



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

Thursday, April 2, 2026

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

HYBRID MEETING

<https://zoom.us/j/96777034224>

Zoom ID: 967 7703 4224

Passcode: 017518

**In-Person: 3003 N. Central Ave 5th floor
Phoenix, AZ 85012**



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

April 2, 2026

AGENDA



Committee on Judicial Education and Training (COJET)

Thursday, April 2, 2026

10am-12pm

Hybrid Meeting

3003 N. Central Ave, 5th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85012

<https://azcourts-gov.zoom.us/j/96777034224>

Meeting ID: 967 7703 4224

Passcode: 017518

2026 COJET MEETING

DATES

AUGUST 27TH @ 10AM

NOVEMBER 19TH @ 10AM

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as auxiliary aids or materials in alternative formats, by contacting Dorcas Caesar at dcaesar@courts.az.gov or 602-452-3060.

REGULAR BUSINESS		
10:00am	Welcome and Opening Remarks	Hon. Craig Jennings, Chair
Action Item	Approval of 8/28/25 and 11/20/25 Meeting Minutes	Hon. Craig Jennings, Chair
BUSINESS ITEMS		
	Introduction of Judge Sherwood Johnston – Judicial Education Officer	Joannie Collins
	2025 Annual COJET Compliance Report	Renu Sapra
	2026 Judicial Conference	Renu Sapra & Julee Bruno
	Cognitive Bias in Judicial Decision-Making Lesson Revision	Joannie Collins
	AZ Law Classes Revamp	Julee Bruno
	AI	Joannie Collins
	Strategic Agenda Initiatives Update	
	Probation Officer Supervisor Training	Deneen Bertucci
	Juvenile Detention Officer Academy Revamp	Deneen Bertucci
	Workforce Development Program	Jared Arthur
	Judicial Officer Supervisor Training	Renu Sapra
	Judicial Mentorship Program	Joannie Collins
	LNJO Revamp	Valerie Silvas
	Center for Judicial & Court Security	Mike Dzezinski
	COJET Standing Committee Reports	
	Judicial College of Arizona (JCA)	Hon. Marianne Bayardi
	Committee on Leadership and Workforce Excellence (COLAWE)	Alexis Allen
	Committee on Probation Education (COPE)	Chief Bryan Prieto
	Call to the Public	Hon. Craig Jennings, Chair
	Adjourn	Hon. Craig Jennings, Chair



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

April 2, 2026

AUGUST MEETING MINUTES

Committee on Judicial Education and Training (COJET)

Minutes – August 28, 2025



Members Present: Honorable Craig Jennings, Alexis Allen, Kip Anderson, Justice Maria Elena Cruz, Honorable Lisa Abrams, Honorable Marianne Bayardi, Josh Frisby, Suzette Williams, Honorable Valerie Wyant, David Byers, Chief Probation Officer Bryan Prieto

Members Absent: Honorable Barbara Brown, Will Gonzalez, Honorable Michala Ruechel, Jennifer Torchia

Staff: Joannie Collins, Dorcas Caesar, Gabe Goltz, Julee Bruno, Amy Steemke, Deneen Bertucci, Renu Sapra

Welcome and Opening Remarks

- Judge Craig Jennings welcomed everyone and introduced new members: Judge Marianne Bayardi, David Byers (AOC Court Administrator), and Chief Bryan Prieto.
 - Committee members and staff introduced themselves.
-

Approval of Minutes

- MOTION to approve the minutes by Alexis Allen.
 - Seconded by Chief Bryan Prieto.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
-

COJET Reporting Process

- Joannie Collins discussed the annual COJET reporting process, current procedures, and the need for a new approach.
 - Potential code changes and streamlining efforts for both staff and training coordinators were discussed and will be considered.
-

Court Leadership Conference

- Renu Sapra discussed the upcoming conference on October 21–22 in Flagstaff, Arizona.
- 157 participants have already registered.
- County Roundtables will be held to address Strategic Agenda Item 2.2c. Counties will develop plans for a Civics or Citizen's Academy to educate the public about the judicial branch.

Strategic Agenda Initiative Updates

- Deneen Bertucci reported on the probation supervisor training program, in collaboration with ESD, JJSD, and APSD.
 - Target rollout: End of 2028.
 - Monthly meetings are ongoing.
 - Deneen Bertucci also updated the committee on the revamp of the Juvenile Detention Officer Academy.
 - The workgroup includes staff from detention facilities statewide.
 - Meetings are held bi-weekly.
 - Renu Sapra shared that the Court Workforce Development Program development is underway with new staff.
 - Pilot courses are expected to be rolled out by December.
 - Amy Steemke provided an update on the Judicial Officer Supervisor Training Program (JOST).
 - As a result of this program, judges will be trained as supervisors.
 - Compliance will be discussed further at a later time.
 - Gabe Goltz discussed the development of a Judicial Mentorship Program for judges in need of support.
 - A written proposal is in progress.
 - A survey was conducted to gauge interest.
 - Amy Steemke also reported on the revamp of the Limited Jurisdiction New Judges Orientation Program.
 - The curriculum, originally developed over 20 years ago, is shifting from lecture-based to additional hands-on activities.
-

COJET Standing Committee Reports

Judicial College of Arizona (JCA)

- Hon. Marianne Bayardi, newly appointed Dean of JCA (2-year term), provided updates.
- Judge Danielle Harris was appointed Associate Dean and joins as a new member of JCA.
- The Judicial Conference was held for the last time at the Camelback Inn; next year's conference will be in Tucson.
- "Excellence in Education" awards were presented to Judge Alicia Villa and Mary Jane Abril.
- Programs delivered this year include Limited Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation and Civil Traffic Hearing Officer trainings.

- Upcoming programs: General Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation, Civil Traffic Hearing Officer training, and Small Claims Hearing Officer training.
- Gabe Goltz shared his positive experience as a participant at the Judicial Conference.
 - Plenary session surveys scored above 4.8.

