

EVALUATION OF
JUDICIAL EDUCATION UNIT
75 DF 040013

NCJRS

DEC 30 1976

ACQUISITION

Department of Justice Evaluation Team
Pat Sims
Richard Thompson
February 4, 1976

38279
c2

OUTLINE

I.	Introduction	
	National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.....	1
	Project Goals.....	2
	Project Staff.....	3
II.	Method.....	4
III.	Results: Implementation of Project Goals and Objectives	
	Goal 1: Faculty.....	5
	Goal 2: Establishment of Library.....	6
	Goal 3: Educational Programs for Limited Jurisdiction Personnel.....	7
	Goal 4: Educational Programs for Circuit Court Personnel.....	9
	Goal 5: Educational Programs for Appellate Personnel.....	11
	Goal 6: Educational Programs for Court Support Personnel.....	12
IV.	Discussion and Conclusions.....	14
V.	Summary.....	16
	Appendices	
	Table 3	
	Orientation Checklists	
	Orientation Packet	
	Table 5	
	Table 7	
	Table 8	
	Judicial Education Unit Participant Evaluations	

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is to evaluate implementation of the goals and objectives of the Judicial Education Unit (JEU), funded with an LEAA discretionary grant for the period of March 1, 1974 through November 30, 1975.

Statements in the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals appear to adequately express the justification and purpose of the JEU project. In the Commission's words:

The role of the judiciary in the Nation's efforts to reduce the crime rate lies in providing a system of unquestioned integrity and competence for settling legal disputes, including contested criminal prosecutions. In order for the courts to fulfill this vital role, judicial processes must be effective, efficient and current in Management methods.

The Commission later notes:

Since judges exercise enormous discretionary power, and since trial judges function without any kind of direct supervision and perform their work alone rather than with colleagues, the quality of judicial personnel is more important than the quality of the participants in many other systems. (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals: Courts, 1973, p. 145)

It is apparent that the JEU was proposed in response to the concerns expressed by the National Advisory Commission. JEU programs reflect the Commission's stance that staffing the judicial system with well-trained personnel contributes to the competent administration of justice.

Specific impact of the National Advisory Commission was evidenced in that four of the six standards that were suggested by the Commission concerning judicial education were used as the basis for subsequent development of specific programs for this project. These standards were as follows:

1. All new trial judges, within three years of assuming judicial office, should attend both local and national orientation programs as well as one of the national judicial educational programs. The local orientation program should come immediately before or after the judge first takes office. It should include visits to all institutions and facilities to which criminal offenders may be sentenced.
2. Each state should develop its own State judicial college, which should be responsible for the orientation program for new judges and which should make available to all State judges the graduate and refresher programs of the national judicial educational organizations. Each State also should plan specialized subject matter programs as well as two or three day annual State seminars for trial and appellate judges.

3. Each State should prepare a bench manual on procedural laws, with forms, samples, rule requirements and other information that a judge should have readily available. This should include sentencing alternatives and information concerning correctional programs and institutions.
4. Each State should publish periodically--and not less than quarterly--a newsletter with information from the chief justice, the court administrator, correctional authorities and others. This should include articles of interest to judges, references to new literature in the judicial and correctional fields, and citations of important appellate and trial court decisions. (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals: Courts, 1973, p. 156)

Reflecting these standards, JEU developed programs that were intended to have impact on judges and other personnel in courts of limited jurisdiction, circuit courts, and appellate court. In consultation with state judicial personnel and with assistance from the National College of the State Judiciary, a comprehensive educational plan was formulated; this educational plan might also be labelled the project's goals. Six goals were defined within the grant proposal:

- Goal 1: To provide faculty for educational programs.
- Goal 2: To enhance the professional libraries and library facilities for court and court-related personnel.
- Goal 3: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for limited jurisdiction personnel
- Goal 4: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for circuit court personnel.
- Goal 5: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for appellate personnel.
- Goal 6: To sponsor training of persons in the court support areas--court reporters, security personnel, clerks, and court administrators.

Objectives for implementation of the above goals were described in the JEU application. In most cases, these objectives are quite comprehensive and detailed; therefore, they are presented in the Results section along with information and data in support of their implementation.

Before presenting a review of the JEU accomplishments in terms of goals and objectives of this project, a description of the JEU staff is relevant. At this time, the JEU (located in the Bureau of Training at Eastern Kentucky University) is fully staffed with four professionals, one part-time professional, and three clerical members. A list of the Judicial Education staff, their experience, and their time on this unit are presented below:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Entrance into Unit</u>	<u>Education/Court-Related Experience</u>
Project Director	October 1, 1975	Attorney 23 years, concurrently Police Court Judge 14 years
Assistant Director	April 1, 1975	LLB, City Manager (Richmond)
Program Coordinator	March 1, 1974	MA (Criminal Justice)
Program Supervisor	August 16, 1975	PhD Candidate (Political Science)
Former Project Director	March 1, 1974 to October 1, 1975	Attorney (now part-time status)
Legal Secretary	October 1, 1973	Associate Degree
Legal Secretary	September 1, 1975	BS
Senior Clerk Typist	March 1, 1975	High School Graduate

To be noted is that the professional staff was not at full complement until August, 1975. Furthermore, in October the original project director assumed part-time consultant status necessitating the initiation of a new director quite late in the project period. The present JEU staff attribute the delay in instituting many of their programs to their initially limited staff.

Other staff activities: The staff have provided extra-project assistance to the other two divisions of the Bureau of Training--the Assistant Director and Program Coordinator have assisted in Correctional Training for Jailers; and the Project Director has participated in Criminal Law Sessions for police. In addition, JEU staff assisted in Penal Code training for county clerks and Department of Justice personnel. Representation at all court-related functions, such as the Kentucky Crime Commission task force meetings on Standards and Goals, is attempted by the staff.

Primarily, however, the function of the staff has been to organize and coordinate the educational programs and activities of this unit.

METHOD

The data and information presented are concerned with establishment of training faculty, distribution of training materials, course offerings, number and kind of court personnel attending the courses, and costs of these activities.

JEU provided most of the above information; however, cost data was gathered by Evaluation staff from Management Services. Average costs for conference activities of participants and faculty are presented since, in many cases, records were incomplete-- either no expense claims made or reported loss of records in the transfer from JEU in Richmond to Management Services in Frankfort. In addition, most of the miscellaneous conference costs were not available.

An additional source of evaluation information is assessment of the value of the training received by participants. JEU staff surveyed all persons attending four of the training sessions. Information from these survey questionnaires will be added to this report at a later date.*

*Results from these questionnaires can be found in the last section of the Appendix.

RESULTS: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: To provide faculty for educational programs.

Objective 1.A.: Through establishing an in-state faculty.

Objective 1.B.: Through selecting national faculty.

