

ACTIVITY REPORTING AND PROPOSAL FORM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVES AOC RESTRUCTURING

DATE	1/25/2013
PREPARED BY	Dr. Diane Cowdrey
OFFICE NAME	<u>Center for Judiciary Education and Research</u>
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE NUMBER	86
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Education Division should conduct true cost benefit analyses in determining the types of training and education it provides for new judicial officers and others, and to report to the council on the results. Analyses should include types, lengths, locations of programs, delivery methods, and the costs to courts.
SEC RECOMMENDATION	The Education Division should conduct true cost-benefit analyses — and not rely only on its own preferences — in determining the types of training and education it provides, including types, lengths, and locations of programs, delivery methods, and the costs to courts. This type of analysis should apply to training and education programs for new judicial officers.
RESPONSE (check applicable boxes)	
<input type="checkbox"/> This directive has been completed and implemented:	
<input type="text"/>	
<input type="button" value="File Attachment"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> This directive is forwarded to the Judicial Council with options for consideration:	
<input type="text"/>	
<input type="button" value="File Attachment"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	
<p>The Judicial Council had requested that CJER submit recommendations on the cost-benefit process at its December 14th meeting with a final report submitted to the Council at its April 2013 meeting. CJER requested a slight extension until the Council's January 17, 2013 meeting for its recommendations and that has now been moved to the February 2013 meeting. The final report will be submitted to the Council at its April 2013 meeting as originally directed.</p> <p>As the following narrative details, CJER's recommendations are to 1) increase oversight by the Governing Committee of CJER management with respect to determining the appropriate expenditures for developing education, 2) ensure validation by the Governing Committee of the analyses and recommendations of curriculum committees, and 3) provide Advisory Committee-level</p>	

oversight of cost effectiveness in the manner in which education is delivered while maintaining educational effectiveness.

In order to comply with Judicial Council directive #86, CJER recommends strengthening the "cost" side of the equation by making the following four changes to current process:

1. CJER staff will provide additional information on costs to the curriculum committees so they can analyze the relative delivery costs against the effectiveness of a particular delivery method for achieving stated educational goals and objectives.
- 2.. The Governing Committee and curriculum committees should examine costs in their selection of the types of delivery methods. It should include variables such as the lengths and locations of live programs, direct and indirect development costs and estimated costs to courts. (This job aid is to be developed.)
3. Staff should facilitate discussion among committee members about the effectiveness and costs of various delivery methods and should ensure that the benefits of more expensive methods are clearly documented for review by the CJER Governing Committee should the curriculum committee determine that a more costly delivery method is necessary to effectively achieve educational goals.

After the curriculum committees have conducted the cost-benefit analysis and made their prioritized recommendations to the Governing Committee, CJER staff will continue with the established practice of resourcing the prioritized committee recommendations to ensure the efficient delivery of as many of the committee recommendations as possible, with the available budget and staff resources.

An additional change to the current process would be to provide this same information on relative costs to the Governing Committee. In their meeting every two years to review a recommended education plan, CJER proposes that:

4. CJER Governing Committee members should 1) review the aggregate delivery and prioritization recommendations of the nine curriculum committees, 2) review and validate the appropriateness of the delivery methods recommended by the curriculum committees, and 3) validate staff recommendations regarding the overall deployment of CJER's resources in response to the educational needs identified by the committees.

BACKGROUND

Currently, CJER employs a cost-effectiveness analysis, which is more applicable to the environment of developing and providing education. Cost-effectiveness analysis is a form of economic analysis that compares the relative costs and outcomes of two or more courses of action. Cost-effectiveness analysis is distinct from cost-benefit analysis, which assigns a monetary value to the particular outcome, which in this instance, would be the delivery of education. The Office of Court Research agrees with CJER's approach.

In both the cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis, the constant factor is cost. To that end, CJER can make changes to the current process of its education plan development that is conducted by the curriculum committees (and reviewed and approved by the CJER Governing Committee) to more fully include information on the relative costs of particular delivery methods. Such changes would provide financial information to the decision-makers regarding costs of the various education delivery methods currently available to CJER so that a more robust discussion could be had by each curriculum committee. The "effectiveness" side of the equation would be to examine the effectiveness of the various delivery methods and this is already being done by use of a job aid (attached) that outlines the appropriate delivery methods for a particular type of content (e.g., a webinar, a live program, an online course, etc.).

