Judicial Education Network Meets in Reno

The Judicial Education Network met March 2-4, 1988, in Reno, Nevada, with representatives from the American Academy of Judicial Education, Conference of State Court Administrators, National Association of State Judicial Educators, National Center for State Courts, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and National Judicial College. Dr. Gordon Zimmerman served as the meeting facilitator.

The meeting focused on articulating and understanding problems perceived among national providers as well as between national and state judicial educators. A frank and candid exchange of viewpoints resulted in some steps toward achieving harmony among the national providers.

In an effort to further resolve some of the issues, Dr. John Hudzik, of Michigan State University, College of Social Sciences, was asked to survey all of the seminars presented by the national providers in 1987 and 1988, as well as six to twelve state programs, as to the seminar's title, the location of the program, total number of participants, tuition, and external funding support, if any. This information will be used to determine the gap between the judicial branch personnel currently served by national and state providers and the total potential audience for judicial education.

At the next Network meeting, which will be held October 12-13, 1988 (following the NASJE conference), the agenda will include the presentation of the Hudzik report and planning for the September 6-8, 1989, national conference in the Reno/Tahoe area. The National Judicial College and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges will cohost the conference, whose proposed theme is "Judicial Education: Master Plans and Master Planning Methodologies."

NASJE Gift to China

Ohio Judicial College director Larry Stone (director of NASJE's Midwestern Region) traveled to the People's Republic of China this spring as a member of the People to People Program. The three-week journey began with a two-day orientation program in Seattle and included travel to Beijing, Nanjing, Shanghai, Fuzhou, and other cities in mainland China, with stopovers in Hong Kong and Japan. Composed primarily of trial court administrators and court clerks from throughout the United States, the group visited courts, penal institutes, and law schools.

NASJE adopted Mr. Stone as its own emissary and contributed funding for a special gift. Larry procured a videotape illustrating the role and tradition of America's jury system and appended to it a visual image declaring the tape a gift from the National Association of State Judicial Educators of the United States of America to the People of China. The tape, originally created under an L.E.A.A. grant, is titled "...And Justice for All." The Jury. Larry presented this unusual and appropriate gift at a designated time during the tour while visiting the local court administrative offices. He took pains to assure that the electronic pulsing on the videotape would be not only playable but also duplicable by Chinese television and VCR technology. A written transcript of the program narrative facilitated translation of the substantive material by the Chinese.
Judicial Education in Connecticut
by Anthony B. Fisser

Through strong and consistent support, the Connecticut Judicial Department has developed a comprehensive range of education programs and materials designed to meet all aspects of employee and organization needs. This support, and the extensive array of education opportunities, is the tangible result of a belief that well-trained personnel—judges and nonjudges—are vital to an effective and efficient court system.

Organization
The Connecticut Judicial Department is a state-funded, unified, centralized court system composed of approximately 2300 employees. It includes a judiciary of 16 appellate judges and 139 general jurisdiction trial judges who are subject to reassignment to any legal matter other than probate.

The Continuing Education unit within the department is a function of the office of chief court administrator. For members of the judiciary, the unit operates through the Connecticut Center for Judicial Education (CCJE). For all other employees, it operates in response to the subject matter, directly designing and producing training programs as well as acting as a resource to provide technical and other assistance to programs produced by court support agencies. Continuing Education's staff includes a director, a research attorney, two staff development officers, an executive secretary, and two word processors.

In 1986, the CCJE was established by Chief Justice Ellen A. Peters to expand existing educational opportunities for the judiciary. The Center’s major objectives are to meet all training needs disclosed by the judicial evaluation process or by separate assessments, to increase the coordination of all activities needed to provide a career track for the profession of judging, and to reach out to users of the system for ideas and assistance. An executive committee of judges is assisted by an advisory committee representing the judiciary, private sector, academia, and members of the bar.

Judicial education is provided through a variety of programs and publications. The main program areas are Orientation, Continuing Education, and Specialty.

The first of these, Orientation, has undergone drastic changes in Connecticut. It is now the policy and practice that all new judges participate in a six-month orientation program, which operates in two stages. The first stage, commencing on the first day of work, includes in-court observation preceded by...
What can Shakespeare, Camus, Tolstoy, Melville, and Conrad teach professionals about the power and authority they exercise in society? Why have so many judges, physicians, schoolteachers, and executives in Massachusetts and throughout the country developed a new interest in reading great literature?

Perhaps the answers are to be found in the following quote from Rene Dubois:

"Only parables can express the full complexity of our times. If you define your subject too precisely, you'll stifle its living richness. But if you tell a story, then your listeners will sense everything that the story may contain...this is the way to make ideas grow." ¹

This philosophy exemplifies the thinking behind the Humanities and the Professions program at Brandeis University. The program began in 1980, when Chief Justice Samuel E. Zoll of the Massachusetts District Court System requested that Brandeis develop a stimulating continuing education program for judges. He had observed that judges were overworked and understaffed, constantly faced difficult decisions, and had too little time for thoughtful decision making. He believed judges needed to be stretched intellectually, as adherence to the routine tasks of their jobs did not allow time for outside educational pursuits. And he suggested that judges needed an opportunity to discuss, reflect upon, and better understand the complex social and moral issues they faced in their courts daily.

The program was originally designed to address law issues, but it soon became apparent that the heart of the program was the way it allowed professionals to explore with one another, in a candid and supportive setting, how it feels to exercise power and responsibility in our society, and to discuss human values. It was an easy step to go from judges to other professionals. Thus, we inaugurated Humanities and the Professions.

These daylong seminars reintroduce professionals to great literature and make them aware of the sensitivities of their colleagues.

...the program...allowed professionals to explore with one another...how it feels to exercise power and responsibility in our society.

Humans and the Professions is based on a two-text idea: the written text and the text of personal experience. What the program tries to achieve is a balance between the two. It leads to discussions of universal themes in the texts and encourages participants to relate those themes to their own lives.

At present, Brandeis has identified about 50 short novels, novellas, and short stories for use in the program. These texts are determined by the themes and issues recognized as being important to a particular profession. Judges discuss Billy Budd and the difference between law and justice, or read Von Kleist's Michael Kohlhaas and debate the pursuit of personal vengeance beyond the law. Executives see in Othello different leadership styles. And physicians understand the life-and-death struggles in Tolstoy's The Death Of Ivan Ilyich.