Committee on Leadership and Workforce Excellence (COLAWE)

- Alexis Allen reported on updates to training coordinator roles and code revisions.
- The Arizona Post Executive Program is the next step after the Court Leadership Program.
- Revamps are underway for the Court Supervisor, Court Manager, and Court Executive Series.

Committee on Probation Education (COPE)

- Chief Bryan Prieto reported on programs delivered from March to June:
 - 26 programs, 139 instructors, 65 COJET hours earned.
 - Average evaluation score: 4.81.
 - Upcoming programs and the hiring of Guillermo Pena as Specialist VII were also discussed.
-

Call to the Public

- Alexis Allen invited public comment.
 - No members of the public were present.
-

Adjournment

- Judge Jennings moved to adjourn.
 - Judge Marianne Bayardi seconded the motion.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
 - Meeting adjourned at 11:26 AM.
-



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

April 2, 2026

NOVEMBER MEETING MINUTES



Committee on Judicial Education and Training (COJET)

November 20, 2025

Minutes

Members Present: Honorable Craig Jennings, Alexis Allen, Kip Anderson, Justice Maria Elena Cruz, Honorable Marianne Bayardi, Suzette Williams, Honorable Valerie Wyant, Jennifer Torchia, Honorable Michala Ruechel, Honorable Lisa Abrams, Will Gonzalez

Members Absent: David Byers, Josh Frisby, Honorable Barbara Brown, Chief Bryan Prieto

Staff: Joannie Collins, Dorcas Caesar, Gabe Goltz, Julee Bruno, Deneen Bertucci, Renu Sapra, Mike Dzezinski

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

- Alexis Allen welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- Judge Craig Jennings joined late

II. Approval of Minutes

MOTION to approve minutes - Minutes will be approved at the next meeting, April 2, 2026.

III. 2025 Annual COJET Compliance Report

- Renu Sapra reported that the Compliance Report was distributed to all training coordinators. Open house meetings with training coordinators are held every two weeks. Renu also mentioned that Joannie assisted the team with streamlining the questions that will hopefully make it easier to retrieve data.
- Joannie Collins reported that there was no code changes needed.

IV. 2025 Court Leadership Conference

- Renu reported on the Court Leadership Conference. The conference was held on October 21st -22nd in Flagstaff. 183 participants, 50 faculty members. The overall evaluation for the Court Leadership Conference was, 4.64. Positive feedback was received from the Judges. Several of them stated that this was one of the best that they attended in the last few years. They enjoyed the classes and the content.

- Joannie discussed the County Roundtables. Individual reports will be created and sent to each county's presiding judges, court administrators, and clerks. The report will be shared at the next COJET meeting.

V. Jury Academy & Judicial Traffic Conference

- Julee Bruno reported on the conference dates and attendees. The conference will be held at the Sheraton Mesa West on December 3rd – 5th. 52 judges will attend on 12/3, and 108 judges, court staff, and MDD administrative law judges will attend on 12/4 & 12/5. There will also be an additional 8 that will attend the closing plenary. The plenary on DUI time standard has now been required of all limited jurisdiction judges.
- Gabe Goltz provided updates on the conference agenda, highlighting a new speaker, Professor Jeffrey Wishart from ASU. A hands-on Arizona traffic law session featuring interactive stations and equipment demonstration will take place.

VI. Center for Judicial & Court Security Summary

- Mike Dzezinski discussed the formation of a new Center that will capture training and education initiative developed since 2019, including an assessor training program launching in May next year. Mike also mentioned the success of three continuing education classes offered this year and his acceptance of a proposal for a breakout session at the NACM conference in March.
- Joannie emphasized the hard work of Mike and his team in developing court security, which has led to increased professionalism and demand for training.

VII. Judicial Decision-Making (Lesson Plan) Draft Proposal

- Gabe discussed a proposal to replace two implicit bias classes in new judge orientation programs with a single 100-minute judicial-making class featuring ASU professor Samuel McClue.

The committee voted to table the proposal and schedule a follow-up meeting in mid-December to allow Justice Cruz time to review the materials and present further information.

VIII. Wendell Updates Strategic Agenda Initiative Update

- Joannie reported on the Wendell redesign, explaining that due to skill gaps within ITD, they are considering outsourcing the project to ADOA, which could provide a free website design using the Drupal platform.

The goal is to have the new Wendell sit operations by the Judicial Conference in June 2026.

- Deneen Bertucci provided updates on two strategic agenda initiatives: the Probation Officer Supervisor Training, which is developing foundational courses, and the Juvenile Detention Officer Academy Revamp, which is reviewing and updating the curriculum.
- Renu discussed the progress of the Workforce Development Program, noting that computer-based training courses are near completion and a pilot program will launch in January.

Updates were provided on the Judicial Officer Supervisor Training. The project is on hold until late December due to a vacant position. A replacement has been hired, and this will be a priority project. Updates will be provided at the next COJET meeting.

- Gabe shared updates on the Judicial Mentorship Program and the LNJO revamp, with both projects making progress. Meetings are being scheduled throughout the first half of 2026.

IX. COJET Standing Committee Reports

- Judge Marianne Bayardi reported on the Judicial College of Arizona. Planning for the 2026 Judicial Conference has begun.
- Alexis Allen gave an update on COLAWE. Trainings for the Leadership Conference and Leadership Institute have been revised. Classes for the court supervisor, court manager, and executive have been scheduled.
- Deneen reported updates on Probation Education, highlighting upcoming events, training programs, and achievements.

