

NASJE NEWS – Winter 2003

State Justice Institute to Offer Judicial Branch Education Technical Assistance Grants

To keep pace with the evolution of judicial branch education, the State Justice Institute plans to reintroduce an expanded version of the Curriculum Adaptation Grant Program in FY 2003 to enable State court systems to access a broader range of technical assistance as their educational needs change. The program was proposed for introduction last year but canceled due to the Institute's budget cut.

Through the Judicial Branch Education Technical Assistance (JBE TA) program, State and local courts can still apply for up to \$20,000 to adapt and deliver an education program that was previously developed and evaluated under an SJI project grant (i.e., curriculum adaptation). Under the expanded program, they may also request up to the same amount to obtain expert assistance in planning, developing, and administering their judicial branch education programs. The services that may be supported through the expanded program include consultant assistance in developing new judicial branch education programs, development of improved needs assessment or evaluation techniques, and faculty development workshops. The Institute plans to set aside up to \$300,000 for the program in Fiscal Year 03.

The application process will not change. Applicants may submit letters describing the educational program they wish to replicate or the on-site consultant assistance they need. This year, however, JBE TA grants will be awarded quarterly as follows:

Applicants Submitting Letters by:

Will be Notified of the Decision by:

January 10, 2003

February 28, 2003

June 6, 2003

September 26, 2003

March 28, 2003

May 30, 2003

August 29, 2003

December 12, 2003

Applicants requesting grants to support curriculum adaptations should allow at least 60 days between the notification deadline and the date of the proposed program to ensure sufficient time for needed planning.

The new matching requirements for SJI grants apply to the JBE TA program. As in the past, State and local courts must provide matching support equal to 50% of the amount requested from the Institute. This year, however, at least 20% of the match must be in the form of cash. For example, if a court requests \$20,000 from the Institute, it must provide an additional \$10,000 in match, \$2,000 of which must be cash. See section III.L. of the Institute's FY 2003 Grant Guideline for the definition of match and examples of cash and in-kind contributions. The Institute's enabling legislation permits its Board of Directors to waive the match requirement in "exceptionally rare circumstances." Applicants may request waivers of the match requirement, the cash match requirement, or both, when they apply. Requests for waivers of the cash match requirement must demonstrate that it would be a financial hardship for the applicant to provide the required cash match.

The expanded JBE TA program is described in detail in section VI.F. of the FY 03 Grant Guideline, which can be accessed on the Institute's web page www.statejustice.org. The web page also includes a tutorial on how to apply for a JBE TA grant with hyperlinks to all of the relevant requirements in the Grant Guideline.

For additional information about the JBE TA grant program, contact Kathy Schwartz, the Institute's Deputy Director, at (703) 684-6100, extension 215, or by e-mail at kschwartz@statejustice.org.

NHTSA Contract Update

NASJE members are hard at work developing a web resource library on DWI for judges and judicial educators, under a contract funded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Since their initial meeting at the NASJE annual conference in Santa Fe, a team of members experienced with DWI training and web-based learning techniques have been compiling and reviewing web-based and other electronic information on DWI law and educational resources.

The purpose of the project is to provide a single web site where judges and judicial educators can find a full array of resources that will help them understand such issues as field sobriety tests, blood and breath testing, and the rationale for various sentencing practices and alternatives. In addition to primary sources of background information for judges, the online library will offer curricula, presentation aides and other resources for educational programming on this subject.

The project is being directed by the New Mexico Judicial Education Center, which maintains the NASJE web site, and is being administered by the National Center for State Courts, NASJE's secretariat.

Transitions - New Members

Please join us in welcoming the following new NASJE members:

- Hon. Lowell Castleton
Idaho Supreme Court, Boise, Idaho
- Dawn McCarty
Interim Director, Michigan Judicial Institute, Lansing, Michigan
- Dottie McDonald
Judicial Services Liaison, Smart Start, Inc., Austin, Texas
- Laurinda W. Porter
Professor of Communication Studies, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota
- Jan Walters
Judicial Education Manager, Idaho Supreme Court, Boise, Idaho

Also, we have word from our friend Kevin Bowling in Nigeria. [Click here: [attach to doc 3a](#)] to find out the latest as of late November. We hope to have more news from Kevin next issue.

-----Original Message-----

From: bowlingk [<mailto:bowlingk@voyager.net>]

Sent: Friday, November 29, 2002 6:54 AM

To: dans@ujs.state.sd.us

Subject: Greetings from Nigeria!

Hi Dan!

Happy Thanksgiving!

Please give my regards to all our NASJE friends.

Life here in Nigeria has been very interesting!!! Especially with the recent riots and killings... Kaduna is less than 2 hours away and is where one of my pilot courts is located. And the Abuja riot was burning less than a mile from where we live... So as you might guess - security is a big issue around here at the moment. The work is fascinating. The courts need lots of help and lots of materials... Especially ADR and court management stuff (caseflow - budgeting - ethics - annual report samples - etc.). Unfortunately, its very expensive to send things over here. The Nigerian training institute could also use a set of JERITT Monographs - I wonder if Maureen has any grant funds available to donate a set???? Any way - it's been quite an experience so far and I'm sure I still have lots to learn. Stay well and stay in touch! Kevin

President's Report

by Thomas Nelson Langhorne

The State of NASJE- An Interim Status Report to NASJE Members

My term as your president is at its halfway mark. Accordingly, I respectfully submit the following interim status report, albeit abbreviated, which generally describes NASJE's present state of health.

If membership level is an accurate gauge of an organization's general well being, then NASJE has never been healthier. As of January 1, 2003, NASJE's membership climbed to a historically high level. We now enjoy the collegiality of about one hundred and eighty members. This steady and sustained membership growth can be credited, in large part, to you. NASJE members, especially those stalwarts who serve as committee members and chairs, have devoted exceptional professional services and sacrifices towards improving the administration of justice. Your unselfish efforts in this regard have gained national attention. As a consequence, NASJE's visibility, prominence and reputation have grown commensurately. This in turn has attracted similarly interested professionals to join us in our compelling mission.

Some of these new members would have, until recently, been ineligible for membership. Fortunately, two years ago, the overwhelming majority of you voted to amend NASJE's bylaws affecting membership eligibility. We now are enriched by the admission and membership of new categories of interested professionals who share a sincere interest in improving judicial branch education. As a positive consequence, we have more judges, educators, attorneys and other qualified persons who are now advancing NASJE's worthy goals and aspirations. Interestingly, several of our newest members are from the international judicial education community.