Review of implementation of objectives for goal 1.

1.A. There is no formal in-state faculty at present, and one is not anticipated until a state college of the judiciary is established. There were 56 in-state professionals participating as instructors at various times: 3 Court of Appeals Justices, 9 Circuit Court Judges, 11 judges of limited jurisdiction, 31 attorneys in public and private practice, and 2 other persons with relevant backgrounds. Some of these instructors have been used for as many as 9 training sessions, but a majority of the in-state instructors (36) were involved only once in the Education Unit's programs. For initial course offerings, the instructors were primarily persons who had participated in developing and writing the new Penal Code. For later courses, additional instructors were persons attending the initial sessions who had shown potential and who had expressed an interest in judicial training.

A one-week "train the trainers" session was conducted by the Bureau of Training and dealt with the new Penal Code; however, fewer than half of the above 56 faculty attended. Otherwise, the in-state instructors have not generally received any explicit instruction from this unit. Some of these instructors had attended national educational programs, but they did not attend for the purpose of subsequently training other state court personnel.

Fulfillment of objective--This objective was met, although not in the literal sense. A formal in-state faculty has not been established; however, a considerable number of instructors (56) have been selected.

1.B. National program personnel have been utilized as instructors in various programs sponsored by the JEU: five persons representing the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and five from the National College of the State Judiciary.

Fulfillment of objective--This objective was met in that 10 national instructors provided the needed training.

Fulfillment of goal 1: Fully met.

The goal was fully met in that both in-state and national faculty were provided for JEU programs.

Goal 2: To enhance the professional libraries and library facilities for court-related personnel.

Objective 2.A.: Through providing selected criminal justice volumes to judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and libraries.

TABLE 1

Goal 2: Dissemination of criminal justice volumes: The objective and its implementation

<u>Volume</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Projected Distribution</u>	<u>Actual Distribution</u>
<u>Brickey's Kentucky Criminal Law</u>	\$20,000	1,000	1,000
<u>Murrell's Kentucky Criminal Law</u>	\$20,000	1,000	1,000
<u>Prosecutors Manual</u>	\$25,000	500	2,000
<u>Criminal Law of Kentucky</u>	\$55,000	10,000	9,000
<u>Public Defenders Manual</u>	--	1,000	--
<u>Russell Publications (being developed)</u>	--	2,000	--
<u>Bench Manual (being developed)</u>	--	1,000	--

Review of implementation of objective for goal 2: This activity was coordinated by James M. Baker, General Counsel for the Department of Justice.

Brickey's and Murrell's Kentucky Criminal Law were distributed to all of the following: 1) state and federal judges (excluding trial commissioners and police court judges), 2) prosecutors, and 3) county and university law libraries.

The Prosecutors Manual was distributed by the Attorney General's office (1,000 copies) and the Department of Justice (1,000 copies); four times the intended number of volumes were distributed. This book was distributed on a wider basis than the above mentioned books: to all judges, prosecutors, public defenders, sheriffs, and law libraries across the state; to key personnel in the Bureau of State Police; to all chiefs of police in the Kentucky Law Enforcement Foundation Program Fund (KLEFPF); and to chiefs of police in non-KLEFPF-participating departments who responded to a notice of availability.

Criminal Law of Kentucky, in addition to the recipients noted in the preceding paragraph, was distributed to all police officers and to the approximately 500 public libraries throughout the state. There are approximately 1,000 copies of the book remaining to be distributed. Due to a budget reduction from \$155,000 to \$120,000, three of the seven intended volumes were eliminated from this part of the program.

Fulfillment of goal 2: Fully met.

This goal was fully met since all volumes with very few exceptions were provided to the intended personnel.

Programs of the JEU were developed for all three groups of judicial personnel-- judges of limited jurisdiction, circuit court judges, and appellate justices and commissioners--as well as for court support personnel.

Goal 3: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for limited jurisdiction personnel.

In Table 2, the project objectives (3.A. through 3.E.) for limited jurisdiction judges are presented. There were five types of programs envisioned for these personnel: A) the establishment of orientation committees to plan and conduct orientations for all new judges, B) training in the Penal Code, C) a seminar on topics of general relevance, D) continuing education at national education centers, and E) a seminar on juvenile law and juvenile justice system. Grant specifications for potential audience, suggested length of the conferences, and provider of training are noted in the table.

TABLE 2

Goal 3. Programs for Limited Jurisdiction
Personnel: The objectives

The Objectives: Nature of Training	Expected Number	Length of Training	Provider of Training*
3.A. Orientation for New Judges	--	1 week	Orientation Committee, KY
3.B. Penal Code Sessions	160 Judges	--	KY
3.C. General Interest Course	68 Judges	3 days	N
3.D. Continuing Education	35 Judges	--	N
3.E. Seminar on Juvenile Law and Juvenile Justice System	60 Judges	3 days	KY

*KY: Denotes in-state personnel/location of training
N: Denotes national education center personnel

In Table 3 (Appendix), actual project activities of the JEU are noted. Reference objective 3.A., an orientation committee (13 advisor judges) for new judges was established in June, 1975. This committee was selected by JEU with approval of the Judicial Council. A curriculum for individual orientation of new judges has been developed. This committee has suggested that an advisor judge review with the new judge checklists of points to be covered when the new judge visits agencies and officials in his home area, (Appendix). The advisor judge will explain the Orientation Packet as well as court administration and court procedures (Appendix). Curriculum for a multiple-judge orientation program has not yet been developed.

While the limited jurisdiction training programs were planned for personnel serving in a judicial capacity, other persons also attended, i.e., prosecuting and other attorneys, law enforcement officers, and social service personnel. These attendees are included as "Others" in Table 3.

Review of implementation of objectives for goal 3.

- 3.A. Orientation for new judges: A committee and curriculum for orientation have been established; however, no orientation sessions have been conducted. One problem was the delay in establishing the orientation committee. Fulfillment of objective-- This objective was not met since no orientations were conducted.
- 3.B. Penal Code sessions: Twelve sessions were offered on a regional basis. Projected attendance--160 judges; actual attendance--207 judges and 121 "Others." Fulfillment of objective-- This objective was fully met and exceeded in that participation was 29 percent above the projected and, in addition, many "Others" were also served.
- 3.C. General interest sessions: In addition to the specified course, an additional course was offered (Lexington). Projected attendance--68 judges; actual attendance--97 judges and 32 "Others." Fulfillment of objective-- This objective was fully met and exceeded in that participation was 43 percent above the projected and, in addition, many "Others" were also served.
- 3.D. Continuing education: Basic and specialty training courses were provided by the National College of the State Judiciary. Projected attendance--36 judges; actual attendance--12 judges. The problem of low participation was attributed to the method of notification. Information about programs and eligibility was made available; however, there was no active recruiting for participation. Fulfillment of objective-- This objective was partially met in that one-third of the projected number were served.
- 3.E. Seminar on juvenile law and juvenile justice system: The proposed course was offered. Projected attendance--60 judges; actual attendance--22 juvenile judges and 27 "Others." Fulfillment of objective-- This objective was partially met in that one-third of the projected number were served, although many "Others" were also served.

