

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Judicial Education Center

541 E Van Buren, Suite B4

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Minutes of the

September 18, 2009 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
Carol Boone	Chief Probation Officer/Juvenile Court Center Director, Maricopa County Juvenile 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	Detention Administrator, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Denise Lundin	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Cochise County
Michael Malone	Court Liaison, Superior Court in Pinal County
Committee Members Absent:	
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Court
Judge Kathy McCoy (Vacant 9/09)	Presiding Judge, Kingman Municipal Court
Frank Owens (Vacant 8/09)	Chief Probation Officer, Gila County Probation Department
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
Vikki Murillo	Specialist I, 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 Judicial Education Center, in Phoenix, Arizona.

Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the minutes from June 26, 2009, for changes or corrections to be made. No changes were recommended. The minutes were approved.

MOTION: CLIA 2009-04

ESD/Staff Updates

Judge Arkfeld introduced Mr. Jeff Schrade, Education Services Division Director, and Ms. Patricia Stansfield, new Specialist V.

Judge Arkfeld welcomed new committee member, Ms. Jolene Hefner. Ms. Hefner has been the Deputy Director of the Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center for over 11 years.

Judge Arkfeld noted that there are a number of CLIA membership vacancies. Of the current members, Mr. Frank Owens and Judge Kathy McCoy have resigned; their positions need to be replaced. Therefore, we will need nominations for the following positions to be submitted to the Chief Justice:

- ◆ Limited Jurisdiction Leadership Judge, Urban (1)
- ◆ Adult/Juvenile Probation, Rural (1)
- ◆ General Jurisdiction, Rural (1)

Judge Arkfeld reported that there has been one program since the last meeting. ICM Financial Management was held August 11-13, 2009, with Arizona faculty, Don Jacobson, Jim Scorza and Dave Byers. The program was attended by 39 participants with an overall rating of 4.44.

Ms. Deb King updated the committee on October and November programs (refer to LEAD Schedule at a Glance). October 7-9, 2009, ICM Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts will be taught by Mr. Ernest Friesen, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) faculty and co-facilitated by Mr. Kent Batty, who will provide an Arizona perspective. This course was advertised to only Arizona Court Management (ACM) participants and was filled within 24 hours, with a wait list.

The AZ Plus Capstone is scheduled for November 4-6, 2009 which was moved from the October date because it was too close to the Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts class. Notification will be sent to participants who are already pre-registered alerting them to the new class date.

Ms. King reported on the two scheduled Judicial Staff Education Committee (JSEC) broadcasts. "Clarifying the Ethical Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees" is scheduled for September 30, 2009, which will give participants a unique opportunity to provide input on the proposed changes to the code. The "Information Technology Implementation" broadcast scheduled for November 19, 2009, will focus on advising courts of upcoming system enhancements and implementations.

The LEAD Unit is also responsible for year-end reporting. Ms. Vikki Murillo works directly with the Training Coordinators to ensure all compliance reporting is completed and submitted to the Supreme Court.

Ms. King noted the Court Leadership Conference if held, is tentatively scheduled for March 2010. Due to budget limitations this conference may be limited in duration to one day. Staff is researching cost effective alternatives such as the ASU Downtown Center/Judicial Education Center, AOC or the Black Canyon Conference Center.

Judge Arkfeld commented that the 2010 Judicial Conference has been cancelled.

Tier III AZ Court Manager Program (ACM)

Judge Arkfeld reminded members of the discussion at the June CLIA Committee meeting regarding whether or not to have the ICM Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts course. At the time, CLIA had decided not to schedule the class as it was not currently part of the ACM curriculum requirements. However, the chance for us to have this class taught by Mr. Friesen at no cost is a rare opportunity and provides us the ability to pilot and evaluate this class.

Ms. King overviewed the NCSC ICM Consortium proposed Certified Court Manager (CCM) and Advanced CCM changes. Refer to handouts: "ACM Certification Current, ACM Tier III Qualifying Experience, ICM CMP & CEDP, ICM Changing Model." The change that immediately affects our ACM program is the substitution of ICM Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts for ICM Concluding Seminar. Additionally the new ICM courses may meet our Tier IV learning objectives and become part of our Executive-level Tier IV program. One very significant benefit of the NCSC proposed changes will be the ability to complete their Court Executive Development Program (CEDP) without having to attend a three-week residential program. There would be some additional training required beyond their Tier II advanced court manager certificate.