X. Call to the Public

- Alexis Allen invited members of the public to speak
- No members of the public were present

XI. Adjourn

- Judge Jennings moved to adjourn
- Judge Marianne Bayardi and Kip Anderson seconded the motion
- The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting ended at 11:37am

Motion to table Action Item (Implicit Bias) – December 15th

Valerie Wyant – Moved to Motion

Alexis Allen – Second Motion



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

April 2, 2026

MATERIALS



Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)

April 2, 2026

2025 ANNUAL COJET COMPLIANCE REPORT



Ann A. Scott Timmer
Chief Justice

David K. Byers
Administrative Director

STATE OF ARIZONA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

To: Chief Justice Ann A. Scott Timmer
From: Joannie Collins, Education Services Division Director
Date: February 10, 2026
Re: 2025 Statewide COJET Compliance Report

Enclosed is the calendar year 2025 statewide COJET compliance report in accordance with Arizona Code of Judicial Administration §1-302. The 2025 statewide COJET compliance rate is **99.91%**. Details attached to this summary include: a list of non-compliant judges and clerks, exempt judges and clerks, a year-to-year COJET compliance comparison, the 2025 compliance aggregate data and compliance by county. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Joannie Collins at jcollins@courts.az.gov or (602) 452-3025.

Court Personnel Reported	Total Employee	Compliance	Non-Compliance	Exempt
Full Time Judicial Officers	530	528	0	2
New Part Time/On Call Judicial Officers	134	133	1	0
All Probation Officers and Surveillance Officers	1,794	1,758	1	35
Juvenile Detention Officers	458	451	1	6
Court Staff	6,257	6,227	5	25
TOTAL	9,173	9,097	8	68

cc: Dave Byers, Administrative Director AOC
Jeff Schrade, Deputy Administrative Director AOC
Committee on Judicial Education and Training (COJET)
Superior Court Presiding Judges

Judicial College of Arizona (JCA)
Committee on Probation Education (COPE)
Committee on Leadership and Workforce
Excellence (COLAWE)

COJET Branch-wide Compliance Year-to-Year

YEAR	COMPLIANT	NON-COMPLIANT	COMPLIANCE RATE	EXEMPT	TOTAL PERSONS
FY 87/88	3,633	139	96.31%	N/A	3,772
FY 88/89	4,333	36	99.18%	N/A	4,369
FY 89/90	4,883	7	99.86%	N/A	4,890
FY 90/91	5,279	16	99.70%	N/A	5,295
07/1991 - 12/1994					
CY 1995	6,364	7	99.89%	66	6,437
CY 1996	7,198	7	99.90%	67	7,272
CY 1997	7,122	17	99.76%	104	7,243
CY 1998	7,667	5	99.93%	135	7,807
CY 1999	8,027	22	99.73%	142	8,191
CY 2000	8,237	26	99.69%	49	8,311
CY 2001	8,733	30	99.66%	35	8,798
CY 2002	8,752	52	99.41%	58	8,862
CY 2003	8,758	34	99.61%	65	8,857
CY 2004	9,102	15	99.84%	51	9,168
CY 2005	9,239	41	99.56%	116	9,396
CY 2006	9,593	61	99.37%	132	9,786
CY 2007	9,889	38	99.62%	102	10,029
CY 2008	9,770	29	99.70%	106	9,905
CY 2009	9,095	4	99.96%	67	9,166
CY 2010	9,206	9	99.90%	69	9,284

CY 2011	8,959	8	99.91%	67	9,034
CY 2012	8,822	10	99.89%	65	8,897
CY 2013	9,040	6	99.93%	71	9,117
CY 2014	8,976	13	99.86%	61	9,050
CY 2015	9,099	20	99.78%	69	9,188
CY 2016	9,256	23	99.75%	57	9,336
CY 2017	9,074	13	99.86%	59	9,146
CY 2018	9,156	13	99.86%	57	9,226
CY 2019	9,029	10	99.89%	79	9,118
CY 2020					
CY 2021	8,578	13	99.89%	66	8,657
CY 2022	8,604	35	99.59%	60	8,699
CY 2023	9,348	38	99.60%	37	9,423
CY 2024	8,988	26	99.71%	63	9,077
CY 2025	9,097	8	99.91%	68	9,173

2025 COJET Compliance Aggregate by County

COUNTY/COURT	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	COMPLIANT	NON- COMPLIANT	EXEMPT
APACHE	62	61	0	1
COCHISE	184	184	0	0
COCONINO	266	265	1	0
GILA	85	85	0	0
GRAHAM	59	59	0	0
GREENLEE	22	19	3	0
LA PAZ	32	32	0	0
MARICOPA	4,696	4,663	3	30
MOHAVE	285	283	0	2
NAVAJO	129	127	0	2
PIMA	1,330	1,319	0	11
PINAL	536	532	0	4
SANTA CRUZ	91	91	0	0
YAVAPAI	408	395	0	13
YUMA	364	359	1	4
AOC	421	421	0	0
COA – DIV I	105	105	0	0
COA – DIV II	49	48	0	1
SC Clerk's Office	8	8	0	0
Staff Attorney & Justices	41	41	0	0
TOTALS	9,173	9,097	8	68

COGNITIVE BIASES & THEIR IMPACT ON JUDICIAL DECISION MAKING

(Definitions + Discussion Questions)

CONFIRMATION BIAS

Definition: The tendency to favor information that supports an initial impression or hypothesis while giving less weight to information that contradicts it.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might early impressions formed from case files influence later evaluation of evidence?
 - In what ways can case narratives shape which facts become more salient during hearings?
 - What procedures help ensure that contradictory information is fully considered?
 - How can courtroom processes reduce reliance on initial assumptions?
-

ANCHORING BIAS

Definition: The tendency to rely heavily on the first piece of information offered—such as a recommended sentence or initial bail request—when making decisions.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might initial numerical recommendations shape perceptions of a reasonable outcome?
 - What forms of “anchors” commonly appear in courtroom settings?
 - What decision-making structures can help offset the influence of initial suggestions?
 - How could outcomes differ if initial anchors were significantly higher or lower?
-