Fulfillment of goal 3: Partially met.

Five programs were to be implemented. Two programs were fully implemented as specified in the grant--Penal Code training and general interest sessions. Two programs were partially implemented--continuing education and seminar on juvenile law and juvenile justice system. One program was not implemented--orientation for new judges.

Penal Code training was the primary concern of the JEU and state-wide impact was obtained; general interest sessions such as probate matters, traffic, and search and seizure also reached a fairly wide audience.

Orientation for new judges and continuing education at national programs were also activities of particular import. Failure to fully implement these activities must be seen as a major deficiency. As well as being specified in the grant and having funding available, these activities were defined by the National Advisory Commission as necessary efforts to improve the quality of the judiciary.

Because the proposal specified that five activities be implemented and only two were completely implemented, we conclude that goal three was partially met.

Goal 4: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for circuit court personnel.

The project objectives for circuit court personnel are indicated in Table 4. Varied activities were planned for circuit court judges: orientation for new judges, Penal Code training for judges and law clerks, continuing education for judges, and funding for the Judicial Conference.

TABLE 4

Goal 4. Programs for Circuit Court Personnel: The objectives

The Objectives: Nature of Training	Expected Number	Length of Training	Provider of Training*
4.A. Orientation for New Judges	--	1 week	Orientation Committee, KY
4.B. Penal Code Sessions for Judges and Law Clerks	All (86) Judges and 5 Law Clerks	1 week	KY
4.C. Continuing Education at National Programs	40 Judges	--	N
4.D. Judicial Conference	All (86) Judges	3-days semi-annually	Judicial Conference

*KY: Denotes in-state personnel/location

N: Denotes national education center personnel

The programs conducted and/or sponsored for circuit court personnel are noted in Table 5 (Appendix). As for the limited jurisdiction judges, the orientation committee for circuit court judges has been established. There are 22 advisor judges on this committee which was selected and appointed by the Judicial Council. The committee first met on November 7, 1975. As of November 30, a standardized curriculum has not been developed, but an approach similar to that of the limited jurisdiction courts was anticipated.

Review of implementation of objectives for goal 4.

- 4.A. Orientation for new judges: An orientation committee was established; however, the curriculum has not been finalized and no orientations have been conducted. Fulfillment of objective--This objective was not met since no orientations were conducted.
- 4.B. Penal Code session: One course was conducted specifically for circuit court judges; in addition, six circuit court judges attended Penal Code sessions conducted for limited jurisdiction personnel. Projected attendance--86 judges and 5 law clerks; actual attendance--67 judges and 1 law clerk. Fulfillment of objective--This objective is considered to have been met for the judges since 78 percent participated. This objective was partially met for law clerks since 1 out of the projected 5 participated.
- 4.C. Continuing Education: Basic and specialty training courses at several national education centers were available. Projected attendance--40; actual attendance--11. Limited participation in these programs appears attributable to lack of active efforts of notification and recruitment. Fulfillment of objective--This objective was partially met in that one-fourth of the projected number participated.
- 4.D. Judicial Conference: Funding for this conference was provided by JEU; planning and implementation were provided by the Judicial Conference staff. Projected attendance--86 judges; actual attendance--70 judges. Fulfillment of objective--This objective was met in that the necessary funds were supplied and 80 percent of the judges attended.

Fulfillment of goal 4: Partially met.

There were four programs for circuit court personnel. One program was fully met--funding for attendance at the Judicial Conference. Two programs were partially met--continuing education and Penal Code training. One program was not implemented--orientation for new judges.

As with limited jurisdiction personnel, Penal Code training was the primary concern of the JEU, and state-wide impact was obtained for judges but not for law clerks.

Likewise, orientation for new judges and continuing education at national programs were also activities of particular import. Failure to fully implement these activities must be seen as a major deficiency. As well as being specified in the grant and having funding available, these activities were defined by the National Advisory Commission as necessary efforts to improve the quality of the judiciary.

Because the proposal specified that four activities be implemented and only one was completely implemented, we conclude that goal four was partially met.

Goal 5. To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for appellate personnel.

The third group of judicial personnel to be served was the Court of Appeals justices, commissioners, and law clerks. Specific activities proposed for appellate personnel are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Goal 5. Programs for Appellate Court Personnel:
The objectives

The Objectives: Nature of Training	Expected Number	Length of Training	Provider of Training*
5.A. Penal Code Session	11 Justices/ Commission- ers 14 Law Clerks	1 week	KY
5.B. Continuing Education at National Education Programs	--	--	N
5.C. Judicial Conference	11 Justices	3 days semi-annually	Judicial Conference
5.D. Continuing Education	10 Law Clerks	3 days annually	N (LSU)

*KY: Denotes in-state personnel/location

N: Denotes national education center personnel

The JEU efforts are noted in Table 7 (Appendix). For both in-state educational programs, the appellate justices and commissioners were served in conjunction with circuit court judges.

Review of implementation of objectives for goal 5.

- 5.A. Penal Code Session: A three-day seminar was offered. Projected attendance--11 justices and commissioners and 14 law clerks; actual attendance--8 justices and commissioners and 1 law clerk. Fulfillment of objective--This objective is considered to have been met for justices and commissioners with 73 percent participation. This objective was not met for law clerks with 1 out of 14 participating.
- 5.B. Continuing Education at National Education Programs: Funding was available for attendance at various educational programs. Projected attendance--not specified; actual attendance--2 justices. Lack of participation appears linked to the JEU's limited efforts at notification or recruitment. Fulfillment of objective--Expected participation was not specified; however, actual participation seems low and thus the objective must be considered partially fulfilled.

- 5.C. Judicial Conference: Funding for this conference was provided by JEU; planning and implementation were provided by the Judicial Conference staff. Projected attendance--11 justices; actual attendance--5 justices and commissioners. Fulfillment of objective--This objective was partially met; although funds were available, attendance was one-half the expected.
- 5.D. Continuing education for law clerks: An annual three-day orientation at the Institute of Continuing Legal Education, Louisiana State University, for 10 of the 14 Court of Appeals law clerks was planned; 6 attended. Fulfillment of objective--This objective was partially met in 1975 with 60 percent participation. It may be noted that there was no participation in the first year of the project. Fulfillment of goal 5: Partially met.

Four programs were to be implemented for appellate personnel. All were considered as partially met--Penal Code training for justices/commissioners and law clerks, continuing education for justices, continuing education for law clerks, and funding for attendance at the Judicial Conference although these funds were made available.