To ensure that professionals' life experiences be taken into account, faculty members who lead the seminars are trained in facilitation methods. Approximately 30 faculty members are associated with the program. They come not only from Brandeis but from Harvard University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mount Holyoke College, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Tufts University, Wellesley College, Simmons College, Hampshire College, Boston College, and Boston University.

More than 50 faculty members from ten other states are also associated with Humanities and the Professions. Our faculty are scholars from virtually all disciplines, who are basically humanists first. They understand how to use literature and are able to work with adults in a non-threatening way.

Other colleges and universities may be interested in implementing similar programs on their own campuses. Since faculty selection and training are essential, these schools may want to ask Brandeis to conduct a two-day training session for them. During the first day we would lead a regular session for a group of professionals designated by the school. Faculty selected by the school to take part in the training session would be observers at this session. On the second day, we would train these faculty in methods we have developed and would expect the trainees to lead discussions of very short texts.

Training sessions similar to the above were conducted for the University of California at San Francisco Medical Center. The program has received wide national publicity through more than 50 articles in newspapers, newsletters, journals, magazines, and other publications and has been featured six times on radio and television. The program founders are Brandeis University’s director of continuing studies, Sanford Lottor, and Professor Saul Touster, director of the Legal Studies program.

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
and The National College of Juvenile and Family Law

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) has dedicated its 50 years of existence to improving the nation’s juvenile justice system. Founded in 1937 and located in Reno since 1969, the National Council has reached more than 100,000 juvenile justice professionals in an average of 50 training sessions a year. It accomplishes this through its training division, the National College of Juvenile and Family Law (NCJFL). Along with the National Judicial College, NCJFL is located in the Judicial College building at the University of Nevada-Reno. A national center for judicial education, this building contains offices, modern classrooms and a law library. The Council also uses a campus housing facility, the College Inn, to provide economical lodging and meals for faculty and participants.

Some 50 staff members work in the NCJFCJ vineyards area—35 in Reno and 15 in Pittsburgh, where the organization’s research office, the National Center for Juvenile Justice, is headquartered. NCJFCJ has also worked with other national judicial education groups, such as the Institute for Court Management, the National Center for State Courts, the American Academy of Judicial Education, and the National Association of State Judicial Educators.

In addition, NCJFCJ has a long history of cosponsored activity with such national groups as the National District Attorneys Association, the National Council of State Legislatures, the National PTA, the American Probation and Parole Association, and the National Juvenile Detention Association; it also serves as the secretariat for the National Juvenile Court Services Association.

Working with States
As a membership organization, NCJFCJ has active members in each state who contribute to and benefit from Council programs. Frequently, NCJFCJ will bring major national programs to a state, as happened when some 1,000 people flocked to Miami for the Fifteenth National Conference on Juvenile Justice in March 1987.

The Council has maintained and developed relationships not only with state judicial organizations but with juvenile justice, child welfare, education, and related conglomerates in individual states. One example of a legislative cooperative enterprise which NCJFCJ cosponsors is the Southern Legislators Conference for 17 southern states.

In the not-too-distant past, NCJFCJ brought faculty and representatives from state judicial education bodies to Reno for “Train the Trainer” programs. At other times, the organization has collaborated with states on state juvenile court programs—in planning, faculty recommendations and provisions, and program cosponsorship.

When NCJFCJ operates special projects such as past projects in the victims, child sexual abuse, child support enforcement and learning disabilities areas, it has been able to subsidize such training in the states. In fact, the Permanent Families project passes federal monies on to states for state programs.

Select publications are often made available to state programs. Technical assistance on a variety of substantive issues is made available to state and local offices.

States with C.L.E. (Continuing Legal Education) and mandatory judicial education requirements for judges have uniformly given approval to programs developed and sponsored by the Council.

Masters Program
In 1986, the University of Nevada approved the Masters of Judicial Studies Program for both NCJFCJ and the National Judicial College. The program has already accepted candidates in the major for juvenile and family court judges specialization. And in concert with the National Juvenile Court Services Association, the Council awards juvenile and family court administrators special certification.

New Headquarters for NCJFCJ
Thanks to an extensive fund-raising campaign during 1986-87, groundbreaking for the National Council’s new headquarters and training facility is scheduled for May 1988. The campaign culminated with a $1-million donation from two Nevadans.

The 31,000-square-foot building will cost $3.6 million. It will be built adjacent to the College Inn, the residence hall which houses program participants during judicial training. A portion of the building will also be shared with the university’s Division of Continuing Education.
Furthermore, state-based CJE programs are constantly in need of new products and, unlike nationally based purveyors of CJE experiences, cannot use the same topic, faculty, and program materials year in and year out. When 75-80% of the judges from a state’s given classes of courts participate semiannually in CJE, and when 99-100% of these individuals take part at least once a year, a state CJE program must offer new activities virtually every time it convenes a session. The typical state CJE supplier must wait four to six years before recycling and necessarily updating an educational program. Consequently, the demand for creativity and topical variety in design and delivery of CJE products is highest at the state level. Therefore, the financial stimulus for developing new products should focus its efforts to achieve greatest impact at the state level.

2. Should funds be awarded on a formula basis to the states for underwriting educational travel expenses to participants in nationally based courses?

Fixed sum or proportional share funding to the states merits serious consideration. To assure that in fiscal year 1988 it bears the magnitude and type of fruit really needed to benefit state judicial education, a laudable formula grant program would possess characteristics similar to those listed below.

Upon acceptance of five program criteria, each state’s CJE office receives from SJI $25,000 (free of any matching requirement) or up to $50,000 (if it will meet standard SJI matching requirements). The five-program criteria critical to state participation are that (1) state CJE programs conform their product development to topical target areas given in the SJI act and regulations of the SJI Board; (2) state CJE programs develop their products with an eye toward facilitating replication by other interested providers and, therefore, devote at least 10% of their total project budget to creating materials that will enable product transfer and replication, e.g., expense records, objectives statements, planning and execution time charts, group process worksheets, research instruments, consultant and literature reference lists, student or planning committee workbooks, program handouts, electronic audio and video and EDP products, evaluation forms, and summaries of results; (3) state CJE programs agree to transmit these materials, together with their expertise regarding use of the product, with the only cost being reimbursement of the actual expense for providing the specified level of transfer support requested, to other CJE providers (state or nationally based) wishing to assess whether to employ the product; (4) state CJE programs consult all other states with which they share a boundary and agree not to develop a product chosen by a neighboring state; and (5) state CJE programs accept standard SJI financial accounting and non-supplanting rules, and agree to complete their projects in no more than 24 months.