Financial position, to many members, is the true litmus test of an organization's health. In a word, NASJE's financial health is "stable." Given the unprecedented decline in states' revenues and dearth of traditional grants previously available to NASJE, maintaining a stable financial condition is, in my humble opinion, a victory. (Following the February NASJE Management Board meeting, NASJE News will post a detailed NASJE budget balance sheet for your meticulous review).

It is little short of remarkable that a national organization of our small size can remain viable, productive, responsive and innovative year after year. Other national organizations concerned with judicial administration (in one shade or color) are much larger than NASJE in terms of their total membership or impressive treasuries. Many NASJE newfound supporters or newcomers are impressed upon learning that NASJE, despite its very small (I prefer "elite") size, offers high quality annual conferences, information sharing and intra-organizational communications capabilities. We as NASJE members, in my opinion, clearly receive a favorable return for our relatively modest membership dues. How can an organization like NASJE post these successes?

The answer to that query is quite straightforward: I know of no national association that receives a greater per capita contribution of time and talents from its members than does NASJE. Believe me, I

have belonged to other much larger national organizations and I managed to contribute virtually nothing to those organizations' missions. But NASJE members are different from other organizations in many positive respects. In turn, our unique (and enviable) organizational dynamic creates a culture that values contribution, community, sacrifice and success. I must add however, that the need for committee volunteers and special task force members has never been more acute. Please favorably consider my invitations (pleadings) asking you to fit a particular niche in our ongoing struggle to solve challenges which requires your collective talents and ingenuity.

Make no mistake about the financial challenges we, as NASJE colleagues and your Board, must continually and creatively navigate. We owe special appreciation to our Treasurer, Sherry Carson, for her tenacious stewardship and abundant energies while guiding us through the many *weekly* fiscal potholes. All of your Board members are acutely cognizant of the fiscal challenges 2003 presents. Last week, for example, the Associated Press indicated that over one half of all states are facing the greatest fiscal deficits in those states' history. That's *ever* folks. Your NASJE Board of management is in the process of visualizing and forecasting how this abysmal public financial condition might affect NASJE's level and quality of member services as well as its ability to realize its ambitious goals.

As a result, with your Board's approval, I have formed a newly created strategic planning task force to analyze and visualize how we can best marshal our resources and anticipate possible trends that might affect the way we conduct business. For example, many NASJE members have told me their states have frozen out of state conference travel. This would obviously affect our 2003 annual conference turnout and also affect NASJE's planning and budget. Accordingly, we are examining alternative methods of providing educational and conference materials to those of you who cannot attend the 2003 conference.

Lastly, but importantly, to maintain NASJE's existing vigor, one of NASJE's priorities must be to ensure JERITT's viability. Moreover, we must be vigilant and give the attention needed to strengthen our mutually valuable relationship with JERITT. We learned all too well last year that we can't take JERITT, an indispensable arm of NASJE, for granted.

We promise that all of us elected to represent NASJE's interests are trying to think proactively during these financially challenging times. Rest assured that in the long term, NASJE will evolve into an even more creative, ingenious and responsive association as a result of our present, compelling need to think contingently.

NASJE's short-term future, fiscal challenges notwithstanding, is very bright. We are taking measures to posture NASJE to serve a leadership role during the 2004 International Judicial Education Conference being held in Canada. Moreover, as I previously reported in the fall 2002 edition of NASJE News, an unprecedented number of prominent national organizations are approaching NASJE for joint collaboration purposes. Again, your diligence and valuable contributions are greatly responsible for this development.

On a final note, you will recall that your Board, via JERITT's invaluable list serve, asked you to vote whether you prefer to keep our 2004 annual conference in August, or instead, move it to October. A solid majority of you advised us that you prefer to keep the 2004 conference in August. We will abide by your vote. We look forward to the North East hosting us at a location being determined as I write this column.

As always, I as well as all of your Board, welcome your input. We appreciate the honor of serving you.

From the Editor: Distance Learning – no longer a stepchild!

by Phil Schopick

The time is past when judicial educators can be attorneys or adult educators to the exclusion of any interest or abilities in delivering education by using distance technology. Whether via satellite, two-way video, synchronous or asynchronous internet hook-ups, distance learning modalities must be considered. The luxury of being able to deliver programming solely via one- or multi-day programs, on-site and in-person may soon be coming to an end.

Especially in light of tight budgets and overstretched schedules, other alternatives should be considered. The cost of transporting a judge to some other city or locality and replacing him or her on the bench for that period of time can be substantial. Having distance learning courses available in as short as one-hour segments can provide valuable supplements to a judge's education and at much less cost per education hour after the initial investment to develop the course.

The National Judicial College, National Center for State Courts, New Mexico, Missouri [see Missouri Update, elsewhere in this issue], Arizona, California [see California update, elsewhere in this issue], and Ohio are just a few of the entities that have invested in distance learning programming and reaped valuable rewards. *NASJE News* has, over the years, reported on these programs and I know of no one at these or other programs who wouldn't be happy to take a few minutes from their busy days to talk to someone inquiring about how to set up or expand a distance learning program.

In February, the National Judicial College is presenting a totally grant funded distance learning workshop that will train judges and judicial branch educators in how to present asynchronous courses via the internet. There may be a space or two left in this limited-enrollment, week-long class. If you are interested in sending someone to this valuable and forward-looking educational experience, contact William Brunson at brunson@judges.org or Joseph Sawyer at sawyer@judges.org before the class is full.

I am not suggesting we stop presenting courses on-site and in person. I am suggesting that we risk not fulfilling our constituents' needs by ignoring the distance learning opportunities out there.

Don't be left behind in the 20th century. It's 2003. Wake up, smell the roses (or fresh fallen snow), and see how distance learning can add additional depth and breadth to your educational programs. If you're not already, be open-minded. Consider it. Don't be left behind.

Missouri Update

by Linda R. Evans, Midwest Regional Director

In addition to our continuing efforts in technology education, Missouri has also partnered with the Management Development Institute of Southwest Missouri State University to offer two certificated programs for managers and supervisors, both of which have proven highly successful. The Supervision Certificate program is designed to help supervisors gain knowledge and skills in areas such as employment law, interviewing, orienting and training, performance appraisal, conflict management, and leadership. The Management Certificate Program is designed for managers and includes courses in managing change, effective communication, motivating today's work force decision making, and the power of personality. Both programs are designed to be offered over a twelve-month period, with a certificate of completion awarded at the end. This is the first time Missouri has offered education programming designed specifically for supervisors and managers.

