

WINGS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFERENCE SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20531

11527

ended

For Defense Manufacturers

National Center



SPECIALIZED DEFENDER MANAGEMENT

TRAINING PROGRAM

Management Training
by
Dru Scott Associates
106 Point Lobos
San Francisco, CA 94121

NCJRS

APR 6 1977

December, 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Coordinated By

The National Center for Defense Management (NCDM)

a project of the

National Legal Aid and Defender Association
2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20037

NCDM Staff
Coordinators
William R. Higham, Esq.
Norma E. Emery

This report was prepared under LEAA Grant Number 75-DF-99-0008.

This report was prepared by the National Center for Defense Management, a project of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, pursuant to a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice.

Organizations undertaking such projects under a federal government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this report do not necessarily represent the official position of the Department of Justice. The grantee is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material presented in this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.	i
Foreword	ii
Executive Summary.	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PROGRAM CONCEPT.	2
A. Problems to be Addressed	2
B. Educational Methodology.	4
C. Technology Transfer: The Use of Proven and Appropriate Approaches Developed for Business, Industry and Government.	5
III. PROGRAM DESIGN	6
A. Program Format	6
B. Program Approach	6
C. Program Content.	8
IV. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION.	10
A. Student Participants; Registration	10
B. Course Materials	11
C. First (September) Session: "Focus on Analysis".	11
D. Between Sessions	13
E. Second (October) Session: "Focus on Implementation"	13
F. The Training Program as Technical Assistance to Defender Offices.	14
APPENDICES	
A. Program Announcement	15
B. Managerial Problems or Areas of Interest of Students Discussed.	18
C. Classroom Outlines of Typical Defender Management Problem Areas Identified and Discussed by Groups	21
D. Bibliography of Recommended Readings for Students.	28
E. Student Feedback	31

PREFACE

The National Center for Defense Management is grateful to Dru Scott and Dr. Jim Morgan for organizing and presenting a sophisticated management training program to defender managers which allowed, for the first time on a national scale, the use of complex behavioral science models for the improvement of management in the preponderance of defender offices in the United States.

FOREWORD

The National Center for Defense Management (NCDM) was founded late in 1974 through a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to the National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA). NCDM was born out of the need to enhance and improve the efficiency of systems for the defense of the poor through sound planning, management assistance and management training, and to maximize the quality of such systems while maintaining their cost-effectiveness.

Under the terms of the LEAA grant awarded to NLADA, the principal goals of the National Center for Defense Management are as follows:

- To conduct management studies and analyses of the operations of existing defender offices and other defense delivery systems, with a view to making practical recommendations which will assist such offices and systems in achieving goals of improved effectiveness, and conduct evaluations of such offices and systems;
- To provide management consultation and technical assistance for defender offices and organized defense systems requesting such services, assisting these offices and systems in their efforts to design and implement improved management systems and procedures;
- To provide management training programs designed specifically for defender managers; and
- To furnish technical assistance to organizations, communities, states or other groups which desire to establish new or improved systems (including defender systems) for the provision of legal representation to eligible criminally accused or convicted persons, or persons facing juvenile court proceedings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The implication of judicial opinion on the availability of legal defense services to indigent criminal defendants pursuant to the Sixth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution has had a significant impact on communities throughout the United States which are attempting to provide such representation in a cost effective manner. In many of these communities, defender systems have been created to achieve these goals; such systems have often expanded at a rapid rate, creating significant management problems.

The National Center for Defense Management (NCDM) has attempted to come to grips with this problem by providing an opportunity for the defender-managers administering the preponderance of defender systems throughout the United States to learn modern management methods through the application of tested behavioral science models.

The project grant provided for the conduct of management training; NCDM, in an effort to maximize the utility of such training, brought together the defenders who manage the major portion of the defender programs in the United States, with a view toward proliferating enlightened management throughout the total defender effort.

Nature of the Technical Assistance

NCDM prepared a conceptual design for training fulltime professional defender attorneys who manage defender offices which, collectively, contain the preponderance of defenders in the United States. Since these were mainly large offices/systems, the organizational behavior model was chosen as the vehicle which could most effectively demonstrate enlightened management and lead to the improvement of defender management style.