The type of formula grant program illustrated above would unleash a measure of creativity unparalleled by current or past CJE grant-awarding practices. Traditional nationally based providers of CJE technical assistance would experience more invitations for contracts to aid state efforts than they should conscientiously handle. Happily, many states would be positioned to enrich the enterprise of CJE by turning to new resources of private, state, or local contractual assistance, which are presently unable to participate in the business of CJE product development and delivery because of the hegemony exacted by certain traditional providers.

The interests of states in expanding the availability of new products and enriching the intellectual capital of resources to apply in CJE would be significantly advanced. Traditional nationally based providers would be positioned, through their technical assistance efforts, to work in parity with the state CJE programs to meet needs expressed by individual states. Also subject to dismissal would be the preference seemingly avowed in particular quarters that the direction, pace, and scope of progress for CJE in America must proceed, if at all, only under the aegis, accord, agenda, and authority of a few traditional nationally based CJE providers.

On the other hand, a formula grant program that compels state CJE programs to limit their vision to the products of traditional nationally based CJE providers lacks commitment to the fundamental needs of states. It gives unwarranted primacy to the institutional maintenance interests of the nationally based providers. It improves neither nationally based nor state-based CJE. It subverts the genius of federalism.

The viability of nationally based course offerings should be an outgrowth of their ability to attract attendance through their intrinsic quality and responsiveness to participant interest. It should not be artificially maintained, especially when the states could just as readily, or even more effectively, employ those same SJI dollars to enhance educational experiences for a far greater number of participants through refinement of products for use at the state level. The SJI must remember that each year state CJE providers reach at least 10 to 20 times more participants than are served by nationally based programs.

3. Should SJI undertake a study of the state of American judicial education in order to help define SJI’s role in judicial education?
Video Applications

by Laurence B. Stone

In the last newsletter, we discussed three ways of using video in judicial education: (1) inserting videotaped excerpts into a “live” presentation, (2) playing back an entire presentation to a group, and (3) providing prerecorded material for individual viewing.

But what types of material can a judicial educator show to these individuals and groups?

In this article, we will discuss some specific types of videotaped material that might be of interest to the judicial educator. This discussion is not all-inclusive; judicial educators are urged to be creative in their use of video.

Playback of Commercially Produced Presentations

There are many producers and distributors of law-related videotapes. Two such producers are the American Bar Association and the National Institute of Justice. A list of over 75 sources can be found in Ellen Miller, Video: A Guide for Lawyers, 1983, Law Arts Publishing, Santa Monica, California.

Also included in this category are videotape recordings of broadcast television programs, which are available from the producers of those programs. For example, videotapes of “The Constitution: That Delicate Balance,” which appeared as a PBS series, are available from Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. Judicial educators should remember that the playback of videotaped recordings made off-the-air may be a violation of copyright law in certain situations.

Most of the videotapes in this category are self-contained presentations which should be played back in their entirety. Nevertheless, they can be used in all three of the methods discussed in the first article.

Playback of Locally Produced Presentations

Some judicial educators videotape all of their programs for possible later use. These are usually single-camera recordings of presentations made to a group and are relatively devoid of sophisticated television production techniques. In general, this type of presentation is not as effective as one which is more highly produced. The exception is when the presenter is a dynamic individual or the content is so important that they outweigh the boredom attributed to viewing a relatively bland presentation.

More sophisticated videotaped presentations are often made locally for use at judicial meetings and for self-study. These might include an edited panel discussion, a courtroom simulation, an edited interview with an expert who would not be available at the time of the meeting, and the like. Such presentations should be prepared well in advance of the anticipated date of use.

As is the case with commercially produced presentations, these locally produced presentations are relatively complete and self-contained and should be played back using the techniques suggested in the earlier article.

Playback of Commercially Produced Excerpts

Some commercial firms have produced videotapes containing short excerpts for use in live presentations. For example, the American Academy of Judicial Education has a series of simulated objection/evidence situations which can be used in an evidence course.

Using a portion of a commercially produced presentation to illustrate a particular point would also fall into this category.

As mentioned in the earlier article, these excerpts are used to illustrate or emphasize points made by a speaker to a live group.

Playback of Locally Produced Segments

In an application similar to the use of commercially produced excerpts, the judicial educator can also produce videotape segments locally to meet a specific need for a program. Examples in this category might include videotaped interviews, excerpts from previously recorded meetings, videotaped demonstrations of equipment which could not be brought to the meeting location, and the like.

Playback of Actual Courtroom Situations or Other Events

Some courts make videotaped records of proceedings in lieu of traditional reporting methods. Using portions of these records is sometimes appropriate to illustrate specific points in a live presentation to a group. Of course, the original recording should not be used for this purpose; a dub (copy) of the original should be used. Portions of these records might also be inserted into a locally produced videotape presentation.

Other videotaped events that might be used in this manner include confessions, depositions, medical and psychological interviews, security and surveillance records, and similar events. Releaes may have to be obtained from some individuals to use these tapes in some situations.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Laurence B. Stone is director of the Ohio Judicial College in Columbus.
Excerpts from the Master Calendar
From the National Center for State Courts

July 3-8 Cambridge, MA
A Judge's Philosophy of Law
American Academy of Judicial Education

July 5-7 Albany, NY
Administrative Environment of Court Management Seminar
Court Systems Management Program, University of Albany
For more information, contact Dr. Thomas Church, (518) 442-3850.

July 8-9 Albany, NY
Microcomputer Spreadsheets in the Courts
Court Systems Management Program, University of Albany
For more information, contact Dr. Thomas Church, (518) 442-3850.