Feedback from the courts suggests that these programs are having a noticeable impact on the bottom line of the courts.

Missouri is leveraging resources through integrating technology in educational services. In the past year, Judicial Department Education has launched the Judicial Education Web Learning System (JEWELS). Since JEWELS was launched in December 2001, the number of people taking online courses rose from 50 to over 1,000, 25% of the Missouri Judiciary. Staff are currently enrolled in or have completed about 3,600 online courses in just the first year of JEWELS availability. In addition, we purchased a wireless computer lab for educational programming. This lab is a portable network that can emulate a regular network connection for training and demonstration purposes, but doesn't require a WAN connection back to OSCA. One of the critical lessons we have learned in the process of harnessing technology to leverage educational resources is to educate our constituency. Recently we have added a cyber café to our Judicial and Clerk Colleges. This allows us to inform court staff about our efforts to provide comprehensive educational services with multiple access points through technology and to provide hands on experience on how to use JEWELS, case management software, CaseNET, and other available online resources.

News From California

California's Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) has been working hard on its top priorities—curriculum development for all of our constituents, increased opportunities for court staff education, and greater use of distance education.

Curriculum Development

In an effort to assure more consistency and comprehensiveness in education in California, CJER formed curriculum committees for each audience we serve—a total of 29 committees. We have separate committees for each area of the law for judicial education, and for each level of court staff—*e.g.*, administrators, supervisors, and clerks. In addition, committees were formed for specific areas, such as collaborative justice courts or access and fairness education.

These committees each came together to do an analysis of the tasks they perform, the skills and abilities needed to perform those tasks, the beliefs and values that are important to perform the tasks well, and information that would be needed to perform the tasks. For example, we asked the judges who serve on a family court assignment to answer the question, "What does a family court judge do?" Committee members wrote tasks, such as calculate child support orders, on individual pieces of paper that were taped all over the walls of the meeting room. Tasks were then categorized, and related skills, knowledge, and beliefs were noted for each category.

In Phase II of this work, committees were asked to develop participant learning objectives for entry, experienced and advanced level participants; identify educational content—topics and subtopics to be included to meet the objectives; and make recommendations for resources, delivery, and faculty. Completed Phase II designs will be given to faculty as a basis for their planning for courses. Potential faculty will be trained to develop these designs at a faculty development conference planned for winter, 2003. For more information, see "Curriculum Development: A Step-By-Step Model" by Karen Thorson in NASJE News, Winter 2001 issue.

Court Staff Education

Court staff directly represent the face of justice to most people who interact with the courts. California has long recognized the importance of having a comprehensive education program for court staff, but the magnitude of delivering education to more than 18,000 people has been daunting. Recently CJER instituted a new Managing @ Court series for court managers and supervisors. Some of the topics in this series are: Performance Management, Coaching, Team Development, Change Management, Conflict Management, and Problem Solving. In addition, we offered two statewide one-week Court Staff Institutes, addressing issues such as criminal and civil case processing, and a one-week Judicial Administration Institute of California, addressing operational issues in the courts. For more information regarding staff education in California please contact Matt Richter or Maggie Cimino. They can be reached at (415) 865-7745 or in the following e-mail format: firstname.lastname@jud.ca.gov.

As an additional resource, the AOC recently established three regional offices, two of which have large training rooms that we now use for delivery of court staff training. CJER has appointed Claudia Fernandes to be the education liaison to the regional offices. Her job will be to bring both judicial and staff education to the regional offices, which will become an increasingly important alternative to traditional conferences during our state's lean economic times.

Greater Use of Distance Education

With 20,000 court staff in California, CJER needed to find an effective way to reach more people with educational services than we could through traditional delivery at conferences and seminars. Our Administrative Director is highly supportive of education, and allocated funds to build a small studio in our building and pay for downlink satellite sites in 200 training areas in trial and appellate courts across the state. This infrastructure enables us to broadcast educational programs four to six times a month. Since April 1, 2002, we have conducted 45 broadcasts to approximately 10,000 court employees statewide on topics such as Orientation to the Judicial Branch, Avoiding Sexual Harassment, Ethics, Fairness, Legal Advice v. Legal Information, and Innovation in the Courts. We have also had broadcasts for judges on recusal issues, jury management, and in-depth discussions of legal issues. In some cases, we collaborate with other AOC divisions, specifically Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel, to ensure accuracy of the content. The broadcasts have received high acclaim from the courts with the added benefit of helping staff feel greater connectedness to the Judicial Branch as a whole rather than just to their own courts. For more information on instituting a broadcast system in your state, please contact Gavin Lane, Eddie Davis, or Barbara Edwards for technical and educational design information. They can be reached at (415) 865-7745 or in the following e-mail format: firstname.lastname@jud.ca.gov.

And finally, CJER has created an educational program for 500+ AOC staff entitled STARs (Staff Training and Resources). During the last 18 months, STARs has offered a variety of programs in personal and professional development. The AOC has instituted mandatory training for its staff beginning in January 2003, and STARs will offer four tiers of educational programming. These include the minimum requirements of sexual harassment prevention, safety, ethics, and at least one-half day training in each of the four competency areas related to the identified values of the organization: business knowledge and organizational skills (excellence), interpersonal and communication skills (leadership), customer service and resource management (service), and thinking skills and technology (innovation). Tiers 2-4 are optional and will provide certificates of achievement for those staff who choose to further their education and training. For more information about the STARs program, please contact Eugenia Tripputi at 415-865-4379 or eugenia.tripputi@jud.ca.gov.

Resource Review

by Carol L. Weaver, PhD

Bruce Klatt's *The Ultimate Training Workshop Handbook* (McGraw Hill, 1999) advertises itself as "a comprehensive guide to leading successful workshops and training programs." I agree. The content does provide a wide array of advice for those who are teaching or facilitating workshops, conferences or short courses. With over 600 pages, *The Handbook* is indeed comprehensive. If you are new to workshop planning or the instructional role or are providing faculty development seminars, *The Handbook* will be of value. Those managing in-house staff development programs will find a number of treasures in this book, as well.

Klatt identifies three questions that provide direction for the book:

- 1) How can I conduct workshops and training programs that support participants' learning naturally, spontaneously, and at deep levels?
- 2) How can I ensure that the workshops I lead help groups achieve significant tangible and critical intangible results?
- 3) How can I succeed personally as a workshop or training-program leader?

