

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Judicial Education Center
541 E Van Buren, Suite B4
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Minutes of the
February 22, 2007 Meeting

Committee Members Present:

Judge Louraine Arkfeld, Chair	Presiding Judge Tempe Municipal Court
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
Bonnie Black	Public Member
Carole Boone	Chief Probation Officer/Juvenile Court Center Director, Maricopa County Juvenile Court
Alice Bustillos	Detention Director, Maricopa County Superior Court
Frank Corrales	Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court Center Director, Court Administrator, Santa Cruz County Superior Court
Judge Margaret Downie	Associate Presiding Judge, Maricopa Superior Court
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Judge John Lamb	Associate Presiding Judge, Navajo County Superior Court
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Superior Court
Judge William Sutton	Presiding Judge, Williams Municipal and Williams Justice Courts
Kathy Waters	Division Director, Adult Probation Services, AOC

Committee Members Absent:

Kent Batty, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Pima County Superior Court
Denise Lundin	Clerk of the Court, Cochise County Superior Court
Philip Urry	Clerk of the Court, Court of Appeals, Division I

CLIA Staff Present:

Deb King, Program Manager
Gabe Goltz, Program Specialist
Susie DeLeon, Program Assistant

Guests Present:

Marna Murray, Education Services Div. Director

Call to Order, Administrative Business

Judge Louraine Arkfeld called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., at the Judicial Education Center, Phoenix, Arizona. Judge Arkfeld asked members that were not present at last meeting to please introduce themselves and provide insight as to why they came on board with CLIA.

Judge Margaret Downie advised she had attended a Leadership Institute in Judicial Education Conference in Memphis, and she is the chair of her court's Judicial Education and Training Committee. Carol Boone advised that someone had invited her to join CLIA. Judge Arkfeld advised the committee that she did have a chance to meet with Carol Boone and Denise Lundin (absent) and bring them up to date as far as what was discussed in the last meeting and what projects are being done currently in the work groups.

Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the November minutes. Judge Arkfeld asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made. No changes needed to be made. She called for the motion to approve the minutes which was made by Mike Baumstark, seconded by Frank Corrales. Minutes from November 2, 2006 meeting were approved. **MOTION:** CLIA 2007-01

Workgroup Updates General Notes/Discussions/Decisions:

Judge Arkfeld moved to the next agenda item, advising members to please review the workgroups' Tier Competencies. She stated that she was aware that all workgroups' met and asked what method the workgroups' used to help them to develop the KSA's. She stated that in her group they met and discussed all the competencies and one at a time, researched what classes or educational opportunities would be available to fulfill each one, and later met again and discussed this information.

David Sanders advised that Kent Batty assigned each member of their workgroup one of the Competencies to research. Mr. Sanders stated they worked independently most of the time, and then later met via conference call and discussed what each member had researched and critiqued the work to bring out what they considered helpful to their particular workgroup for Tier 3. Mr. Sanders went on to say that for his particular area, Purposes of the Courts, he considered years of personal experience along with the rest of his research.

Don Jacobson stated they all met which helped their workgroup agree where and how to start. He stated that they are still working on determining the qualifying educational experiences for their competencies.

Gabe Goltz advised that he inserted the ICM information into some of the workgroups' materials to give the idea of some of the qualifying educational experiences.

The committee then discussed three issues relative to qualifying courses or events as meeting the Tier 3 identified competencies.

1) Will CLIA's approach be to have a predetermined curriculum accredited as meeting a tier's competencies? Or will CLIA allow for any combination of educational sessions and/or experiences submitted individually to be evaluated on a cases by case basis? No decision was reached on this question. Discussion points are summarized as follows.

- There are a number of obvious resources, such as American Academy of Judicial Education, Institute for Court Management, National Judicial College, Mesa Community College, Michigan State's judicial degrees that could meet many of the competencies. CLIA could accredit a combination of resources as an option.
- Individual course, or experience, accreditation would be labor intensive. A future option would be for CLIA to set criteria and for staff to accredit based on that criteria. (See question 2 for detailed discussion on "experience.")
- Following up on what Mr. Goltz has started, (a comparison of ICM to the Tier 3 competencies), a first-step would be to see how much of Tier 3 is already met by ICM Phase I and CMP programs, CLIA could then develop classes that covered competencies not met with ICM and use that as the recommended path for a certificate.

2) For competencies that are stated as "experience in" or "demonstrated ability to" how can CLIA qualify these as "met competencies" with any validity? Consensus of the following discussion points leads the Workgroups to change the wording of all Tier III competencies to learning objectives, versus experience or demonstrated skills and abilities.

- It would be difficult, if not impossible, for CLIA to measure or assess skills and abilities.
- On-the-job training or work experience is highly varied and not always the best practice or correct training.
- Arizona Court Leadership Institute, (ACLI) an ad hoc committee of Judicial Staff Education Committee, (JSEC) had discussed this point and decided to stay on a course-level without tested competencies, and not to allow experience in lieu of courses.
- ICM doesn't allow for experience to be used in lieu of attending their courses to obtain their certificates.

- Typically a person’s competency in a managerial position comes from a combination of directly related experience and formal education – thus do we really want to eliminate experience?

3) Will we be offering some type of credential or certificate upon completion of a Tier and what will this certificate mean? No decision was reached on this question.

Discussion points are summarized as follows.