 File Attachment

 File Attachment

TIMELINE AND RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

**IMPLEMENTATION
DATE OR
PROJECTED**

April, 2013

IMPLEMENTATION DATE	
RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	None projected at this time.
ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION (complete only applicable sections)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROCEDURES/ POLICIES UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<p>Attached is CJER's current financial analysis procedure. This will be updated as a result of implementation of Judicial Council Directive #86, according to the proposed recommendations in the previous section.</p> <div data-bbox="500 575 818 772">  <p>86 JC rpt updated_1.22.2013.docx Microsoft Office Word Document 54.4 KB</p> </div> <div data-bbox="500 806 818 1066">  <p>Attach C_Education Delivery_Events and Products Standard Definition Table vSEC2.xls Microsoft Office Excel 97-2003 Worksheet 51.0 KB</p> </div> <div data-bbox="500 1100 818 1163">  File Attachment </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<div data-bbox="500 1234 818 1297">  File Attachment </div>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAVINGS	<p>Implementing a more rigorous cost effectiveness analysis and workflow process may enable CJER and the committees it serves to develop and deliver more education to the judiciary and the courts with reduced resources, while maintaining a focus on the effectiveness of the education provided. When provided with financial data on the costs of providing education in the various delivery methods, curriculum committees may still determine that a more costly delivery method is the most effective one to use.</p> <div data-bbox="500 1549 818 1612">  File Attachment </div>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COST	<p>The overriding purpose of this recommendation is to ensure that information on costs is being effectively provided to the appropriate decision-makers, and that each education program and product is effective in imparting the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary.</p> <div data-bbox="500 1766 818 1829">  File Attachment </div>
	To be determined.

<input type="checkbox"/> EFFICIENCIES	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">  File Attachment </div> <div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px;">  File Attachment </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE LEVEL IMPACT	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">To be determined.</div> <div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px;">  File Attachment </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 2px;">  File Attachment </div>
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COURTS (ADOC) REVIEW AND APPROVAL	
ADOC REVIEW	Administrative Director of the Courts Review Date: <input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="2/7/2013"/>
EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING (E&P) COMMITTEE REVIEW	
E&P REVIEW	Executive and Planning Review Date: <input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="2/14/2013"/>

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER) Current Resource Analysis Process

As a result of Judicial Council Directive #86, which relates to a cost-benefit analysis for education programs, the Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER) recommends a change in the way it creates the two-year education plan. The recommendations are to (a) increase oversight by the CJER Governing Committee of CJER management with respect to determining the appropriate expenditures for developing education, (b) ensure validation by the Governing Committee of the analyses and recommendation of Curriculum Committees, and (c) provide Curriculum Committees information on cost effectiveness in the manner in which education is delivered while maintaining educational effectiveness. In making these changes, it is useful to note the current process used by CJER.

Overview of Current Process

The Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER) performs a resource (financial and staffing) analysis of every delivery method currently used. This includes the direct costs of producing each event (e.g., hotel and travel costs) as well as CJER's staffing resources (e.g., the capacity of staff to complete these projects) and a consideration of costs to courts. Decisions regarding which training to offer and how to deliver it properly rests with the nine Curriculum Committees, and ultimately, with the CJER Governing Committee as it develops, and in due course, approves its two year education plan. They determine the *benefit* of whether to offer education programs and products and which delivery methods would be most *effective*. CJER then conducts the financial and staffing analysis in order to see if these programs and products can be adequately resourced, after recommendations from curriculum committees have been submitted.

In developing the two-year education plan, curriculum committees are asked to recommend to the Governing Committee (a) a prioritized list of education programs and products for the two-year period, and (b) the recommended method(s) of delivery for those programs and products. Committees determine the best possible way to provide the education, based upon their understanding of the content, the audience, timing and need—in other words—how can this education be provided so that it is the most effective? Currently, CJER does not share the detailed financial analysis with the curriculum committees because their focus is not the resources available to CJER, but how to deliver the education in the most effective way. The financial and staffing analysis is conducted *after* committees make their recommendations and necessarily includes analysis of the aggregate work of the nine committees.

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

CJER does provide the committees with information regarding the *relative* costs of each method (e.g., a live statewide event is more expensive to deliver than a broadcast) as well as the *relative* benefit of each type of delivery (e.g., a live event is more *effective* educationally than a broadcast because it is a richer educational experience and allows for more interactivity). This general analysis was envisioned by the Governing Committee as part of the new model it approved (see excerpt in Attachment A).

