Team Teaching in Judicial Education

Gordon I. Zimmerman

In 1977 the California Center for Judicial Education and Research embarked on the Continuing Judicial Studies Program (CJSP), a bold plan for team teaching midcareer judges. The mission: provide small learning groups of 15 to 20 experienced judges, teams of trained faculty, a course length of one-half day to five days, and intensive participative learning methods. CJSP continues to grow. Several other state and national providers are also experimenting with team teaching.

This article discusses strategies for implementing team teaching in state judicial education.

Team Teaching: A Definition

A true faculty team has these characteristics:
1. two or more people, who design the course together;
2. role differentiation—team members do not necessarily perform the same teaching functions;
3. faculty participation and mutual support in delivering the course; and
4. interactive teaching methods and continual student participation.

For example, a team of three faculty design a one-day course in “plea taking” for new municipal court judges. One instructor might focus on content, the legal requirements for accepting a guilty plea. Another might develop demonstration segments (modeling), using the other instructors as actors. A third might coordinate a videotaped practice session with each participant conducting the colloquy. After live critiques, one of the faculty might offer private videotape review for each student.

It should be noted what team teaching is not. It is not a panel. It is not a daylong course with various faculty in solo performances. It is not the addition of a second or third instructor because the course content is meaty and hard for one person to cover. It is not a method to expand learning objectives. If anything, teaching teams narrow the objectives, spending more time to assure that the objectives are achieved.

Developing Teaching Teams

Successful team teaching involves three factors: judicial educator leadership, planning resources, and faculty development.

1. The judicial educator. Judicial planning committees are valuable resources in developing progressive education programs. But they rarely have the insights of a professional educator. Fortunately, most committees accept reasonable direction from the judicial educator. The judicial educator must introduce the team-teaching approach, help form teams, and organize time for team planning.

In contrast to the traditional program involving one teacher per course, team courses require continual coordination and nourishment. The judicial educator must kick start the team to get it organized. But once up and running, the team acquires synergy and momentum, and the judicial educator’s role moves more toward coordination.

2. Planning resources. A travel budget is necessary for team planning meetings. Much more advance preparation is necessary. Run-throughs of key learning segments may be required. Teams typically use more creative methods, which usually require audiovisual equipment. Long-distance phone calls are frequent. Most important, team members must clear their calendars for meetings.

3. Faculty development. Team teaching presumes participative adult education strategies. A group of co-lecturers, each presenting a course segment alone, is not a teaching team. Faculty development may be a first step before any team assignments are made. All team members must be competent facilitators and method planners.

Getting Started

1. Identify a course or program to be taught by teams. Select a
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AARP's National Guardianship Monitoring Program Can Be Resource for Courts

Mary Twomey

The Problem
Three vignettes from reports of volunteers in the National Guardianship Monitoring Program illustrate the need to maintain oversight of guardianships.

Mrs. Thomas was the guardian of her developmentally disabled adult son. Since the establishment of the guardianship, both Mrs. Thomas and her son had grown progressively frail. He developed serious bedsores, and she was on the verge of exhaustion. Mrs. Thomas had been told that it would be five years before her son could be placed in a local care facility.

Mrs. Smith suffered from Alzheimer's disease. Her daughter Joan was appointed guardian and agreed to care for her mother at home even though she was bedridden and required 24-hour supervision. Over time, this arrangement became difficult, and Joan began to leave her mother home alone for long periods of time.

Mr. Peters's son Tim had been awarded a large settlement in an accident suit. Mr. Peters was named conservator of his son's estate. A few years later, when Mr. Peters decided to start a business, he "borrowed" over $30,000 from Tim's estate.

The Program
Since 1988, the American Association of Retired Persons' National Guardianship Monitoring Program has been working with courts around the country to establish programs using older volunteers as guardianship monitors. The impetus for the program came from a series of Associated Press articles in 1987 that was very critical of the U.S. guardianship system. Among the pervasive problems noted was a lack of resources for monitoring guardianship cases. Many probate judges wanted to monitor guardianships but lacked the staff to follow up once a guardian was appointed for an incapacitated person. Some cases had not been checked in many years. Legal Counsel for the Elderly, a department of AARP, saw an opportunity to help overburdened courts by recruiting and training volunteers from the AARP membership and by working with court staff to monitor cases. A demonstration project with four sites was funded by the State Justice Institute with matching funds from AARP.

Volunteers serve the courts in three roles:

- Court visitors act as the eyes and ears of the court. They make personal visits to the ward and guardian and, using a standard form, report back to the court on the care the ward is receiving. They make recommendations for court action, when appropriate, and may help the court to follow up.

- Court auditors review the reports of guardians of the property, looking for discrepancies and checking for compliance with guardianship law.

- Records researchers update court records to show current addresses and telephone numbers for wards and guardians. Ongoing monitoring of cases is contingent upon being able to locate the wards.

The program is usually coordinated by a court staff person. It takes court staff approximately five hours per week to coordinate the program.

