

COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

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

Minutes of the February 28, 2008 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
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
Carol Boone	Chief Probation Officer/Juvenile Court Center Director, Maricopa County Juvenile Court
Alice Bustillos	Detention Director, Superior Court in Maricopa County
Frank Corrales	Court Administrator, Superior Court in Santa Cruz County
Judge Margaret Downie	Associate Presiding Judge, Superior Court in Maricopa County
Don Jacobson	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Superior Court in Pima County
Kathy Waters (via phone)	Division Director, Adult Probation Services, AOC

Committee Members Absent:

Judge John Lamb	Associate Presiding Judge, Superior Court in Navajo County
Denise Lundin	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Cochise County
Judge William Sutton	Presiding Judge, Williams Municipal and Williams Justice Courts
Professor Bonnie Black	Public Member (resigned)
Philip Urry	Clerk of the Court, Court of Appeals, Division I (resigned)

CLIA Staff Present:

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

Guests Present:

Cathy Lowe, Division Director, Education Services, AOC

Call to Order, Administrative Business

Judge Arkfeld welcomed and introduced the new Director of the Education Services Division, Cathy Lowe. Ms. Lowe shared her court background, and then Judge Arkfeld asked committee members to introduce themselves.

Judge Arkfeld called for all members to review the November minutes. Judge Arkfeld asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made. No changes were recommended. She called for the motion to approve the minutes which was made by Kent Batty and seconded by Mike Baumstark. Minutes from November 8, 2007 meeting were approved. *MOTION: CLIA 2008-01*

Committee By-Laws & Membership

Judge Arkfeld noted that Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) 1-108 establishes CLIA as a sub-committee of COJET. The ACJA 1-202 sets forth the standards for public meetings, therefore CLIA's establishing order 2006-78 has been effectively replaced by the ACJA 1-108. The language from this Administrative Order (AO) has been put into a bylaw format deleting any repetitive language to the codes and adding new references, proxy information and chair responsibilities. The committee reviewed the proposed bylaws and a motion to adopt was made by Mr. Batty and seconded by Don Jacobson. The motion to adopt CLIA Committee Bylaws as presented pass unanimously. Copy of approved CLIA Committee Bylaws is attached. *MOTION: CLIA 2008-02*

Judge Arkfeld noted that there are a number of CLIA membership vacancies and expiring terms. Of the current members, Phil Urry and Bonnie Black have resigned; their positions need to be replaced. Judge William Sutton was asked to serve on another education committee and will not be seeking reappointment to this committee. All other members with expiring terms have agreed to be considered for reappointment. Therefore the following positions will need nominations to submit to the Chief Justice:

- ◆ Appellate Judge (1)
- ◆ Limited Jurisdiction Leadership Judge, Urban (1)
- ◆ Academic/Education Agency (Public) (1)
- ◆ Public Member (1)
- ◆ General Jurisdiction Second Level Manager (1)
- ◆ Limited Jurisdiction Second Level Manager (1)

Deb King noted that the appointment packet requires 2 nominations for each position. Mr. Baumstark clarified that for reappointed positions a second name is not required. To meet the appointment deadlines, Judge Arkfeld asked that committee members submit potential member names to Ms. King by mid-March so staff can prepare the nomination packet by the April 11, 2008 deadline. Mr. Batty recommended Professor Rodger Hartley as a candidate for appointment to this committee.

Arizona Court Manager

Judge Arkfeld asked staff for updates on the Arizona Court Manager (ACM) Program. Ms. King reported that there are currently 52 applications received with 50 approved to date. All the fiscal year 2009 classes are only tentatively scheduled due to budget consideration and will be capped with a maximum of 40 participants to avoid a higher cost per class. The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) has agreed to allow 10 additional participants in the Technology, Human Resources and Financial Management classes without additional cost. This enables us to register court staff, not in the ACM program, who would benefit from the class because it is directly relevant to their work in the court.

The May Court Manager Program (CMP) is full, with a wait list of 11 people and there are 13 pre-registered in the August CMP session for a total of 23 eligible to attend in August. By fiscal year-end there will be enough participants for two week-long CMP programs. However, because it is one of our more costly programs we may only be able to offer one this fiscal year with a likelihood of canceling the tentatively scheduled August CMP program. The persons currently eligible would then be preregistered in the May program. Mr. Baumstark noted that the budget challenges are greater than originally thought and that the court may know more about the state's budget in the upcoming weeks. He added that the court supports continuing management and leadership training. We may need to consider alternatives; whether that means charging a registration fee or offering fewer programs would still need to be determined.