Cost-Benefit Analysis: Determining Options and Resources Needed

Delivery Methods Available. CJER currently utilizes seven distinct delivery methods:

1. Live face to face education, provided either statewide, regionally, or locally
2. Videoconferencing (primarily using equipment at the AOC and the Courts of Appeal)
3. Webinars
4. Online videos (filmed at programs or in the AOC studio, produced, and uploaded to the web)
5. Satellite broadcasts (transmitted from the AOC in San Francisco)
6. Self-paced online courses (produced at the AOC and uploaded to the web)
7. Publications (produced at the AOC and uploaded to the web, as well as mailed out)

Many of these methods are also combined to create a blended education product, which can be effective in reducing costs by reducing the live, face-to-face component of some programs and thereby reducing the most expensive component of the program.

In order to assist the committees in formulating their recommendations, CJER created a chart called ***Education Delivery Options*** for the Curriculum Committees to use in considering which delivery method worked best with particular content (see Attachment B). Armed with this information, the committees recommend and prioritize specific education content and preferred methods for delivering that education. CJER then performs a resource analysis on those recommendations to identify how many of the committees' recommendations can be implemented with the current financial and staffing resources available. This is done adhering as closely as possible to the committees' delivery recommendations, in the priority order they created. This analysis is conducted before the Governing Committee approves the final plan, so they are able to see how much can be produced and delivered, given the financial and staffing resources available to CJER.

Determining Financial Resources Needed. Once the Curriculum Committees provide their prioritized lists of education programs and products, CJER applies a *financial and staffing analysis for each delivery method* used, comprised of the following generic factors:

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

1. The direct General Fund costs to CJER for:
 - a. Staff lodging, meals, and travel
 - b. Additional costs associated with events and products
2. The direct IMF (for trial court products only) costs for:
 - a. Participant lodging and meals
 - b. Program costs such as printing, meeting room rental, equipment rental
 - c. Faculty lodging, meals, and travel
 - d. Satellite broadcast infrastructure
3. The staff resources available (CJER staff capacity)

Each delivery method has a very different impact on these factors. For example, a live statewide event, such as the Criminal Law Institute, would have financial costs in all of these categories (e.g., hotel costs for staff and judges, travel costs for judges, production of participant class materials, staff resources including an attorney, coordinator, secretary, AV and media production staff, and registration and conference services staff).

CJER also considers other indirect costs of the education that cannot be factored in, such as time away from the court for participants and travel costs for courts. Recent efforts to increase regional and local education, with the goal of reducing direct and indirect costs to courts, have been made despite the consequent increase for CJER in direct and staffing costs.

To assess the direct costs of items 1 and 2, above, CJER uses a document called the ***Standards Document*** (Attachment C, attached separately), which includes each of the variables related to a particular program or product in each category noted above. The first six pages of this document have been included for illustrative purposes. With this document, CJER can create an estimate of the General and IMF costs associated with a specific program or product, and this document is continually refined as new products are added to the list and make any modifications to the costs associated with each item.

For live programs, whether they are statewide, regional, or local, ***Contract Calculations*** (Attachment D, attached separately) are subsequently created to determine even more thoroughly the costs associated with programs.

Determining Staffing Resources Needed. Staffing costs are also determined as part of this financial analysis. When CJER first started using this new model, it had to be determined how much staff time it took to complete a particular program, broadcast or publication. To ascertain this, a ***Resource Analysis*** document was created and an excerpt is attached (Attachment E)

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

showing attorney and education coordinator work. For example for a statewide Institute, it was determined that it takes an education attorney approximately 80 hours for each day of an Institute to complete all of the tasks for that project, from recruiting the Institute workgroup, planning the course content with the workgroup, recruiting faculty, developing the actual course lesson plans with the faculty, and finally attending and monitoring the program. So for a two day Institute, it would take an attorney 160 hours or one month to complete it. Obviously this is not accomplished all at once and the attorney has other concurrent assignments, such as working on broadcasts, online videos, regional programs, etc. Contrast that with a local judicial education program where a court contacts CJER to schedule a local education program. This effort takes approximately 10 hours of the attorney's time per class because the course does not have to be designed from scratch; there is no workgroup to recruit and staff, etc.

After completing the first education plan using this process, it was determined that the information generated on staffing capacity by the resource analysis was very close to the more general practice which was used in the past (an attorney can complete a certain number of statewide programs, broadcasts, regional programs, etc. per year). Because of the close alignment with the two methods of determining available staffing resources, there was internal validation of the new method of resource analysis.

Information Provided to Curriculum Committees and Governing Committee

As outlined above, CJER performs a detailed financial analysis of the various education methods used to deliver education to the judicial branch. This detailed budgetary analysis is not currently provided to either the Curriculum Committees or to the Governing Committee.

