

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Arizona Supreme Court

1501 W. Washington

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Minutes of the

April 23, 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
Phil Hanley	Director of Human Resources/ Administrative Services, Judicial Branch of Arizona in Maricopa County
Jolene Hefner (via conference call)	Detention Administrator, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
Denise Lundin (via conference call)	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Cochise County
Michael Malone	Court Liaison, Superior Court in Pinal County
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation Department
Committee Members Absent:	
Judge Margaret Downie	Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals, Division I
Roger Hartley	Associate Professor of Public Administration and Policy, University of Arizona
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Guests Present:	
Jeff Schrade	Director, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Peggy Lee (proxy for Don Jacobson)	Deputy Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Marcus Reinkensmeyer	Court Administrator, Maricopa County Superior Court
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 10:10 a.m., at the Arizona Supreme Court Building, in Phoenix, Arizona. Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the meeting minutes from January 29, 2010, for changes or corrections to be made. Minutes were reviewed and approved with one change: Judge Margaret Downey change to Judge Margaret Downie.

MOTION: CLIA 2010-02

ESD/Staff Updates

Deb King updated the committee on the two programs held since the last meeting: ICM Human Resources held March 10-12, 2010, and ICM Technology held April 13-15, 2010. Participant evaluations were distributed and reviewed by members.

Ms. King updated committee on upcoming programs scheduled or to be scheduled:

- ICM Court Performance Standards is scheduled for July 21-23, 2010
- ICM Financial Management is scheduled for August 3-5, 2010
- Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts (to be scheduled)
- Essential Components, an Executive level class to be scheduled as part of our State Justice Institute grant.

Ms. King also provided consortium updates. There are four classes still in the development phase:

- Education and Training is in its first review phase
- Leadership is being developed
- Visioning and Strategic Planning is in the planning phase
- Court Communication is being developed

Along with the curriculum, test questions are being developed for each course by the curriculum developers from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) as opposed to the subject matter experts. Judge Arkfeld commented by the end of this year all 12 courses will be developed.

Mr. Batty stated that in Ohio, there is a strong expectation that all participants follow a sequence to complete the classes. Discussion ensued regarding pros and cons:

- We currently allow participants to enter the program at any time. Scheduling these classes sequentially wouldn't allow for this practice to continue. Additionally if a class was missed, it could be over a year before it could be taken – extending the timeframe for program completion.
- Presenting courses sequentially can be helpful, as some of the courses directly relate to, or can build upon, the content of other courses.
- Courses are designed as stand-alone. However the Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts class is referenced in most courses and is foundational material.
- What might be considered would be a clear starting and ending class.

No decisions were made.

Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Testing Requirements

Judge Arkfeld noted that when the original consortium met, there was an expectation that a testing component be included in the course. Discussion ensued surrounding the benefits and concerns of testing:

- Adults learn best in a participatory environment.
- If tested, what would the “grades” consist of? Would “pass/fail” be sufficient? How do we know whether the questions are valid?
- NCSC does not require testing for their Certified Court Manager certificate – can we impose a more rigorous requirement?
- The consortium states have not implemented testing, but enough are committed to initiating testing.
- An online test which would allow participants to move onto the next question only if they answer each question correctly would meet the needs of material review and would eliminate the concern of pass/fail criteria.
- CLIA is only being asked to consider options of when and how testing will be done, not whether it will be done. A primary goal of testing is to ensure each participant meets minimum competency, thus open book or testing options that do not allow for individual grading can’t be considered.
- It was suggested that testing be done after each section rather than comprehensive last day testing.
- A concern is that faculty may teach according to the test and not to the materials.
- Electronic voting (Option Finder) could be used in lieu of paper and pencil tests as we can match responders to users. This is what we do for New Judge Orientation.
- With regards to additional time it would take in class to administer a test, do all 40 questions need to be used? Can faculty change the questions or select a sub-set of questions?

ACTION ITEM: Deb King will ask the faculty for ICM Financial Management, and CourTools classes, to pilot testing for the participants and get faculty feedback on testing options.

Arizona Court Executive (ACE) Tier IV Executive Level – Review of Classes for inclusion

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer discussed his experience with attending Tier IV Court Executive Faculty training. He said it was more like a symposium with an assortment of topics that were not necessarily interrelated. It would be a difficult course for someone with limited experience in court administration as the content relied heavily on the audience experience and prior knowledge.

Ms. King suggested that the Tier IV Essential Components course be piloted by a select group of invitees of no more than 20 people to evaluate difficulty level and to allow the faculty an opportunity to evaluate the content with a potentially diverse audience. The class will be added to this calendar year schedule if possible.

Jeff Schrade provided an overview of the Tier IV Education and Development Course.

- There are over 300 slides and 29 activities included in the course material.

- There is an entire day devoted to Unit 4 which is Fundamentals of Adult Education.
- When looking at the Tier IV Learning Objectives, external educational opportunities are not encapsulated.
- The course is not about how to be a better faculty member, or how to teach better, but was focused on Courts becoming better learning organizations.

The committee agreed that both Essential Components and Education and Development courses are primarily executive level (Tier IV) courses.

Arizona Court Executive (ACE) Tier IV Application

Ms. King and members reviewed the Tier IV draft application. Suggestions and discussion key points were:

- Should completion of the ACM Program be a prerequisite requirement? Most ACM graduates assume they are now qualified for ACE program.
- ACE classes are new content.
- There are potentially senior executive level employees who might not have completed ACM – but are within the target audience.
- At the executive level should a supervisor’s signature be required? What if the applicant is the department head?
- Signature approval line should read “I approve the time and appropriate funding.”
- Should the application list other formal trainings, degrees and/or certifications?
- It needs to be determined what the real purpose of application is when it comes to listing certificates or degrees.
- The purpose of the application is to alert both supervisor and employee of the program expectations and to ensure we have the right target audience in classes.
- There is no definite date for the completion of program in the new application. Should this be added?
- “Length of Service” should include Probation department experience.

Ms. King noted that with each program, we create a brochure which describes the target audience and the purpose and requirements of the program. Because we are still determining ACE program curriculum and requirements, we can’t implement an application just yet.

Tier II Supervisory Level - Case Flow Management Curriculum

Members were provided with a detailed course outline (attached). Mike Malone walked members through the course outline, “Supervisors Role in Effective Case Flow Management.” Members approved the curriculum for further development and pilot.

The Chair made a call to the public. There was no new business from the public. The next scheduled CLIA Committee Meeting is July 16, 2010. The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.