

ACTIVITY REPORTING AND PROPOSAL FORM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVES AOC RESTRUCTURING

DATE	4/3/2013
PREPARED BY	Diane Cowdrey
OFFICE NAME	<u>Center for Judiciary Education and Research</u>
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE NUMBER	80
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate the efficiencies identified by the working group reviewing all education for new judges to ensure that education is provided in the most effective and efficient way possible.
SEC RECOMMENDATION	The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken: (a) A workgroup has been formed to review all education for new judges to ensure that it is being provided in the most effective and efficient way possible. The efficiencies identified by this working group may present opportunities for reductions.
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="button" value="File Attachment"/>	
<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 type="button" value="File Attachment"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	

The CJER Governing Committee will submit recommendations to the Judicial Council at their June 2013 meeting on new judge education, based upon the assessment of the New Judge Education Workgroup. The Workgroup was created by the Governing Committee to study all education provided to new judges.

The workgroup was charged by the CJER Governing Committee with evaluating the following four inquiries and to return at the end of calendar year 2012 with recommendations:

1. Is the current approach to education for new judges meeting the educational needs of this audience in the most effective and efficient manner possible?
2. Given the wide variety of methods for delivering education, would you support the use of alternative approaches for the delivery of new judge education which could reduce the length of time new judges are currently required to spend away from their courts while continuing to meet their education needs?
3. Should specific content areas be added to or deleted from the B. E. Witkin Judicial College (College), New Judge Orientation (NJO) or the Primary Assignment Orientations (PAOs), and if so, what content and what delivery method is the most appropriate?
4. How best can the issue of having deliberately overlapping content in these programs, knowing that it is intended to repeat certain content areas that are critical for new judges, be addressed?

This assessment of new judge education was included in the Governing Committee's 2012 Annual Agenda. During the time of the SEC evaluation, the New Judge Education Workgroup was conducting its assessment and their work was included in the SEC Report, recommendation 7–20(a), noted above. The work of the New Judge Education Workgroup was initiated prior to the SEC recommendation, which focuses on identifying any efficiencies that can be made in providing education for new judges with the overall goal of effectiveness and efficiency.

Recommendations were submitted by the New Judge Education Workgroup to the CJER Governing Committee in October 2012 and the Governing Committee discussed those recommendations and voted on them at their February 2013 meeting. The recommendations are:

Recommendation #1: The Workgroup recommended that New Judge Orientation (NJO), the Judicial College (as recently modified in 2011 and 2012 reflecting reductions in both length and content), and the Primary Assignment Orientations (PAOs), remain as currently designed and delivered. The Workgroup found that the current content and method of delivery were the most effective and efficient way to provide this education.

[Note: in 2011, the College was reduced by 1.5 days and several introductory courses were removed from the curriculum. In 2012, one half day was restored and one of the introductory courses, family law, was restored.]

Recommendation #2: The Workgroup recommended that CJER, the Judicial College Steering Committee, and the PAO faculty teams continue evaluating and refining the New Judge Education programs through the work of the curriculum committees and workgroups to eliminate unnecessary overlap among NJO, the Judicial College and the PAOs.

Recommendation #3: The Workgroup recommended that the B.E. Witkin Judicial College Steering Committee explore the use of WebEx as a way to connect seminar groups after the College had concluded, to answer questions, and to see how the College has impacted their work back at the court. This would also be a way to gain feedback from the participants on the College after they have had a month or two to digest the learning and apply it.

Recommendation #4: The Workgroup recommended that PAO faculty teams and education attorneys continue to explore ways to increase the efficiency of delivering PAO education. First, the Working Group recommended that the faculty teams and education attorneys examine the possibility of moving some content to blended learning options without reducing the quality of the learning experience. Second, the Workgroup recommended that PAO faculty teams explore the possibility of designing separate orientation courses for experienced judges returning to an assignment. The goal would be shorter PAOs for that audience and at less cost for the courts. The Workgroup did recognize that a separate orientation course already exists for experienced civil law judges returning

to that assignment. The Workgroup also recognized that both these possibilities could result in increased costs and resource demands for CJER.

[Note: The Governing Committee recommends that in addition to designing shorter PAOs for experienced judges, the Curriculum Committees should also consider a recommendation that the subject matter Institute, where appropriate, would also fulfill the education requirement for the experienced judges returning to an assignment after two years.]

Recommendation #5: The Workgroup recommended that CJER explore the possibility of moving a PAO to southern California.

After review and discussion, the Governing Committee supported all of the above recommendations. As a policy matter, these should now be brought to the Council for their review and approval.

Also, the Governing Committee has recommended to the Executive and Planning Committee that the Dean of the Judicial College be appointed as an advisory member. This appointment will ensure that the Governing Committee is more fully connected and engaged in the development and delivery of this critical judicial education program.

The CJER Governing Committee will present their recommendations to the Judicial Council at the Council's June 2013 meeting. Additionally, these recommendations were presented to the Trial Court Presiding Judge Advisory Committee's Executive Committee on March 21, 2013. There were no concerns noted with the recommendations at that meeting.

 File Attachment

TIMELINE AND RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

IMPLEMENTATION DATE OR PROJECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	<input type="text"/>
RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	<input type="text"/>

ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION (complete only applicable sections)

<input type="checkbox"/> PROCEDURES/ POLICIES UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<input type="text"/>  File Attachment
<input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<input type="text"/>  File Attachment
<input type="checkbox"/> SAVINGS	<input type="text"/>  File Attachment
<input type="checkbox"/> COST	<input type="text"/>  File Attachment

<input type="checkbox"/> EFFICIENCIES	<input type="text"/> <input type="button" value="File Attachment"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE LEVEL IMPACT	<input type="text"/> <input type="button" value="File Attachment"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	<input type="text"/> <input type="button" value="File Attachment"/>
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COURTS (ADOC) REVIEW AND APPROVAL	
ADOC REVIEW	Administrative Director of the Courts Review Date: <input type="text" value="4/10/2013"/>
EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING (E&P) COMMITTEE REVIEW	
E&P REVIEW	Executive and Planning Review Date: <input type="text" value="4/17/2013"/>