The Curriculum Committees are comprised of subject matter experts in various areas (e.g., criminal law, court administration) and their role is to provide direction on the content which ought to be developed and taught to their audiences. Because they are also experienced in education, they are familiar with the various delivery methods CJER employs when developing education products and they make recommendations on how that content ought to be delivered. Great deference is given to those delivery mechanism recommendations when the financial analysis is performed, and any changes made by staff as a result of the resource analysis are reviewed and approved by the curriculum committees. The committees prioritize their recommendations, which provide guidance on how to allocate CJER resources to these projects. And as mentioned already, the recently approved education plan for the next two fiscal years beginning July 1, 2012, contains all of the curriculum committees' priority 1 recommendations. Many priority 2 recommendations were not incorporated and no priority 3 recommendations were incorporated. This means that all of the Curriculum Committees' top

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

priorities (specific content and delivery method) were able to be accommodated, based on the current capacity of CJER staff and budgets.

The Governing Committee reviews the outcomes of the staff's resource analysis in the form of the proposed Education Plan. Staff explains for the Governing Committee's review the decision-making rationale associated with significant changes to committee recommendations and decisions regarding relative resource allocation between various committees.

Summary

Analyzing CJER education products is a complex process involving the interplay of many cost and resource factors. It is coupled with CJER's responsibility to fulfill, as much as is feasible, the recommendations of the Curriculum Committees as well as the CJER Governing Committee. When Curriculum Committees consider the relative costs of various delivery methods, they may nevertheless determine that a relatively more expensive method is a priority and recommend that method specifically. Alternatively, they may state a more expensive method but also provide staff with guidance on considering less costly methods if necessary. Recommended changes in delivery method made by staff are reviewed and approved by the respective committee. The Governing Committee reviews the overall outcome of the resource analysis in the form of the proposed Education Plan and the rationale associated with its allocation of available resources between the areas of responsibility of the various committees. It also considers the overall approach to the delivery of education, including the strategic direction associated with ongoing development and implementation of cost effective delivery methods.

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

Attachment A

Excerpt from “*Developing the Judicial Branch Education Plan: Objectives, Roles and Responsibilities*” approved by the CJER Governing Committee in November 2009, with highlighting added.

Education Plan: Content and Delivery Analysis

The *Education Plan* (see **Attachment B**) describes the Curriculum Committee’s proposal for programs and products to be developed within a specific two-year period. To develop this plan, Curriculum Committees will review existing curriculum and update it as necessary by conducting a *content analysis*. This will ensure that all curricula will be reviewed on a regular basis affording the opportunity to change, add, or delete content and determine what content is essential and desirable for the audiences who require it. Each education plan will include the following:

1. Content analysis that identifies the essential content needed for each audience (new and experienced) within a curriculum area
2. Content analysis that identifies the desirable content needed for each audience (new and experienced) within a curriculum area¹
3. Delivery analysis that proposes the delivery method (e.g., programs and products) for each content area, for the two year period, such as:
 - Live multi-day events for audiences new to a curriculum area (Overview courses, for example)
 - Live multi-day events for audiences experienced in a curriculum area (Institutes, for example)
 - Live single day events
 - Broadcasts, video conferences, webcasts, and other visual media
 - Online Courses
 - Written materials, such as bench guides, bench books, and other job aids
4. Recommendations of qualified faculty for each content area

The level of content analysis performed by the Committees will be on a macro-level. The analysis will include topics and areas that ultimately will be part of education events; however, the actual courses and specific products are not developed by the Curriculum Committees but by workgroups, which are discussed later in this document. Workgroups will also have the ultimate responsibility for selecting appropriate faculty for specific programs or products, although they will benefit from having recommendations from each Curriculum Committee.

Delivery analysis will occur after content analysis has been completed, and will result in categorization of all content for a specific audience into four types, with suggested delivery methods for the Curriculum Committee to consider. *NOTE: Content may fit into one or more categories.*

¹ Essential and desirable content has largely been identified in most of the existing curriculum areas.