Mary Twomey is a senior program specialist for the American Association of Retired Persons.—ED
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National Professional Associations Foster Communication and Education

There are many advantages to membership in a professional association. The courts community, of course, is represented by many such groups, from local bar associations to the huge National Court Reporters Association, which has an annual budget exceeding $4 million. Here is a very brief list of several national professional organizations that may be of interest to court personnel. It is by no means exhaustive, nor is it an endorsement of the organizations or their objectives by NASJE or its newsletter committee. — ED

American Bar Association. 360,000 members. (312) 988-5000. The ABA comprises 25 sections, including the Judicial Administration Division. Membership may be made in more than one section. Each section sponsors continuing education, seminars, and research and publishes newsletters, bulletins, and journals.

American Judges Association. 3,200 members. (804) 259-1841. AJA seeks to improve the administration of justice at all levels of courts. It conducts an annual education conference and publishes a quarterly journal and a quarterly newsletter.

American Judicature Society. 22,000 members. (312) 558-6900. Members include lawyers, judges, judicial officials, and citizens interested in the effective administration of justice. AJS conducts research, presents educational programs, offers consultation services, and sponsors conferences on judicial improvement.

American Law Institute. 3,284 members. (215) 243-1600. ALI promotes the clarification and simplification of the law and its better adaptation to social needs by continuing work on the Restatement of the Law, model and uniform codes, and model statutes. With the ABA it conducts a continuing legal education program. ALI publishes the ALI-ABA Directory, ALI Reporter (4/year), and drafts of its work.

Institute of Judicial Administration. 1,000 members. (212) 998-6288. Lawyers, judges, and others promote judicial, procedural, and administrative improvements in the courts. The institute conducts continuous study of the organization and operation of state and federal courts with an emphasis on congestion and delay and court modernization. It offers educational programs for appellate and trial judges and publishes annual and quarterly research reports.

National American Indian Court Judges Association. 256 members. (202) 296-0685. The association seeks to improve the American Indian court system throughout the United States by furthering knowledge and understanding of it. It offers periodic training sessions on criminal law and family law/child welfare.

National Association for Court Management. 2,000 members. (804) 259-1841. Court clerks and court administrators foster communication and hold educational meetings. NACM publishes a quarterly journal and newsletter and the Trial Court Financial and Trial Court Personnel Management Guides.

National Association of Women Judges. 850 members. (804) 259-1841. NAWJ seeks to promote the administration of justice and discuss and formulate solutions to legal, educational, social, and ethical problems encountered by women judges. It conducts research and educational programs through the

Women Judges’ Fund for Justice and publishes a newsletter three times a year.

National College of Probate Judges. 675 members. (804) 259-1841. NCPJ promotes efficient and just administration of probate courts. Twice yearly meetings provide an opportunity for continuing judicial education for probate judges and related personnel.

National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks. 175 members. (804) 259-1840. NCACC works to improve judicial administration at the appellate level through education. It conducts an annual conference and publishes a bimonthly newsletter.

National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges. 275 members. (301) 443-7010. Active and former bankruptcy judges promote improvement in law practice and administration of justice in bankruptcy courts, encourage uniformity in the administration of estates in bankruptcy, and support expedition in the liquidation of estates and economy in their administration. The conference publishes a quarterly newsletter and a quarterly journal.

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. 2,500 members. (702) 784-6012. NCFJC seeks to improve the effective administration of justice for young people through the improvement of juvenile and family court standards and practices. It sponsors education programs; publishes journals, newsletters, and reference materials; conducts research, and provides technical assistance.

Membership Information

To receive NASJE membership information, contact Jane Tanner, chair, NASJE Membership Committee, Institute of Continuing Judicial Education, School of Law, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602 (706) 542-7401.
National Conference of Special Court Judges 1993 Judicial Education Award

The Judicial Education and Training Unit of the Florida Supreme Court received the 1993 Judicial Education Award at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in New York. Presented annually by the Judicial Administration Division's National Conference of Special Court Judges, the award recognizes state programs that provide the highest quality of training and education for judges of limited and special jurisdiction courts.

Mignon "Dee" Beranek, director of Florida's Judicial and Training Unit and deputy state court administrator, received this year's award on behalf of the state of Florida from Judge Louis Condon, education committee cochair of the National Conference of Special Court Judges. Judge Condon noted that Florida had distinguished itself in presenting a wide array of comprehensive programs for limited jurisdiction judges. These programs include a residential new judges college, a mentoring program, numerous specialty courses, and annual education programs through the Conference of County Court Judges and the College of Advanced Judicial Studies.

Florida has also provided nationally based education opportunities for its limited jurisdiction judges by funding tuition for attendance at programs presented by the National Judicial College and the American Academy of Judicial Education.