AVAILABILITY BIAS

Definition: The tendency to judge the frequency, importance, or risk of events based on how easily examples come to mind, often due to recent or emotionally memorable cases.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might recent high-profile or emotionally charged cases influence perceptions of risk?
 - What courtroom patterns might become overly influential because they are memorable?
 - How can courts support case-by-case evaluation rather than relying on vivid recollections?
 - What safeguards help ensure that decisions remain grounded in the specific record?
-

IMPLICIT BIAS

Definition: Unconscious attitudes or stereotypes that can influence interpretation of behavior, credibility, or risk assessments based on demographic or cultural characteristics.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How can unconscious associations influence perceptions of credibility or trustworthiness?
 - What courtroom behaviors are most susceptible to cross-cultural misinterpretation?
 - How can decision-making processes stay consistently tied to objective criteria?
 - What systemic safeguards help reduce the influence of unconscious associations?
-

AFFINITY (IN-GROUP) BIAS

Definition: The tendency to feel greater familiarity or comfort with individuals who share similar backgrounds, experiences, or characteristics.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might perceived familiarity influence interpersonal dynamics in the courtroom?
 - In what ways can shared background or communication style affect evaluations of litigants?
 - What procedures help ensure consistent treatment across diverse litigants?
 - How can decision-making avoid relying on comfort or familiarity?
-

OVERCONFIDENCE BIAS

Definition: The tendency to overestimate the accuracy of one's judgments, particularly in areas of high experience or routine decision-making.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might experience with common case types create assumptions that limit fresh analysis?
 - What types of legal arguments or evidence are most easily overlooked due to familiarity?
 - What decision-making habits support thorough evaluation even in routine matters?
 - How can courts encourage ongoing learning and re-evaluation?
-

HINDSIGHT BIAS

Definition: The tendency to view past events as more predictable than they were, based on knowledge gained after the fact.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How can knowledge of an outcome shape perceptions of what someone should have foreseen?
 - In what types of cases does hindsight create challenges for fair evaluation?
 - What methods help re-focus assessments on information available at the time of the event?
 - How might the legal requirement of foreseeability be affected by hindsight-thinking?
-

STATUS QUO BIAS

Definition: The preference for maintaining existing conditions even when change may be justified by evidence.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might the desire for stability influence decisions involving ongoing orders or arrangements?
- What factors make changes to existing conditions seem riskier than they are?

- How can courts ensure that current arrangements receive the same scrutiny as proposed changes?
 - What processes help ensure decisions are based on evidence rather than on inertia?
-

FRAMING EFFECT / EMOTIONAL BIAS

Definition: The tendency for decisions to be influenced by how information is presented—particularly when it is framed in an emotional, dramatic, or vivid manner.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- What courtroom moments are most susceptible to emotional influence?
 - How can emotional presentations affect perceptions of harm, culpability, or risk?
 - What practices help refocus attention on statutory or evidentiary standards?
 - How might the framing of information by counsel shape decision outcomes?
-

BLIND-SPOT BIAS

Definition: The tendency to believe that one is less susceptible to biases than others, making it harder to identify personal vulnerabilities.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How can confidence in objectivity make bias harder to detect?
 - What data or patterns might reveal unnoticed disparities in decision-making?
 - How can peer dialogue and review support awareness of potential blind spots?
 - What structures can courts implement to promote self-assessment?
-

STEREOTYPE EXPECTATION BIAS

Definition: The tendency to rely on generalized expectations about groups or roles when evaluating individual behavior.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How can role-based or demographic expectations influence assessments of conduct?

- What courtroom scenarios create opportunities for generalized expectations to influence judgments?
 - What techniques help ensure individuals are evaluated independently of group stereotypes?
 - How can systems support objective, individualized assessments?
-

REPRESENTATIVENESS HEURISTIC

Definition: The tendency to assume a person or case fits a broader pattern or category based on superficial similarity rather than detailed evidence.

Questions for Group Discussion:

- How might similarities to past cases shape expectations in current matters?
 - What risks exist when a case is viewed as “typical” rather than unique?
 - What approaches help ensure independent evaluation of each case’s facts?
 - How can courts prevent pattern-recognition from overtaking individualized judgment?
-

FACILITATOR GUIDE

Cognitive Biases in Judicial Decision Making

(Definitions + Discussion Goals + Suggested Talking Points)

CONFIRMATION BIAS

Definition: The tendency to favor information that supports an initial impression while discounting information that contradicts it.

Discussion Goals:

- Explore how early impressions can shape interpretation of later evidence.
- Examine how case file summaries, police narratives, or opening statements create initial frames.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Early case impressions often feel accurate because they provide a coherent story; this can make later contradictory information seem less credible or less important.
 - Confirmation bias doesn't require intentional unfairness—it's an automatic cognitive process.
 - Structured decision steps (e.g., checklists) can help ensure all legally relevant factors are reviewed.
 - Asking “what evidence points in another direction?” helps broaden analysis.
-

ANCHORING BIAS

Definition: The tendency to rely heavily on the first piece of information encountered (e.g., sentencing recommendation, bail request).

Discussion Goals:

- Highlight how numerical anchors influence judgments, even when known to be arbitrary.
- Discuss anchors created by attorneys, pretrial reports, or initial case narratives.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Even implausible or extreme numbers can pull later judgments toward them.
 - Sentencing and bail determinations are particularly susceptible because they involve numerical decisions.
 - Independent, criteria-based assessments reduce anchor influence.
 - Deliberate “resetting” (e.g., listing statutory factors first) helps judges recalibrate.
-

AVAILABILITY BIAS

Definition: The tendency to overestimate the importance or likelihood of events based on how easily similar examples come to mind.