July 10-15 Reno, NV
Advanced Evidence
National Judicial College

July 10-15 Reno, NV
Constitutional Criminal Procedure
National Judicial College

July 10-15 Ft. Lauderdale, FL
51st Annual Conference
National College of Juvenile and Family Law

July 10-15 Boulder, CO
Trial Skills Workshop
American Academy of Judicial Education

July 10-16 Steamboat Springs, CO
Management Seminar for Judges
Institute for Court Management

July 10-August 5 Reno, NV
General Jurisdiction
National Judicial College

July 11-15 Cambridge, MA
Fact Finding and Decision Making
American Academy of Judicial Education

July 17-20 Steamboat Springs, CO
Juvenile Court Dispositions
Institute for Court Management

July 17-22 Reno, NV
Advanced Judicial Writing
National Judicial College

July 17-22 Palm Beach, FL
National Association for Court Management Annual Meeting
For more information, contact Director of Secretariat Services, National Center for State Courts.

July 17-22 Moran, WY
Philosophical Ethics and Judicial Decision Making
American Academy of Judicial Education

July 17-29 Reno, NV
The Decision-making Process
National Judicial College

Many of the conferences listed in the Master Calendar are sponsored by these organizations:

ABA Judicial Administration Division
Appellate Judges' Conference
Sanford M. Roos
701 N. Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, IL 60611 (312) 988-5696

American Academy of Judicial Education
2025 Eye Street, NW, Suite 303
Washington, DC 20006 (202) 775-0083

Institute for Court Management
of the National Center for State Courts
Suite 402
1331 17th Street
Denver, CO 80202 (303) 293-3063

National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23167-8798 (804) 253-2000

National Council of Juvenile
and Family Court Judges
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507 (702) 784-6012

National Council of Juvenile and Family Law
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507 (702) 784-6012

National Judicial College
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89557 (702) 784-6747

This calendar contains notices of seminars, meetings, institutes, and similar events of interest to judicial educators. For further information about specific events, please call or write the sponsoring organization directly. The information in this calendar may be reprinted. Please specify the correct sponsoring organization and phone number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 18-29</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>The Trial Judges' Academy - General Jurisdiction</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24-29</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Great Issues of Law in Literature</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24-August 20</td>
<td>Steamboat Springs, CO</td>
<td>Phase II Court Executive Development Program: Management in the Courts and Justice Environment</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25-27</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>Human Resources Development Seminar</td>
<td>Court Systems Management Program, University of Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For more Information, contact Dr. Thomas Church, (518) 442-3850.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28-30</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>Research Methods for Court Managers Workshop</td>
<td>Court Systems Management Program, University of Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For more Information, contact Dr. Thomas Church, (518) 442-3850.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31-August 5</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Current Issues in Civil Litigation</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31-August 5</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Judicial Writing</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7-10</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Victim-Witness Programs for Juvenile Courts</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7-10</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Designing and Delivering Effective Presentations for Court Personnel</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7-12</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Advanced Juvenile Justice Management Institute</td>
<td>National College of Juvenile and Family Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7-12</td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA</td>
<td>The Many Roles of a Judge - And Judicial Liability</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7-12</td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA</td>
<td>Trial Judges' Writing Program</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14-19</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>Appellate Judicial Writing Program</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14-19</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>Appellate Judicial Writing Program - Advanced</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11-30</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28-31</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Courts and the Public</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28-September 1</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Appellate Judges Seminar</td>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
<td>(312) 988-5696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11-30</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>General Jurisdiction</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14-17</td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA</td>
<td>Strengthening the Executive Component of the Court</td>
<td>A Program for Chief Judge/Court Manager Teams</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18-23</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Medical Evidence</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25-29</td>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>Appellate Judges Seminar</td>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
<td>(312) 988-5696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25-30</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Search &amp; Seizure</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-5</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Advanced Management Seminar: Executive Leadership in the Courts</td>
<td>Institute for Court Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-7</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drugs and the Courts</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-7</td>
<td>Durham, NH</td>
<td>Constructive and Creative Judicial Change; Use of State Constitutions</td>
<td>American Academy of Judicial Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-14</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Special Court for Attorney Judges</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-14</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>Special Court for Non-Attorney Judges</td>
<td>National Judicial College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New course offering
October 7-10 New Orleans, LA  
National Association of Women Judges Annual Meeting  
For more information, contact Director of Secretariat Services, National Center for State Courts.

October 9-12 Alexandria, VA  
National Association of State Judicial Educators Annual Conference  
For more information, contact Richard Reaves, (404) 542-7491.

October 9-14 Philadelphia, PA  
Court Case Management Information System Institute for Court Management

October 9-14 Toronto, Canada  
American Judges Association Annual Meeting  
For more information, contact Director of Secretariat Services, National Center for State Courts.

October 9-14 Reno, NV  
Evidence for Non-Attorney Judges National Judicial College

October 12-15 Williamsburg, VA  
National Conference of Metropolitan Court Judges Annual Meeting  
For more information, contact the National Center for State Courts.

October 16-19 Boston, MA  
Alternative Dispute Resolution Institute for Court Management

October 16-21 Reno, NV  
Evidence National College of Juvenile and Family Law

October 16-28 Reno, NV  
Fall College National College of Juvenile and Family Law

October 18-23 San Francisco, CA  
Council of Chief Judges of Courts of Appeal Annual Seminar  
American Bar Association

October 23-26 San Diego, CA  
Management for Chief and Presiding Judges Institute for Court Management

October 23-28 Reno, NV  
Family Law National College of Juvenile and Family Law

October 27-28 San Francisco, CA  
Western Regional Office Western Judicial Conference  
National Center for State Courts, Western Regional Office  
For more information, contact the Registration Coordinator, (415) 557-1515.

* New course offering
State Judicial Educators

ALABAMA. "Mr. Frank Gregory, Director, Alabama Judicial Education Office, State Court Building, Montgomery, AL 36100, (334) 242-6900

ALASKA. "Ms. Carole A. Baekley, Director, Office of Magistrate Services, Office of the Administrative Director, 300 K Street, Anchorage, AK 99501, (907) 264-8237

ARIZONA. "Ms. Nancy Scheffel, Administrative Director, Office of the Courts, Arizona Judicial Center, 11201 E. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ 85020, (602) 255-5700

ARKANSAS. "Ms. Kay Boothen, Judicial Education Coordinator, Arkansas Judicial Department, Justice Building, Little Rock, AR 72201, (501) 371-2295

CALIFORNIA. "Ms. Constance E. Dove, Executive Director, California Judges Association, For Plaza, Suite 208, 1390 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102, (415) 552-0125

COLORADO. "Mr. Paul M. li, Executive Director, Colorado Judicial Center for Judicial Education and Research, 2000 Powell Street, 8th Floor, Emeryville, CA 94608, (510) 464-3824