The answers to these questions are important not only to the workshop leader, but the participants and program sponsors as well. These questions raise the issues that often underscore evaluation efforts. At a time when accountability and concern regarding wise use of resources are at an all time high, answering these questions may be essential for future programming. The author provides excellent advice about planning for program evaluation and provides sample forms that can be used to judge the outcomes of the program.

The content of the book is organized into five sections and includes a total of 16 chapters. The text is supported with six appendices and an extensive reference list. The first two chapters provide excellent theoretical foundation regarding learning and the role of the workshop leader. The author describes the need for trust and rapport and how workshop leaders can "earn" the trust of participants. In his discussion of learning, Klatt provides content related to the learning process, kinds of learning, and learning style using the Kolb model. He expertly describes single- and double-loop learning (Argyris and Schön) and focuses on the importance of the kind of deep learning that double-loop learning fosters. Because professional development frequently requires unlearning and re-learning, Klatt's content is very appropriate for judicial education programming.

Beginning with Chapter 3, the author provides practical advice about the planning, management, conduct and evaluation of the workshop. The content is supported with numerous charts, tables, diagrams, and examples that make absorption of the content and utilization of the information straightforward. Different approaches are often compared allowing the reader to find an approach that fits and develop a personalized approach from the examples given. The reason that this book stretches for more pages than my community telephone book is because it is so full of ready-to-use forms. Going from this book to application is easy.

Chapter 9, for example, is "Conditions for Workshop Success." It addresses learning climate, learning readiness, participation readiness, and the interrelationship of these three variables. The content is based solidly on an understanding of adult learners and provides many practical suggestions for building a learning climate. When discussing strategies for encouraging learning

readiness, the author provides a list of ten strategies to foster readiness that can be employed early in the workshop. Another section of particular value is the author's discussion of how most people are not ready to actively participate and how the workshop leader can increase the probability that people will take an active role in the learning process. Klatt shares a number of personal stories that illustrate practice issues. At the end of the chapter, a checklist provides a summary of the key points and two exercises encourage the reader to analyze content related to learning climate and group readiness for learning and participation.

The Ultimate Training Workshop Handbook is a resource worth purchasing. Because it is based on adult learning principles and practical experience, it is especially appropriate for staff development, continuing professional education, and faculty development. I think you will find it extremely useful and flexible. Once you have read it through, I suspect it will spend more time on your desk than on your bookshelf.

Klatt, B. (1999). *The ultimate training workshop handbook*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Impact Evaluation: Or, "Everything I Know About Impact, I Learned from Maureen Conner"

by Blan L. Teagle

The following article is a summary of what we discussed in Maureen Conner's session at the NASJE conference in August. After the session I reviewed my notes and felt that the discussion, though short, had been very rich and had formed an excellent summary of what all who are contemplating serious impact evaluation or measurement of return on investment should ask themselves first. I submit this as mostly a summary of Maureen's practical advice, but it captures the discussion points made by some others. Unfortunately, my notes do not distinguish names and voices, but in a sense all present were contributors to the ongoing dialogue on this topic that is increasing in importance in these austere budgetary times. I think that if we are armed with the information below, we put ourselves in a better position to advise our educational boards, commissions, standing committees and policy and governance bodies under whatever name they may operate. So, with credit to Maureen and attribution to the discussion participants as well, here is my submission, with the understanding that any errors are obviously those of the scrivener.

Evaluation of education program impact on practitioners can be a very important and accurate indicator of whether given programming is having any effect upon the constituent group and whether the impact is that which was intended.

The dilemma many organizations face as they decide whether to undertake impact evaluation is that to do it right is costly in time and human resources and often the organization has not given in-depth thought to answering the key questions, "Why are we doing this?" and "How are the results going to be used?"

If you need to demonstrate some kind of change within the organization or practice community, you must have an organizational commitment to measurement at the outset of the project under review. Change indices require follow-up not only on site or close in time to the event or project, but follow-up evaluation in the workplace.

This means saying something to the effect of, "Our organization believes in job improvement. Those who participate in this event, seminar, workshop, etc., will be required to participate in a six-month evaluation process."

Interest in the subject of measuring change in the workplace is growing in the corporate world and in government. More and more companies and state agencies are being required to show return on investment (ROI). CLE committees and providers, and judicial branch educators who want to do impact evaluation to measure ROI, will have to get organizational movers and shakers to champion the cause that will require more than the educational office simply wanting to know the information. It will have to be critically important to the institution and the institution will have to be clear about two things:

1. Commitment.

Who is your client? Who really wants to know if the programs are having an impact? How large will be your recipient group that reviews the evaluations and what will their goals be? Answering these questions entails a careful consideration of whether you really want the question answered and requires that your organization decide whether it intends to do anything differently if the answer suggests a need for change of some sort. If you decide you really want the answers, then you have to look at the mission and the vision statements as a starting point, since these are your global indicators of the purpose, the values and the goals that were held at the time of inception. You will then have to take a serious look at the stakeholders and which, if not all, of those stakeholders you want to ask for information. Then you develop your evaluation strategy and design your measurement tools.

2. Objectives.

The organization has to be absolutely clear about the objectives. Do they want to justify the existence of the program? Are there reasons that the program or entity under consideration for evaluation should exist irrespective of whether some constituents value it? Are there things that you are currently doing that you legitimately want to improve or are there things that you are not doing you would really consider doing if the data indicated that to do so would benefit the organization or the professional group? How many resources are you willing to throw at the measurement effort? Can you justify the expense of full fledged ROI or impact evaluation based on what you are prepared to do with the results?

If you intend to go forward, you need to make sure that the organizational leaders know something about the levels of evaluation that you can achieve given your resources. Donald Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation is still the prevailing model used in academia, government and the private sector. There are four increasingly complex, and thus increasingly difficult and expensive levels of evaluation in Kirkpatrick's scheme:

LEVEL 1. "Feel Good" or "smiley sheet"☺ evaluations, usually consisting of likert scale numbers where participants rate their immediate reaction on a scale of 1-5. This is not impact evaluation.

LEVEL 2. "What did you learn" evaluations, where you really get at whether anything happened. These are usually accomplished through asking participants to describe what they learned or to rate how well some specific concrete learning objectives were accomplished. These are self assessments and while they get at perception of impact, and may be reliable measures over time of participant opinion of impact, they lack the validity level of independently conducted analysis.

