proposal and Executive Summary

Proposal

Problem Statement – In a clear and succinct manner leaders within the judicial branch should be able to answer the question, “What is required of you to administrate a court in the State of Arizona?”

Proposal – To develop an educational program to help those who are new to the administrative role, or at least new to Arizona, understand the responsibilities and mandates incumbent on those who have administrative responsibility over the courts. The focus of the program will be to introduce both the practice of modern court administration and the mandates and standards required for managing a court in the State of Arizona.

Concept – The program shall be made up of several parts which vary in content and method of delivery to help establish basic competencies and provide ongoing support for those who have administrative responsibility over the courts. The main elements of the program include:

- Introductory “TED Talk” on the role of administration in the courts and procedural justice.
- Intensive 2 ½ day “boot-camp” to introduce the specific areas of operational understanding needed to administer a court. This program includes:
 - Introduction – The Authority to Administrate
 - Areas of Operational Understanding
 - Resources Available
- Providing a set of support materials, physical, electronic and personal to act as resources to be referred to when questions arise regarding specific management or reporting issues within the court.

Target Audience – Judges, administrators and others with administrative responsibility.

Purpose – It is the hope of the subcommittee to “fill the gap” in training and knowledge that exists in our development of leaders in the court between those that perform the tasks required of court management on a day-to-day basis and those that oversee and are responsible to make sure those tasks are performed.

Executive Summary

The following is a summary of the main areas of the intensive training session and the support material to be made available.

Introduction –

The Authority to Administrate: Balancing Autonomy and Accountability in Court Governance

By Donald Jacobson

If you work in the court system, even for a short period of time, you will most often at some point be asked “what does a court administrator do?” This is asked in different forms – to a judge with administrative duties, a chief clerk within a court who is given responsibility to administer operations or an individual who actually has the title of “court administrator.” Regardless of the title, regardless of the local requirements placed on a court, and regardless of the size or jurisdiction of a court there are many commonalities between what each jurisdiction must do to administer a court. In addition to these common elements there are numerous expectations and requirements that should be adhered to. These mandates of a modern court are spread throughout numerous sources and are not easy to consolidate into a single reference for those charged with managing a court. They can be found throughout the statutes of the State, in the Code of Judicial Administration, within the years of Administrative Orders that have been handed down, within local ordinances, policies and orders and even throughout case law. The canonization of court mandates and standards presents a significant challenge to those who have been given administrative responsibility over the judicial branch.

Another aspect is that administrative duties are often not seen to be part of, or have a tendency to be occluded within, the concept of “separation of powers.” This is especially true at the local levels of court operations where a court must work closely with and is often dependent upon the people and efforts of their local funding authority in the day-to-day work of the court. Excluding jurisdictional challenges, it is rare that anybody, even at the local level, denies the authority of a judge to hear and decide on a case that is before them, but it is not unusual to be questioned if that same judge has the authority to manage the people or the budget that support their work on the bench. Although it is usually understood that the work of a judge while on the bench is under the sole purview of the judge, the lines become blurred around how specific operational aspects of the court are implemented.

There are times we may even ask ourselves why we need someone to administer the court. We train our judges in the law, to sit on a bench and decide cases based on the law and evidence presented to them in a particular case. But how does that case get to the bench? What happens to the case when the judge has completed their work with it? And how do we know the proper procedures we are to follow both before and after? Getting a case prepared, scheduled and to the judge as well as following up after the decision has been made requires a process, and that process needs to be manned, managed and administered. The smallest court in the State has the same requirements to manage operations, report to various authorities and maintain operational consistency as the largest court. While the element of scale can change dramatically, the aspects of accountability remain consistent. If a judge, with administrative responsibility over a court, is unable to have a professional court administrator it behooves them to seek the same training and understanding that a court administrator must have. Court administrators who are new to the role, or new to what Arizona asks of those in the role, should educate themselves on what is needed to fill the expectations inherent in that role. They are responsible for the administration of their court and must meet the public's expectations of operational integrity as well as fulfill all the mandates that are incumbent on all courts. Lack of knowledge regarding the mandates and requirements inherent in running a court will not be seen as excusable should functional failures become manifest within our operations.

Procedural justice is based on the concept that fair decisions arise from a fair process. In order to have a fair process we must seek to make it consistent, participatory, transparent and impartial. While it may be argued that having a fair process by itself is no guarantee of a fair outcome, it should be obvious that inconsistent treatment of parties, bias in how a case is handled, exclusion of participants and obfuscation of the process are antithetical to just results. Procedural justice, however, requires tending. If you plant a garden and then ignore it, you can count on weeds growing, plants withering and the chaos of entropy encroaching. You should not expect much of a harvest. If we are seeking to harvest justice we need to tend our garden. We should establish policies that can be applied consistently, train our staff in impartiality, make sure our procedures are understandable to participants and remove all barriers to being able to take part in the judicial process. Somebody needs to be responsible for making sure this is done. Any process, regardless of how simple or complicated, must be managed to be consistent, and that consistency must be more than local and should cut across all jurisdictional levels for us to have hope in exhibiting procedural justice in our courts.