Judge Arkfeld asked the committee, "Given proposed changes that ICM is making, how does that impact what we already have and do we want to make any changes?"

Comments were as follows:

- Does mirroring their program mean deleting the Concluding Seminar as part of our ACM - Tier III program? Yes

- An option would be to adjust the AZ Plus Capstone to cover what is missing if we no longer taught the Concluding Seminar and delete what is redundant between AZ Plus Capstone and the Purposes and Responsibilities course.
- An option would be to move our Purposes & Responsibilities content into our Phase II Supervisory Tier and make the AZ Plus Capstone shorter. Possibly eliminating Judicial Independence.
- Concerns were shared that some of the management topics currently in the Concluding Seminar such as Management and Leadership in the Courts and Stimulating Change, if eliminated would need to be integrated elsewhere.
- An additional component for AZ Plus Capstone could be the Strategic Agenda and how the courts do their strategic planning.
- If the week-long Concluding Seminar is not included, courts and their relationships would be missing.
- Some committee members were concerned that participants who attended the Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts course might see the same information repeated in the first day of the AZ Plus Capstone.

Ms. King mentioned to the committee that there are about 20 participants waiting to attend the Concluding Seminar, who under our existing program wouldn't have to attend the Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts course to receive their ACM certification. The NCSC will allow people who are already in their ICM program to choose the Concluding Seminar or the Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts class to receive their CCM, for an interim period of time.

The Concluding Seminar is tentatively scheduled for May 2010, subject to faculty availability. Faculty certification for the Concluding Seminar is scheduled for January 2010. Curriculum is being developed now for next year's Concluding Seminar. The Concluding Seminar will change from a week to a 2 ½ day program. NCSC will take out topics such as Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts, Judicial Independence, and Visioning & Organizational Leadership from the Concluding seminar which will reduce repetition with other courses.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. King will make a side-by-side comparison of Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts and the AZ Plus Capstone once they've been taught to determine where the overlap is and what is missing.

Tier IV Executive Level

Ms. King provided the following status overview of the ICM consortium development of their Tier II program:

- The NCSC's new advanced level court manager program (their Tier II) consists of five new classes and the ICM Concluding Seminar.
- The learning objectives in the NCSC ICM course outlines represent what is intended to be covered, but the courses have not been developed.

- The Concluding Seminar and Essential Functions courses will be developed by year-end and the other four courses will be developed in 2011.
- The NCSC has not yet provided a course outline for the Concluding Seminar which will limit our review of this course.
- Each course will be designed to be completed in 2 ½ days of classroom training.
- Curriculum will be reviewed by subject matter experts for Essential Components and Concluding Seminar in September.

Mr. Batty commented that the new courses don't include anything on Case Management and there are at least 4 of our executive-level topics not covered in the NCSC new curriculum. Judge Arkfeld suggested that any Tier IV areas not covered in these courses could be included in a Tier IV AZ Plus Capstone.

The committee broke into small workgroups to review the NSCS Tier II (advanced ICM classes) program proposals and discuss whether these new classes might meet our Tier IV executive-level learning objectives. Ms. King asked the committee to also discuss who would benefit from the curriculum, if it does not appear to be at an executive level.

Workgroups reported as follows:

Essential Components – Workgroup: Carol Boone, Jolene Hefner

- The first three learning objectives could be for a lower level manager, but the last two are more of an executive level.
- The sub-topics of case preparation and court infrastructure could be implemented somewhere else, possibly in the AZ Plus Capstone.
- Mr. Batty suggested if we don't offer the complete course, we articulate to participants that we will offer a shortened version - but if a participant wants the NCSC certification they should plan to attend the national course.

Leadership – Workgroup: Louraine Arkfeld, Kent Batty, Margaret Downie

- This is targeted toward an executive level.
- Much of the content applies to our objectives.
- Approximately 10% isn't covered, but that can certainly be added to the AZ Plus Capstone.

Court Community Communication – Workgroup: Denise Lundin, Don Jacobson

- This is targeted toward an executive level.
- It touches on contact with media, contact with other governmental organizations and the public in general.
- Overall, the direction of this competency is geared towards executive level.
- It directly relates to Tier IV Public Education and Media Relations Competency.
- All four of our Tier IV objectives are covered somehow.

