

# COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Judicial Education Center  
541 E. Van Buren Street, Suite B4  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Minutes of the  
November 18, 2010 Committee Meeting

<b>Committee Members Present:</b>	
Kent Batty, Chair	Court Administrator, Superior Court in Pima County
Judy Aldrich, Ed. D.	Professor, Chandler/Gilbert Community College
Randolph A. Bartlett (via conference call)	Judge, Superior Court in Mohave County, Division II
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Court
Margaret Downie	Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals, Division I
Maria L. Felix	Presiding Judge, Tucson Justice Court
Billie Grobe	Chief Probation Officer, Yavapai County Adult Probation
Jolene Hefner (via conference call)	Detention Administrator, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
Vincent J. Iaria	Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Superior Court in Maricopa County
Michael Malone	Court Liaison, Superior Court in Pinal County
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation Department
Michael D. Slovek	Presiding Magistrate, Bullhead City Municipal Court
<b>Committee Members Absent:</b>	
Phil Hanley	Director of Human Resources/ Administrative Services, Judicial Branch of Arizona in Maricopa County
Don Jacobson, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Denise Lundin	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Cochise County
<b>Guests Present:</b>	
Heidi Kohler (proxy for Don Jacobson)	Field Trainer, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Cindy Reid (proxy for Phil Hanley)	Education and Training Director, Superior Court of Maricopa County
Jeff Schrade	Director, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
<b>CLIA Staff Present:</b>	
Deborah King	Program Manager, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Julie Binter	Specialist V, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Deanna Carter	Administrative Assistant, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division

## *Call to Order, Administrative Business*

Mr. Kent Batty called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m., at the Judicial Education Center, in Phoenix, Arizona. The minutes for August 20, 2010 were reviewed by the committee and approved. **MOTION: CLIA 2010-03 passed**

## *ESD/Staff Updates*

Ms. Deb King updated the committee on CLIA programs held since the last meeting. Participant evaluations were distributed and reviewed by members.

- Institute for Court Management (ICM) Court Certified Manager (CCM) Court Performance Standards - CourTools, September 28-30, 2010, had 44 participants with an overall rating of 4.38. Don Jacobson and Phil Knox taught the class.
- ICM Court Certified Executive (CCE) Essential Components, November 2-4, 2010, taught by Kip Anderson and Marcus Reinkensmeyer, 28 participants attended with an overall rating of 4.65. Juvenile court center directors, chief probation officers, presiding judges, court administrators, and elected clerks of the court were the target audience. This was the first time we taught this class and the structure was noticeably different than other ICM classes using more of a symposium format. He also observed that the information was more on a broad topic scale. The NCSC has strict guidelines where content cannot be removed but it is possible to add content and PowerPoint slides.
- The next scheduled ICM CCM Programs are Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts, January 19-21, 2011, and Caseflow Management February 15-17, 2011.

Ms. King shared that the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) is currently in a process of receiving faculty feedback on the first four courses developed. The purpose of these conference calls is to discuss experiences in presenting the course and identify any areas of concern or potential needs for revisions. Mr. Batty has participated in some of these calls and stated that he doesn't believe major changes will be made to the curriculum, given the NCSC faculty and their expertise in developing and teaching.

A faculty list was distributed to CLIA members for review. Ms. King explained this list contains the new faculty that will be trained in February and March to teach the new ICM CCE classes. We are in the process of applying for an SJI grant to help fund some of the out-of-state travel. We were fortunate to have approximately \$3000 we can carry over to the next year.

## *Presiding Judge Training – Curriculum Planning*

Mr. Mike Baumstark updated committee on Presiding Judge Training conference call meeting. During the workgroup conference call, the curriculum from the 2004 Presiding Judge Training was reviewed. The 2004 Program was done in partnership with the National Judicial College and was approximately two weeks spread over a couple of months.

The following was briefly discussed regarding **target audience**:

- Should we extend this to the executive personnel team? Views expressed included:
  - Training should consist of only presiding judges, given the nature of the training and the opportunity for them to network among peers.
  - Possibly offer an executive team building opportunity.

- It was suggested that we survey participants at the Judicial Conference to get an idea of who would be interested in attending the training.
- Use break out groups when needed, as a means of accommodating the difference in focus for limited jurisdiction versus general jurisdiction judges.
- ACTION ITEM: Ms. King will report back to the committee the number of presiding judges and superior court judges to see the possible number of attendees for this training.