Discussion Goals:

- Understand how recent or emotional cases become overly influential.
- Explore how salient cases affect perceptions of risk or future behavior.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Memorable or intense cases can distort perception of typical case patterns.
 - Availability bias can unconsciously elevate perceived danger or severity.
 - Written findings and structured checklists help refocus on the case at hand.
 - Regular reflection helps differentiate individual cases from emotional memory.
-

IMPLICIT BIAS

Definition: Unconscious attitudes or stereotypes that can influence interpretation of behavior, credibility, or risk.

Discussion Goals:

- Encourage understanding of how unconscious processes operate without attributing intent.
- Explore high-impact zones: demeanor, credibility, risk assessment, sentencing.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Implicit bias influences perception of body language, tone, and communication style.
 - Cultural expression or stress responses can be misinterpreted as disrespect or dishonesty.
 - Objective criteria and standard questions reduce reliance on subjective perception.
 - Implicit bias training and periodic self-review can improve long-term fairness.
-

AFFINITY (IN-GROUP) BIAS

Definition: The tendency to feel more comfortable with people who seem familiar or similar in background, culture, or communication style.

Discussion Goals:

- Explore how familiarity influences rapport and credibility assessments.
- Highlight differences between comfort and objective evaluation.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Similarity can subtly influence perceptions of trustworthiness or good intentions.

- Differences in culture or life experience can inadvertently reduce empathy or patience.
 - Standardized evaluation criteria help maintain equity.
 - Awareness of emotional comfort levels can reduce unintentional favoritism.
-

OVERCONFIDENCE BIAS

Definition: The tendency to overestimate accuracy of judgment, particularly in familiar or routine case types.

Discussion Goals:

- Illustrate how experience can create blind spots.
- Encourage recognition that new legal issues or case dynamics may require fresh analysis.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Expertise is valuable, but familiarity can reduce careful review of novel arguments.
 - Assumptions such as “I’ve seen this many times” can overshadow important new facts.
 - Systems that encourage double-checking (e.g., reviewing recent case law) help maintain accuracy.
 - Peer discussion can help reduce overconfidence in routine decisions.
-

HINDSIGHT BIAS

Definition: The tendency to see events as more predictable after the outcome is known.

Discussion Goals:

- Explore challenges in cases involving foreseeability, negligence, or risk assessments.
- Encourage examination of what information was available at the time of an event.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Outcomes often feel “obvious” once they have occurred, but were not obvious beforehand.
- Hindsight can make behavior seem more negligent or reckless than it was under real-time conditions.

- Judges benefit from focusing evaluations on what a reasonable person would have known then—not now.
 - Thought experiments such as “what would this look like without knowing the outcome?” help reduce hindsight effects.
-

STATUS QUO BIAS

Definition: The preference for maintaining current conditions rather than implementing change.

Discussion Goals:

- Examine cases where ongoing orders or arrangements persist because they feel stable.
- Discuss the tension between stability and responsiveness to new evidence.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Existing arrangements often feel safer even when evidence favors modification.
 - Courts aim to ensure current conditions undergo the same scrutiny as proposed changes.
 - Structured evaluations, particularly in family or probation cases, ensure decisions reflect current facts.
 - Recognizing “inertia” in decision making improves fairness.
-

FRAMING EFFECT / EMOTIONAL BIAS

Definition: The tendency for decisions to be influenced by how information is presented, especially when delivered in emotional or dramatic terms.

Discussion Goals:

- Highlight how emotional presentations can shape perceptions of harm or culpability.
- Distinguish empathy from legal analysis.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Victim statements, attorney rhetoric, or graphic descriptions can strongly sway perception.

- Emotional information can shift attention away from legal requirements or statutory factors.
 - Conscious refocusing on the standard of proof or elements of the offense mitigates framing effects.
 - Taking time for reflection improves neutrality.
-

BLIND-SPOT BIAS

Definition: The tendency to believe one is less biased than others, making bias difficult to detect.

Discussion Goals:

- Promote openness to continuous improvement and peer collaboration.
- Discuss the value of data review and feedback mechanisms.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Most people notice bias in others more easily than in themselves.
 - Judicial performance data can reveal patterns not visible case by case.
 - Peer discussion groups and mentorship foster accountability.
 - Recognizing the possibility of bias is itself a protective factor.
-

STEREOTYPE EXPECTATION BIAS

Definition: The tendency to rely on group-based expectations when evaluating individuals.

Discussion Goals:

- Identify how role expectations (e.g., “typical defendant,” “typical victim”) can influence case analysis.
- Encourage individualized, evidence-based evaluation.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Expectations can arise from repeated exposure to certain patterns.
- Group-based assumptions may overshadow individual facts.

- Asking “what evidence specifically supports this conclusion?” helps counter stereotypes.
 - Clear separation between facts and expectations improves fairness.
-

REPRESENTATIVENESS HEURISTIC

Definition: The tendency to categorize cases or individuals based on superficial similarity to other cases rather than detailed evidence.

Discussion Goals:

- Discuss how prior experience shapes assumptions about new cases.
- Promote individual assessment rather than pattern matching.

Suggested Talking Points:

- Cases that appear similar at first glance may differ in legally significant ways.
 - Pattern recognition is useful but can lead to overlooking unique facts.
 - Structured questioning helps isolate what is truly distinctive about the current case.
 - Encouraging judges to articulate the specific basis for decisions reduces reliance on general impressions.
-



Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)

April 2, 2026

STRATEGIC AGENDA UPDATES



**Committee on Judicial Education and Training
(COJET)**

April 2, 2026

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Judicial College of Arizona (JCA)

Highlights/Program Updates

- 2026 Judicial Conference agenda set, and registration will open in April. New JCA appointment of Jamie Sparks (non-judicial appointment); reappointments of Judge Manuel Delgado and Judge Leonore Driggs.

