

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

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

Minutes of the
June 11, 2007 Meeting

Committee Members Present:

Judge Louraine Arkfeld, Chair	Presiding Judge Tempe Municipal Court
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
Carole Boone	Chief Probation Officer/Juvenile Court Center Director, Maricopa County Juvenile Court
Frank Corrales	Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court Center Director, Court Administrator, Santa Cruz County Superior Court
Judge Margaret Downie	Associate Presiding Judge, Maricopa Superior Court
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Judge John Lamb	Associate Presiding Judge, Navajo County Superior Court
Denise Lundin	Clerk of the Court, Cochise County Superior Court
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Superior Court
Judge William Sutton	Presiding Judge, Williams Municipal and Williams Justice Courts
Kathy Waters	Division Director, Adult Probation Services, AOC

Committee Members Absent:

Kent Batty, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Pima County Superior Court
Bonnie Black	Public Member
Alice Bustillos	Detention Director, Maricopa County Superior Court
Philip Urry	Clerk of the Court, Court of Appeals, Division I

CLIA Staff Present:

Deb King, Program Manager
Gabe Goltz, Program Specialist
Susie DeLeon, Program Assistant

Guests Present:

Call to Order, Administrative Business

Judge Louraine Arkfeld called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., at the Judicial Education Center, Phoenix, Arizona.

Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the February minutes. Judge Arkfeld asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made. No changes needed to be made. She called for the motion to approve the minutes which was made by Don Jacobson, seconded by Mike Baumstark. Minutes from February 22, 2007 meeting were approved. **MOTION:** CLIA 2007-02

Workgroup Updates - General Discussion Tiers 1 and 2

Judge Arkfeld asked the workgroups to provide a status update on their work and to discuss specific items related to the competencies in Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

Judge Arkfeld asked if all members had defined their Tier 1 and 2 Competencies. Mike Baumstark stated that in reviewing competencies for IT Management, he questioned whether there were specific objectives relevant for both a Tier 1 and Tier 2. Judge Arkfeld asked the committee whether Tiers 1 and 2 should be combined into one Supervisory Tier. Several members recommended combining Tiers 1 and 2 and Judge Lamb advised that the workgroup he is in decided to combine the two tiers in their work. Gabe Goltz stated that while he was reviewing the information submitted by the workgroups, he noticed the total number of learning objectives for each competency were significantly lower for Tiers 1 and 2 as opposed to Tier 3. David Sanders recommended that Tiers 1 and 2 should be kept separate, suggesting that the two tiers should be easy to complete and that completion of them would motivate individuals to pursue additional tiers.

Don Jacobson suggested a re-examination of Tier 1 as an “introductory” tier to the broader court system including various aspects of court operations including probation, trial courts, and civil and criminal matters. Judge Arkfeld stated that Tier 1 could also function as an introduction to the Tiered Competency Model (TCM) itself. The committee discussed different ways of delivering Tier 1 information including the use of a Computer Based Training (CBT) approach, a 2-3 day course at a Judicial Staff Conference, a DVD course, and through the use of CENTRA instructor-lead online classes.

Action Item: Make Tier 1 an “introductory tier” fundamentally different in nature than the rest of the tiers. Workgroups should review and complete their work in defining competencies for Tiers 1 & 2.

Action Item: Since workgroups are a small cross-section of the whole CLIA committee, Judge Arkfeld also asked members to make sure they have reviewed and approved the TCM learning objectives created by the other workgroups.

Executive Level Tiers 4 and 5 Discussions

The committee discussion progressed to whether there was a distinct difference between Executive Level Tiers 4 and 5. Don Jacobson summarized that Tier 4 could still be addressed by identifying advanced NACM competencies and listing them as learning objectives in the same manner as was done for Tier 3. The Tier 5 level would switch the focus from training to mentorship. Tier 5 could be constructed more as a mentorship program providing networking and mentor resources to executive leaders.

Action Item: Workgroups should meet and identify core competencies/learning objectives for Tier 4 and discuss what mentorship for Tier 5 would mean.

ICM Program AZ Plus Proposal/ Tier 3 Competency

Gabe Goltz presented a proposal for an “ICM Arizona Plus” program, which would provide Arizona-specific content to accompany the existing ICM Court Management Program (CMP) curriculum which includes five 2.5 day classes and a week-long concluding seminar. Denise Lundin asked if this would cover Tier 3 identified competencies. Mr. Goltz and Judge Arkfeld confirmed that the “Arizona Plus” program was intended to provide instruction on those learning objectives identified by CLIA for Tier 3, but not covered in the existing CMP curriculum. Judge Arkfeld asked members for their thoughts on such a program, including alternative ideas. In response to a question from Mike Baumstark, Mr. Goltz indicated that “Arizona Plus” course modules could be presented in a single, week-long format, as stand-alone courses, or as additional components added on to the end of the existing ICM CMP courses.