Mignon "Dee" Beranek (l.) receives the 1993 Judicial Education Award from Judge Louis Condon.
State Courts and Tribal Courts: The Need for Education and Cooperation

H. Ted Rubin

A state court judge is holding a pretrial conference in a disputed child custody matter as part of a divorce proceeding. The father’s attorney states that the court lacks jurisdiction over this dispute because a tribal court had earlier found the child to be neglected and awarded custody to the father’s mother. The attorney for the child’s mother scoffs at this claim, protesting that even if the tribal court finding is true it should be disregarded since the state court domestic relations proceeding takes precedence. The state court judge continues the matter and calls for written briefs.

In another part of the state, a state juvenile court judge begins to hear an abuse and neglect case that involves a child who is part Indian. The child’s appointed guardian ad litem asks that the court delay the hearing so that notice of the proceeding can be provided to the tribe pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), legislation enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1978. The lawyer for the state child protective services agency counters that the child is not an enrolled member of a tribe and that the court should take evidence and ensure the protection of the child. The judge calls a recess to review the ICWA and a string of appellate cases that have ruled on who is an Indian child and when does the ICWA apply. When ICWA applies, a tribe has the right to intervene and have the proceedings transferred to the tribal court.

Thirty-two states have federally recognized Indian country within their boundaries. ICWA cases were most frequently cited as problem matters by respondents to a 1989 survey conducted by the National Center for State Courts as part of its Tribal Courts and State Courts: The Prevention and Resolution of Jurisdictional Disputes Project. Judicial educators can play a significant role in decreasing unnecessary litigation in states with Indian country through education and cooperation initiatives.

Some states have held educational sessions on the ICWA as specialized seminars or as part of an annual judicial conference. New judges need this enlightenment, and other judges need a refresher course on the purposes and complexities of this law.

The 1989 survey identified domestic relations disputes, including difficulties that surround child support enforcement, as the second most problematic area. Contract actions, torts, taxation, economic development, hunting and fishing, natural resources, and gaming issues were frequently noted. Now that the project has gone beyond civil disputes to the criminal arena, other tribal-state conflicts have been recognized: traffic court jurisdiction on state highways through Indian country, the issuance and enforcement of search and arrest warrants, obtaining arrest and conviction records, cooperation with an extradition request, state prosecution when neither the tribal nor federal court has jurisdiction, problems regarding the cross-deputization of tribal and local government law enforcement personnel, and more.

The practice of bringing tribal and state judges together in educational sessions is growing. Former chief justice Vernon R. Pearson, Supreme Court of Washington, who has chaired the coordinating council guiding the tribal-state courts project since its inception, may have been the first chief justice to invite all tribal court judges to attend a state’s annual judicial conference. Other states, such as Arizona and South Dakota, invite tribal court judges to their annual conferences (and schedule several topics of particular relevance to the tribal-state court interface) or to the meetings of a specialized judicial group, such as municipal court judges. South Dakota also involves tribal probation officers to participate in the training programs provided to state court probation officers.

Cross-visitations have been useful in a growing number of states. Arizona’s current chief justice and his predecessor have made much-noticed visits to the Navajo judiciary headquarters at Window Rock, and the former Navajo chief justice spoke at the recent dedication of the new Arizona Supreme Court building. Judicial educators may want to facilitate state judge visits to tribal continued on page seven
program that permits relatively small learning groups, probably under 50 students, with 20 to 30 being ideal. A course lasting one day or more is best; many team-taught courses, like family law or trial management, could well last a week.

2. Make sure that the planning committee supports the approach and will provide the needed resources. If this committee has special expertise in curriculum planning and instruction, it may develop general learning objectives and select the team members.

3. Start small. With major funding, a state may embark on an ambitious team-teaching project. But it is probably more realistic to focus on one pilot program. For example, within a weeklong judicial institute, consider a two-day skills development course that is team taught.

4. Select trained faculty. At least half the states have done faculty development programs, and most have a pool of outstanding instructors. Select the best; give the program the very best chance for success.

5. Select a team leader who will stay in contact with team members, chair planning meetings, coordinate assembly of materials, and be a liaison with the judicial educator and the planning committee.

6. Conduct an initial planning meeting. Total team attendance is a must. The judicial educator should chair the meeting. Most team courses can be developed with no outside help. The meeting should last at least one full day.

7. Conduct a final preparation session. Regardless of the number of planning meetings, a preprogram session (perhaps on-site the day before the program) best assures success.

8. Do a postprogram review. While the experience is fresh, the team should identify trouble spots, review the student evaluations, set targets for change, and develop a tentative schedule for meeting before the next presentation. (Team courses are rarely one-time-only offerings. After the first year’s substantial investment, the team will have momentum for repeating courses regularly.)

Judicial Team Teaching: A Worthy Goal

Team teaching is expensive, but the payoffs are great. Some of the benefits of team teaching are:

1. Team strategies enhance the role and importance of the judicial educator. The judicial educator provides conceptual leadership and a vision of what team teaching can achieve.

2. Team teaching is a natural progression of faculty development, giving the best faculty a chance to deliver a major showcase program.