LEVEL 3. "Job Behavior Change" evaluations, where you rely either on self report of the participants (easier, but with less validity), reports you solicit from recipients of services (more difficult, but with greater validity), or on your actual observation of behavior and documentation of the findings based on criteria you identified in conjunction with the program development (more difficult still, but with the highest validity). As a caveat, you cannot do behavioral change evaluation without a firm commitment from the top. You have to ask, "What looks like evidence to the client group?" and then you go out

and measure to that specification. If the governing body of your organization really wants to know if individuals made change in their level of competency, you may be able to do a super-assessment including even interviews or surveys that include their employees and co-workers, the recipients of services, and their supervisors. You could also look at aggregate results of performance evaluations, assuming those instruments deal with the same competency issues you have identified. The bottom line with level 3 is that you have to know the scope of the evaluation project before you ever begin it. Although it is relatively expensive by comparison to levels 1 and 2, you can get to level 3 relatively quickly. Behavioral change, if carefully defined, can be measured by most institutions, given adequate resources.

LEVEL 4- "Results", "systemic improvement", or "ROI" is costly and time consuming. Before you head down this road, do a cost-benefit equation. Authentic, valid and reliable LEVEL 4 is done in reality by few entities. You have to do two things that frequently become an impediment to the undertaking.

1. Identify and isolate all variables. You have to catalogue every variable that could have made an impact on organizational or systemic effectiveness during the review period and you have to be able to answer as to each, "Did the organization change for the better because of variable "x." Often the variables in a complex system cannot be dis-aggregated.

2. Conduct cost-benefit analysis. Ask whether all of the money that went into developing the process and all of the salaries that are used to identify the needed changes are worth the investment or outcome you are anticipating.

Level 4 is usually worth the effort if you are going to commit to it over a period of years or if the need for the information is business critical. Level 4 is not advisable if you know that for philosophical, political, or liability avoidance reasons you are going to continue with exactly what you are doing, no matter what the results.

Domestic Violence Education for Judges

Federal Firearm Provisions: What State Court Judges Need to Know and Why

As part of the Gun Control Act of 1994, Congress enacted several federal firearms provisions concerning the right to possess a firearm or ammunition, which provisions have implications for state court judges. The first, 18 U.S.C. § 922 (g)(8), applies to any person subject to a qualifying state protection order. The second, 18 U.S.C. § 922 (g)(9), familiarly known as the Lautenberg Amendment, applies to any person convicted of a qualifying misdemeanor crime of domestic violence. The following chart provides a summary of the terms of each of these provisions:

18 U.S.C. § 922 (g)(8)	18 U.S.C. § 922 (g)(9)
Proscribed person is subject to qualifying state protection order	Proscribed person has been convicted of qualifying dv misdemeanor
Unlawful to possess a firearm or ammunition	Unlawful to possess, ship or transport a firearm or ammunition
Unlawful to ship or transport firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce	Applies to qualifying convictions that occurred both before and after passage of this amendment
Unlawful to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been so shipped or transported	Does not contain an official use exemption for law enforcement or military personnel

Unlawful to have seized firearms returned	
Applies only while the protection order is in effect	
Applies only to protection orders issued after the proscribed person had actual notice and opportunity to be heard	
Includes a broad definition of “firearms” and “ammunition”	
Has an exception for official use by military or law enforcement personnel while on duty	

Why do state court judges need this information?

For a number of reasons, state court judges need to understand the provisions of these federal firearms statutes and to whom they apply. First, courts should routinely inform persons subject to qualifying protection orders and defendants convicted of qualifying misdemeanor domestic violence crimes about the collateral consequences that can flow from violating any federal firearms statute provision. Although federal prosecutors are by no means consistent in their willingness to prosecute violations of these provisions, a significant and increasing number do make these violations a priority target for prosecution. State court judges are doing no favors for those subject to these laws by failing to advise them about the requirements of the statutes and the potential consequences of lack of compliance.

Second, a number of states have enacted their own versions of these statutes, thereby signifying the importance they accord these issues. In those states, violating the terms of the firearms provisions, which generally closely mirror the federal provisions, is likely to subject a non-compliant defendant to both state and federal penalties.

Third, feedback from judges to polls and their requests for technical assistance indicate that this is a topic about which most judges believe they need more information. For example, at workshops offered by the National Judicial Institute on Domestic Violence, jointly sponsored by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the Family Violence Prevention Fund, judge participants, who by now number in the hundreds from all across the nation, consistently have more questions about this topic than any other covered in the curriculum, so much so that the faculty now devotes twice as much time to the topic as it did originally. And all of the courts involved in the Judicial Oversight Initiative, funded by the Office on Violence Against Women, have included training on this topic among their top three requests for technical assistance.

Fourth, there appears to be a widespread mistaken belief among state court judges that these federal statutes are no concern of theirs. Some judges deny petitions for needed protection orders or refuse to convict for qualifying misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence solely to avoid triggering the firearms consequences. Obviously, this approach deprives victims of domestic violence of the protections available to them under the law and thereby undermines the ends of justice. This is a result no judicial educator could desire.

True judicial leadership — what might be considered “best practice” — calls for judges to create a safe climate in the judicial system. Strategies suggested by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and other leaders in the field include:

- Providing leadership to ensure the establishment of clearly defined, “user-friendly” procedures for processing requests for enforcement of protection orders and incorporating the procedures into regular training;
- Providing local safety information to persons seeking protection order enforcement;
- Developing linkages to agencies with related responsibilities concerning the enforcement of protection orders; and
- Providing information about how the court can itself be contacted, and taking the initiative to contact courts of other jurisdictions, to clarify issues and questions about the enforcement of orders.

Commensurate with these strategies, and incumbent upon judges in order to enhance safety, is a thorough understanding of the federal firearms statutes and a commitment to award protection orders or to convict for misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence where the evidence calls for doing so without regard to the firearms consequences for defendants, and to educate those defendants who are subject to these statutes about the importance of compliance with their terms. To that end, judicial educators must provide good education on the firearms issues.

Where are information, training, and technical assistance available?