The following was discussed regarding content and **curriculum development**:

- This program can be done in-house with our faculty; however, the committee entertained the idea of guest speakers. It was recommended that Judge Burke in Minnesota be contacted; he was one of the original subject matter experts that helped organize the original judge training.
- Review and adapt the original content and PowerPoint slides as needed and still applicable for this training.
- Use the NCSC ICM curriculum wherever appropriate for this training.

The length of the program, topics/content, dates, and audience are still under consideration. ACTION ITEM: Mr. Baumstark invited the committee to contact him with suggestions or other ideas for this training.

### **Tier II – Implementation Proposal**

The Committee members were given “Tier 2 Learning Objectives Master List” for their review. (chart attached) Ms. King overviewed the chart for approval of new content and proposed blended delivery methods.

The following was discussed relative to Tier 2 **content**:

- The Human Resources class is one full day. It was piloted last April and will be offered again in 2011. After the second pilot we can determine what revisions may be needed.
- Mike Malone, Alexis Allen and Eric Silverburg are currently developing the Caseflow curriculum and that class is targeted to be piloted the first quarter of 2011. It is also a full-day face-to-face class.
- Previously CLIA agreed that there should be a half-day class on Probation Case Management as a separate content area under Caseflow Management.
  - Mr. David Sanders mentioned that the chief probation officers had a strategic planning meeting for developing training for first line supervisors but nothing was finalized.
  - Mr. Jeff Schrade mentioned that our new Specialist V, David Chaison, will be focusing on additional training for Probation Supervisors. Mr. Schrade suggested that the COPE Committee and the CLIA Committee communicate and share ideas on training and prevent duplication of efforts. It was also suggested we take a look at Maricopa County’s and Orange County’s Probation training.
  - ACTION ITEM: Ms. King will contact Michael Collins for information on supervisor competencies and training modules for Probation. Michael.collins@prob.ocgov.com.
- Additional learning objectives and content areas were added for essential supervisory skills. This added content was a result of comparing the proposed Tier 2 content to other court’s and agency

supervisory courses to see what we might be missing. The California courts' supervisory training and the NCSC online training were two specific sources researched.

- Mr. Vincent Iaria suggested we have something on Project Management. Ms. King will review Visioning & Strategic Planning component when we develop it, to add some focus on Project Management.
- We need to better define what line supervisors need to know for the media and public relations content, as this is usually a function of higher-level staff.

Development process, **implementation** and delivery methods were discussed as follows:

- This supervisory tier can benefit from a blended learning approach which combines online Element K classes, CENTRA online instructor-lead classes and face-to-face classes.
  - This will reduce cost of travel and provide an opportunity for more supervisors to take these classes without having to leave their court for two and a half days per class.
  - We currently have Element K classes covering some of the essential skills content areas. These classes have simulations and are interactive – however, they need to be evaluated to determine whether they meet our learning objectives. Using these self-paced classes first, supervisors could complete the class and then have a follow-up session lead by an instructor online with activities and discussions on how to apply the information in our work environment.
  - One concern was that there wouldn't be enough face-to-face where networking is important. Ms. King commented that the self-paced portions of the training could be more like homework (between classes) or prerequisite (before class) assignments.
- Ms. Julie Binter commented on her experience with the NCSC online supervisory training. She said she was able to follow along with the training but it was difficult to retain most of the information once she was done. She thought adding reference resources and practice or application scenarios in follow-up would be helpful.
- We need to consider how frequently we can offer classes and how many people need training.

#### **Tier IV**

The Committee members were given “Tier IV Arizona Court Executive Competency Group with Learning Objectives” for their review. Ms. King asked the committee to consider whether the learning objectives and/or content areas have been covered in a previous tier. She also noted that the targeted audience for this tier may not have taken any Tier III Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Institute for Court Manager (ICM) courses. The committee reviewed each competency group to determine what content was already covered, and what content would need to be developed as follows:

#### **Competency – Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts**

- This competency is foundational and useful in the discussion of the proper role in making decisions and policy.
- It is covered extensively in the management tier and we have limited additional information to offer at this level.
- This competency group can be incorporated into other training for this level.