3. Team teaching moves naturally toward behavioral learning objectives, the skills focus that is becoming the essential feature of judicial education.

4. A teaching team shares resources. The learners have the benefit of several perspectives and talents. As a group, the team can more easily stay at the cutting edge of changes in the law, judicial learning needs, and adult-learning methods.

5. A teaching team builds credibility of the course material. A longer course with several faculty members stands out in the curriculum.

6. Team teaching reduces the preparation burden on each member; no one is responsible for everything as in individually delivered courses.

7. Yearly faculty turnover is less traumatic. Once the format is set and materials prepared, new team members may be integrated with minimal disruption.

Overall, team teaching appears to be the wave of the future. Courses are becoming longer and more skills-based. The pool of trained faculty is increasing. Not incidentally, faculty are having fun planning and delivering courses; it is not difficult to find competent volunteers. Budgets are at least stable in most states, and some budgets are increasing. Judicial educators’ credibility for leadership has never been stronger. All the pieces are in place for pilot projects in team teaching.

In conclusion, some judicial learning objectives cannot be achieved in short, single-faculty courses. In continuing legal education, the National Institute for Trial Advocacy (NITA) discovered long ago that its market niche was intensive trial lawyer training, which could only be delivered by faculty teams. NITA could not lecture trial skills into lawyers’ heads, and no single faculty member could monitor and evaluate skills practice sessions alone.

As with NITA, judicial education faces a challenge to build observable judging skills, whether analytical/decisional (ruling on evidentiary motions) or overtly behavioral (managing a trial). Trial skills, family and juvenile law, judicial writing, media interviews, courtroom fairness, plea taking, sentencing, calendar management, contempt, and settlement conferences are but a few appropriate team courses.

Looking for a way to revitalize your judicial education program? Need to build judges’ enthusiasm for ongoing education? Want to get more “bang for the buck” in expensive seminars? Team teaching is a good place to start.

Judicial Education Standards

NASJE members, are you using the NASJE Judicial Education Standards? If so, please let us know how.

Send your comments to Anne Kelly, c/o National Center for State Courts, P.O. Box 8798, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798.
State Courts and Tribal Courts, continued

courts and tribal judge visits to state courts. Such visits allow judges to get acquainted and discuss common problems. South Dakota has carried this spirit of cooperation still further by arranging for one court system to use the courthouse of the other when this facilitates juror selection or expert witness testimony.

The Conference of Chief Justices sponsors this project. To date, six chief justices have initiated tribal-state court forums, the model for devising an agenda for reducing these disputes. Arizona, Oklahoma, and Washington first tested this approach in 1990; Michigan and South Dakota conducted forums in 1992; North Dakota initiated its forum in January 1993. The chief justice appoints forum members, usually four state court judges or officials, three tribal court judges, a law professor or lawyer consultant, and a staff member from the administrative office of the courts as liaison. The forum meets from four to six times over a one-year period. One or more meetings take the form of public hearings held in or adjacent to Indian country. The forum makes recommendations in such areas as education, legislation, state supreme court and tribal court rules, formal intergovernmental agreements, informal working agreements, and executive agency collaboration. Each forum has promulgated a tribal court directory, which details information on the tribal courts and their jurisdiction, practice, and appeal provisions, and often includes a useful treatise on Indian law. Forum agendas need a plan and time to implement it. The Arizona forum meets two or three times a year, and the Michigan and South Dakota forums have developed mechanisms to further their implementation plans. One very successful implementation in Arizona has been the annual Indian law symposium for tribal and state court judges, whose sponsorship rotates between the schools of law at the University of Arizona and Arizona State University.

The Conference of Chief Justices wants more states to initiate forums. Judicial educators can encourage the creation of a forum in their states and, if they're lucky, be designated as staff liaison by their chief justice. Judicial educators should obtain a copy of the National Center's 1993 booklet, Tribal Court-State Court Forums: A How-to-Do-It-Guide to Prevent and Resolve Jurisdictional Disputes and Improve Cooperation Between Tribal and State Courts. State Justice Institute funds have supported the project activities and six forums. Fred Miller, Project Director, Court Services Division, National Center for State Courts, 1331 17th Street, Suite 402, Denver, CO 80202, (303) 293-3063, can provide additional information and will be interested to learn of tribal-state court issues and developments in your state.

AARP, continued

Accomplishments

In the four sites, court visitors have made over 1,000 visits to guardians and wards. Court Auditors have audited over 3,400 guardian reports. Records researchers have checked 2,600 guardianship records.

The volunteers have proven to be strong advocates for problem cases, such as those identified at the beginning of this article.

With the help of a court visitor, Mrs. Thomas’s son received emergency placement in a care facility, and her other son was named as successor guardian.