Past Programs

- Jury Trial Academy
 - o 12/3/25
 - o Sheraton Mesa
 - o 52 participants
 - o 4 faculty
 - o 7 instructional hours
 - o 4.35 Overall evaluation score
- GOHS AZ Judicial Traffic Conference
 - o 12/4/25 – 12/5/25
 - o Sheraton Mesa
 - o 108 participants
 - o 28 faculty
 - o 8.5 instructional hours
 - o 4.65 Overall evaluation score
- Limited Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation (LNJO) week 1
 - o 1/26/26 – 1/30/26
 - o Judicial Education Center
 - o 28 participants
 - o 28 faculty
 - o 32 instructional hours
 - o 4.59 Overall evaluation score
- Limited Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation (LNJO) week 2
 - o 2/9/26 – 2/13/26
 - o Judicial Education Center
 - o 28 participants
 - o 22 faculty
 - o 36 instructional hours
 - o 4.67 Overall evaluation score

Upcoming Programs

- General Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation (4/6-10)
- Limited Jurisdiction New Judge Orientation week 3 (4/27-5/1)

- Civil Traffic Hearing Officer Training Program (5/13-15)
- 2026 Judicial Conference (6/16-18)

Committee on Leadership and Workforce Excellence (COLAWE)

Highlights/Program Updates

Strategic Agenda Item 5.2 – Workforce Development

- January 20, 2026 – A statewide email was distributed to the 100 pre-identified staff members. The email communicated:
 - A clear overview of Strategic Agenda 5.2
 - Included a 5-minute, high-level CBT highlighting the strategic importance and statewide impact of the initiative
 - Defined participant roles, expectations, participation requirements, and the purpose behind their involvement
- Following deployment, court staff received direct link access to begin their assigned rollout CBTs. Participants were provided one month to complete required trainings and surveys (Jan. 20, 2026 – Feb. 20, 2026).
 - Superior Court participants will complete 3 of the 4 CBTs, including: AZ Courts; Where Do I Fit In?; The Three Branches of Arizona Government; Court Records; and Rule 123.
- After the completion of the CBTs and associated surveys, AI was leveraged to compile the data to average out the time of each CBT and awarded each participant with the average allotted time for their COJET certificate.
- The survey data has been fully compiled and analyzed, reflecting the following:
 - Key findings and participation trends
 - Identified strengths and areas requiring improvement
 - Training gaps, emerging needs, and strategic opportunities for refinement
 - See summary data below:

Data Overview (Q8–Q18; % Positive)

“Positive” = Strongly Agree + Agree. Denominators: **AZ Courts** (n=62), **Rule 123** (n=68), **Three Branches** (n=69), **E-Citations** (n=40). [1234](#)

Dimension	AZ Courts	Rule 123	Three Branches	E-Citations
Navigation (Q8)	96.77% 1	94.12% 2	89.86% 3	97.50% 4
Organization (Q9)	96.77% 1	94.12% 2	94.20% 3	97.50% 4
Clarity (Q11)	96.77% 1	98.53% 2	98.55% 3	92.50% 4
Instructions (Q12)	98.39% 1	98.53% 2	94.20% 3	97.50% 4
Role relevance (Q13)	98.39% 1	95.59% 2	97.10% 3	75.00% (neutral 22.5%; negative 2.5%) 4
Activities reinforced (Q14)	96.77% 1	98.53% 2	95.65% 3	95.00% 4
Length appropriate (Q15)	90.32% 1	85.29% 2	89.86% 3	97.50% 4
Engagement (Q16)	83.87% 1	88.24% 2	84.06% 3	90.00% 4
Quizzes reinforced (Q17)	96.77% 1	97.06% 2	95.65% 3	92.50% 4
Overall positive (Q18)	95.16% 1	95.59% 2	97.10% 3	95.00% 4

- The second phase of Tier 1 is now underway. Subject matter experts (SMEs) have been identified for each of the topic areas outlined below, and we have begun both gathering existing training resources and developing new instructional materials where needed. This phase continues the “Essential Skills” curriculum by expanding and deepening the topics introduced in Phase I. Phase II of Tier 1 is a substantial effort, and the projected completion timeline is October 2026.
- See below of current list of classes being developed:
 - Ethics
 - Judicial Employee Code of Conduct
 - Legal Advice v. Info
 - Procedural Fairness
 - Self-Awareness
 - Accountability
 - Self-Care and Mindfulness
 - Don’t Take It Personally
 - Communication
 - Customer Focus / Emotional Intelligence / Language of Caring
 - Court Customers
 - Professionalism and Communication
- Phase III of Tier 1 will center on automation and court-related technologies, marking a significant shift from the foundational skills emphasized in the earlier phases. This portion of the curriculum will address the increasingly complex technological landscape within Arizona’s courts, including the wide variation in case management systems (CMS) and the differing operational practices across jurisdictions.
- Because each court utilizes its own combination of platforms, workflows, and levels of automation, developing standardized training that is both accurate and broadly applicable presents a unique challenge. As a result, Phase III requires a more extensive research and development period to ensure the content is comprehensive, adaptable, and reflective of real-world processes.
- Given these complexities, Phase III carries a longer projected timeline, with an estimated completion date of June 2027. This extended schedule allows for thorough consultation with technical experts, careful mapping of system variations, and the creation of training materials that can be effectively implemented statewide.

2025 COJET Compliance Report

The 2025 COJET Compliance Report was distributed on November 5 to all designated Training Coordinators (TCs) responsible for gathering, verifying, and submitting compliance data for their respective jurisdictions. As part of the annual reporting cycle, TCs were asked to review staff training records, ensure all required hours and course types were accurately documented, and submit their finalized reports no later than January 15, 2026.

This year’s reporting period demonstrated exceptionally strong engagement across the state. The final results reflect an outstanding **99.91% compliance rate**. Of the **9,173 total staff members** included in the report, **9,097 successfully met all COJET requirements** for the year. Only **8 individuals were identified as non-compliant**, a remarkably low number given the size and diversity of the statewide workforce. Additionally, **68 staff members received approved exemptions**, which were granted in accordance with established COJET guidelines.