### **Competency – Case Management**

- Attendance in the ICM Caseflow Management class should be a prerequisite to this content.
- Learning objectives 1 & 2 have a different focus than the ICM class; therefore curriculum should be developed for those two objectives using scenario case studies and real data.
- Learning objective 3 may not be practical as written but should be moved to the Information Technology content.

### **Competency – Education, Training and Development**

- The ICM CCE class for this level covers the objectives. No further development needed.

### **Competency – Essential Components**

- There is no specific class for these learning objectives and they are not covered in previous training.
- Virus exposure and blood borne pathogens should be added to the learning objectives.
- Curriculum will need to be developed for this content group.

### **Competency – Human Resources Management**

- These learning objectives have a different focus than the Tier III, ICM Human Resources class.
- Curriculum should be developed to cover this content.
- Add “Develop performance measurement systems ...” to the beginning of learning objective #2.
- Add a fifth learning objective to cover the proper roles of persons involved in Human Resources including a discussion on the independence and interdependence of the HR function in the judicial branch.

### **Competency – Information Technology**

- These learning objectives have a different focus than the Tier III, ICM Technology Projects Management class.
- Curriculum should be developed to cover this content.
- Add “Know when to assess...” to the beginning of learning objective #5.
- Add a sixth learning objective to cover the roles of executive leadership in making technology decisions.

### **Competency – Leadership**

- Compare to final ICM CCE curriculum and see whether these objectives are fully met. If not, we can add to the ICM Leadership course if needed, as long as we do not delete any NCSC content.

### **Competency – Public Education and Media Relations**

- Compare to final ICM CCE curriculum and see whether these objectives are fully met. If not, we can add to Court Community Communications course if needed.

### **Competency – Resources, Budget and Finance**

- Combine learning objective #1 with objectives #2 & 3.
- Delete objective #6 it is already covered in the ICM Financial Management class.
- The remaining objectives have a different focus than the ICM class, and should have new curriculum developed.

### Tier V

The committee discussed whether there was a difference between Tier V and Tier IV, both of which were designed to meet executive level needs. Tier V has no designated content. Ideas for this tier were:

- Instituting a mentoring program as part of Tier V
- Using Tier V as instructors for previous Tiers
- Eliminate Tier V – there is no current distinction in levels of executive leadership
- Implement a course structured around personal growth, sort of a self-realization type course. Mr. Batty completed a course such as this. However, it took two years to complete.

The committee discussed entry into the executive level tier and others. The participant's current position is important; however, title alone should not decide what Tier a person could attend. Titles could be a factor in not having to complete prerequisites – for example, if you were in the target audience (by title) you could come to these classes without having to do any pre-requisite classes. The committee agreed that future applications should include the criteria for entry into each Tier. Pre-requisites for the executive level tiers should be discussed at future meetings.

### CODE 1-108 Revisions

Mr. Schrade gave a brief history of the Code and asked the committee to review the ACJA Code 1-108 handout. He provided an overview to proposed changes made in red which aligns CLIA's structure with other standing advisory committees. This includes: changing the "adoption" of policy to making "recommendations" to policy; providing the ability for members to represent more than one category; changing term limits; and allowing chair to appoint subcommittees as needed. It was recommended that the code descriptions for probation members be changed from "officer" to "administrator."

### CODE 1-302 Revisions

Mr. Schrade he provided an overview to proposed changes in ACJA 1-302, as noted in red text. Committee members had the following input:

- Special masters appointed under Rule 53 may not be intended in the definition of judge. It was recommended that water master be used instead in the definition.
- This code (1-302) refers to "subcommittees." To be consistent with ACJA 1-108, it was recommended that "standing advisory committees" be used instead of subcommittees.
- In section H. 4 Orders of Protection and Injunctions against Harassment, committee members recommended that the words "on a regular basis" be deleted from the sentence.
- In section I.3.a Orientation, grammar needs to be corrected.

Mr. Schrade noted CLIA's comments and will be presenting the final draft for the Committee on Judicial Education and Training, COJET's review and approval at their business meeting December 2, 2010.

### CLIA Meeting Scheduling

The committee agreed to the following CLIA Committee meeting dates, **April 1, 2011, August 10, 2011 and November 17, 2011**

Meetings will start at 9:30am.

The Chair made a call to the public. There was no response. The next scheduled CLIA Committee Meeting is scheduled for April 1, 2010. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.