- Does completing a Tier or obtaining a certificate mean that you can competently perform at that level? Is this a credential or a certification?
- If this is a certificate or credential only and not a certification, will it have any meaning? ICM proves only a certificate and it has meaning within the judiciary.
- If you complete all the requirements of a Tier III, does that mean you have met the requirements of Levels I & II? Is there a sequential or prerequisite order for receiving certificates?
- Would a person who is already achieving, performing at the managerial level be grandfathered into Tier III, or for succession planning and consistency, would the person need to complete the educational requirements?
- The issue on whether specific training is “recommended” versus “required” impacts this decision. (This is also relevant to question 1.)

CLIA members discussed how to best change the wording of competency requirements to eliminate experience and demonstrated abilities. The heading for each competency group read:

KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS/ABILITIES FOR THE COMPETENCY AND TIER

As defined by the Court Leadership Institute of Arizona, in order to fulfill this competency, an educational experience(s) must provide the following knowledge, skills and abilities:

Consensus of the committee was to change the heading to read:

LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR THIS COMPETENCY AND TIER

As defined by the Court Leadership Institute of Arizona, in order to fulfill this competency, an educational experience(s) must meet the following learning objectives:

The three workgroups separated to work on refining their competency descriptions to be consistent with learning objectives. **ACTION ITEMS:** CLIA staff will take workgroup changes and post the new drafts for Tier 3 on the Workgroup WEB page. Staff will continue a more detailed comparison of Tier 3 newly revised competencies to

ICM Phase I and CMP classes to identify and report back the gaps in competencies. Workgroups will continue to create a competency list for Tiers I & II using language consistent with educational learning objectives. CLIA staff will attend workgroup meetings to create documentation, identify areas of overlap between competency groups and ensure consistency.

Leadership Institute in Judicial Education Onsite

Gabe Goltz announced the LIJE On-site program which will take place at the Judicial Education Center in Phoenix on March 28-29, 2007. He advised CLIA members that if they or someone in their staff would like to attend, we will make sure they guaranteed spots in the program. CLIA members wishing to attend included Bonnie Black, Carol Boone, and Kathy Waters.

Tiered Competency Model Matrix Online Demo

Mr. Goltz demonstrated for committee members the online version of the Tiered Competency Model Matrix and CLIA leadership resources. Mr. Baumstark stated that this WEB site could be opened up in the near future to court staff to begin using resources. This would not include the Tiered Competency Model until decisions are made on what resources and criteria will meet the competencies identified.

ICM Program

Deb King announced that the AOC is contracting with ICM to add additional classes, with the first additional class to be held in Phoenix on June 26-28, 2007. Ms. King stated that previous ICM courses were frequently at maximum capacities and it took over two years for an employee to complete the Phase I and CMP program. If CLIA sponsored two more ICM programs a year this would decrease the time to 18 months.

Ms. King asked the committee whether ICM course registration should remain on a first-come, first serve basis reflecting a career path model; or whether registration should be based on court-selected attendees, a succession planning model. Ms. King also asked whether the committee found benefit in reserving space for court-selected participants in the series versus on a class-by-class basis.

The committee felt that the court should select attendees leaving some space in each class for a first come, first serve registration. Ms. King shared that Maricopa Superior court has offered to partner and pay the overage costs if they could be given the extra space for their staff. Costs usually increase if the class size exceeds 50, and most classes are limited to 80. She also asked whether one of the selection criteria could be completion of one or more ICM classes previously – this would minimize any negative impact to those already attending ICM by moving them into a priority position for reserved spots.

The committee agreed to a court-selection process which identified and reserved space in the Phase I series for a group of participants with the idea that courts would commit to their employees attendance and we would commit to reserving their spot in classes.

The committee discussed an application process where applications would be sent through court management versus an all employee distribution - with the following information suggested for the application:

- Check box for ICM courses already completed and date completed.
- Current work assignment/job function.
- Check box for whether applicant is a supervisor or manager and number of staff.
- Length of service with the court.
- Short goal statement from applicant on why he/she wishes to attend this training.
- Supervisor's signature recommending the applicant and committing the employee's time to attend all classes.

ACTION ITEM: CLIA staff will draft an application form and send it to the following CLIA members for review and input: Mike Baumstark, Kathy Waters, Louraine Arkfeld, Frank Corrales, David Sanders and Alice Bustillo.

Mr. Jacobson also recommended that CLIA staff attend the Superior Court Administrator's meeting and other associations to cover what CLIA is doing and the use of this resource.

JCA Judicial Conference - Leadership Sessions

Marna Murray, Director, Education Services Division, updated the committee on the planning committee discussions for the 2007 Judicial Conference. She indicated that the planning committee embraced the idea of one or more leadership-focused sessions, sponsored by CLIA, at this event. CLIA was asked to recommend potential topics.

Suggested topics included:

- "Now that I'm In Charge, What Do I Do?" (addressing challenges of becoming a presiding judge)
- "Management Strategies - The Next Step"
- "Court Administration - Lessons Learned"

Sub-topics included:

- Project implementation / project management
- Change management
- Impact of court practices/process changes on constituent components
- Court self-evaluation tool

- Strategic planning, visioning for your court -> preparing for future trends (Mike suggested this would be better for the CLC)
- Nuts and bolts of court administration - (NJO follow-up session)

Ms. Murray indicated she would communicate CLIA's ideas to the planning committee.

Next Meeting:

Judge Arkfeld noted that the next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 11, 2007. The agenda will include the conclusion of the workgroups' identification of learning objectives/courses for Tiers 1-2. An optional CLIA meeting date for December 6th is being held so as not to conflict with the Court Leadership Conference.

Call to the Public/Adjourn

The chair made a call to the public; no new business from public.

The meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.