A number of resources are available for judicial educators interested in providing or brokering such education for their judges. In its program, “Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases,” the National Judicial Institute on Domestic Violence, a joint project of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the Family Violence Prevention Fund, offers comprehensive information on the federal firearms statutes and their operation. Judicial educators can arrange to send judges to trainings offered by the Institute several times each year and, for a catalogue of these trainings, can call (800) 527-3223 and ask for the Judicial Institute Desk. Alternatively, by calling the same number, judicial educators can seek assistance from the Institute in designing a firearms education segment to include in their own domestic violence curricula. Other sources of technical assistance on firearms issues for judicial educators are: the National Center on Full Faith and Credit, a program of the Battered Women’s Justice Project, whose phone number is (800) 256-5883, extension 2; and the Website for the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice, at www.ojp.usdoj.gov.vawo.

Seminal Judicial Education

. . . or how the little buckaroos learned to dispel moral ambiguity

by Hon. William P. Williams

Getting Cranked Up

What follows is the first in a series of columns about judicial education from the judge’s perspective. Since this is the first installment, I have decided to start at the beginning. This installment examines the seminal learning experiences of the fattest part of the judicial bell curve – the judges born between 1945 and 1955. Yep, the “babyboomers,” or more precisely the population segment described by sociologists, advertisers and increasingly nervous Social Security actuaries as “early boomers.”

Early boomers, including those of us who have become judges, share a unique and romantic identity – a generation of social activists coming of age during times of sweeping change. Indeed, as we passed from pubescence to adulthood during the turbulence of the 1960s, much of the turbulence was about **us**. With unprecedented fervor, we decried racial discrimination and social inequity. Likewise, with equal fidelity, we pursued the prosecution and the termination of the war in Viet Nam. And, while some form of rebellion is emblematic of youth, our rebellion was always about a **cause**.

Whenever we took over a campus, burned a brassiere or got conked on the head, it was always in the service of some perceived moral imperative. So, if we weren't always successful, or even consistent, at least we acted selflessly – always in the name of love, peace, freedom, and justice.

So, what got us early boomers so cranked up? Obviously, planning our continuing education – including judicial education – would benefit from knowing the life experiences and education that may have prompted our youthful altruism. What were our seminal learning experiences and what authors and books did we read – Jefferson, Paine, Voltaire, “Fun with Dick and Jane?”

Well, as some may have guessed already, a vast amount of our seminal learning didn't come from books or any sort of formal training. Instead, it was absorbed and internalized while looking out a ten-inch porthole at a black and white universe – it was brand new – they called it television.

Pass the pencil box, Pardner

Television is so ubiquitous now; it is difficult to imagine life without it, or the impact of its arrival. But the impact was huge. And, the impact was most huge for us little early boomers as we began plopping in front of TV sets in the late 40s and early 50s.

No doubt we would have been willing to watch almost anything. The grown-ups, however, seemed to be concerned about the content of our programming. And, since no one knew what the long-range effect of television upon us would be, the networks were cautious. Kids' shows, it was decided, would depict morality and portray traditional values. So, once we graduated from cartoons and puppet shows, what we got were Gene Autry, Hopalong Cassidy, Roy Rogers, the Cisco Kid and the Lone Ranger.

The cowboy heroes of early television profoundly affected our collective social consciousness. Each of us may have had a particular favorite, but we liked all of them, and we watched them whenever we could. And, if we weren't watching, we were buying (or imploring, begging or cajoling our parents to buy) lots of cowboy stuff. For example, the popularity of Hopalong Cassidy's black outfit, and our ensuing acquisition of thousands upon thousands of little Hoppy outfits, actually caused a nationwide shortage of black dye. Every cowboy hero generated a long list of products, but the marketing champ was Roy Rogers. Collectors are still locating and discovering forgotten Rogers treasures, but the current count exceeds 150 different products, ranging from alarm clocks to yo-yos, bedding to viewmasters and camping gear to puzzles.

Of course, our most prized acquisitions were those most closely associated with the cowboys as they appeared on TV – hats, boots, spurs and gunbelts. Still, though, there was also a comforting sense of connection and acceptance that came from trundling off to school with more mundane products such as raincoats and lunch boxes. And, the cowboy products provided our earliest experiences with capitalism – a shrewd player might be able to trade a Gene Autry writing tablet for a Roy Rogers pencil box.

The Melody Ranch Manifesto

The cowboys really did depict morality. Essentially, they were video extensions of the literary characters created by James Fennimore Cooper and Owen Wister. Intellectually, they weren't the sharpest knives in the drawer, but they were reflective and insightful, and they had extensive knowledge of “natural things.” More important, they were selfless defenders of the weak, and they were fearless in the face of evil. They routinely brought bad guys to justice, but they never killed anyone. In fact, they sometimes risked their own lives to save particularly stupid bad guys from calamities such as explosions and cave-ins. Moreover, while every show included at least some brawling and gunplay, the violence was always stylized and bloodless – the hero always shot the gun out of the bad guy's hand.

Positive female roles appeared in the cowboy shows. Dale Evans and Annie Oakley were more than a match for any man at riding and roping, while they too were proficient at shooting the guns out of bad guys' hands. Also, the stock female lead characters were more independent and liberated than the female characters in any other contemporary genre. Indeed, the female lead was usually a sophisticated tomboy (often from the "east") placed in the path of the villain's treachery because of loyalty to earnest and dimwitted relatives (often "Uncle John and Aunt Sally" or, more often, a widowed "dad"). And, while Hoppy, Gene, Cisco, *et al.*, would appear at the critical moment to save the ranch, mine, river, bank, *etc.*, the female lead was the character that most often experienced some realization, or at least whatever realization there was to be had.

Besides depicting morality, the cowboys readily espoused it. And, considering that the cowboy shows appeared as many as eight years before *Brown v. Board of Education*, much of what the cowboys had to say was prophetic. Consider, for example, the following excerpts from various cowboy credos:

I believe that all men are created equal and that everyone has within himself the power to make a better world. (The Lone Ranger's Creed)

[The Cowboy] must not advocate or possess racially intolerant ideas. He must help people in distress. (Gene Autry's Cowboy Code)

Protect the weak and help them. (Roy Rogers Riders Club Rules to Live By)

The foregoing statements are remarkably similar to those that would appear ten to fifteen years later in the literature of the civil rights and anti-war movements. Indeed, one writer has suggested that the Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) may have originated with The Lone Ranger's Creed. That may go a bit far, but the cowboy shows did cause millions of us to internalize simple principles of equality and fair play. Moreover, the cowboys espoused activism – we were not supposed to tolerate wrongdoing – we were expected to take action. As Davy Crockett said, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead."