CONNECTICUT. "Mr. Anthony B. Fiser, Director, Connecticut Judicial Department, 2 East 14th Avenue, Denver, CO 80203, (303) 861-1111

DELAWARE. "Mr. John Fisher, Director, Office of Judicial Education, University of Delaware, Dover, DE 19904, (302) 463-8376

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. "Ms. Cassandra Penn, Training Officer, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 1100 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20001, (202) 727-1606

FLORIDA. "Ms. Mignon U. Lawton, Judicial Education Officer, Office of Continuing Judicial Education, Florida Court of Appeals, State Capitol Complex, Tallahassee, FL 32308, (850) 488-8621

GEORGIA. "Mr. Richard D. Reaves, Director, Office of Magistrate Services, Office of the Administrative Director, 817 S. Court Street, Montgomery, AL 36100, (303) 834-7990

IDAHO. "Ms. Maryann Motza, Administrative Director, Idaho Judicial Department, P.O. Box 100, Boise, ID 83723, (208) 334-2246

ILLINOIS. "Ms. Maureen Conner, Associate Director for Judicial Education, Supreme Court Building, 118 W. Edward Street, Springfield, IL 62706, (217) 782-7770.

INDIANA. "Mr. George Goss, Executive Director, Indiana Judicial Center, 400 N. Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204, (317) 232-1313

IOWA. "Mr. Jerry K. Bestly, Executive Director of Education & Planning, Office of the State Court Administrator, State Capitol Building, Des Moines, IA 50319, (515) 281-8279

KANSAS. "Ms. Evelyn Gates, Administrative Director, Kansas Judicial Education Commission, 301 Washington Boulevard, Topeka, KS 66601, (785) 296-4873

KENTUCKY. "Mr. Mike Stoltenberg, Manager of Education & Public Information, Administrative Office of the Courts, 403 Wapping Street, Frankfort, KY 40601, (502) 564-4051

LOUISIANA. "Mr. Frank Marais, Executive Director, Louisiana Judicial College, 500 Hillcrest, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, (504) 388-8825

MAINE. "Honorable David G. Roberts, Chairman, Judicial Education Committee, Supreme Judicial Court, P.O. Box 1068, Bangor, ME 04401, (207) 947-8606

MARYLAND. "Mr. Elian Mashia, Director, Judicial Institute of Maryland, Administrative Office of the Court, Court of Appeals Building, Row Boulevard, Annapolis, MD 21401, (301) 269-2353

MASSACHUSETTS. "Ms. Susan M. Tripp, Judicial Education Coordinator, Office of the Chief Administrative Justice, Room 100, Old Courthouse, Boston, MA 02108, (617) 547-7486

MICHIGAN. "Mr. Dennis W. Cottin, Executive Director, Michigan Judicial Institute, 200 Washington Square North, P.O. Box 30104, Lansing, MI 48909, (517) 334-7805

MINNESOTA. "Ms. Susan M. Tripp, Judicial Education Coordinator, Office of the Chief Administrative Justice, Room 100, Old Courthouse, Boston, MA 02108, (617) 547-7486

MISSISSIPPI. "Mr. Charles Clark, Director, Mississippi Court Education Program, University of Mississippi, 2311 43rd Street, Oxford, MS 38655, (662) 236-6322

MISSOURI. "Ms. Melinda Elsberry, Director, Missouri Bar, 401 E. Capitol Avenue, Jefferson City, MO 65101, (314) 751-3585

MONTANA. "Mr. James Oppedahl, Executive Director, Office of the District Court Administrator, State Capitol Building, Helena, MT 59602, (406) 444-2621

NEBRASKA. "Ms. Kim Peirce, Director, Nebraska College of Law, State Court Administrator, 1220 State Capitol Building, Lincoln, NE 68505, (402) 474-7800

NEVADA. "Mr. T. Thomas Berry, Chief Judge, Nevada Supreme Court, Office of the Clerk, 4130 S. Virginia St., Ste. 300, Reno, NV 89502, (775) 323-2300

NEW HAMPSHIRE. "Mr. Thomas J. Berry, Staff Attorney, Supreme Court, Supreme Court Building, Concord Drive, Concord, NH 03301, (603) 271-6291

NEW JERSEY. "Mr. Richard L. Soks, Judicial Education Officer, Administrative Office of the Courts, Hughes Justice Complex, Trenton, NJ 08626, (609) 292-0622

NEW MEXICO. "Mr. Tony Altair, Chief of Personnel & Training, Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court Building, Santa Fe, NM 87505, (505) 827-4600

NEW YORK. "Ms. Helen A. Johnson, Director of Education & Training, Office of the Chief Judge, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, (212) 587-5823

NORTH CAROLINA. "Ms. Carmen Colley, Administrative Assistant, North Carolina Court of Appeals, 8400 State Capitol Drive, Raleigh, NC 27607, (919) 733-5800

OHIO. "Mr. Thomas C. Saraco, Executive Director, Ohio State Bar Association, 785 West Third Street, Columbus, OH 43215, (614) 221-6419

OKLAHOMA. "Ms. Joy Jones, Director, Oklahoma Supreme Court, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, OK 73101, (405) 521-2450

OREGON. "Mr. Duane M. Anders, Director, Office of the Court Administrator, Oregon Supreme Court, State Capitol Complex, Salem, OR 97301, (503) 378-6200

PENNSYLVANIA. "Ms. Bunny Cantor, Director, Office of the Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, 1841 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102, (215) 560-6325

RHODE ISLAND. "Ms. Holly Hitchcock, Director, Rhode Island Court Administration, Office of the Chief Justice, 588 Washington Street, Providence, RI 02903, (401) 777-5851

SOUTH CAROLINA. "Ms. Jeff Boyd, Administrative Director, South Carolina Court of Appeals, P.O. Box 50447, Columbia, SC 29253, (803) 738-2961

SOUTH DAKOTA. "Ms. Dan Schenk, Personnel & Training Officer, State Court Administrator, State Capitol Building, Pierre, SD 57501, (605) 771-2455

TENNESSEE. "Ms. Gail M. Warden, Director, Tennessee Court Administration, Office of the Chief Justice, Supreme Court Building, Nashville, TN 37243, (615) 741-6100