One program had what may be considered adequate participation in part, i.e., Penal Code training for justices and commissioners; however, law clerk participation in this training was very low and thus the Penal Code training program as a whole was partially fulfilled.

Considering the objectives separately for justices/commissioners and for law clerks, the training received by justices and commissioners was considerably greater. For these persons, there was adequate participation in Penal Code training and partial participation for continuing education and the Judicial Conference. For law clerks, Penal Code training was very low; continuing education did not occur the first year and was partially fulfilled the second year.

Because the proposal specified that four activities be implemented and all were partially implemented, we conclude that goal five was partially met.

- Goal 6: To sponsor training for persons in the court support areas-- court reporters, security personnel, clerks, and court administrators.

Objective 6.A: Through providing twenty \$500 scholarships (covering all costs) for persons in the support areas--court reporters, security personnel, clerks, and court administrators--to attend appropriate training courses.

It was estimated that 1,000 to 3,000 could be eligible for these scholarships. The participants, training courses attended, and costs are listed in Table 8 (Appendix):

Review of implementation of objective for goal 6.

Of the 20 scholarships available, 7 were applied for and awarded. A factor in this low participation is the small amount of publicity given to the availability of these scholarships.

Fulfillment of goal 6: Partially met.

This goal was partially met since participation was considerably less than specified in the proposal.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

From the information collected for this report, it appears that the JEU did not fulfill completely its mandate. Although a variety of judicial personnel were impacted, the actual delivery of services in a number of instances was considerably less than possible with the JEU funding capabilities.

In review, goals 1 and 2 were classified as having been fully met. For goal 1, JEU selected and utilized both in-state and national personnel as instructors in the programs. The Unit now has a roster of available instructors who can serve as educators in future in-state educational efforts. An established training faculty is not considered feasible at this time.

Goal 2, also fully implemented, was the dissemination of a number of criminal justice volumes. With the distribution of these volumes to criminal justice professionals and to libraries throughout the commonwealth, this activity achieved a state-wide impact.

The four remaining activities proposed for the JEU consisted of educational programs for various groups of court personnel. Several activities were planned and, in most cases, offered to each target audience--judicial personnel in limited jurisdiction courts, circuit courts, and the appellate court and, in addition, court support personnel.

For goal 3, five programs were proposed for limited jurisdiction personnel--orientation for new judges, Penal Code training, a general interest session, continuing education at national programs, and a seminar on juvenile law and juvenile justice system. Of these, Penal Code training and the general interest session were defined as fully implemented and exceeded in that the programs yielded attendance that was more extensive than projected in the grant application. There was only limited participation in the continuing education programs and juvenile law seminar; thus, these activities were considered partially implemented. Finally, no orientations of new judges were conducted during the grant period. Since full implementation of only two of the five proposed programs was achieved, it was concluded that Goal 3--providing and conducting educational programs for limited jurisdiction personnel--was partially met.

For goal 4, the JEU was to provide four programs to circuit court personnel--orientation for new judges, Penal Code training, continuing education at national programs, and funding for the Judicial Conference. One activity--Judicial Conference funding--was fully delivered. Penal Code training was fully implemented for judges but not for law clerks. No orientations for new judges were conducted and participation in the continuing education programs was quite limited. Since three important programs were less than fully implemented, Goal 4--sponsoring and conducting educational programs for circuit court personnel--was partially met.

For goal 5, four program areas were designed for appellate personnel-- Penal Code training for justices and law clerks, continuing education at national programs for justices, Judicial Conference funding, and continuing education for law clerks. Penal Code training for appellate justices was the only activity considered fully implemented. In contrast, this activity was considered unfulfilled for the appellate law clerks. The remaining programs, due to limited participation, were defined as partially met. Thus, goal 5--sponsoring and conducting educational programs for appellate personnel--was partially fulfilled.

For goal 6, a fourth group to be provided training was court support personnel. Twenty scholarships were available; seven were awarded. Because of limited participation achieved in this program, goal 6--sponsoring training for court support personnel--was considered partially met.

Assessing efforts and effectiveness of JEU according to the nature of training offered (rather than according to kind of audience), it is apparent that the majority of training resources were devoted to the new Penal Code. Of the 632 persons served in in-state training programs, 454 participated in Penal Code training. This emphasis was undoubtedly valid in that proper administration of this new legal code requires an informed judiciary. JEU achievement in this area is impressive.

Other important in-state training programs were fulfilled to a lesser degree than anticipated. Most notable was the lack of orientations to be conducted for new judges of limited jurisdiction and circuit courts. Orientation committees of advisor judges were formed late in the grant and some orientation planning has been accomplished. Also, participation in continuing education was considerably less than planned, quite possibly due to limited notification of such offerings. General lack of fulfillment of objectives may also be attributed to initially limited staff. The lack of training in both of these areas must be considered serious deficiencies.

In summary, a comprehensive educational program had been planned for the JEU but this was not actualized. Successful implementation was limited to one area, Penal Code training. This was a real need of court personnel; however, other important areas of instruction were considerably neglected, i.e., orientation for new judges and continuing education at national programs.

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION. The focus of this study is to evaluate implementation of goals and objectives of the Judicial Education Unit (JEU), funded with an LEAA discretionary grant for the period of March 1, 1974 through November 30, 1975.

The JEU program was developed to reflect the stance of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals--that staffing the judicial system with well-trained personnel contributes to the competent administration of justice. The specific impact of the National Advisory Commission was evidenced in that four of the six standards suggested by the Commission concerning judicial education were used as the basis for subsequent development of specific programs for this project. These standards were as follows:

1. All new trial judges, within three years of assuming judicial office, should attend both local and national orientation programs as well as one of the national judicial educational programs. The local orientation program should come immediately before or after the judge first takes office. It should include visits to all institutions and facilities to which criminal offenders may be sentenced.
2. Each state should develop its own State judicial college, which should be responsible for the orientation program for new judges and which should make available to all State judges the graduate and refresher programs of the national judicial educational organizations. Each State also should plan specialized subject matter programs as well as two or three day annual State seminars for trial and appellate judges.
3. Each State should prepare a bench manual on procedural laws, with forms, samples, rule requirements and other information that a judge should have readily available. This should include sentencing alternatives and information concerning correctional programs and institutions.
4. Each State should publish periodically--and not less than quarterly--a newsletter with information from the chief justice, the court administrator, correctional authorities and others. This should include articles of interest to judges, references to new literature in the judicial and correctional fields, and citations of important appellate and trial court decisions. (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals: Courts, 1973, p. 156)

Reflecting these standards, JEU developed programs that were intended to have impact on judges and other personnel in courts of limited jurisdiction, circuit courts, and appellate court. In consultation with state judicial personnel and with assistance from the National College of the State Judiciary, a comprehensive educational plan was formulated; this educational plan might also be labelled the project's goals. Six goals were defined within the grant proposal:

Goal 1: To provide faculty for educational programs.