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

- a. **Foundational Knowledge:** content that is basic and foundational to the learning of the broader and more complex subject matter - for example, terminology, rules, or resources. Or content that is primarily facts or prescribed process, such as process or procedures governed by rule or statute. Suggested delivery methods include:
- Online Self-Paced
 - Job Aid
 - Web based facilitated
 - Video
 - Face to Face
 - Broadcast
- b. **Skill-Based:** content that requires practice, discussion, analysis, and/or application - for example, problem solving, ruling on evidence, jury voir dire, or decision-making. Suggested delivery methods include:
- Face to Face
 - Video
 - Broadcast
 - Threaded Discussion
 - Post course work
- c. **Knowledge/Skills requiring interaction:** Content that is open to interpretation, fosters discussion, or involves new, innovative practices, and content that is best learned through shared experience - for example, fairness, ethics, public trust and confidence, handling the media or judicial independence. Suggested delivery methods include:
- Face to Face
 - Video Conference
 - Facilitated Video
- d. **Information needed on Ad Hoc basis:** Content that requires process or procedures requiring post course support. This includes content that is not accessed often enough for the learning to be reinforced through practice and/or that requires specific steps to be followed to be in compliance - for example, requirements under Title 4E Findings related to Foster care and Federal Funding, or handling habeas matters. Suggested delivery methods include:
- Job Aid
 - Online Self-Paced
 - Publication
 - Resource List

During this process, the Curriculum Committee can recommend faculty who have expertise in each subject area. Once the content has been organized by type, it is important to ascertain what, if any, education products already exist in each content area, and staff can easily identify and list those existing products (such as online courses, broadcast, publications and videos). After this has been completed, gaps can be determined and the Committee can then propose a two-year

Report on Judicial Council Recommendation #86

delivery plan that will take advantage of the multiple delivery mechanisms available and that is best suited to the content and the respective audience.

Attachment B
EDUCATION DELIVERY OPTIONS

FACE TO FACE EDUCATION –Courses are designed and delivered to encourage participants to interact with the content, and share experiences, expertise, challenges, concerns, and successes. This format is especially effective when interaction and immediate feedback are important.

Statewide: Opportunity to work with participants from across the state and learn from their varied experience. Often multiday programs and focused on mandatory education requirements. (Portions of these programs may also appear online in video format).

This delivery option is the most costly form of education per participant.

Regional: Focused on a tighter geographical area and content that can be covered in a one-day format. } Less costly than statewide

Local: Content delivered by courts internally or through the Local Court Initiative.

ONLINE VIDEO–Video for content that can be developed in short segments designed for focused and/or “just-in-time” learning. **(24/7)**

Lecture Series–Discrete topics delivered in primarily lecture format by one or more subject matter experts that last 30 minutes to 1 hour.

10 minute Mentor–This series consists of short topic videos presented by judicial officers who are experts in the areas they discuss.

Video Simulation Series–A series of short videos demonstrating techniques that participants can use to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

BROADCAST–Scheduled courses developed for delivery through the statewide satellite broadcast system and focused on specific audiences.

Live Broadcast–Content selected is may be either lecture/information based (short format) or skills based (1-2 hour format).

Individual & Facilitated Locally–Courses are repurposed for online desktop viewing and/or viewed by a group in a face-to-face course facilitated locally from DVD.

SELF-PACED ONLINE –Education that is designed for and housed online. These courses represent a range of complexity and interactivity. Content is generally stable, with limited updating requirements. Courses are designed for participants who are new to the content, or in need of a refresher. Additionally, online courses provide judicial branch audiences with a convenient reference for related statutes, rules, and forms. **(24/7)**

PUBLICATIONS– Bench Guides, Bench Handbooks, Benchbooks and Job Aids are resources written and updated by staff with review by workgroups. These are available in hard and/or soft copy online. **(24/7)**

VIDEO CONFERENCE TRAINING–Video Conferencing is linking two or more locations (up to 8) by two-way video, allowing participants to communicate with each other and faculty during the course. Best designed for small numbers in multiple locations and short formats (1-2 hours). Currently only available at the Appellate Courts and the AOC Regional Offices.

WEBINARS– Short for Web-based seminar. These are courses transmitted over the internet consisting of a shared group environment online which includes live audio and video communication with an audience that is in a remote location from the faculty. Webinars may include video, PPT, chat capability with faculty, faculty feedback, and polling for audience participation. (i.e. WebEx)

Each of these delivery options can be part of a blended learning plan. For example, a face-to-face course might require participants to complete an online course prior to attending the course or a webinar might follow a studio video as a way to engage the participants further to a deeper understanding of the content.

Attachment B

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES MATRIX*

Grayed out boxes represent methods that are generally not compatible with corresponding activities.