Visioning & Strategic Planning – Workgroup: Roger Hartley, Phil Hanley

- Executive level, maybe even higher level managers, could benefit from this course.
- Every one of the course competencies was a Tier IV learning objective.

Education & Training – Workgroup: Judy Aldrich, Mike Malone

- There are four objectives that would apply to an executive level. The rest could apply to anyone else.
- This could be covered in a half day class.
- The subtopic of resource development was questioned as to whether it should be in the education piece at all.
- This course as a whole would not be an executive level class.
- Conclusion, some executive level managers should have already experienced some of this training already.

To summarize, Visioning & Strategic Planning, Court Community Communication, and the Leadership classes target an executive level. The Concluding Seminar can't be reviewed until we have the course proposal or curriculum. There is some question as to whether the Essential Components and the Education & Training classes are at the executive level. Based on this preliminary review, an option for our Arizona Court Executive (ACE) Tier IV level is to do three or four of the ICM classes, (depending on the Concluding Seminar), and then develop two other full classes that target the missing executive level learning objectives for an ACE certificate. This proposed Tier IV structure would be similar to Tier III, where there are some foundational courses offered that will be the ICM courses, and then some additional content that we will develop and package to complete the tier.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. King will bring the content and curriculum for Essential Components and the Concluding Seminar to the committee for review at their next meeting.

Tier II Supervisory Level

In follow-up on curriculum development for Tier II (Supervisors), members discussed length of session and additions to sub-topics and activities previously recommended by workgroups. Discussion was as follows:

Case Management

- *Obj. 1. Describe case flow principles and why they are used.*
 - This does accurately identify the purpose of Case Management.
 - The learning objectives for the additional half day specific to Probation would need to be added to better explain what it would cover.
 - It was suggested that the course be a day and a half and integrate Probation, so when someone reaches the executive level they can understand the full scope.

- With the development of learning objective for the probation ½ day, the committee could further discuss who would benefit most from this content.
- *Obj. 3. Demonstrate knowledge of the details of different case types and their methods of initiation in multi-jurisdictional levels.*
 - This is a very narrow definition of what should be explored.
 - There should be an activity to include civil case flow.

Ms. Lundin suggested the content should include case closings and post-adjudication. Mr. Batty thought this Tier should not go into that kind of detail.

ACTION ITEM: Deb King will schedule a conference call with Dave Sanders and Carol Boone to identify some specific learning objectives for half day.

Education and Training

- *Obj. 2. Describe what motivates court employee and how personal development contributes to motivation, performance and commitment.*
 - In addition to covering how to conduct goal setting and career planning, add information on career paths within the courts especially with entry level individuals.

Essential Components – Workgroup: Louraine Arkfeld, Frank Owens, David Sanders

- *Obj. 1. Understand the policies and resources relating to the difference between providing legal advice and information and the ability to navigate difficult real-world situations where the difference between providing information and providing legal advice may be unclear.*

ACTION ITEM: Ms. King distributed the CBT, “Legal Information vs Legal Advice” to committee volunteers for them to review before the next meeting to see if it would be relevant to a supervisory target audience. She also asked them to make suggestions on what should be added or changed to make it fit a supervisory focus.

- *Obj. 2. Understand methods to capture, store, retrieve, and purge (as appropriate) court records.*
 - Regarding sub-topic “Overview various technology resources and programs used to capture and store information.” Ms. King informed the committee that there are two broadcasts coming up that might address this topic - the “Information Technology Implementation” in November, and the “Public Access to Court Records” in January. She suggested that we look at those broadcasts and later determine whether we can adapt that content and/or create a CBT.
 - Supervisors not only need to understand records retention but also storage media.
 - Security should be in a portion of this. 30 minutes max.

- *Obj. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of the relationships between work flows and processes, and the organization of work spaces and their adjacencies.*
 - Facilities management and design, basic understanding of court house zoning and security issues, etc. should be included.
 - Rewrite #4 to say “individual work units”. Or, provide the resources of where you can find this information if it is a general topic.

Mr. Jacobson remarked that some of the learning objectives would take more than two hours, possibly two days. Judge Arkfeld suggested that some of these learning objectives could be developed and introduced as a CBT instead of a class that needed to be attended. A compromise might be a half day class in addition to CBTs.