In two separate visits with Mrs. Smith’s guardian, a court visitor discovered Mrs. Smith had been left alone. Mrs. Smith’s daughter was ordered into court to show cause why she should not be removed as guardian and to apply some of the funds she received for caring for her mother toward respite care. A satisfactory arrangement for 24-hour supervision of her mother was developed.

During a review of Mr. Peters’s guardian of the property report, a court auditor discovered that Mr. Peters was using money from his son’s estate for his own business. The court arranged a schedule of payments for Mr. Peters to reimburse his son’s estate.

AARP’s model volunteer guardianship monitoring program has been both effective and cost-efficient. AARP has also written a two-volume handbook to provide courts with the practical information and materials needed to establish a volunteer guardianship monitoring program. The handbook covers the steps for establishing a program, volunteer management, and volunteer training, and includes a trainee’s manual. The handbook is free to courts and $15.00 to all others. AARP can also offer courts assistance with volunteer recruitment, training on volunteer management for court staff, training of volunteers, and management of the program. Interested courts should contact Mary Twomey, AARP/LCE, 601 E St. NW, Washington, DC 20049, or telephone (202) 434-2165.
PROFILE: Richard Rosswurm

His credentials are indeed impressive. Twenty years ago this determined (and self-described) overachiever earned his Ph.D. in government and politics from the University of Maryland. Four years later he gained a master's degree in judicial administration from the University of Denver. Richard, then in his forties, proceeded to the University of Cincinnati College of Law. In 1984 he acquired his J.D. and in 1985 passed the West Virginia Bar. Along the way, Richard taught college political science, received numerous awards for academic achievement, wrote several publications and papers, served an externship with the International Commission of Jurists, and served as managing editor of the Human Rights Quarterly.

A descendent of German immigrants, Richard was born and raised in New Haven, Indiana, a small town of 2,000. The seventh of nine children, he was the first in his family to attend college. His fascination with politics in the election year of 1952 propelled him into the political science arena.

In 1968, Richard moved to West Virginia to teach at Marshall University. It did not take long before he “fell in love with the state and its people.” Living in Charleston, in the beautiful Kanawha River Valley, he enjoys walking and gardening. Naturally, reading is another pastime.

Between the reception of his master’s degree from Catholic University in Washington, D.C., and the completion of his Ph.D., Richard married. His wife, Mary Ann, serves as director of nursing research at the Charleston Area Medical Center. The couple has three children: Glenn, an attorney in South Bend, Indiana; Elise, a speech therapist at a Dayton, Ohio, nursing home; and Katrina, a supervisor at the Cincinnati, Ohio, Children’s Home.

Needless to say, when Richard Rosswurm assumed his duties as director of judicial education and supreme court law librarian in West Virginia in 1984, he came with a unique background. But he had to learn his jobs from the ground up. Two persons preceded Richard in the position, but the post had been vacant for two years when he assumed the reins in 1984. “It was full throttle immediately,” Richard commented. There had been an election and a need to implement orientation programs for both circuit judges and magistrates. In addition, there were other formidable challenges, including difficult budget constraints. One of the achievements for which Richard is justifiably proud is that today both education and library programs are “soundly on track.” Typically, Richard notes he receives great support from the court and the administrative office.

In short order Richard was promoted. Today he is the chief deputy and administrative counsel in the administrative office of the courts for the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals.

Richard’s judicial education duties include responsibilities for some 900 court personnel in the West Virginia system. This involves both orientation and continuing education programs for circuit judges, circuit clerks, family law masters, magistrates, magistrate assistants, magistrate court clerks and deputy clerks, juvenile and adult probation officers, and mental hygiene commissioners.

One of the programs of which Richard is most proud is the educational benefits program whereby persons in the court system may take college or graduate work at court expense. Court personnel may obtain tuition and/or registration fee reimbursement for in-state, undergraduate, graduate, or non-credit continuing education courses relevant to job responsibilities.

In West Virginia, the state constitution provides that the court set its own budget. Nonetheless, in lean times, it still seems true that continuing education and training are early casualties of budget cuts. One item that has not been cut is the educational benefits package.

Supervising a staff of three who have some judicial education duties, Richard manages an annual budget ranging from $250,000 to $500,000. Richard’s additional responsibilities include overall management of the system and 35 local law libraries. The budget for the library system is some $800,000 annually.

Other regular responsibilities include oversight of probation services, handling personnel policy and procedure, assisting the administrative director and others in the system in legal and administrative matters, and writing the AOC newsletter.

How did Richard get involved with NASJE? Shortly after his appointment to the post of West Virginia judicial educator, Richard attended the 1984 NASJE conference. What were his impressions of his first meeting? “Judicial educators from other states were ‘kindred souls’ from whom I could learn a lot.” With the exception of years in which there was a conflict with a West Virginia judges conference, Richard has been back every year since.

Last fall Richard was elected by his colleagues to the NASJE board of directors as the southeastern regional representative. He describes other members of the board as “extraordinarily sharp, dedicated, reasonable, and congenial professionals who share common purposes and concerns.” Richard Rosswurm, the man of impressive credentials, a healthy work ethic, and great modesty, can well apply these adjectives to himself. ■
Values and Attitudes: Can Judges Confront Theirs?