Instructional Activities	Complex knowledge/skill building, interactive			Basic knowledge, limited skill development, one-way delivery			
	Face-to Face	Video Conference	Webinar	Online Video	Satellite Broadcast	Self-Paced Online Course	Publications
Case Studies/Hypotheticals	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Peer Presentations	✓	✓					
Role-Playing/Simulations	✓	✓					
Demonstration	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Writing	✓						
Small Group Discussions	✓	✓			✓		
Tests, Self-Assessments	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Question & Answer	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Panels/Debates	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Handouts/Course Materials	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lecture	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Research							✓
Mentoring/Coaching	✓						
Brainstorming	✓	✓	✓				
Games/Responders	✓						
Job Aids	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Complex knowledge/skill building, interactive, preferably smaller audience size. Acquiring complex knowledge and/or skill building typically requires more formal instruction and/or mentoring with small numbers of learners. Face to face classes, live video/web conferences, and instructor-led online course are best suited for content that requires significant interaction between participants and instructor(s).

Basic knowledge, one-way delivery, unlimited audience. Basic knowledge and information can be learned on one's own by providing learners access to books, electronic resources, self-directed online courses job aids, etc. Satellite broadcast and lecture-type methods can also be used to deliver basic knowledge, particularly to large audiences where interaction between participants and instructor(s) is not critical to learning the content.

* Adapted from 2001/2002 Distance Education Yearbook, Delivering Instruction at a Distance Using a Blended Approach, by Simone Conceicao-Runlee.

Events & Products Standard Definitions Table (Partial). This is a working document. Attachment C

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Judicial Ed											
Stand alone onsite Regional Judicial Ed Course San Francisco	Regional Offering (1 day, x faculty Overnights)	0	2	0	1	2	25	2	Typically half-day classes. May be held back to back. Full day and two-day classes require different calculations. No participant lodging is standard.		
Stand alone onsite Regional Judicial Ed Course AOC Sacramento	Regional Offering (X 1 day, x faculty Overnights)	0	2	0	1	2	25	2	Typically half-day classes. May be held back to back. Full day and two-day classes require different calculations for lodging and meals. No participant lodging is standard.		
Stand alone onsite Regional Judicial Ed Course AOC Burbank	Regional Offering (1 day, x faculty Overnights)	0	2	1	1	2	25	2	Typically half-day classes. May be held back to back. Full day and two-day classes require different calculations. No participant lodging is standard.		
Judicial College**,%,	Judicial College	1200	210	50	10	10	120	16.8			
Primary Assignment Orientations Week for new and experienced judges: Spring (combined with Criminal Assignment Courses: Spring)	Live Onsite Program (JCCC or Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	304	85	5	Variable by subject. See notes	4	95	17	4 Orientation Courses. Exp Civil (20 people for 3 days), Criminal (30 people for 5 days), Family (20 people for 5 days), Traffic (20 people for 2 days)		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Primary Assignment Orientations Week for new and experienced judges: Fall	Live Onsite Program (JCCC or Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	400	85	5	Variable by subject. See notes	5	100	13.6	5 Orientation Courses. Juvenile Dep (20 people for 5 days), Criminal (30 people for 5 days), Family (20 people for 5 days), LJSCUD (20 people for 3 days) Probate (20 people for 5 days),		
Primary Assignment Orientations Week for new and experienced judges: Winter	Live Onsite Program (JCCC or Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	440	90	5	Variable by subject. See notes	5	110	14.4	5 Orientation Courses. Juvenile Del (20 people for 5 days), Criminal (30 people for 5 days), Family (20 people for 5 days), Basic Civil (20 people for 5 days) Probate (20 people for 5 days),		
AB 1058 Primary Assignment Orientation (NEW: develop standard from actuals for first event)									1/2 day - Offered once per year in conjunction with CFCC Annual Training for 1058 Commissioners; 1 faculty 5-10 participants Required by Rule of Court – NEW in 2011.		
Criminal Assignment Courses week for experienced judges: Program 1 (date tbd)	Live Onsite Program (JCCC) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	475	40	0	4	4	125	8	4 Courses: Basic Felony Sentencing (30 people for 2 days), Death Penalty Trials (20 people for 2 days), Advanced Capital Case Roundtable (20 people for 1 1/2 days every other year), DV Selected Issues (25 people for 1 day),		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Criminal Assignment Courses week for experienced judges: Program 2 (date tbd)	Live Onsite Program (Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	236.8	25	8	4	4	74	8	5 Courses: Advanced Felony Sentencing (30 people for 2 days), Handling Sexual Assault Cases (25 people for 2 days), Death Penalty Trials (20 people for 2 days), Homicide Trials (30 people for 2 days), DV Selected Issues (25 people for 1 day),		
Probate Law Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	192	8	10	3	2	120	3.2	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon		
Juvenile Law Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	208	14	10	3	2	130	5.6	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed		
Family Law Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	224	32	10	3	2	140	12.8	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Civil Law Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	128	24	10	3	2	80	9.6	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed		
Criminal Law Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	224	40	10	3	2	140	16	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon. In B3 years, the Basic and Advanced Felony Sentencing Workshops are held associated with Crim. 1.5 days each. NOTE: CFCC DV course held the day before the event.		
Appellate Justices Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	171.2	30	10	2	2	107	12	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon		
Appellate Justices Orientation	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	8	5	10	1	1	10	5	Held every other year typically associated and immediately prior to the Institute. May be held independently on site, however. Participant number varies based upon appointments.		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Trial Attorneys Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	280	11	10	2	2	175	4.4	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon		
Cow Counties Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	112	15	10	2	2	70	6	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon. NOTE: CFCC DV course held the day before the event.		
Appellate Attorneys Institute	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	360	36	10	2	2	225	14.4	Wed Noon - Fri Noon OR Mon Noon-Wed Noon		
Science and the Law Institute Advanced Issues and Topics	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	96	20	10	2	2	60	8	Will run on an 18-month cycle in the spring and fall. Next held in fall of 09. Will begin to incorporate Mental Health Issues previously addressed at Mental Health Institute.		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
Exec/Branch Leadership Conf. (i.e. Sentencing Summit)	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	800			2	2	500	0	Variable. One or two programs may be held. May be held in association with Court Management Institute. Typically held in even numbered years when B3 Conference is not held.		
Supervising Judges Institute	Live Onsite Program (JCCC or Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)	96	20	0	2	2	60	8	Locate in Southern Regional Office if it reduces travel costs for attendees		
Complex Civil Roundtable	Live Local Program(X days, X faculty, participant, and staff overnights)	4	4	1	1	1	36 (2x18)	3.2	Limited support in local court location. Unique reimbursement arrangements. Usually onsite at SRO.		
New Judge Orientation Session **	New Judge Orientation sessions	600	200	0	50	50	120	4	Number of events will vary depending on number of new appointees		
CORE 24: Skills and Strategies for Managers	Regional								3 day multi-regional program; 25-35 participants per session 3 X /year		