Overall, the 2025 compliance cycle highlights the effectiveness of local training programs, the diligence of Training Coordinators, and the strong culture of continuous learning within Arizona's courts. These results will help inform future training initiatives, identify areas for targeted support, and reinforce the importance of maintaining high standards of professional education across all jurisdictions.

Court Personnel Reported	Total Employee	Compliance	Non-Compliance	Exempt
Full Time Judicial Officers	530	528	0	2
New Part Time/On Call Judicial Officers	134	133	1	0
All Probation Officers and Surveillance Officers	1,794	1,758	1	35
Juvenile Detention Officers	458	451	1	6
Court Staff	6,257	6,227	5	25
TOTAL	9,173	9,097	8	68

2025 COJET Compliance Aggregate by County				
COUNTY/COURT	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	COMPLIANT	NON-COMPLIANT	EXEMPT
APACHE	62	61	0	1
COCHISE	184	184	0	0
COCONINO	266	265	1	0
GILA	85	85	0	0
GRAHAM	59	59	0	0
GREENLEE	22	19	3	0
LA PAZ	32	32	0	0
MARICOPA	4,696	4,663	3	30
MOHAVE	285	283	0	2
NAVAJO	129	127	0	2
PIMA	1,330	1,319	0	11
PINAL	536	532	0	4
SANTA CRUZ	91	91	0	0
YAVAPAI	408	395	0	13
YUMA	364	359	1	4
AOC	421	421	0	0
COA – DIV I	105	105	0	0
COA – DIV II	49	48	0	1
SC Clerk's Office	8	8	0	0
Staff Attorney & Justices	41	41	0	0
TOTALS	9,173	9,097	8	68

Statewide Trainings

For this year's statewide training calendar, a total of **16 statewide training sessions** have been identified, developed, and scheduled. This lineup was intentionally designed to provide broad coverage of essential topics while ensuring accessibility for staff across all jurisdictions. By offering a robust selection of statewide sessions, we aim to support consistent professional development opportunities regardless of location, staffing levels, or local training capacity.

The decision to schedule 16 statewide trainings aligns directly with our goal of maintaining the highest possible rate of COJET compliance. Because all judicial branch employees are required to complete **16 COJET hours annually**, providing an equivalent number of statewide training opportunities (excluding Computer and Network Security) ensures that staff have ample flexibility to meet their requirements. This approach helps accommodate varying workloads, scheduling constraints, and operational demands that may limit participation in local training events.

In addition to supporting compliance, the expanded statewide calendar promotes uniformity in training content, reinforces key competencies across the branch, and strengthens collaboration among jurisdictions. These sessions also serve as a valuable resource for smaller courts that may have limited training staff or fewer in-house offerings.

Leadership Institute (LI) Programs, Leadership & Workforce Unit Programs and AZ Plus Workgroup Report for April 2026 COJET Meeting

ACS Online Coursework – ACS REVAMP PROJECT

This project aims to transition from using Percipio for Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Program online courses to creating and delivering our own courses in-house through Tracorp. The goal is to provide tailored, interactive, and trackable learning experiences for court supervisors or those with supervisory aspirations. New course content provided by subject matter experts assistance is expected to be completed by Fall 2026, with the in-house computer-based trainings completed and implemented by June 2027.

Past Programs

- Arizona Court Executive (ACE) Leadership
 - December 10-12, 2025
 - 12 participants
 - 3 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
 - Overall eval = 4.70
- Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Project Management
 - January 21 - 23, 2026
 - 35 participants
 - 1 faculty candidate certified to teach the class in the future
 - 3 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
 - Overall eval = 4.73
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Transition to Role of Supervisor (webinar)
 - January 28, 2026
 - 13 participants
 - 1 faculty
 - 1.50 instructional hours

- Overall eval = 5.00
- Arizona Court Manager (ACE) Modern Court Governance
 - February 18 – 20, 2026
 - 11 participants
 - 2 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
 - Overall eval = 4.50
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Supervisory Ethics (webinar)
 - March 4, 2026
 - 24 participants
 - 1 faculty
 - 1.50 instructional hours
 - Overall eval = 4.91
- Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Budget & Fiscal Management
 - March 11 - 13, 2026
 - 44 participants
 - 3 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
 - Overall eval = TBD
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Transition to Role of Supervisor (webinar)
 - March 25, 2026
 - 23 participants registered
 - 1 faculty
 - 1.50 instructional hours
 - Overall eval

Upcoming Programs

- Arizona Court Executive (ACE) Executive Decision Making
 - April 1 – 3, 2026
 - 25 participants registered
 - 2 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Managing Human Resources (virtual)
 - April 15 & 16, 2026
 - 51 participants registered
 - 2 faculty
 - 7.5 instructional hours
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Supervisor's Role in Effective Caseflow Management (virtual)
 - April 29 & 30, 2026
 - 49 participants registered
 - 2 faculty
 - 7.5 instructional hours
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Supervisory Ethics (webinar)
 - May 6, 2026
 - 0 participants registered
 - 1 faculty
 - 1.5 instructional hours
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) S.AZ Operational Excellence (formerly Capstone)
 - May 15, 2026
 - 17 participants registered
 - 3 faculty / 5 sessions
 - 5 instructional hours

- Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts
 - May 20 - 22, 2026
 - 40 participants registered
 - 3 faculty
 - 16.25 instructional hours
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) Transition to Role of Supervisor (webinar)
 - May 27, 2026
 - Registration opens March 27
 - 1 faculty
 - 1.50 instructional hours
 - Overall eval

Committee on Probation Education (COPE)