Mary Finn Maples

Values are the cornerstone of a civilized society. They include attitudes toward the political, educational, economic, social, legal, work, family, and aesthetic aspects of life. They are all encompassing, and we face them at every turn.

No group of leaders is more involved in value-related work than the nation's judges. In the United States, unlike many other nations, we turn to our courts and to our judges to decide society's critical issues. From questions of state and federal power to questions involving child rearing, family life, and personal values, our courts have the final say in resolving conflicts.

It should follow, then, that the nation's judges have either received ample education or been involved in consciousness-raising experiences related to their own values and the effect of those values on their decisions. Such is not the case. Judges, whether elected or appointed, have traditionally received no formal training about the application of values in their own lives.

A project sponsored by the State Justice Institute and coordinated by Merry Hofford, director of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, gave judges just such an opportunity in 1991. Dr. Gordon Zimmerman, associate professor of speech communication at the University of Nevada, Reno, and I were contracted to develop a three-day training program for judges: "The Crucial Nature of Values and Attitudes in Judicial Decision Making."

Important Assumptions

Just as in courses on gender or racial fairness, values and attitudes cannot be taught from an exclusively cognitive perspective; an objective that reads "the participant will know the importance of treating all persons equally" cannot be adequately measured. Therefore, it was assumed that the objectives for the workshop would include cognitive (theoretical), attitudinal (personal value systems), and behavioral activities to show attitude change or reinforcement perspectives.

A second assumption was that participants wanted to acknowledge their values and change their behavior. A third assumption was that this project would be applicable to most of the participants' personal and professional values.

Objectives of the Program

Again, it is important to stress that attitudes and values cannot be acknowledged, understood, appreciated, or described. They must be experienced and demonstrated.

As a result of successful completion of course tasks and assignments, the participants can:

1. Describe the relationship between personality types and individual value systems (cognitive).
2. Identify some of the important values and attitudes that affect judicial decision making (cognitive).
3. Explain the relationship between attitudes and values and judicial decision making (cognitive/behavioral).
4. Acknowledge personal attitudes and values that may influence judicial decision making (attitudinal).
5. Participate in small group activities to strengthen understanding and knowledge of the influence of attitudes and values in judicial decision making (attitudinal/behavioral).
6. Discover the capability to use participants' specific values and attitudes in conducting training programs (attitudinal/behavioral).
7. Demonstrate a minilesson that can be expanded into formal course content for future presentation by participants (behavioral).
8. Follow through by agreeing to teach colleagues and other court professionals courses that will include attitudinal, cognitive, and behavioral components (attitudinal/behavioral).

Ironically, while the judges readily accomplished all of the objectives, they strongly believed that objective #4 should read confront, rather than acknowledge, thus dramatically strengthening this objective.

The Process

For the project, 28 judges and other court professionals attended one of two three-day workshops designed to train them to serve as instructors in their individual jurisdictions of courses that would include cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral training objectives. Specific topics included values and attitudes in judicial decision making related to AIDS, family violence, and cultural sensitivity.

Responses of Participants

To evaluate the values and attitudes workshops, participants completed a fairly extensive written form. After three months, the project director called participants with another set of questions.

The written evaluations included the following responses:

- All judicial education should incorporate the techniques taught here. The importance of sensitizing judges to the role (and sometimes dominant role) their values and attitudes play in their decision making; sensitize judges to the values and attitudes of others of which we are unaware, but should be aware; sensitize judges to their heretofore unknown values, attitudes, biases, prejudices.

- The best educational training I've

Mary Finn Maples, Ph.D., has been a faculty member of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges since 1985. She is professor of counseling and educational psychology at the University of Nevada, Reno, and is a consultant on such topics as organizational and group dynamics, strategic planning, and team building. — ED
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State Judicial Educators

ALABAMA *Mr. Frank Gregory, Director, Alabama Judicial College, 817 S. Court St., Montgomery, AL 36106-0101 (205) 834-1100

ALASKA Ms. Janna Stewart, Manager of Magistrate Services, Office of the Administrative Director, 303 K St., Anchorage, AK 99501 (907) 264-9237

ARIZONA *Ms. Karen Hildrop, Director, Education Services, Arizona Supreme Court, 1314 N. Third St., Ste. 330, Phoenix, AZ 85004 (602) 542-9478

ARKANSAS *Ms. Kay Boothman, Director, Judicial Courts, Office of the Administrative Director, 200 Mill Hill Park, Frankfort, KY 40601-9230 (502) 564-2350

LOUISIANA *Mr. Frank Marais, Executive Director, Louisiana Judicial College, Paul M. Herbert Law Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70803 (504) 388-8825

MAINE Hon. David G. Roberts, Chairman, Judicial Education Committee, Supreme Judicial Court, P.O. Box 1068, Bangor, ME 04401 (207) 924-9200