Objective 1.A.: Through establishing an in-state faculty.

Objective 1.B.: Through selecting national faculty.

Goal 2: To enhance the professional libraries and library facilities for court and court-related personnel.

Objective 2.A.: Through providing selected criminal justice volumes to judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and libraries.

Goal 3: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for limited jurisdiction personnel.

(For objectives see Table 3)

Goal 4: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for circuit court personnel.

(For objectives see Table 5)

Goal 5: To sponsor, coordinate, and conduct educational programs for appellate personnel.

(For objectives see Table 7)

Goal 6: To sponsor training of persons in the court support areas--court reporters, security personnel, clerks, and court administrators.

Objective 6.A.: Through providing twenty \$500 scholarships (covering all costs) for persons in the support areas--court reporters, security personnel, clerks, and court administrators--to attend appropriate training courses.

At this time, the JEU (located in the Bureau of Training at Eastern Kentucky University) is fully staffed with four professionals, one part-time professional, and three clerical members. While the function of the staff has been to organize and coordinate the educational programs and activities of this unit, they have also been involved in extra-project training programs and other court-related functions.

METHOD. The data and information presented are concerned with establishment of training faculty, distribution of training materials, course offerings, number and kind of court personnel attending the courses, and costs of these activities.

JEU provided most of the above information; however, cost data was gathered by Evaluation staff from Management Services. Average costs for conference activities of participants and faculty are presented since, in many cases, records were incomplete--either no expense claims made or reported loss of records in the transfer from JEU in Richmond to Management Services in Frankfort. In addition, most of the miscellaneous conference costs were not available.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

From the information collected for this report, it appears that the JEU did not fulfill completely its mandate. Although a variety of judicial personnel were impacted, the actual delivery of services in a number of instances was considerably less than possible with the JEU funding capabilities.

In review, goals 1 and 2 were classified as having been fully met. For goal 1, JEU selected and utilized both in-state and national personnel as instructors in the programs. The Unit now has a roster of available instructors who can serve as educators in future in-state educational efforts. An established training faculty is not considered feasible at this time.

Goal 2, also fully implemented, was the dissemination of a number of criminal justice volumes. With the distribution of these volumes to criminal justice professionals and to libraries throughout the commonwealth, this activity achieved a state-wide impact.

The four remaining activities proposed for the JEU consisted of educational programs for various groups of court personnel. Several activities were planned and, in most cases, offered to each target audience--judicial personnel in limited jurisdiction courts, circuit courts, and the appellate court and, in addition, court support personnel.

For goal 3, five programs were proposed for limited jurisdiction personnel--orientation for new judges, Penal Code training, a general interest session, continuing education at national programs, and a seminar on juvenile law and juvenile justice system. Of these, Penal Code training and the general interest session were defined as fully implemented and exceeded in that the programs yielded attendance that was more extensive than projected in the grant application. There was only limited participation in the continuing education programs and juvenile law seminar; thus, these activities were considered partially implemented. Finally, no orientations of new judges were conducted during the grant period. Since full implementation of only two of the five proposed programs was achieved, it was concluded that Goal 3--providing and conducting educational programs for limited jurisdiction personnel--was partially met.

For goal 4, the JEU was to provide four programs to circuit court personnel--orientation for new judges, Penal Code training, continuing education at national programs, and funding for the Judicial Conference. One activity--Judicial Conference funding--was fully delivered. Penal Code training was fully implemented for judges but not for law clerks. No orientations for new judges were conducted and participation in the continuing education programs was quite limited. Since three important programs were less than fully implemented, Goal 4--sponsoring and conducting educational programs for circuit court personnel--was partially met.

For goal 5, four program areas were designed for appellate personnel-- Penal Code training for justices and law clerks, continuing education at national programs for justices, Judicial Conference funding, and continuing education for law clerks. Penal Code training for appellate justices was the only activity considered fully implemented. In contrast, this activity was considered unfulfilled for the appellate law clerks. The remaining programs, due to limited participation, were defined as partially met. Thus, goal 5--sponsoring and conducting educational programs for appellate personnel--was partially fulfilled.

For goal 6, a fourth group to be provided training was court support personnel. Twenty scholarships were available; seven were awarded. Because of limited participation achieved in this program, goal 6--sponsoring training for court support personnel--was considered partially met.

Assessing efforts and effectiveness of JEU according to the nature of training offered (rather than according to kind of audience), it is apparent that the majority of training resources were devoted to the new Penal Code. Of the 632 persons served in in-state training programs, 454 participated in Penal Code training. This emphasis was undoubtedly valid in that proper administration of this new legal code requires an informed judiciary. JEU achievement in this area is impressive.

Other important in-state training programs were fulfilled to a lesser degree than anticipated. Most notable was the lack of orientations to be conducted for new judges of limited jurisdiction and circuit courts. Orientation committees of advisor judges were formed late in the grant and some orientation planning has been accomplished. Also, participation in continuing education was considerably less than planned, quite possibly due to limited notification of such offerings. General lack of fulfillment of objectives may also be attributed to initially limited staff. The lack of training in both of these areas must be considered serious deficiencies.

In summary, a comprehensive educational program had been planned for the JEU but this was not actualized. Successful implementation was limited to one area, Penal Code training. This was a real need of court personnel; however, other important areas of instruction were considerably neglected, i.e., orientation for new judges and continuing education at national programs.

APPENDICES

TABLE 3

Goal 3. Programs for Limited Jurisdiction Personnel:
Implementation of the objectives

Training Programs	Location/Date	Participants		Average Cost Per Attendee	Instructors	
		No./Title			No.	Average Cost Per Instructor
<u>--Objective 3.A.--</u> <u>Orientation for New Judges</u>	None	--		--	--	--
<u>--Objective 3.B.--</u> <u>Penal Code Sessions</u>						
KY County Judges Training Seminar	Louisville April 15-17, 1974	4 County Judges 1 Trial Commissioner		No cost to project	5	No cost to project
KY Penal Code Judge's Course	Richmond June 17-20, 1974	13 County Judges 10 Police Judges		\$11 (Based on 19)	7	Not available
KY Penal Code Judge's Course	Bowling Green July 29-August 1, 1974	18 County Judges 22 Police Judges		\$32 (Based on 38, only travel cost available)	7	Not available
Louisville Penal Code Course for Judges	Louisville September 4-12, 1974	19 County Judges 14 Police Judges		\$142 (Based on 18)	9	\$35 (Based on 1)
KY Penal Code Judge's Course	Somerset November 6-8, 1974	7 County Judges 6 Police Judges		\$79 (Based on 12)	9	\$56 (Based on 7)
KY Penal Code Judge's Course	Ft. Mitchell December 10-17, 1974	35 Police Judges 5 County Judges 2 Others		\$101 (Based on 10)	5	\$59 (Based on 2)
Bardstown Penal Code Seminar	Bardstown April 4, 1975	9 County Judges 3 Police Judges 26 Others		\$41 (Based on 13)	14	\$32 (Based on 8)
Harlan Penal Code Program	Harlan May 1-13, 1975	1 County Judge 13 Magistrates 7 Police Judges 21 Others		\$84 (Based on 14)	6	\$34 (Based on 3)
Paducah Penal Code Program	Paducah May 29-30, 1975	1 County Judge 2 Police Judges 3 Magistrates 26 Others		\$45 (Based on 5)	10	\$82 (Based on 2)