Highlights/Program Updates

- A total of 26 programs were delivered between November to March 2026, impacting 425 participants. Additionally, 171 instructors served as faculty offering 3,363.75 individual COJET Hours with a total of 10,337.5 participant hours. The overall evaluation scores for all training ranged between a 4.38 to a 5.0 with an average score of 4.82 for this time frame.
- The Sheraton Mesa Hotel at Wrigleyville West has been selected as the site for the 2026 Statewide Probation Conference. A *Call for Presenters* was released in February resulting in the submission of numerous proposals from around the state focusing on exciting work being done in our departments. The conference work group is reviewing the proposals for inclusion in the conference, which is scheduled for September 9, 2026.
- Work continues toward the strategic agenda initiative of revamping the Juvenile Detention Officer Academy. All existing curriculum was reviewed, and work group members are modifying existing materials to incorporate new procedures and information more reflective of the current role of detention officers in Arizona.
- Curriculum development also continues for the first module of the new Supervisor Skills Enhancement Program (SSEP), which is based upon another strategic agenda initiative. The work group will be piloting these for existing supervisors for feedback. Work has also started on creating content for the next module focusing on effective communication, coaching, and providing feedback.
- A new collaboration has been formed with Child Help, a national non-profit agency helping abused, neglected, and at-risk children. Four webinars have been scheduled for 2026, open to all probation staff on the requirements for Mandatory Reporters.
- All three modules of CBTs in the new series on mental health issues were released in March of this year and are now available to new and existing probation staff around the state through Tracorp.

Past Programs

Programs November 2025 – March 2026

Date(s)	Training Name	Location	Total Participants	Total Faculty	Total Instructional Hours	Total Participant Hours	Overall Evaluation
10/27-11/07	Probation Officer Certification Academy (JPO)	JEC	17	12	62	1054	4.82
10/27-11/07	Probation Officer Certification Academy (APO)	JEC	34	21	62	2108	4.78
11/03-11/07	Defensive Tactics	JEC	10	4	37	370	4.91
11/17-11/21	Juvenile Detention Officer Academy	JEC	15	13	30.75	461.25	4.38
11/17-11/21	Firearms Academy	Maricopa	12	7	37	444	5.00

12/01-12/05	Defensive Tactics	JEC	11	6	37	407	4.90
12/8-12/12	Firearms Training	Maricopa	11	6	37	407	4.75
12/8-12/9	Faculty Skills Development	JEC	18	6	11.25	202.5	4.75
12/15-12/19	Firearms Training	Globe	10	4	37	370	4.89
1/05-1/16	Probation Officer Certification Academy	JEC	41	20	2604	62	4.79
1/12-1/16	Defensive Tactics	JEC	12	3	37	444	4.92
1/12-1/16	Firearms Training	Maricopa	12	4	37	444	5.0
1/26-1/30	Firearms Training	Kingman	8	5	37	296	5.0
1/26-1/30	Defensive Tactics	Maricopa	12	4	37	444	4.83
2/2-2/3	Behavior Management TTT	JEC	9	2	7.5	67.5	4.63
2/9-2/13	Defensive Tactics	JEC	9	7	37	333	4.89
2/13	Mandatory Reporters	Webinar	71	1	1.5	106.5	4.89
2/22-2/27	Firearms Training	Kingman	7	5	37	259	5.0
2/26-2/27	Faculty Skills Development	JEC	17	4	11.25	191.25	4.95
3/2-3/6	Firearms Training	Maricopa	12	5	37	444	4.40
3/2-3/6	Juvenile Detention Officer Academy	JEC	11	14	30.75	338.25	4.64
3/9-3/13	Defensive Tactics	JEC	8	4	37	296	5.0
3/16	Adult IPS Institute	Webinar	21	1	2.50	52.5	4.82
3/16	Juvenile IPS Institute	Webinar	9	0	2	18	4.83
3/18-3/20	Surveillance Officer Academy	JEC	19	10	20.25	384.75	pending
3/23-3/27	Firearms Training	Globe	9	3	37	333	Pending

Upcoming Programs

- Defensive Tactics: 4/6-4/10
- Rifle Training 4/6-4/9
- Probation Officer Certification Academy 4/13 – 4/24
- Defensive Tactics Train the Trainer 4/13-4/17

- Firearms Training 4/27-5/1
- Faculty Skills Development 5/4-5/5
- Mandatory Reporter webinar 5/11
- Firearms Training 5/18/5/22
- Motivational Interviewing Train the Trainer 5/18-5/20
- Firearms Training 6/22-6/26
- Juvenile Detention Officer Academy 7/6-7/10
- Firearms Training 7/20-7/24
- Probation Officer Certification Academy 7/20-7/31
- Mandatory Reporter webinar 8/6
- Firearms Training 8/24-8/28
- Faculty Skills Development 8/24-8/25



Court Security



Highlights/Program Updates

- **Judicial Branch Court Security Officer Continuing Education**

- In-person
- *Firearm Train-the-Trainer (Q1 2026)*
- *Security Assessor Training Program (Q2 2026)*
- *Defensive Tactics Train-the-Trainer (Q2 2026)*
- Virtual
- *Court Security Ethical Considerations (Q1 2026)*
- *Hand Wanding Refresher (Q2 2026)*
- *Security Sweep Considerations (Q3 2026)*
-

- **Judicial Officer Continuing Education**

- In-person
- *Judicial Officer Defensive Tactics (Q1 – Q4)*
- *Court Security Hot Topics & Lessons Learned - 2026 Judicial Conference*
-

- **Total Numbers to Date**

<u>In-Person</u>	<u>Participants</u>
CSO Academy	19
CSO Firearm Academy	13
Guard Academy	10
CSO Firearm Train-the-Trainer	9
Judicial Officer Defensive Tactics	9

- Average evaluation score 5.00
-

<u>Virtual</u>	<u>Completions</u>
Court Security Ethical Considerations	53

- **External Continuing Education**

- National Association of Court Management (Albuquerque, NM)
- *Court Security Training & Education: Lessons Learned* 105
- Evaluation Score 5.00
-