TEXAS. "Mr. Gary Blinkley, Executive Director, Texas Municipal Courts Training Center, 812 San Antonio, Suite 405, Austin, TX 78701, (512) 475-7087

TEXAS. "Ms. Karla C. Smith, Executive Director, Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, P.O. Box 9001, Austin, TX 78763, (512) 475-7087

UTAH. "Ms. Joanne C. Stiles, Director, Office of the Court Administrator, State Court Administration, 406 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84102, (801) 328-5371

VIRGINIA. "Ms. Virginia A. Smith, Director, Office of the Court Administrator, P.O. Box 1201, Richmond, VA 23218, (804) 786-6455

WASHINGTON. "Ms. Carol L. Weaver, Executive Director, Washington State Court Administration, State Capitol Building, Olympia, WA 98504, (360) 586-6105

WEST VIRGINIA. "Mr. Richard H. Rosenwurm, Director, State Department of Judicial Education, West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, P.O. Box 61026, Charleston, WV 25320, (304) 558-6105

WISCONSIN. "Ms. V. K. Wetzel, Director, Supreme Court of Wisconsin, 900 W. Washington Ave, Madison, WI 53705, (608) 266-7800

WYOMING. "Mr. Robert Duncan, Director, Supreme Court of Wyoming, 2000 State Capitol, Cheyenne, WY 82002, (307) 777-7581

This list of state judicial educators represents the latest information we have received. Please notify us if any changes should be made. —Editor

*NASJE member
Ethics Issues in Judicial Education

by William A. Melone

Ethics in government, or alleged lack thereof, is of continuing interest in the news media. Reacting to this attention, ethics was placed on the agenda of the 1986 NASJE annual meeting. Some hypothetical cases, raising ethical issues on accountability for funds and programs, responsiveness, whistle blowing, and professional development, were distributed to members and discussed at the meeting. The ten written responses to these hypotheticals and notes from the discussions showed some disagreements on principle and practice, but even this very limited exploration of the issues allowed some useful general observations.

Three of the six hypotheticals presented seemed to spark the most interest and are reproduced below. NASJE members were asked to tell what they would do in each case, how they might respond, and to comment on the ethical and procedural issues raised. The hypotheticals, and a summary and analysis of the responses, follows.

Hypothetical A
Judge X registered for a three-day program you are conducting. He paid his $350 registration fee with a personal check and was given a receipt. After attending the opening lunch, the judge is not seen by any of your faculty or staff until the closing banquet.

After the concluding speech, your staff will distribute evaluation forms and completion certificates that have been prepared in advance, each bearing the program title and the name of the participant. You have heard that some counties require these certificates for reimbursing participant costs and that some judges list these certificates on their *curriculum vitae*. You think it likely that Judge X expects to receive a certificate.

What do you tell your staff to do with the certificate with Judge X's name on it?

RESPONSE: This case showed a general rejection of the role as truant officer, although half of the respondents would give out the certificate and half would withhold it. Most comments on the case stressed that responsibility for attendance should be clearly assigned to the participants, and, if necessary, nonattendance should be dealt with by a peer who chairs or otherwise coordinates the sessions. All agreed that comments on participants' private or social activities were inappropriate.

Hypothetical B
You are holding a regional seminar for 160 judges in a new suburban hotel. You have arrived a day early, as your spouse has business in the nearby city, and you wanted a better look at the facilities. The management has given you a very competitive rate, and although the staff is a bit inexperienced and unfamiliar with your special needs, they have been very cooperative.

In a meeting the day before the seminar, the sales manager tells you it is their standard policy to offer a rebate of one free room for every 20 rooms booked for a conference and offers you eight free rooms. As each of the judges pays for his or her own room, there are only five rooms coming out of the conference budget for faculty and staff. The sales manager assures you those five rooms will not be charged to the conference and says there will be no charge for your previous night's stay. In addition, he invites you and your spouse to stay on for two days after the seminar or come back for another two days when you are visiting the city. He says you have earned the credit for two nights, and anyway, their occupancy rate is expected to be low this first year. At the conclusion of the meeting, he invites you and your spouse to dinner in the hotel restaurant so that he can show you what their chef can do.

How do you respond to each of his suggestions?

RESPONSE: All respondents agreed that personal or staff use of bonus rooms after a conference was inadvisable. About half also ruled out accepting an early sample meal. Most said they measured the acceptance of free services against the same standards used when billing the government or claiming reimbursement, so anything unreimbursable would be unacceptable. Using this standard, "gifts" are savings to the government, not to an individual. Some suggested that bonuses unused for direct conference expenses be offered to participants who assist on the conference to reduce reimbursement expense to their local jurisdictions.

Hypothetical C
A chief clerks' management seminar takes you to the jurisdiction of the head of the state clerks' association. This clerk (Clerk Z) invites you to attend a civil wedding later that afternoon and shows you a marriage certificate which bears the signature of the local chief judge.

At the wedding, however, it is Clerk Z who performs the ceremony. At a dinner later with Clerk Z and other chief clerks, you mention your surprise at his role, as you know the law gives this power only to judges. Clerk Z laughs and says this is common practice in his

continued on page 12
substantial homework assignments; mini-seminars, with an experienced judge discussing what was observed and answering questions; meetings with numerous support agencies who affect, and are affected by, what the judge does; and the handling of all personnel matters. Two vital sessions are discussions on judicial ethics and a brainstorming session to identify the key qualities possessed by the best judge. The second stage of orientation, a six-month mentoring component, includes such mentor responsibilities as answering questions that arise, observing the new judge at work in a courtroom, and meeting regularly with the new judge to encourage questions or make comments.

The Continuing Education type of programming is frequent and varied, often responding to new developments. Recent examples are an analysis of new tort reform legislation; handling multiparty and complex litigation; expert witnesses; decision making in ex parte family violence cases; children as witnesses in criminal, neglect, and sexual abuse cases; issues in substance abuse; and evidence.

Many Continuing Education programs are offered as three-day required or elective courses at the Connecticut Judges Institute. The Institute, established in 1983 and attended by all judges, adheres to a special focus, concentrating on the series of personal and professional skills a judge exercises in making decisions. Generally, the faculty are judges who must complete a multi-day Faculty Development workshop.

In addition, Connecticut’s judiciary may elect to attend a two- or three-day specialty program on subjects such as judicial writing, handling administrative appeals, faculty development, mentor development, law and the humanities, and stress and judicial performance.