Ultimately, of course, there was a collision between the idealized world of the TV cowboys and the stark realities of the second half of the century. By the 1960s television news had become proficient at capturing live events. For us early boomers, there was a rude and ironic awakening – after spending our early years gleaning simple moral values from television, suddenly the same medium was exposing us to gristly reality and moral ambiguity. By the mid-sixties, the world had become a malevolent place, filled with recurrent images of protest, assassination, racial violence and war. For this, and a genuine variety of other reasons, our generation rebelled. And the rest, as they say, is history.

Old Buckaroos

Educators might wonder whether early boomers still retain any semblance of the altruism absorbed from the cowboys. Well, pardner, I'm here to tell you that we do. Consider, for example, our divergent views with regard to war. Viet Nam was an unpopular war – the objective was uncertain, the enemy was ill defined and, too often, we were the ones that ended up looking like the bad guys. In contrast, Desert Storm, was a justifiable war – Saddam Hussein was a bad guy straight out of central casting, we defended the weak from invasion, and we fought with surgical air strikes and "smart bombs" – figuratively shooting the guns out of the bad guys' hands. Likewise, we overwhelmingly supported the war against Al Quaida and the repressive Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Apparently, no one ever told Bin Laden about Hoppy, Gene and Roy.

The legacy of the cowboys extends beyond views of war. Good arguments can be made that environmentalism (particularly in the west) and progress toward human equality (witness the age of “politically correct”) have resulted, at least in some part, from those millions of hours spent before the little black and white screen. Of course, we’re still far from perfection, but we would be hard pressed to think of another single era evidencing social change of similar breadth and scope.

But, this column was supposed to be about Judges. Well, just like the rest of the early boomers, we have internalized views of right and wrong. Indeed, an honest judge will tell you that far more decisions are made with recollection of The Cowboy Code than with recollection of **Pound’s Jurisprudence**. In fact, I’ll go one step further and let you in on a little secret. Sometimes judging can be a lonely profession – working in isolation from old friends and former colleagues, surrounded by moral ambiguity, yet always expected to make the right decision. But, there are times, special moments, when you know you got it right and you made a difference. And, it’s at these moments, as you leave for home, walking down the darkened corridor of the empty courthouse, that your memory recalls an old familiar voice: “Hi Yo, Silver. The Lone Ranger rides again!”

Judge Bill Williams has taught at the National Judicial College, and he is a frequent speaker and lecturer at law schools, CLE programs, public forums, and legislative hearings. Additionally, he has chaired the Education Committee for Virginia Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and is co-editor of the Benchbook for Virginia Judges.

As a passionate advocate for the protection of children, Judge Williams serves on the Board of Directors for the Child Abuse Program at the Childrens' Hospital of the King's Daughters. He is also a member of the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse.

The Institute of Continuing Judicial Education (ICJE) of Georgia’s International Outreach

*Richard D. Reaves, Executive Director
Institute of Continuing Judicial Education of Georgia*

A series of courses targeting visiting delegations of judicial officials from foreign lands has been developed and regularly offered by the ICJE of Georgia, over the past four years. Impetus for this effort derived from the Georgia state judicial education entity’s affiliation with the University of Georgia, its School of Law and its Dean Rusk Center for International and Comparative Legal Studies. The ICJE sets aside four weeks per year in which delivery of these courses may occur, and they are in turn marketed internationally by the Dean Rusk Center.

The initially developed learning activity featured a two-week course focusing upon practices in effective judicial administration. The second endeavor was a one-week effort strictly targeting contemporary court technology applications. The third endeavor, again for two-weeks, emphasized design and delivery of judicial educational products and services.

Court officials from Brazil, Ghana, and Egypt apparently have found these ICJE of GA undertakings worthwhile, as these countries have repeatedly supplied delegations to take part (Brazil, 4 teams; Ghana 3 teams; and Egypt, 2 teams). The visiting nations’ pay travel expenses for their attendees as well as a tuition fee, sometimes using grants from international support organizations based in the US. Participating teams number from 6 to 16 persons.

These courses highlight subject matters not commonly viewed as properly within the realm of judicial education in many foreign countries, where substantive law and court procedures dominate notions about what is acceptable in judicial education.

The initial course on effective judicial administration focuses on: access to justice, inherent powers of courts, jurisdictional relationships among courts, court rule making authority, judicial ethics and professionalism, appropriate dispute resolution options, case flow management practices, court record keeping, judicial office support and staff workload delegation, lawyer and judicial education.

The second course on modern court technology applications illustrates: CD-ROM and online legal research database resources, electronic filing capabilities, distant and widespread hearing or conference facilitation, video and audio remote initial criminal process issuance (arrest and search warrants), jury summoning and subpoena issuance, foreign language interpretation, worldwide web-based aids for self-representing litigants, case management as well as court record keeping hardware and software systems.

The third course on continuing judicial education product design and delivery is intentionally connected with an ongoing ICJE of GA Faculty Training and Course Development Activity (train-the-trainer), so the visitors and Georgia judges participate in learning together, along with at least one regular Georgia CJE effort so the visitors observe in actual delivery aspects of what they've been instructed upon as better practice. In this regard, many states' existing CJE providers could deliver a similar type of international continuing judicial educational experience.

A recent visit to GA by one such delegation, participating in the judicial educational products design and delivery course, revealed that allowing judicial practitioners a chance for input into identifying their continuing professional educational needs reflected a very novel proposition. The structure, longevity, preparation, authority and power of educational planning committees comprised of project consumers became a matter of intense focus and lengthy discussion. The planning committee of practitioners, a facility taken-for-granted in much American continuing professional education, was outside the cultural experience of these visitors. Rather, law school teachers or the judges of higher level courts were deemed appropriate and sole determiners of CJE program contents for trial judges.

On the other hand, Georgia-based practitioners taking leadership roles in these courses have come to enjoy the questions and reflections advanced by the delegations visiting from other countries. They challenge our understandings as to why American court practices are conducted in the ways that we perform them; and they help us more fully appreciate the legal reasons and institutional resources for conducting continuing judicial education in the manner that we do it. Articulating these values for foreign visitors provides a valuable learning experience for our judicial branch professionals.

DOWNSIZING WITH GRACE

by Mindy Masias

To be considered a successful court manager, obtaining and maintaining a sufficient budget is the number one concern...or is it?