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (lodging& Meals. Add travel separately)
Qualifying Ethics 3 Course	Live Local Program(X days, X faculty, participant, and staff overnights)	0	2	1	1	1	1050 (35x30)		Number may vary per year depending upon the year of the cycle.		

* See Notes

**AOC pays for participant travel

% College learner overnights are calculated as 100% of the number of learners/

\$ Faculty travel cost is calculated as \$350 x 80% of the total faculty and is part of the Mod Fund Estimated cost

Other assumptions

1) participant overnights are calculated as 80% of total learners

Overnights cost either \$191 (offsite programs) or \$130 (onsite programs) and include lodging and group meals.

Total Learner Overnights

Number of learners × .80 × learner lodging nights

Total Faculty Overnights

From contract calculations

Total Staff Overnights

From contract calculations

Total Learners

?

Specific Delivery Name	Product Type	Total learner overnights	Total Faculty overnights	Total Staff overnights	Event days each	Learner Lodging nights each	Total Learners	Total Faculty	Notes & Specific Characteristics	General Fund Estimates (incl staff travel)	Mod Fund Estimates (loding& Meals. Add travel separately)
------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------------------------------	--	---

Total Faculty

Faculty overnights ÷ Learner lodging nights × .80

Staff Estimates

Staff overnights ÷ event days

Staff travel (\$350) * 80% of staff

Mod Fund Estimates

Learner overnights * cost (\$191 or \$130)

Faculty overnights * cost ((\$191 or \$130)

Faculty Travel (\$350) * number of faculty

General Fund Estimates

Total Staff overnights * cost (\$191 or \$130)

Staff Travel (\$350) * number of staff

	Product Type
1.	Live Onsite Program (JCCC or Regional Office) (X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)
2.	Live Offsite Program(less than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)
3.	Live Offsite Program(more than 25 miles) X days, X participant overnights, X faculty Overnights, X staff overnights)
4.	Live Regional Programs (ICM, Mgr Sup etc.) (note. Includes local ct ICM also) (X days, X faculty, participant and staff overnights)
5.	Live Local Program(X days, X faculty, participant, and staff overnights)
6.	Judicial College
7.	CCTI (two-1-week programs back to back)
8.	New Judge Orientation sessions
9.	Live Videoconference 1-4 Hours
10.	New Live Broadcast (simple) .5-2 Hours
11.	Encore Broadcast (from Tape) , .5-2 Hours
12.	Online: Studio Video Lecture on demand, Online: 10-Minute Mentor video, Online: Video simulations
13.	Online : Video lectures from live programs on demand
14.	Scripted Videos and complex broadcasts (Ed/Other AOC)
15.	Online Course: Synchronous Interactive/WebEx Webinar
16.	Online course: Asynchronous interactive/Moodle
17.	Online course: self-paced limited/Moodle
18.	Online course: Self-paced comprehensive workbook (New)
19.	Online course: Exercise/article
20.	New Bench Books/Handbooks (entire function)