Court Executive Program – Seven State Consortium

Ms. King reported that the court, in conjunction with seven other states, has moved forward with the consortium to develop the Court Executive Program (CEP), selecting four curriculums to be developed in 2008. They are:

- ◆ Budget and Finance
- ◆ Caseflow Management
- ◆ Court Performance Standards
- ◆ Purpose and Responsibilities of the Courts

As a pioneer state, Arizona will benefit by having this curriculum available to be taught in-state by local faculty. Our agreement provides to Arizona a perpetual license to use the curriculum. This would eliminate the fees we pay to the NCSC to provide faculty and present their Phase I ICM curriculum; leaving only a nominal per person processing fee. There are tentative plans to hold a faculty training for these new classes December 10-12 in Williamsburg, VA. Three of the four classes being developed this year would replace three of the current Phase I classes. One of the new classes, Purpose and Responsibilities of the Courts, may cover similar content to classes being developed for the AZ Plus capstone session. We will monitor this while both curricula are being developed and adjust for overlap in content.

Human Resources AZ Plus - Diversity and Succession Planning

Ms. King reviewed the curriculum detailed design documents for the learning objectives selected by CLIA for Diversity and Succession Planning content. She reported that the workgroup of Judge Antonio Riojas, Ms. Rosa Inchausti and Mr. Phil Hanley, met and further defined the focus of these sessions adding terminal objectives for each. Once this step was completed, the workgroup agreed that a three-hour time period was too short to address both of these topics. Ms. King reviewed the terminal objectives, content outlines and methodology for each proposed session.

CLIA committee feedback on the Diversity session:

- The content covering “action planning” in the Diversity session should not cover developing a diversity action plan (for example hiring policy), as this is potentially a legal issue and beyond the scope of this training. The focus should be more on awareness and embracing diversity. Ms. King clarified that action planning was geared more to having participants plan how they would personally transfer what they learned in the session and apply it in the workplace.

CLIA feedback on the Succession/Career Planning session:

- The content outlined relative to succession planning was geared to a higher level than manager, Tier III, and is better in a Tier IV or Tier V, Executive level.
- A Tier III should introduce managers to the idea that they have responsibilities towards developing others, such as career planning as part of performance appraisals.
- The outline on succession planning if developed for a Tier IV audience should be run by smaller courts to ensure the curriculum addresses their unique needs in succession planning.

The curriculum will be revised to focus two hours on managing diversity with an added one hour component on career planning with your employees.

Curriculum Workgroup Assignments

Judge Arkfeld requested that a CLIA member be part of each workgroup assignment to ensure that we have the committee’s perspective on why we came up with each objective. This input would be helpful in maintaining the focus and scope for each topic as originally planned. Ms. King added that having CLIA members as part of the curriculum workgroups would also enable work to be completed between CLIA meetings by have members willing to review curriculum and provide input. Most learning objectives already had a committee member listed as a subject matter expert. The following lists member assignments by content areas for those areas that did not already have a CLIA member:

Carole Boone	Diversity, Career and Professional Development
Mike Baumstark	Channels of Communication
Kent Batty	Jury Management

Ms. King offered to copy draft curricula to committee members to allow for review outside the committee. This would ensure members were aware of what content was being developed in the other workgroups. Judge Margaret Downie noted that Judge Dean Fink should be listed as a subject matter expert in the category of garnishments, judgments and writs instead of the category covering alternative dispute resolutions.

Tier II Supervisory Tier

Judge Arkfeld referred to handouts listing the competencies and learning objectives currently identified by CLIA for Tier II. She opened the discussion on the audience needs for this group. Ms. King questioned whether the target audience for Tier II is predominately a front-line supervisor or beginning supervisor level? If so, does this group represent a significantly larger number of employees than the manager level? The committee felt that front-line supervisors are the target audience, but the numbers and specific needs of this audience are unknown. The proposal developed by CLIA staff offers some distance learning options to help meet the following potential needs:

- Higher turnover or relatively new staff creates greater need for immediate, point-in-time training.
- Budget constraints for travel creates a greater need for locally available training.
- Extended out-of-office time for line supervisors may be difficult for some courts and departments.