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

Training Programs	Location/Date	Participants		Average Cost	Instructors	
		No./Title	Per Attendee	No.	Average Cost Per Instructor	
Criminal Law and Procedure Practicum	Morehead August 21-22, 1975	4 County Judges 2 Police Judges 22 Others	\$49 (Based on 5)	11	\$34 (Based on 4)	
Criminal Law and Procedure Practicum	Ft. Mitchell September 11-12, 1975	2 County Judges 4 Police Judges 17 Others	\$74 (Based on 4)	6	\$55 (Based on 6)	
Criminal Law and Procedure Practicum	Pikeville September 25-26, 1975	1 County Judge 1 Police Judge 7 Others	\$38 (Based on 9)	3	\$38 (Based on 3)	
<u>--Objective 3.C.--</u>						
<u>General Interest Courses</u>						
Probate Matters Seminar	Bowling Green October 29-30, 1975	25 County Judges 32 Others	\$75 (Based on 26)(Extra Staff expenses \$249)	4	\$42 (Based on 4)	
City and County Judges Course (Co-Sponsored by National College of the State Judiciary, which provided all instructors)	Lexington November 21-23, 1974	27 County Judges 45 Police Judges	\$122 (Based on 64)	4	Not available	
<u>--Objective 3.D.--</u>						
<u>Continuing Education</u> (Between July and October, 1975)						
National College of the State Judiciary						
Regular 4-Week Basic		1 Judge	\$1,760 (Based on 1)			
Regular 2-Week Basic		8 Judges	\$1,825 (Based on 6)			
Graduate/Speciality 1 Week						
Speciality Sentencing Misdemeanants		2 Judges	\$780 (Based on 3)			
Probate Law Speciality Course		1 Judge				
<u>--Objective 3.E.--</u>						
<u>Seminar on Juvenile Law and Juvenile Justice System</u>						
Juvenile Court Procedures and Problems Seminar (Co-Sponsored by National College of Juvenile Court Judges, which provided 4 of 9 instructors)	Lexington June 30- July 2, 1974	22 Juvenile Judges 27 Others	\$88 (Based on 36)(Extra Conference Costs \$363)	9	\$270 (Based on 8)	

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR VISIT TO CIRCUIT COURT

If possible the advisor judge should set up a conference for the new judge with the circuit judge in the new judge's area. Also, it would be beneficial for the new judge's clerk and court administrator to meet with the circuit court clerk and circuit court administrator.

1. What are the policies and procedures on appeals?
Who handles appeals?
2. Appeal-policy, procedure,--record.
3. Bond Forfeitures?
4. Appointment of Counsel?
5. Who pays the fees of appointed counsel? Circuit or lower court?
6. Transcripts?
7. Grand jury dates? How much time is allowed between lower court case and grand jury case?
8. Property bonds and deeds? What should happen to these documents on appeal?
9. Cash bonds - who keeps the cash?
10. Domestic Cases?
11. Civil Cases?
12. Child Neglect?
13. Exhibits in Trials? Are they documented? Are they kept in a safe? Cash? Automobiles? How are they handled during trial? On Appeal? After final adjudication? Who is responsible and what is the security for exhibits?
14. Civil Commitment? Emergency Commitment? KRS 202.012.
15. Does the Circuit Court have any suggestions to make or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICE

1. In your area is there a probation and parole officer assigned to lower courts?
2. How does he operate his office? How does he serve the court?
3. Will the probation office make pre-sentencing and pre-probation investigations and reports for the judge?
4. What does he require from the judge?
5. What procedures should be followed in the event the probation office determines the defendant has or is violating the terms of his probation? How does the office notify the judge?
6. What if there is no lower court probation officer?
7. What forms are required to be sent to the State Department of Corrections?
8. Is there a volunteer probation program?
9. Conditional Discharge?
10. Work Release Program (KRS 439.179)?
11. Suspended sentence list in same county?
12. Misdemeanants can be paroled by city judges of the first three class cities and be paroled by all county judges (KRS 439.177).
13. Restitution? How to handle orders?
14. Procedure on Recognizing Defendants?
15. Does the Probation and Parole Office have any suggestions to make or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE CENTERS,
MENTAL HOSPITALS, ETC.

1. Are there social agencies with programs that would help you? (mental health, alcohol, drugs, etc.)
2. How to handle referrals to comprehensive care center? What forms are required?
3. Will they take immediate referrals? If so, how are they handled?
4. If he fails to continue in the program, how does the comprehensive center notify the court of such?
5. Will they go to jail to check a prisoner?
6. What is defendant sent to the center or hospital for?
7. Local hospitals themselves; what are their policies?
8. Who pays?
9. Health Department?
10. Transporting prisoners to these agencies - who does it - How?
11. Do these agencies have any suggestions to make or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR JAILS, PRISONS, AND DETENTION
FACILITIES FOR JUVENILES

1. What is the physical layout of the facilities?
2. Jailer releasing prisoner under some circumstances without contacting the judge?
3. What communication ground rules should be set with detention personnel? (When should jailer call the judge, for example?)
4. Authority of jailer to take or reject prisoner without a warrant? No statute on this.
5. Transportation from jail to court and back or from jail to other agencies - Who does it? How?
6. Handling Prisoner's Medication.
7. Do these agencies have any suggestions to make or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR RELATIONS WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Have policy session with local legislative body; have it understood that you, not they, will be running your court.
2. Familiarize yourself with those city ordinances or or county regulations you will be enforcing regularly.
3. Building inspector?
4. Planning and zoning ordinances? Subdivision regulations?
County Health Department regulations?
5. Licensing ordinances?
6. Does the local government have any suggestions to make or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR RELATIONS WITH PRESS AND PUBLIC

1. Does the press have set reporting policies?
2. What records will be available to the press?
3. Policy as to visits by the public (schools, civic clubs, etc.)?
4. Do these organizations have any suggestions or additional matters to discuss?

SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR RELATIONS WITH DEFENDANTS

1. Make information available about defendant's rights?
Where, at police station?

PROPOSED CHECKLIST FOR MATTERS TO BE
COVERED IN THE PRESENCE OF THE ORIENTING JUDGE

- I. Review of materials in Orientation Packet.
- II. Determine experience of new judge.
- III. Court Administration
 1. Calendar management
 2. Juror and witness management
 3. Jail reports
 4. Record keeping
 5. Financial management
 6. Space and equipment management
 7. Relations with other courts
 8. Relations with Judicial Council, Administrative Director of Courts, and Department of Justice
 9. Public information and press relations
- IV. Court Procedure
 1. Explain the jurisdiction of his court
 2. Explain court procedure, using the Bench Manual and the Orientation Packet procedural outlines as guidelines.
- V. Stress Professional Ethics, Explain the Ethical Pitfalls that await a judge
- VI. Urge Him to Constantly Continue his Judicial Education

ORIENTATION PACKET CONTENTS
(Final Draft)

I. Introductory Letter

(From Orientation Committee and Division of Judicial Training)

II. Handout Materials

1. Current Lower Court Bench Manual
2. Criminal Law of Kentucky Annotated
3. Kentucky Criminal Law Manual
4. Penal Code Notebooks
5. A.B.A. Standards Relating to the Function of the Trial Judge
6. (For Juvenile Court Judges):
Handbook for New Juvenile Court Judges, Regnal W. Garff,
National Council of Juvenile Court Judges
7. Criminal Law Outline (1973), National College of the State
Judiciary
8. Palmore's Instructions to Juries (1974)
9. The Code of Professional Responsibility (1975) and The Code
of Judicial Conduct (1975), American Bar Association
10. Trial Judges Guide - Objections to Evidence (1974),
E. Gardner Brownlee
11. Sample forms and jury instructions
12. Contempt materials
13. Outline of criminal procedure, from arrest through appeal,
keyed to Rules of Criminal Procedure
14. Outline of civil procedure, from filing of suit through
appeal, keyed to Rules of Civil Procedure
15. Most recent issues of Kentucky Legal Information Service
Newsletter
16. "Summary of Recent Court Decisions," Division of Judicial
Training
17. Article on Kentucky Criminal Justice System (emphasizing
agencies, their locations, functions, etc.), to be prepared
by Division of Judicial Training and Kentucky Legal Infor-
mation Service
18. Brochure on Division of Judicial Training
19. Calendar of Judicial Training and Education Courses
20. KACCJS & G Task Force Reports on Court, Corrections, or
Juveniles
21. Drivers License and Motor Vehicle Regulations

III. Reference List

1. Black's Law Dictionary
2. Constitutional Rights of the Accused: Trial Rights,
Joseph G. Cook

3. Constitutional Rights of the Accused: Pretrial Rights,
Joseph G. Cook
4. Criminal Justice System (1973), Hazel B. Kerper
5. Kentucky Criminal Law (1974), Kathleen F. Brickey
6. Kentucky Criminal Practice (1975), David Murrell
7. Kentucky Law of Evidence, Richardson
8. Kentucky Penal Code Final Draft (With Commentary, 1971),
Kentucky Crime Commission and Legislative Research
Commission
9. Law and Child Advocacy in Kentucky Juvenile Courts (1973),
Mortimer Stamm
10. McCormick on Evidence
11. Federal Rules of Evidence, Paul F. Rothstein
12. "Ethics Opinions" and "Unauthorized Practice Opinions,"
Kentucky Bar Association - Baldwin's Kentucky Revised
Statutes, Volume VII
13. National Law Week

TABLE 5

Goal 4. Programs for Circuit Court Personnel:
Implementation of the objectives

Training Programs	Location/Date	Participants		Average Cost	Instructors	
		No./Title		Per Attendee	No.	Average Cost Per Instructor
--Objective 4.A.--						
<u>Orientation for New Judges</u>	None	--		--	--	--
--Objective 4.B.--						
<u>Penal Code Sessions</u>						
KY Circuit Court Judge's Program	Louisville January 8-10, 1975	61 Judges 1 Law Clerk		\$110 (Based on 54) Extra Conference Costs \$400	8	\$79 (Based on 1)
Bardstown Penal Code Seminar	Bardstown April 4, 1975	4 Judges		\$41 (Based on 3)	See Table 3: Penal Code, Bardstown	
Criminal Law and Procedure Practicum	Morehead August 21-22, 1975	2 Judges		Not available	See Table 3: Penal Code, Morehead	
--Objective 4.C.--						
<u>Continuing Education at National Programs</u>						
National College of the State Judiciary						
Regular 4-week Basic		3 Judges		\$1315 (Based on 1)		
Regular 2-week Basic		1 Judge		\$520 (Tuition only)		
Graduate/Speciality: 1 week Graduate Evidence II		1 Judge		\$699 (Based on 1)		
Graduate/Speciality: 2 weeks New Trends in the Law		3 Judges		\$1138 (Based on 3)		
American Academy of Judicial Education						
Judiciary Writing 1 week		1 Judge		\$664		

TABLE 5 (Cont.)

Training Programs	Location/Date	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Instructors</u>	
		No./Title	Average Cost Per Attendee	No.	Average Cost Per Instructor
American Law Institute					
Federal Rules 3 days		1 Judge	\$295		
University of Kentucky					
Federal Rules 2 days	June 20-21, 1975	1 Judge	\$55		
--Objective 4.D.--					
<u>Judicial Conference</u>	Louisville May 21-23, 1975	70 Judges		6	

TABLE 7

Goal 5. Programs for Appellate Court Personnel:
Implementation of the objectives

Training Programs	Location/Date	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Instructors</u>	
		No./Title	Average Cost Per Attendee	No.	Average Cost Per Instructor
<u>--Objective 5.A.--</u>					
<u>Penal Code Session</u>					
KY Circuit Court Judge's Program	Louisville January 8-10, 1975	4 Justices 4 Commissioners 1 Law Clerk	Not available	See Table 5:	Penal Code, Louisville
<u>--Objective 5.B.--</u>					
<u>Continuing Education at National Education Programs</u>					
National College of the State Judiciary					
Graduate/Speciality New Trends in Law	2 weeks July, 1975	1 Justice	\$955		
New York University Law School Appellate Judge's Seminar		1 Justice	Not available		
<u>--Objective 5.C.--</u>					
<u>Judicial Conference</u>	Louisville May 21-23, 1975	5 Justices and Commissioners		6	
<u>--Objective 5.D.--</u>					
<u>Continuing Education</u>	Louisiana State University Aug- ust, 1975	6 Law Clerks	\$125-Registration fees; remaining costs unavailable		

