

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Arizona Supreme Court
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 850047
Minutes of the
January 29, 2010 Committee Meeting

Committee Members Present:	
Judge Louraine Arkfeld, Chair	Presiding Judge, Tempe Municipal Court
Kent Batty, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Superior Court in Pima County
Judy Aldrich, Ed. D.	Professor, Chandler/Gilbert Community College
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Court
Judge Margaret Downie	Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals, Division I
Phil Hanley	Director of Human Resources/ Administrative Services, Judicial Branch of Arizona in Maricopa County
Roger Hartley, Ph.D.	Associate Professor of Public Administration and Policy, University of Arizona
Jolene Hefner (via conference call)	Detention Administrator, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Denise Lundin (via conference call)	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Cochise County
Michael Malone	Court Liaison, Superior Court in Pinal County
Committee Members Absent:	
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation Department
Guests Present:	
Jeff Schrade	Director, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
CLIA Staff Present:	
Deborah King	Program Manager, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Patty Stansfield	Specialist V, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Deanna Carter	Administrative Assistant, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division

Call to Order, Administrative Business

Judge Louraine Arkfeld called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., at the Arizona Supreme Court, in Phoenix, Arizona.

Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the meeting minutes from September 18, 2009, for changes or corrections to be made. Minutes were reviewed and approved with one change: add Judge Margaret Downie to the "Leadership" workgroup member list on page 5.

MOTION: CLIA 2010-01

ESD/Staff Updates

Judge Arkfeld stated there are no new committee appointments as of yet.

The committee was provided the evaluations from the ICM Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts (October 7-9, 2009) and the AZ Plus Capstone (November 4-6, 2009) sessions for review. Both programs received high overall ratings. Judge Arkfeld noted that the evaluation comments may be helpful in our discussion of whether the Purposes and Responsibilities class should be added to the Arizona Court Manager (ACM) program. Additionally, the comments on each section of the AZ Plus Capstone session may help with the discussion on potential revisions to this course to address areas of overlap.

LEAD Schedule at a Glance was distributed. Ms. Deb King noted that the ICM classes scheduled prior to fiscal year end in June have confirmed faculty. All other dates are tentative subject to funding and faculty availability. An ICM Essential Components class is a likely addition to the schedule as it is a class that we are having faculty certified to teach under a SJI grant. The Court Leadership Conference has been reduced to one day and is now scheduled for June 24, 2010.

Ms. King reported that ICM Caseflow Management class is scheduled for February 9-11, 2010 and will be taught by Kent Batty, Jim Scorza and Judge Song Ong.

Judge Arkfeld overviewed the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) ICM program changes recently posted on their web site. These changes are consistent with the ones overviewed at the last meeting. They will go into effect January 1, 2011. The NCSC is already providing CCM certificates for the Tier I program listed (without the Concluding Seminar and adding Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts). She also pointed out a positive change in the ability for a participant in the program to complete 6 two and a half day classes instead of a three-week residency program. Mike Baumstark commented that it would be helpful to have a one page chart showing our program similarly formatted to what the NCSC did for their program and posting it online.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. King will develop a reference chart.

Ms. King mentioned that the NCSC program developed as part of the consortium now has test questions for each of the developed courses. CLIA has not yet considered whether testing should be a requirement of ACM completion. Currently tests are not administered. NCSC has left this

option open to each state and is not requiring testing for receipt of their CCM or CCE certificates. Discussion on testing was as follows:

- a. Testing was in the original concept of the consortium developed programs with assessments being part of the memorandum of understanding.
- b. Testing where someone can fail may have both positive and negative effects:
 - i. Positive - better participant attention during class
 - ii. Positive - more potential for participants to take the time to review and understand the material. Examples given of NJO and Probation training where study groups have formed to prepare for testing.
 - iii. Negative – potential to stress some participants, possibly affecting whether or not they would want to participate in the program
 - iv. Negative – might extend class duration
- c. If NCSC doesn't require testing, how can we require it? Mr. Kent Batty believes that the NCSC expects tests to be used in the curriculum but not required for passing the class. **ACTION ITEM:** Ms. King should clarify what NCSC expectations are.
- d. Testing could include various options:
 - i. Using an anonymous responder voting system similar to what we currently do in NJO
 - ii. Providing an online test to complete after class which could be open book
 - iii. Conducting a paper and pencil test after class
 - iv. Using test questions throughout the curriculum to assess understanding during the class
- e. Because we teach these classes with a local (Arizona) focus, should we consider adding questions specific to Arizona?
- f. It would be helpful to see the test questions for the ICM programs. **ACTION ITEM:** Ms. King will send ICM test questions to CLIA members.
- g. Discussion on how to incorporate tests into the ACM program will be tabled for next meeting. **ACTION ITEM:** Invite Mr. Dave Byers, AOC Director, to attend and add his perspective.

Tiers II & IV Admission/Registration

Judge Arkfeld noted that due to the NCSC announcement of their CCE program and our intent to schedule both Tier II and Tier IV classes as they are developed, we need to discuss both the short-term and long-term approach to registration for these classes.

Discussion was as follows:

- a. Mr. Batty thought that we initially intended that the program be more of a succession model with admission into each tier level.
- b. Mr. Don Jacobson commented that consistent with COJET's intent for professional development we can look at a succession approach.
- c. Mr. Baumstark noted that although we talk of succession planning, we should market our program with a focus on current and emerging leadership staying away from a succession plan label.
- d. For long-term registration, the committee consensus was that we should use an application process similar to our ACM Tier III model. The ACM application did contain demographic information that could have been used to assign priority to class registrations should applications exceed program capacity. CLIA did not

- add these as screening criteria for admission into the program and did not want to become the gate-keeper, preferring that courts screen by virtue of signatures.
- e. Admission to each tier would require an application. Completing a previous tier may be helpful criteria for admission into the next tier but it would not be required, nor would it automatically qualify someone for the next tier. Experience, length of service or current job responsibilities in supervisory or management capacities would be other criteria for priority in registration if needed. **ACTION ITEM:** Staff should draft sample applications for Tier II & Tier IV.
 - f. For short-term registration, new classes or piloted classes can be registered through a targeted solicitation. For example, potential Tier IV classes can be advertised to ACM graduates and senior court management such as court administrators, clerks of court, presiding judges, etc.