Human Resource Management

- *Obj. 3. Describe the basic principles of performance management supervision, and evaluation.*
 - Fourth bullet point – the use of the word “versus” indicates there will be a winner. This should just be a comparison.
 - Fifth bullet point - “red flag” words should be addressed in regards to hiring and certain performance situations.
 - It was suggested that first line supervisors need some discussion about helping employees adapt and deal with changing organizations. This might be found in Leadership or in Visioning and Strategic Planning.

Leadership

- *Obj. 1. Understand the basic concepts of organizational leadership.*
 - This should include chain of command concepts, collaborative management, and introduce different methodologies for accomplishing change in organizational leadership.
 - It was suggested that movies that demonstrate leadership scenarios be utilized.
- *Obj. 2. Assess your own leadership style and temperament.*
 - This should not only be focused on assessing your own leadership style but also realizing what the general style of the organization is.
 - Expand on this objective by including understanding different personality types and how to deal with them. Possibly adding a Colors class or the DISC Evaluation.
- *Obj. 4. Recognize and understand the perspective of different (sometimes competing) stakeholders.*
 - This objective should address a new supervisor who now has to deal with employees that were once his/her equal.
- *Obj. 6. Recognize the importance of consistency within the scope of leadership actions.*
 - Consistency doesn’t necessarily need a separate unit but needs to somehow be incorporated, maybe in all sections.

- *Obj. 7. Understand the application of administrative rules, orders, statutes, and governing policies.*
 - Suggestion, this should cover how a supervisor would determine which policy to implement if there is more than one policy governing.

Additional recommended topics for the class in Leadership to cover: organizational change, budgets, merging units, and dealing with massive employee and structural change.

Public Education and Media Relations

- *Obj. 1. Awareness of and ability to quickly access public information about the court and other related entities, as well as the ability to assess the accessibility of this information.*
 - Change “overview of” Freedom of Information Act to “awareness of”.
- *Obj. 2. Understand the importance of educating the public, legislature, and executive branch about court systems, processes, and programs.*
 - Broaden the definition more by adding court users.
 - This Objective could even be pieced into two parts:
 - a) Understanding the importance to the court of educating the public, legislative and executive branch, processes and programs
 - b) Understanding the importance to the supervisors.

Purposes & Responsibilities of Courts

Ms. King suggested the committee review the March 2009 broadcast, “A Historical and Contemporary View of Courts’ Role in Government and Society: The Arizona Judicial Branch”. She also mentioned that the New Judge Orientation CBT’s cover legal terminology, legal research, etc.

ACTION ITEM: Some of the committee members present took a copy of the broadcast to review.

Visioning and Strategic Planning

- *Obj. 2. Define the differences among values, vision, mission, goals, and action items.*
 - Add metrics or measures for achieving goals and action items.

Judge Arkfeld asked the committee to identify the top 3 or 4 priority classes to be developed. The committee’s suggestions are:

1. Case Management
2. Human Resource Management
3. Essential Components
4. Leadership

Judge Arkfeld asked the committee to consider what criteria should be included to complete Tier II. Mr. Batty suggested we pull portions of content from the Tier III and Tier IV courses for this Tier. Mr. Jacobson thought that developing a two day management introduction course to include these four courses might be beneficial. Ms.

Lundin suggested we go back into groups before the next meeting to review these courses again. Ms. King will leave this topic open for the next CLIA Committee meeting to discuss.

Judge Arkfeld suggested that committee members, who haven't taken any of the CBTs, review the curriculum for Human Resources and Essential Components to see what is crucial.

ACTION ITEM: Member's comments and suggestions to be forwarded to Ms. King.

CLIA deliverables relative to our Strategic Planning goals

Based on prior committee work, the following was summarized:

- 1) COJET's strategic goals were submitted to the court's strategic plan and included the goals from CLIA's fast track planning session.
- 2) Committee priorities of classes to be developed this year:
 - Tier II priority development of the four classes already discussed
 - ICM new curriculum being developed through the consortium
 - Presiding Judge training, investigate what is being done now.Ms. King suggested doing an initial investigation for this training to see what's already covered and what might need to be included. Mr. Batty mentioned recruiting a limited jurisdiction administrator and a superior court administrator to form a workgroup. He also mentioned the possibility of connecting with Judge Armbruster to see what is offered from the Judicial College.

The next scheduled CLIA meeting is November 20, 2009.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.