MARYLAND Assistant State Court Administrator, Judicial Education and Information, Administrative Office of the Courts, Courts of Appeal Bldg., Route Blvd., Annapolis, MD 21401 (410) 974-2475

MISSISSIPPI *Mr. Leslie G. Johnson, Director, Mississippi Judicial College, 3825 Ridgewood, 6th Fl., Jackson, MS 39211 (601) 982-6590

MISSOURI *Mr. Michael Baumstark, Director of Court Services, Office of State Courts Administrator, 1105 N. Southwest Blvd., Jefferson City, MO 65109 (514) 751-3585

MONTANA Mr. James Oppedahl, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Montana, Justic Island Bldg., Rm. 315, 215 N. Sanders, Helena, MT 59620 (406) 444-2621

NEBRASKA *Ms. Janet Hammer, Public Information/Education Officer, Nebraska Supreme Court, P.O. Box 98910, Lincoln, NE 68509 (402) 471-2643

NEVADA Dr. Dennis Mettrick, Court Administrator, Second Judicial District Court, 75 Court St., Reno, NV 89501 (702) 328-3515

NEW HAMPSHIRE *Ms. Elizabeth Hodges, Legal Counsel, Administrative Office of the Courts, New Hampshire Supreme Court, Frank Rowe Kenison Supreme Court Bldg., Concord, NH 03301 (603) 271-2521

NEW JERSEY *Mr. Richard L. Saks, Chief, Judicial Education Unit, Office of the Courts, Hughes Justice Complex, CN-037, Trenton, NJ 08625 (609) 292-0622

NEW MEXICO *Mr. Paul L. Biderman, Director of Judicial Education, New Mexico Judicial Center, Institute of Public Law, 1117 Stanford NE, Albuquerque, NM 87104 (505) 277-5006

NEW YORK *Ms. Helen A. Johnson, Director of Education & Training, Office of the Court Administrator, 270 Broadway, Rm. 524, New York, NY 10037 (212) 587-5823

NORTH CAROLINA *Mr. Thomas H. Thurmond, Assistant Director, Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, Knapp Bldg., CB3330, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3330

NORTH DAKOTA *Ms. Carla Kolling, Director of Personnel and Training, Supreme Court of North Dakota, State Capitol Bldg., Bismarck, ND 58505 (701) 224-4216

OHIO *Mr. Laurence B. Stone, Director, Ohio Judicial College, 301 W. Ohio St., Columbus, OH 43266-0419 (614) 752-8677

OKLAHOMA Ms. Juanita Mayfield-Holley, Administrative Assistant, Administrative Office of the Courts, 1915 N. Stiles, Ste. 305, Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-2450

OREGON *Ms. Nore McCann-Cross, Judicial Education Director, Oregon Judicial Department, 1101 Capitol St., Salem, OR 97310 (503) 564-5171

PHILADELPHIA *Ms. Ruthy Cantor, Director, Judicial Services, Administrative Office of the Courts, 1515 Market St., Ste. 1414, Philadelphia, PA 19102 (215) 560-6325

RHODE ISLAND *Ms. Holly Hitchcock, Court Education Officer, Administrative Office of the Courts, 250 Benefit St., Providence, RI 02903 (401) 277-2500

SOUTH CAROLINA *Mr. Jeff Boyd, Staff Attorney, South Carolina Court Administration, 2300 Gadsden St., Columbia, SC 29250 (803) 758-2961

SOUTH DAKOTA *Mr. Dan Schenck, Personnel & Training Officer, State Court Administrators Office, Supreme Court of South Dakota, 500 Capitol, Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 773-3347

TENNESSEE *Ms. Suzanne G. Keith, Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, Tennessee Supreme Court, 1400 Nashville City, Nashville, TN 37224-0607 (615) 741-4416

TEXAS *Ms. Hope Lochridge, Executive Director, Texas Municipal Courts Training Center, 1101 Capitol of Texas Hwy. S., Ste. B 220 Austin, TX 78701 (512) 326-9150

TEXAS Mr. B. B. Schaub, Executive Director, Texas Judicial Center for the Judiciary, P.O. Box 12487, Texas Law Center, Ste. 502, Austin, TX 78711 (512) 463-1530

TEXAS *Mr. Scott C. Smith, Executive Director, Texas Justice Court Training Center, 5W Texas State University, P.O. Box 931, San Marcos, TX 78667 (512) 245-2349

UTAH *Ms. Diane Tallman, Judicial Education Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 230 S. 500 E., Ste. 300, Salt Lake City, UT 84101 (801) 533-6371

VERMONT Ms. Marna Murray, Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Vermont, 111 State St., Montpelier, VT 05602 (802) 828-3276

VIRGINIA Mr. Thomas Langhorne, Director of Educational Services, Supreme Court of Virginia, 110 N. Ninth St., Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 786-4542