The publication of judicial education materials is also a major part of the overall opportunity for improvement through education. The Civil Deskbook and Criminal Deskbook offer 1,000 pages of in-
In March, the State Justice Institute announced its intent to award 36 grants totaling some $3.75 million to 27 state courts, judicial support organizations, universities, and other applicants, subject to the resolution of programmatic and financial issues raised at its March board meeting in Alexandria, Virginia.

University of Iowa College of Law: The Judicial Management of Jury Awards for Noneconomic and Punitive Damages
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Computer Assisted Innovation in State Courts
Kentucky Sheriff's Academy: Bailiff Training Program for the Rural-Small Court Systems of Kentucky
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges: National College of Juvenile and Family Law Appellate Judge Training Project
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges: A Juvenile and Family Law Scholarship Program
Institute of Public Law, New Mexico Law Center (in cooperation with the National Judicial College and the Women Judges' Fund for Justice): National Conference of the State Judiciary on Bioethical Issues
Alaska Judicial Council: Presumptive Sentencing/ Plea Bargaining
Supreme Court of Virginia: Commission on the Future of the Virginia Judicial System
Institute for Social Analysis: An Evaluation of Court-ordered Treatment for Domestic Violence Offenders
Criminal Justice Section, American Bar Association: Improving Enforcement of Court-ordered Restitution to Victims
T.C. Williams School of Law, University of Richmond: State Judicial Clerk Education Project
Rhode Island Supreme Court: Victim Restitution Unit and Special Payment Calendar
Vera Institute of Justice: Improving the Use and Administration of Criminal Fines: An Experiment to Replace Fixed Fines with Means-based Fining
The Center for Policy Research: The Equity of Mediated Divorce Agreements
The Institute of Judicial Administration, Inc.: Appellate Judges Seminar Advanced Refresher Course
Office of the District Attorney, City of San Francisco: The Judicial Response to Domestic Violence Project
Supreme Court of Wisconsin: State Trial Court Records Management Training Project
Administrative Office of the Courts, State of North Carolina: A Proposal to Determine the Additional Cost Imposed on the North Carolina Criminal Justice System by the Death Penalty
Rural Justice Center: State Trial Court Education Program on Farm Credit Issues
Special Committee on Evaluation of Judicial Performance, American Bar Association: An American Bar Association National Project on Judicial Performance Evaluation
The National Judicial College: National Conference of the Judiciary on Alternate Dispute Resolution
The National Judicial College: Faculty Data Base
Youth Law Center: Innovative Family/Juvenile Court Training
Aiken County, South Carolina: Prototypal, Instant-Retrieval Data System for the Courts
North Dakota Supreme Court: Alternative Dispute Resolution: Prioritizing the Needs of Children as Part of the Divorce Process: A Rural Model
Court Studies, Inc.: Evaluation of Abbreviated Procedures in Appellate Courts
Institute for Legal Studies, University of Wisconsin: Mediating Medical Malpractice Claims in Wisconsin
Rural Justice Center: Rural Delay Reduction Project
Colorado Judicial Department: Innovative Uses of Judicial Resources: Rejuvenating the Commitment to Justice
National Center for State Courts: Video-recording Evaluation and Guidebook Development
National Center for State Courts/National Judicial College: Managing Trials: An Educational Program for State Trial Judges
National Center for State Courts: State Court Expenditures and Staffing
National Center for State Courts: Case Processing and Delay Reduction in Rural Courts
National Center for State Courts: Delay Reduction: Videos and Educational Materials
National Center for State Courts: Assessment and Improvement of Judicial Education Faculty Development Programs
Committee on Standards of Judicial Administration, American Bar Association: Revision of Standards of Judicial Administration

Professional Development
The last few years have seen a parallel expansion of educational opportunities for the Department's nonjudge workforce. The present level of activity provides seminars and workshops for managers and supervisors, technical and professional staff, clerical staff, new employees, and individuals seeking to improve their personal capabilities.

The extensive assortment of programs available to all professional, technical, and administrative staff is based on training needs identified in a department-wide assessment. Within the past six months, for example, employees had an opportunity to attend programs on behavioral interviewing, CPR, AIDS, courtroom presentation skills, labor-management and the role of the supervisor, nonviolent crisis intervention, presentation skills, substance abuse, and time management. In addition, a wellness program helps participants assess and take responsibility for their health care and lifestyle, and a Focus-on-You series assists administrative and clerical staff with effective communications, stress, and time management strategies.

A recent development of Continuing Education is a standardized, mandatory orientation program for every new employee in the Connecticut Judicial Department.

All department personnel—judges and nonjudges—are encouraged to improve themselves, learn new skills, and acquire the necessary tools to achieve their goals. To facilitate this individual growth, the Connecticut Judicial Department has designed one of the broadest, most comprehensive arrangements of programs, services, and materials in the country.
It's been the historical experience of state judicial education programs to have nationally-sponsored policy studies or research reports, which are intended to illuminate new policy or funding efforts, and to exhibit some limited relevant and insightful appreciation of the role played by state-level CJE activity, of the difficulties it confronts, and of the even greater service it stands poised to provide. I refer to such items as the Report of the Judicial Education Study Group (1978) and the ABA Standards for Judicial Education (1982). But state-level CJE providers or interests have never been permitted a highly visible place in these undertakings. Prior studies have been of virtually no use by state programs in dealing with the nonjudicial branches of state and local government. Implementation of the recommendations from such reports, if any, seems to have been confined to those recommendations benefiting nationally based providers. They, it appears, have tended to exert the necessary influence to shape both the focus and outcome of the various inquiries as well as to employ them in approaching national funders, either private or public. Frankly, in light of current state CJE needs, a new study cannot be recommended. More thorough or comprehensive review and implementation of the old studies might just as readily aid the states. Because of this past experience, the mere thought of another study lacks any potential to stir inspiration.

If the undertaking is inexorable, however, extreme caution should accompany the investigation proposed. If SJI contemplates that its execution will involve any person with more than a program participant's professional connection to any nationally based CJE provider, the effort will be plagued by questions of credibility from its outset. One would think SJI doesn't need more allegations of partiality to certain CJE providers. SJI should carefully weigh whether this expenditure of resources will, in fact, receive any greater credence at the state and local level than previous studies and whether its pursuit must obviate an unequivocal commitment in fiscal year 1988 to state-based CJE enrichment.