We have both the responsibility and authority to administer the courts. The authors of the United States Constitution saw firsthand what happened to justice when the authority to administer the judicial process was placed in the hands of a single person. King George III had the authority to appoint, pay and provide other resources to judges. So when a judge was hearing a case that the King had a concern about there was a significant amount of pressure, even if unspoken, to keep the King happy. One of the most unique aspects in the establishment of our country was the moving of the judicial process into a third branch of equal standing with the executive and legislative processes. The establishment of this third branch sought to

separate the process of judging a case from any pressure that might be imposed by others, seeking to bring about independent and fair results without undue influence. Thus we have a long tradition of judicial independence that is not only based on the ability of an individual judge to manage and make decisions on individual cases, but also includes the concept that the judicial branch has the authority to manage itself as a whole. This self-management is, however, not unbridled. While constitution and case law give the judicial branch leeway in how we run our own house, we are still accountable to the other branches and to the people whom we seek to serve. This authority to self-govern is limited by the executive branch in how they enforce, the legislative branch by how they write laws and fund, by the people in how expectations are framed for the court and internally within the judicial branch in how we regulate the process. There is a balance beam we walk between autonomy and accountability. We need to know both the authority we have to regulate and manage ourselves as well as the limitations placed on us as one of three partners in governing. We must establish a clear practice of governance for the courts and keep ourselves accountable in following it, this process of governing must be understood and managed within the parameters set by rule and law. We must know the authority that we have to operate with and the limitations that we must stay within, the responsibility for governing our courts falls to us and none other.

In order to help judicial branch leaders administer our courts, both the freedoms and limitations we possess, we must know what is mandated and required, be able to create a just process within those parameters and then be willing take responsibility for our own governance. We will set forth the following broad areas of operational understanding to help refine this process:

At the most basic level the court process is a judge sitting on the bench having a case presented before them and then making rulings on that case. Not only does the judge follow a process in hearing the case, but for that case to get before them there must be a process in place to make sure it gets there, and after the judge is done there must be a process to make sure the decisions made are codified and enforced. All those processes must be administered which involve the following areas:

1. **Personnel** - To administer it you must have people, they have to be hired, trained, payed and managed.
2. **Financial Management** – To administer it you must be able to handle money, before, during and after the case is heard.
3. **Local Relationships** – To administer it you must be able to work with other entities, you need facilities and a budget so you must work with your funding authority, you must work with attorneys, law enforcement, other courts and a myriad group of others who all participate in the judicial process.

4. **Case Management** – To administer it you must manage the life of the case while you have control of it. It is our responsibility to set expectations and policies in case processing.
5. **Legal Requirements and Mandates** – To administer it you must be able to meet all the requirements set for that case type as well as meet expectations of effective management and be able to report on it all. This is to guarantee procedural justice and to be responsive to those you are accountable to. We answer to the people, but that is first done by reporting to the Executive and Legislative branches as well as ourselves, the Judicial Branch through the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Within each of these five areas of operational understanding there are clear concepts of what should be required, a minimum standard, what that standard means, a narrative, and what authority supports that concept.

Some broad operational concepts need to be kept in mind as we move through the five areas of understanding:

- 00.01 Management Issues
- 00.02 Duties of the Presiding Judge
- 00.03 Duties of the Court Administrator
- 00.04 Arizona Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees
- 00.05 Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct

Areas of Operational Understanding -

Each area listed will have subcategories covering specific issues within each section.

01 - Personnel

- 01.01 Court Policies and Procedures
- 01.02 Customer service
- 01.03 Personnel management
- 01.04 Courtroom etiquette
- 01.05 Legal advice v information
- 01.06 Training

02 - Financial Management

- 02.01 Minimum Accounting Standards
- 02.02 Payment Processing
- 02.03 Allocation
- 02.04 Fines, Fees, Assessments and Surcharges
- 02.05 Fines Management
- 02.06 Payment Priority
- 02.07 Clerk Fees
- 02.08 TIP/FARE and Collections
- 02.09 Processing Bonds
- 02.10 Fine and Bond Schedules
- 02.11 Bonds Collected by other Agencies

03 - Local Relationships

- 03.01 Funding Authority Relations
- 03.02 Facilities
- 03.03 Security
- 03.04 Budgets (includes purchasing and procurement)
- 03.05 Contract Management
- 03.06 Appointments
- 03.07 Other courts
- 03.08 Other justice system entities
- 03.09 IGAs

04 - Case Management

- 04.01 Judicial Responsibilities
- 04.02 Judicial Staff Responsibilities
- 04.03 Diversion Programs
- 04.04 Calendar Systems
- 04.05 Jury Management
- 04.06 Case Processing
- 04.07 Case Events
- 04.08 Specialty Courts
- 04.09 Appeals
- 04.10 Disposition Reporting
- 04.11 Entry of Judgement
- 04.12 Enforcement of Court Orders
- 04.13 Records Management and Retention

05 – Legal Requirements and Mandates

- 05.01 AOC Reporting Requirements
- 05.02 Statistical Reporting
- 05.03 Case Processing Reports
- 05.04 Local Reporting Requirements
- 05.05 Internal Operational Monitoring Reports

Resources Available -

Self-Evaluation Tool
Code of Judicial Administration
Supreme Court Guide for New Administrators
Information re: Court Answer Line
Video Vignettes
Researching A.S.R.S.