Tier IV Executive Level – Review of Classes for inclusion

Judge Arkfeld reminded CLIA that at the last meeting they reviewed the course proposals for NCSC's CCE classes and determined that Leadership, Visioning and Strategic Planning and Court Communications were at an executive Tier IV level. She asked Mr. Jacobson to overview what the ICM Concluding Seminar currently covers. Mr. Jacobson provided an overview of the curriculum noting that the focus of the course was on developing high performance courts. While many of the topic areas seemed to be repetitive of other ICM courses, he noted that this course had participants using those concepts. Therefore, attending the ICM CCM courses would need to be a prerequisite and that the Concluding Seminar is probably a more of a Tier IV level.

The Essential Components course outline and learning objectives were reviewed with committee. Because the content is very general in outline and learning objectives it was suggested that we consult with faculty to determine whether it is a Tier IV class.

ACTION ITEM: Invite Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer to the next CLIA meeting to overview this class.

At the last CLIA meeting, only a portion of the Education, Training and Development class seemed to fit in Tier IV. **ACTION ITEM:** Bring this course's curriculum to a future CLIA meeting to enable a second review for consideration of whether this curriculum meets a Tier IV level.

Tier III Arizona Court Manager Program – Should we change requirements based on NCSC changes?

CLIA reviewed a comparison of topics contained in the old ICM Concluding Seminar with the new course and the ICM Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts course. Ms. King noted that there were three learning objectives on leadership that are part of the old course and current ACM requirements that are not contained in the new course or Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts. CLIA was asked to decide how to best address the changes in content and impact of the new NCSC ICM program. Discussion was as follows:

- a. Keeping the Arizona program consistent with the NCSC program would be cleaner and offer the best value to the participants.
- b. If the Concluding Seminar is really a Tier IV level now it should be incorporated into the Arizona Court Executive program.
- c. The Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts course is foundational and based on evaluations and is a course we should continue to offer.
- d. Consensus was that we should change the ACM program criteria to add in ICM Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts, move ICM Concluding seminar to Tier IV, revise day one of the AZ Plus Capstone 3-day program to cut the current content to a half-day and add a half-day of Leadership. Mr. Batty noted that of the three topic areas, if we needed to limit content, “creating and sustaining effective teams” is not as important as the first two covering leadership styles, supervision versus leadership, situational leadership and worker development. **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Jacobson and Mr. Batty will work with staff to develop the Leadership class before the next AZ Plus Capstone session. Staff will work with faculty to revise Day One.
- e. CLIA approved allowing current ACM participants who were ready to complete the program by finishing the ICM Concluding Seminar, to do so with the upcoming scheduled class. New ACM participants should be provided the new program completion criteria. This transitional approach is similar to what the NCSC will be doing for their current ICM participants.

Tier II Supervisory Level – Follow-Up on Curriculum Development

Ms. Judy Aldrich and Mr. Phil Hanley were asked to overview the Tier II Human Resources class content. CLIA was very favorable on the content developed and had some questions and suggestions as follows:

- a. Mr. Batty suggested that faculty should highlight the value of a court having its own HR policy and resource when possible. Dr. Roger Hartley stated there is the Handbook on Judicial Administration that makes this point nicely.
- b. Questions arose regarding what was covered on exempt versus nonexempt and employees covered under merit systems versus uncovered. Mr. Jacobson brought up the challenges related to union activities and what supervisors should know in these situations. The curriculum does cover definitions and provides an example of a judicial merit system. Union activity can be mentioned at least to the extent that supervisors are aware they should seek guidance in what is appropriate – such as issues around “meet and confer.” It was noted that Probation Officers have different requirements as set in statute.

The next Tier II session to be developed is Caseflow Management. In addition to CLIA members, Ms. King asked if she could use some line supervisors to provide input into curriculum development to ensure we meet needs. Mr. Mike Malone volunteered to be part of the curriculum workgroup. Alexis Allen from Tempe Municipal Court will be part of the workgroup. **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Batty, Mr. Jacobson and Ms. Denise Lundin volunteered to forward names to Ms. King for this workgroup.

ICM Faculty Selection and Updates

Judge Arkfeld asked CLIA for feedback on how we should handle faculty selection for supervisory management training in the future. While we have relied on selecting faculty based on our knowledge of who has the background, knowledge and skills to teach the ICM classes, as this program is becoming more known, there are persons who would now like to be considered for faculty. She noted that the NCSC guidelines were contained in their handouts. CLIA discussed the following:

- a. SMEs were not always skilled in facilitating/training.
- b. For management level ICM classes, participants need to know the faculty has the expertise and credentials
- c. For now, we have been able to select high quality faculty from those known to the committee and AOC
- d. Consensus was that ICM criteria can be used as a guideline when CLIA considers and recommends faculty. When someone volunteers to serve as faculty, staff can provide information to them on what credentials we consider including: how they are a subject matter expert in the field (experience and training), and their ability to effectively teach (class evaluations, attendance at faculty skills training). Staff can create a potential faculty file should someone choose to submit information for future consideration.

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

The next scheduled CLIA Committee meeting is April 23, 2010.

Ms King reviewed Action Items with the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.