TABLE 8

Goal 6: Programs for Court Support Personnel:
Implementation of the objective

Position of Participant	Courses Attended	Cost
Court Administrator Fayette Circuit Court	Jury Management Seminar Institute for Court Management Aspen, Colorado (4 days)	\$604
Court Administrator Jefferson Circuit Court	Court Administration Institute for Court Management San Fransisco, California (5 days)	Not available
Court Coordinator Jefferson Circuit Court	Court Administration Institute for Court Management San Fransisco, California (5 days)	Not available
Director of Court Referral Program Owensboro	Court Referral Mills College Oakland, California (3 days)	\$390
Circuit Clerk Simpson County	Court Administration Western Kentucky University Bowling Green, Kentucky (1 semester)	\$116
Circuit Clerk Allen County	Court Administration Western Kentucky University Bowling Green, Kentucky (1 semester)	Not available
Circuit Clerk Warren County	Court Administration Western Kentucky University Bowling Green, Kentucky (1 semester)	Not available

JUDICIAL EDUCATION UNIT PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

Participant questionnaires were administered at four of the JEU seminars: the Richmond and Bowling Green Penal Code sessions, the Probate Law and Practice seminar and the Juvenile Law and Justice System conference. Results are available and presented for the first three conferences; records on the latter conference are not available.

The questionnaire for the Penal Code sessions (attached) obtained ratings on the material--its value and relevance, the presentations, use of time, facilities, and recommendations. Speaker ratings--best and least liked--were also requested. Finally, comments and criticisms were probed.

At the Richmond Penal Code Session, 10 of the 23 attendees (43%) completed an evaluation of the conference. Both the mean and modal scores on the various aspects of questionnaire were highly positive (see table below). Taking all the questions together, the mean score was a 1.4 (1 was the highest positive score; 10 was the lowest or most negative score). The overall modal response, the score most frequently given, was a 1--or the highest possible score. (Modal values as well as mean values are presented for comparison since the data are skewed considerably in the direction of high positive values.)

Comments were highly complimentary; several participants suggested that such courses were needed by themselves as well as others in the system. Several suggested that more time on the whole would have been useful, as well as more time for discussions after the sessions.

At the Bowling Green Penal Code session, 70% (27) of the attendees completed a questionnaire. Again, the respondents gave high positive scores on the various aspects of the conference.

The majority of comments were highly complimentary to the quality of speakers and material. As at Richmond, the need for such education for judges as well as other court support personnel was noted. Criticism centered on the interjection of too much personal observation by the attendees.

Speaker ratings were subsequently used by the JEU in the selection of instructors for later sessions. Few speakers received negative remarks from the participants.

Below are the average scores (means and modes) for each of the questions at the Richmond and Bowling Green Penal Code Sessions.

	<u>Richmond</u>		<u>Bowling Green</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
1. Extent that course material was valuable	1	1	1.1	1
2. Extent that course material was relevant	1.5	1	1.9	1
3. Adequacy of presentations	1.7	1	1.9	1
4. Time used effectively	1.6	1	1.7	1
5. Facilities adequate	1.5	1	1.1	1
6. Extent that you would recommend to others	1	1	1.1	1

Scale: 1=Positive to 10=Negative

There were 57 attendees at the Probate Law Seminar; 30 (53%) completed questionnaire (attached). The classroom presentations, written material, and overall quality of the session were rated as very good. Average scores in terms of the type of knowledge gained are listed below.

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
1. Obtained legal knowledge	5.1	5
2. Obtained new skills (practices and techniques)	5.0	7
3. Obtained new insights into court practices	5.4	8
4. Obtained an awareness of standards that serve as guidelines of judicial practices	5.2	6-7 (double modes)

Rating Scale: 1=None 4-5=Moderate Knowledge
 2-3=Slight Knowledge 6-7=Great Knowledge

Comments were overwhelmingly in praise of the program. Several suggested that county and probate clerks could use such a course. Suggestions that were made: a need for presentation of more cases, the usefulness of trips and evening seminars, the need for more literature and topics, and less repetition of subjects.

The JEU requested that noteworthy topics be suggested for future sessions and asked for those willing to teach in the future.

In summary, the responses to these questionnaires appear to indicate that the participants in these JEU programs were satisfied with the sessions and the material offered. The often-cited need for this type of educational opportunity appears to commend the JEU's efforts.

PENAL CODE SESSION

QUESTIONNAIRE

My official position is:

_____ Circuit Court Judge

_____ City or Police Court Judge

_____ County Court Judge

_____ Trial Commissioner

Other (specify) _____

Do you hold a law degree? _____

1. To what extent do you think the course material will be valuable to you?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

2. To what extent has the course material been relevant to your needs?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

3. Was the presentation adequate?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

4. To what extent was the time spent used effectively?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

5. Were the facilities adequate?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

6. To what extent would you recommend this course to other judges?

_____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____
Positive Negative

7. In order of preference, which speakers in this course would you most like to hear again?

8. Which speakers would you least like to hear again?

9. Do you have any other comments, observations or criticisms concerning this course?

10. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
 DIVISION OF JUDICIAL TRAINING
 PROBATE LAW AND PRACTICE SEMINAR

OCTOBER 29-30, 1975

Please fill out and return this form before receiving your diploma. Circle the number of your response or write your response in the space provided.

1. Rate each of the following elements applicable to the overall program:

	<u>Poor</u>		<u>Average</u>		<u>Very Good</u>		
A. Classroom presentations (lectures, discussions)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
B. Written materials, if any	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
C. Overall rating of this program	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)

2. Indicate how the course compared with your expectations:

	<u>None</u>		<u>Slight</u>		<u>Moderate</u>		<u>Great</u>
A. Obtained legal knowledge	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
B. Obtained new skills (practices and techniques)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
C. Obtained new insights into court practices	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
D. Obtained an awareness of standards that serve as guidelines of judicial practices	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)

3. A. Please list the topics, if any, you feel should not be offered in future programs:

B. Please list the subjects you feel should be included in future programs:

4. What changes would you recommend be made in the organizational format of the sessions? (i.e., increase or decrease the number of topics, discussion groups, include field trips and workshops, evening seminars, etc.)

5. A. Have you ever been a practicing attorney?

(1) Yes (2) No

B. If so, circle how long you practiced law.

(1) less than 2 years

(2) 2 - 4 years

(3) 4 - 6 years

(4) 7 - 10 years

(5) over 10 years

6. A. Have you ever done any teaching?

(1) Yes (2) No

B. If yes, in what areas?

(1) Undergraduate

(2) Graduate

(3) Law School

(4) Continuing Legal or Judicial Education

(5) Other _____

C. In what subject area(s)?

D. Would you like to be considered as a part-time instructor for one or more of our own seminars in an area of your choice?

(1) Yes

(2) No

7. General Comments:

END

7 abcs/mre