WASHINGTON Mr. Chuck A. Erickson, Judicial Education Manager, Office of the Administrator for the Courts, 1206 S. Quince St., P.O. Box 41170, Olympia, WA 98504-1700 (206) 705-5233

WEST VIRGINIA *Mr. Richard H. Rosswurm, Chief Deputy of Administrative Counsel, West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, State Capitol, Capitol E 400, Charleston, WV 25305 (304) 558-0145

WISCONSIN *Mr. V. K.-Wetzel, Director of Judicial Education, Supreme Court of Wisconsin, 110 E. Main St., Ste. 420, Madison, WI 53703 (608) 266-7807

WYOMING Mr. Robert Duncan, Court Coordinator, Supreme Court of Wyoming, Supreme Court Bldg., Cheyenne, WY 82002 (307) 777-7581

*NASJE member

This list of state judicial educators represents the latest information we have received. Please notify us of any changes.—ED
1994 NASJE Committees, Representatives, Liaisons

Education (Standing)
- Maureen P. Colley, MI (Chair)
- Karen Waddy, AZ (Board)
- Richard L. Saks, MA (Host Region Director)
- June H. Crotro, MN
- Leslie G. Johnson, MS
- Catherine J. Lowe, CA
- Bla L. Tingle, FL

Membership (Standing)
- Jane H. Tanner, CA (Chair) (Southwest)
- Kay S. Boettman, AR (Treasurer)
- Holly Hulmeck, RI (Northeast)
- Maureen Laffy, WA (West)
- Sandra M. Bone, IL (Midwest)

Nominating (Standing)
- Catherine M. Springer, IN (Chair) (Midwest)
- Paul J. Holland, CA (West)
- Richard E. Reaves, GA (Southeast)
- Elizabeth L. Hughes, MI (Northeast)
- Lawrence E. Showe, OH (East)

Standards (Standing)
- Anthony D. Miller, CT (Chair)
- W. K. Welzal, WI (Board)
- Richard L. Saks, MA
- Catherine M. Springer, IN
- Joseph A. Titter, DC

Bylaws Revision (Special)
- Paul Springer, SP (Chair)
- W. K. Welzal, WI (Board)
- Richard E. Reaves, GA
- John R. Meek, WV
- Herb C. Smith, NY

Newsletter (Special)
- Michael W. Banner, CA (Chair)
- Maureen P. Colley, MI
- M. James Teter, NCSRC
- Richard L. Saks, MA
- Fran W. Mancino, DE
- Bla L. Tingle, FL

Mentor (Special)
- Kay S. Boettman, AR (Chair)
- Paul J. Holland, CA (Board)
- June H. Crotro, MN
- John C. Crotro, CO
- John R. Meek, WV
- Herb C. Smith, NY

Audit (Special)
- Scott C. Smith, IA (Chair)
- Richard E. Reaves, GA
- Janet Rimmer, NE
- Jerry K. Beauty, IA

JEAP NASJE Representatives
- Kay S. Boettman, AR
- Elizabeth J. Hughes, NH
- Kathleen M. Skora, CA

JERIC NASJE Representatives
- Jerry K. Beauty, IA
- Kim A. Callister, KY
- Lawrence E. Showe, OH

NASJE Liaison to Leadership Institute
- June H. Crotro, MN

NASJE Liaison to ABA Appellate Judges Conference
- Committee on Continuing Appellate Education
- Michael W. Banner, MI

NASJE Liaison to ABA Special Court Judges Conference
- Elizabeth J. Hughes, NH

NASJE Liaison to National Court Reporters Association
- Leslie G. Johnson, MS
ever been to—thanks can't be fully expressed. Constructive criticism: (1) The training should have been another one-half to one day (without changing how hard we worked) to allow more time for presentations and critiques. (2) More in-depth critique would be welcome, both by trainers and participants.

- Very powerful. The team approach to teaching has been very effective and goals were met. While the purpose may have been to polish participants' teaching skills, this program has also made me confront my own values and attitudes. How could I instruct others if I had not been through this experience! I'm so thankful that I was invited to attend.

Conclusion
While both workshops met with resounding success, it should be noted that the participants were judges and other court personnel who readily recognized the importance of the topic.

With the increasing complexities of value-laden cases being brought to court (as one judge asked, "What case is not value-laden?") it is critical that all court professionals, but especially judges, be constantly aware of their values and attitudes when making decisions. Increasingly, cases do not have precedence in law upon which the judge can rely. New ground is broken daily, and it is critical that judges examine what causes them to make different decisions or impose different sentences in similar cases. This is not an easy task. It is also a long process and cannot be resolved in a three-day workshop. It is ongoing. The workshop simply helps judges develop and maintain an awareness of the role played by their own values in their work and teaches them to incorporate such awareness into the training they conduct for their peers.

A curriculum guide is available from each state SJI library, judicial educator's office, and chief justice's office. Dr. Maples will conduct this workshop at the 1994 NASJE annual conference in Philadelphia.