Gabe Goltz discussed resources for this supervisory level. Mr. Goltz found that most large courts' supervisory training comes from non-court specific resources, for example Maricopa used their county's supervisory training, and the Phoenix Municipal Court used their city's training. Some courts, such as Pima County were beginning to develop supervisory training. When the curricula for these sample trainings were reviewed it appeared that most of the learning objectives were general in nature. When reviewed against our Tier II competencies, typically not more than half the learning objectives would be met. It was also difficult to do in-depth reviews of these curriculums as the organizations were hesitant to share their curricula. Supervisory academies were also weeks to months in length. Mr. Goltz reviewed the draft program proposal for Tier II as follows:

- The budget, finance and resource competency has no learning objectives for this level.
- The Arizona Courts CD may meet the learning objectives and will be reviewed to verify.
- The Management "nuts and bolts" learning objectives are estimated to be about 6 hours of curriculum and might be covered via CENTRA - synchronous, real-time online instructor lead training.
- Emerging court leaders content is estimated at 8 hours and combines leadership, visioning and strategic planning. There are 10 learning objectives for this content, so possible pre-requisite individual work would help cover the objectives.

- Caseflow management is estimated at 5 hours and is an example of content not covered in any of the existing supervisory classes.
- Essential component content such as emergency preparedness, legal advice, and public records may have content developed as part of broadcasts that could be incorporated into the supervisory training.

Committee members provided input on the proposal as follows:

- The nuts and bolts section needs more substance. New supervisors need more information on their roles. Additionally there are foundational skill areas that are not covered in the existing learning objectives such as: Chain of Command, Delegation, Giving Feedback, Problem Solving and Decision Making.
- Distance learning is a good delivery method, but perhaps the topics that can be delivered in that format should be different than the ones proposed.
- As we develop curriculum for this level, we will need to consider the appropriate focus and should use other supervisory classes to help verify that we have the appropriate learning objectives for this level and audience.
- Code of conduct and ethics learning objectives should be added to include supervisory responsibilities for their staff under the judicial code, and appropriate use of electronic communications.
- Dealing with the media can be shorter and covered in an hour or less. The other content such as public disclosure and records are more of a priority in this category for this Tier.

The next steps for Tier II were discussed as follows:

- Volunteers from the courts will take the National Center for State Courts online supervisory class and evaluate it for delivery method effectiveness, usefulness/applicability to work, and how well does it match Tier II learning objectives. Ms. King requested that committee members email names of any staff they would recommend to take the course and evaluate it. It would be helpful to have at least one volunteer be a relatively new supervisor or lead person who may become a supervisor.
- CLIA staff will review the existing broadcasts and computer based training to verify whether these resources can be used to meet learning objectives in this Tier.
- CLIA staff will develop and pilot one soft-skills supervisory class to be delivered online via CENTRA over the summer, to evaluate the effectiveness of this delivery method.
- Other than the pilot, development of Tier II curriculum will not begin until after the Tier III AZ Plus curriculum is completed and delivered in October. Review of resources will be ongoing.
- When Tier II is developed, the top three priorities would be: Purpose and Responsibilities of Courts (who we are and what we do), Emerging Court Leader (making the transition to supervisor) and Supervisory Ethics.

Tier IV Executive Level Learning Objectives

Judge Arkfeld requested committee input and verification of the Tier IV learning objectives. The committee reviewed the learning objectives to determine whether they were in the appropriate Tier. Committee input and changes to Tier IV learning competencies were as follows. Learning objectives that had no changes are not listed, all CAPS indicate new wording, and strikeovers indicate deleted text.

Competency

Purpose / Responsibility

1. Demonstrate knowledge of governmental and organizational structures in which courts operate, the legal authority of the courts, ~~and its implication for human resources.~~

Human Resource Management

~~5. Be prepared for new challenges and lead and manage change of the courts and its human resources management.~~

Committee input: Delete this objective, it is not measureable and the Human Resource objective #1 covers change relative to this category. There may be a need to add a general change management learning objective in another more general competency group.