Tier 3 Competency – What Constitutes Completion

Judge Arkfeld asked members to discuss what it means to complete Tier 3. Should it be the completion of required curriculum (ICM CMP and the Arizona Plus); the completion of recommended curriculum with the ability for CLIA to approve equivalent curriculum from other sources, or a combination of both? Committee discussion centered on the idea that at least for Tier 3 it should be a set of required curriculum consisting of ICM CMP and specific curriculum developed to cover learning objectives not covered in ICM CMP. What it means to complete other tiers would be discussed after finalizing learning objectives for those tiers.

Further discussion on Tier 3 led to the question of whether too much was being required at the manager level. Members questioned whether we should be requiring more than what the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) viewed as essential for

court managers? After a short discussion it was determined that because Tiers 2 and 4 are still being developed it is not possible to fully address this question.

Action Item: AOC staff will revise the handout listing Tier 3 learning objectives not covered in ICM Phase I CMP to allow members to reflect upon and identify the following for each of the learning objectives listed.

- Should the learning objective be deleted?
 - Should the learning objective be moved to another Tier?
 - Should the learning objective be kept in Tier 3 and covered in curriculum offered at the end of a specific ICM class or in a 3-day capstone follow-up (AZ Plus) session.
- This review should be completed by the end of July.

Action Item: Upon receipt of the above information, AOC staff will compile members' input and see if the week-long proposed session can be reduced to no more than 3 days with possible mini sessions offered at the end of ICM classes as applicable.

Application for ICM CMP classes offered in state

In follow-up to a previous action item, an example brochure and application for participation in ICM CMP with an "Arizona ICM Plus" component was presented. Frank Corrales asked whether this application process included both CLIA sponsored and JSEC sponsored ICM classes. Deb King responded that yes, the intent was to have one process for all Arizona court sponsored classes. Ms. King mentioned the logistical challenge of implementing a reserved status for approved applicants without impacting those who have been taking the classes on a first come first served basis. Members asked how many can attend ICM classes and how many spots would be available for approved applicants versus the registration currently used. Ms. King stated that ICM classes are designed for a maximum of 50, but with an additional fee to cover a second instructor, the NCSC allows up to a maximum of 80. She will work with the Judicial Staff Education (JSEC) manager to identify how many participants are currently supervisors or managers thus more likely to be in the group of applicants versus attendees who come for a specific subject relative to their current work assignment. Ms. King stated that because of the demand for these classes, they have been at or near capacity and even with an application process a certain percentage of available space should still be made for attendees needing only that topic.

Carole Boone raised the awareness that the brochure and sessions as listed do not include probation as a target audience. Members discussed whether probation leaders have significantly different learning objectives. Gabe Goltz pointed out that in the last ICM Financial Management class 25% of the attendees were from probation. Kathy Waters added that there is a benefit for court leaders to know both probation and court processes. It was generally agreed that at this time the curriculum should include both probation and court leaders as one group, but that additional curriculum focusing on probation processes may need to be added to provide a more complete program.

Members reviewed the example brochure and made the following recommendations:

- AZ ICM Plus may not be the best way to reference the capstone session because the learning objectives are not always specific to Arizona courts . No alternative was given, but what to call each level for certificate purposes was discussed.
- Tier 3 could be referenced both by the Tier number in the TCM and by the acronym "ACM," Arizona Court Manager. Tier 2 could be "ACS" Arizona Court Supervisor and Tier 4 "ACE" Arizona Court Executive. Because probation managers are not specifically referenced in the suggested acronyms, references to "probation" should be made on the front cover of the brochure and through-out as applicable.
- Acronyms should be spelled out in the application.
- Add "length of service in the court system" in addition to Arizona courts.
- Add two check boxes for application for ACM program, and one for application only for AZ ICM Plus
- Add "provide funding and leave to attend" to the approval box page two.
- Change the approving authority from supervisor signature to "Court or Probation Department Heads or Designee."

Don Jacobson recommended that when we are ready to implement this process, AOC staff should attend a Court Administrators Association meeting to present the program.

Action Item: Example brochure will be revised to reflect recommended changes.

Leadership in Judicial Education (LIJE) Project - Curriculum Around the Circle

Gabe Goltz presented a project proposed by the CLIA team who attended the LIJE seminars. The Curriculum Around the Circle is a way to design training to incorporate all learning styles based on the David Kolb model of adult learning. Through a checklist-type form, faculty and subject matter experts can easily see whether any learning styles are missing from their training. If so, they can then choose from a list of teaching methods to use in revising their program design. Committee members commented that the form should be distributed to Training Coordinators to make it more available.

Call to the Public/Adjourn

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

Next meeting September 24, 2007.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.