21.	Updates to Electronic Bench Guides (CD-ROM) (Half of project or function?)
22.	Job Aids (simple)
23.	Updates to current Online course (entire function)
24.	Updates to current Bench Books (entire function)
25.	Updates to Current Bench Guides & Bench Handbooks (entire function)
26.	New Judicial Bench Guide

Staff Resources
Content Unit: Assumptions and Output Capacity

Start with total work hours/year	2,080
Subtract 13 Holidays/year	104
To get total actual working hours/year	1,976
Deduct standard overhead of 20%	395.2
To get the net working hours/FTE/year	1,580.8

Live events – divided into several categories

Live statewide events with no staff serving as faculty. (new courses being developed.)	80 hours/event day
Live statewide events that also have faculty workshops.	85 hours/event day
Live events in which both staff and faculty teach, ICM and Core 40. (count once regardless of offerings.)	40 hours/event day
Fairness and Administrative Education offered locally. (Staff teaches these.)	40 hours/event day
Judicial education offered locally. (existing courses and faculty.)	10 hours/class
Regional Education (repeated three times, so count each unique course only once.)	80 hours/class
Broadcasts	80 hours/event
Online courses	120 hours/course
Videos	20 hours/video
Publications/Job aids	Other staff to complete, so very little time

Available FTEs

Judicial Education:	12,646.4 hours/year
6.5 Attorney FTEs	
1 Education Specialist	
Managing Attorney (.5 FTE)	
Admin. Branch Education:	8,694.4 hours/year
5 Education Specialists	
Manager (.5 FTE)	
Special Consultant:	1,580.8 hours/year
Senior Manager (.25 FTE):	395.2 hours/year

Attachment E

PDET Unit, Conference and Faculty Services: Assumptions and Capacity

Staff time admin overhead is standard, for the purpose of this analysis, at about 18% of each for meetings and other purposes (meetings, vacation, leave, sick, education & training, performance mgt., HR requirements, other)

10 coordinator staff perform production work and/or overhead tasks associated with production.

There is a total of **~9.55 Coordinator FTEs** because some staff work less than full time. **3.0 Secretary FTEs** support this work.

List of “overhead” tasks and percentages that are general functions that support all work (i.e. publicity) or not associated with education for the courts (i.e., AOC Ed) (**~3.55 FTEs**)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. All Secretarial Work | 2.50 Secretarial FTE |
| 2. HREMS | 0.57fte Coord |
| 3. Publicity | 0.20fte |
| 4. Broadcast Administration work | 0.10fte |
| 5. Content Mgt.: Web content mgt | 0 .025 (evolving to .25 with web redesign?) |
| 6. Content Mgt.: Requests fulfillment | 0.02fte |
| 7. Division Delivery Coordinator | 0.20fte (evolving upwards to .5?) |
| 8. AOC Ed | 0.57fte |
| 9. Lead support by Susan | 0.15fte |
| 10. Overall admin time at 18% + | 1.72fte (18% of 9.55 Coord and 0.5 Sec fte) |

Sub Total ~3.55 Coordinator FTE, 3.0 Secretary FTE

List of coordinator product development work. (**~6 FTEs**)

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Broadcast production | .37fte |
| 2. Video production | .13fte |
| 3. Regional office program support (at current levels) | .85fte |
| a. ICM, ct staff, mgr/sup | |
| 4. Offsite & onsite program support (at current levels) | 2.75fte |
| Suzanne Renner | .25fte |
| Susan Carroll | .60fte |
| Debra | .82fte |
| Gricelda | .25fte |
| Jane | .48fte |
| Other as needed | .35fte |
| Sub total | 2.75fte |
| 5. Judicial College and NJOs | .60fte |
| 6. CCTI (1 2-week program per year) | .20fte |
| 7. Local Ct Ed and QE & appellate staff videoconf | .75fte |
| 8. Online course dvlpt all types | .35fte |

Attachment E

a. Publicity flyers 5%	.04
b. Judicial articles coding 5%	.04
c. Calendars 10%	.08
d. Reports 5%	.04
e. Updating courses (coding) 15%	.12
9. Print publications & job aids	
a. Publicity flyers 0-5%	.02
	Sub Total ~6.0 Fte
	Total 9.55FTE