Many managers are rethinking this approach to the court manager's job. Whether it is an increase in caseload or a reduction in the court's budget, every court in the country has experienced some budgetary or financial impact in the last year. Many courts now face the need for downsizing. Arguably, success during these difficult budgetary times isn't measured by the size of the court's budget, but rather the grace with which we handle the lack thereof.

Good managers are looking for advice on how to handle the immediate difficulty of communicating the news of downsizing, how to help employees with transitioning out of the organization, and how to address survivor guilt and stress of those employees who remain. The following are a few tips on each.

Communicate, communicate, communicate before you need to communicate. Too many of us take our employees for granted and fail to communicate until it's too late. Employees are sensitive. For most, one-third of the employee's life is spent at work; because of this, employees feel entitled to be fully informed and part of the decision making process, particularly when their livelihoods are at stake. The following, gleaned from www.workforce.com, will keep your employees feeling that they are part of the court community when budgetary times are tight.

- **Be as honest as you can.** Even if you can't fully communicate all the details of the budget, layoffs or other crises, be as honest as you can. Where you can't be forthright, explain that you can't. Where you don't have information, explain that you don't. Most employees will appreciate your consideration of "their need to be informed" about the process.
- **Employees aren't always as informed as managers.** Managers make the mistake of assuming employees know what they know. Although the grapevine can be prolific, it's often fraught with misinformation and misinterpretations of accurate information. Where information is missing, employees will fill in the gaps with worst-case scenarios. As a rule of thumb, communicate messages you want your employees to know three or four times in different ways to increase accuracy and consistency in the message.
- **Ask employees for help and educate them in the process.** Where practicable, allow employees the opportunity to provide feedback. Involve them in devising plans to reduce costs. In most instances, employees can be incredibly creative in assisting management in its efforts at exploring options that will avoid downsizing. Through the process, employees will become educated about the constraints facing the organization. If done correctly, you will have created "champions of change." Despite these measures, it still may be necessary to downsize. In this difficult time, management can take a number of steps to ensure the best possible results.

Downsizing done right.

If done correctly, management can reduce the often litigious impact of downsizing.

While meeting with the affected employee, it is important to be sensitive to the loss, but not allow the meeting to extend beyond 15-20 minutes. Prolonging the meeting will lead the employee to believe that there is some hope that management will change its mind.

Employees being laid off will often compare notes after receiving the news; consistency in delivering the news, providing the same information to everyone, and being honest are critical elements to a successful meeting.

Managers delivering the news should be firm and concise in their statements to employees. This is the time a manager should rehearse what needs to be said ahead of time and be sure to consult with the organization's legal staff for compliance with legal standards.

The news itself should be concise, and employees who are provided with the resources to help them cope with the loss are likely to seek positive avenues for moving on after layoff, instead of deciding to sue your organization. Management should research and compile local resources to assist employees with the change in their employment status. Sharing these resources/information with

employees being laid off will show staff that you are aware of the impact, and that layoffs are truly a last resort. Here's a quick guide to follow:

- Severance package information (if applicable): be sure that employees are fully informed of all money they will receive upon departure and when that money will become available. Check with counsel to ascertain if there are any requirements for the timeliness of the severance payment(s).
- Financial/consumer credit counseling services.
- Unemployment: Information on how to apply for unemployment benefits.
- Employment resources: websites and contact information for employment seekers.
- Resume writing information/resources: include tips, techniques, software, and organizations that can assist your employee in writing resumes.
- Interviewing techniques: resources, tips and techniques that can improve your employees' chances of success during interviews.
- Reemployment information: should the financial picture of the organization change, provide information regarding how your organization will reemploy those who have been laid off.

Survivor guilt.

Finally, management needs to attend to those employees who remain. Managers often make the mistake of assuming that employees who remain in the workforce will be relieved that they weren't laid off. On the contrary, employees may feel guilty, have difficulty in letting go of their relationships with coworkers who were laid off, and tend to be unmotivated for a period of time after the initial crisis.

Managers are responsible for setting the correct tone for the environment. One way to do this is to begin where you started....communicate, communicate, and communicate quickly, and then maintain a consistent level of communication.

The most important move a manager can make after experiencing downsizing is to call your staff to action. Employees want to know what needs to be done to be successful. This may include stepping up customer service or reviewing business practices to improve efficiency.

Additionally, if necessary and available, refer your employees to the employee assistance program. One of the most underutilized management tools is the assistance of your EAP.

Summary and additional resources.

In summary, remember that these difficult times are stressful for everyone, and that they won't last forever. Remember to treat employees the way you would want to be treated.

In five years, when we will likely be trying to figure out how to attract and retain quality employees in a competitive work environment, will we be proud that we were able to maintain grace under the pressure of downsizing? With the implementation of these ideas, you have a much better chance of answering the question affirmatively.

For more information and resources, visit www.hrhero.com , www.shrm.org, or www.workforce.com.

Mindy Masias is currently the human resources manager for the Colorado Judicial Department, where she has spent the last 6 years of her career. Also, for the past 5 years, she has served on the University of Denver College of Law faculty as an adjunct professor of human resources management. She received her bachelor's degree in psychology from Metropolitan State College of

Denver and her master's degree in legal administration from University of Denver College of Law. In the past year, while supervising the full range of human resource programs, she has facilitated over 75 courses in 12 different subject areas varying from coaching skills for managers to human resource law. Her private consulting endeavors include providing training programs for the State of Nevada Judicial Department, the State of Wyoming Judicial Department, and various human resource associations.

California Court Education Director Wins National Award

San Francisco—Chief Justice Ronald M. George today presented the 2002 Warren E. Burger Award to Karen M. Thorson, Director of the Education Division of California's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). The ceremony took place at the Judicial Council's business meeting this morning.

Presented annually by the National Center for State Courts, the Warren E. Burger Award recognizes individuals who have made a significant contribution to the field of court administration through management and administration, education and training, and research or consulting.

Ms. Thorson has more than 16 years experience in court administration with an extensive background in education. In California, she is noted for implementing a curriculum-based planning model for judicial branch education; enhancing distance education with a new satellite broadcast system and increased online education; and creating an AOC staff education program.

In addition, Ms. Thorson has provided consulting services to more than 18 states and has served as faculty for the National Judicial College and the Leadership Institute in Judicial Education. Before joining California's AOC as its education director in 2000, Ms. Thorson worked for the Arizona Supreme Court for 14 years as director of that state's AOC Education Services Division.

Ms. Thorson was among the first educators to develop educational programs for a statewide judicial system.