No mystery enshrouds what needs to be done by SJI in relation to state judicial education. Truly, the only difficult question in this area is whether SJI is going to assert national leadership in committing to fulfill the needs of states or acquire to the generalized institutional maintenance preferences of certain intermediate entities. The role of federal agencies vis-a-vis the states is to stimulate healthy diversity and experimentation in fulfilling state needs. Aiding the states is the SJI mission. Assisting the state CJE programs in the development of contemporary, varied, and numerous products to employ in the education and training of the vast numbers of court personnel and officials these CJE providers serve every year should be SJI's primary function in the area of judicial education. Secondarily, SJI should do everything within its power to assure dissemination of these products among CJE providers, especially at the state level. After generous treatment of nationally based interests in fiscal year 1987, a state-level focus should be attempted in fiscal year 1988 before opting to study CJE.

4. Should funds be awarded to sustain the operations of major educational organizations or to underwrite particular exemplary and innovative projects based upon periodic submittals for financial support?

Funding of major national CJE

PROFILE

Helen Johnson

Helen A. Johnson serves as director of education and training in the office of court administration in New York. Her responsibilities include planning, developing, and directing continuing judicial education programs for the 3,500 judges and justices of the New York Unified Court System in addition to providing training programs for the 12,000 nonjudicial employees of New York's courts.

Helen served as an assistant district attorney in the Bronx District Attorney's Office for 20 years. As an assistant district attorney, she was the first woman to prosecute criminal cases in Bronx County. As a prosecutor in the Homicide Bureau of Bronx County, she was also the first woman to prosecute a homicide case.

Her educational activities as an employee of the district attorney's office included directing a CLE program for staff attorneys. She also developed a crime victims assistance program and implemented a law enforcement video project, the first of its kind nationally. She has helped create similar video programs for law enforcement officials throughout the country.

A graduate of Hunter College and Brooklyn Law School, she is a member of several boards and associations in New York. Her husband, Peter Grishman, is Bronx County's executive assistant district attorney. They have two children: Kathleen, 10, and Alexander, 8.
organizations in fiscal year 1988 is justifiable to the extent those entities responsibly orient their SJI-funded efforts in cooperation with individual states to develop products usable at the state level. After all, in fiscal year 1987 they received significant services to improve their in-residence courses. Measured in that light, periodic (biennial or annual) submittal of specific project proposals for funding is preferable.

Non-supplanting rules compel state applicants for SJI funds to absorb the expense of operations, that is, pre-existing and committed personnel and space and equipment requirements. No exception should be afforded nationally based providers in this area. Like the states, they should only recover financially for what they actually and demonstrably contribute to particular projects. This parity of treatment is especially justifiable when the rationale for funding nationally based entities ostensibly is to assist and improve state-level activity, because states will doubtless be competing for these same funds. A new measure of less-generous treatment of national organizations will enable limited funds to go farther to enable particular projects sought by states.

Speaking of periodic submittals for particular projects, continuation grant applications should not be due in April at the same time as new project-funding requests. They should be due later, say in July, which would enable time for at least two quarters of experience to be reflected in the continuation rationales.

5. Should a fixed sum, or a maximum or minimum percentage of total SJI grant funds, be established for underwriting projects to improve judicial education and training?

No. SJI would operate with greater flexibility than would be left by such a fixed sum or percentage. Programmatic emphasis preferences of SJI, not arbitrary apportionment of available dollars, should determine funding. We all know SJI has numerous purposes and constituencies to serve. Consequently, only adjustable benchmarks need be set, subject to yearly movement, targeting funds available for each SJI program area or administrative category. Such benchmarks should be based upon prior experience, as well as foreseeable trends, with a growth or shrinkage factor relative to each category that is a percentage (say 10%) of total grant dollars held by SJI.

Admittedly, such benchmarks would be subjective standards, arrived at from some policymaking consensus achieved by action of SJI's governing board. However, that is just what such a blue-ribbon board is impaneled to do. Emphasis areas for project funding, nevertheless, should be projected forward over a period of three-to-five years, so that the various SJI purposes and constituencies can cyclically revolve through higher and lower levels of funding.

6. A final note.

I wish to commend SJI for the responsible and eminently reasonable way in which it has responded to concerns previously expressed by NASJE with regard to charges for grant-related products. That portion of the guideline proposed for fiscal year 1988, along with the section making recommendations to grant writers, exemplifies a noteworthy spirit of goodwill and conscientious practice on the part of SJI staff, which has so patiently listened to NASJE during the past year.
county; couples are happy because the judge charges twice as much. You later discover, from the local chief judge, that he gives Clerk Z a stack of signed marriage certificates each year.

You recall a mention of administrative office procedures, raised at a recent judges conference, for judges to account for and report wedding fee income.

Do you tell anyone of Clerk Z’s weddings? If so, whom?

RESPONSE: This case brought a variety of responses. One said responsibility ended with a report to the local judge, even though this brought acknowledgment and support for the clerk’s actions. Two suggested additional notice and instruction to clerks and judges on procedures in this area and the consequences of violations. A plurality mentioned referral to central administrative authority, and an almost equal number would have reported the incident to the judicial ethics body.

Admitting that only a small number of responses and comments are considered here and that hypothetical cases leave out many important factors, there are some common threads in the experiences and thoughts of the respondents which are reflected in the work of some writers on ethics for public officials. While it is evident that good, committed people will act ethically on their own, judicial educators, like other public servants, are often exposed to pressures to take actions counter to their own judgment. These pressures come from enemies, from friends, from those with authority, from those with power (real and assumed), and from those serving no other interest than their own but who are very skilled in doing just that. Such pressures were hinted at in the hypothetical cases and recognized in the responses and discussions.

Some of the clearest responses were from those who seemed to have anticipated the pressures or enticements that would appear and who had developed, in advance, ways to respond. These procedures resist pressures in three ways: (1) clearly put responsibility for an action on the person who advocates or takes that action, (2) refer decisions to match outside authority or power with appropriate internal authority, and (3) keep procedures and decisions open by consulting and informing all levels of the organization and those whom the organization serves.

By examining our operations and procedures to see if they meet these standards, perhaps we could avoid being tricked or pressured into questionable actions or, worse yet, being forced to take blame for someone else’s indiscretions.