Leadership

1. ~~Enhance~~ UNDERSTAND your individual leadership STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES style, and ~~applying that style~~ HOW LEADERSHIP STYLES AFFECT the development and implementation of the organizational vision. (This objective will include an update to a "leadership style inventory" tool taken earlier in the leader's career development.)

3. ASSESS ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR, ~~Explain~~ and effectively navigate through organizational politics, including positive and appropriate uses of power, and effective negotiation and influence.

~~5. Assess organizational behavior and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques.~~

Committee input: Delete this objective, it is now covered in Leadership objective #3.

6. Understand the need to create collaborative partnerships among courts, ancillary organizations, community services ENTITIES, non-profits, and legislative and executive branch agencies at the state and local levels to solve justice system problems.

Visioning and Strategic Planning

2. Explain the importance of planning and its relationship to other management functions and to distinguish between different types of planning (i.e. strategic, tactical, and operational planning), their purposes and characteristics.

Public Information and the Media

1. ~~Knowledge of~~ IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP methods to assess and address the public's concerns and opinions.

4. Develop media policies applicable to staff and judges at all levels, including by identifying THE IDENTIFICATION OF internal and external key contacts.

Information Technology

1. Demonstrate knowledge of ways in which technology may be used to support strategic objectives of the judiciary JUDICIAL BRANCH; ~~e.g., public trust and confidence in judges and the administration of justice; accountability; good governance.~~

Committee input: Don't include an example list, leave open - this would then encompass IT learning objective #3.

2. Demonstrate knowledge of Judicial Branch technology policies including funding AND OTHER requirements, project approval procedures, AND technology standards.

3. ~~Complete strategic plan required by the Commission on Technology and Code of Judicial Administration.~~

Committee input: Covered in IT learning objective #1.

Essential Components

1. Assess the adequacy of the court's facility for space, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, safety, security, environmental comfort (including use of circulation zones), ~~as well as~~ AND EVALUATE BUSINESS PRACTICES TO IDENTIFY WAYS TO INCREASE FACILITY EFFICIENCY AND FORMULATE MID-TO LONG-TERM PLANS FOR COURT FACILITIES. ~~respond to and improve facilities as needed.~~

~~2. Increase facility efficiencies through changes to business practices and knowledge of the range of financing options to improve facilities.~~

Committee input: Combine with Essential Component's learning objective #1 and #7.

3. Demonstrate knowledge of the elements critical in the development of an emergency preparedness plan ~~as well as~~ AND a continuity of operations plan. ~~Understanding~~ IDENTIFY the role of other agencies in partnering to implement these plans.

~~4. Develop a model and demonstrate the ability to create collaborative partnerships among courts, ancillary organizations, community services, non-profits, and legislative and executive branch agencies at the state and local levels to solve justice system problems.~~

Committee input: This is already contained within the Leadership learning objectives.

6. Formulate mid- to long-term plans for court facilities.

Committee input: This is now covered in Essential Component's learning objectives #1.

7. ~~Understand~~ DISCUSS EFFECTIVE mechanisms AND FINANCING OPTIONS used to fund public facilities: revenue and general obligation bonds; lease buy-back systems; general fund use; and other sources.

8. Identify and solve a system's problem INCLUDING DEVELOPING A PLAN TO ~~by designing~~ new processes, programs, or procedures; AND EVALUATE ITS SUCCESS.

~~9. Design and execute a plan for the evaluation of a specific program.~~

Committee input: Delete and combine with Essential Component's learning objective #8.

General Updates/Call to the Public/Next Meeting Date/Adjourn

Judge Arkfeld announced that a report will be provided by Mr. Batty at the next COJET meeting, scheduled for March 11th. CLIA members were asked for their input on the report.

Ms. King announced that the Western States Leadership Academy will be specifically geared towards court administrators. However, because there will be a train-the-trainer program, Arizona representatives can obtain this training and, if needs be, refine the curriculum in order for it to be more broadly applicable, including for

judges and probation officers. CLIA members were asked to solicit any recommended attendees for the train-the-trainer program.

Ms. King also announced that due to funding availability, that while the 2008 Arizona Court Leadership Conference had a potential date, its status was tentative at this time.

The next scheduled CLIA meeting is May 22nd.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.