The management problems identified as typical of medium and large
size defender offices were:

- Failure to establish measurable and attainable goals and objectives;
- Failure of internal and external communication procedures;
- Diminished productivity due to lack of proper time and resource management programs;
- Failure to properly balance authority and responsibility; failure to delegate these where span of control problems prevailed; and
- Failure to perceive the qualitative impact of rapid office/system growth.

The training program was developed because no such program was available to defender managers on a national scale.

NCDM established six major goals for this training program:

- Maintaining ways to cope with the demands for high production in the defender office without losing sensitivity to the mandate of providing service to the client.
- Learning to work under stress.
- Learning to deal with clients who have a sense of personal failure.
- Learning to respond to rapidly changing priorities.
- Demonstrating the need for perception of the changing role of the defender-manager in a rapidly expanding office/system.
- Demonstrating capabilities for resolving conflicting demands on time.

Procedures

In order to maximize the performance objectives of the program, it was divided into two sessions. The first session focused on problem identification and definition while the second session was devoted to deriving specific solutions to such problems. The period of time between sessions (one month) was used by

the students to analyze a specific problem in their office and be prepared to provide options for solutions thereto.

Report Preparation

A report was prepared which described the training program, as follows:

- Program Concept
- Program Design
- Program Description

Impact narratives from each of the students, dictated at the close of the training program, were included in the report as an evaluation component.

Impact Summary

While the use of complex behavioral science models for the demonstration of how to apply enlightened management does not lend itself readily to performance-oriented instruction, the student narratives appear to demonstrate that the alteration of perception from administrative technician to manager of programs provides a cost-effective means of diffusing sound management style throughout a structure of professional public service executives. The accomplishment of such goals through the use of a series of management skill development seminars would prove to be significantly more costly and time consuming.

I
INTRODUCTION

When the National Center for Defense Management was initially funded in 1974, one of the stated goals carried into effect by the grant award was that the Center should provide management training for defender offices.

Since the National College of Criminal Defense Lawyers and Public Defenders had commenced sponsorship of management seminars oriented on skill development, it was decided to use a different approach. A professional management training firm (Dru Scott Associates of San Francisco) which specialized in training and managerial problem-solving for business, industry and government was retained. They agreed to research the applicability of their specialized methods to the unique problems of defenders and defender management. This culminated in a program held in late 1975; a program which stressed to defender manager attendees not only the imparting of information but also the actual development of managerial styles.

PROGRAM CONCEPT

A. Problems to be Addressed

Defender programs are, for the most part, organizations of professional and supportive staff, generally fulltime and generally salaried. They are public service institutions, as distinguished from profit-making business entities, and therefore operate on the basis of budgets of varying degrees of rigidity which are usually fixed by, or in conjunction with, discussions with funding sources.

Most defender programs of any size will have tables of organization of personnel, structural procedures and established responsibilities. Many will have systems of branch offices.

In terms of personnel strength, defender offices may vary in size from one attorney and one secretary to organizations of several hundred attorneys and almost equal numbers of supportive staff (e.g., clerical, administrative, investigative, social service and paralegal). There are an estimated four hundred-plus programs and six hundred or so defender offices¹ in the United States as of 1975. About thirty programs had more than fifty fulltime personnel; it is estimated that less than twenty programs were representing over half the defender program clients in the United States.²

Therefore, it follows that fairly clearly, well over half of this country's defender office clients are being served by institutions within

¹By program we mean unified organizations under a single top management, whether operating out of one or more branches. By office, we mean either the branches of programs or programs operating out of a single location.

²This was determined through an informal survey conducted preparatory to a management study by NCDM. Data was supplied by NLADA's Indigent Defense Systems Analysis Project and through NCDM research. Assigned counsel program clients were not considered in this survey.

which the dynamics of organizational behavior occur. The success or failure of such institutions in achieving high quality representation for clients will, in such instances, no longer depend solely on the degree of professional skill of the staff involved and the amount of resources available, but will also depend, in a major way, on the quality of the management of these institutions.

The management problems which beset larger defender programs³ are characteristic of those which beset service institutions, business and government. They typically include such things as:

- Failure to establish measurable and attainable goals and objectives;
- Failure of communication, both internal and external;
- Diminished productivity caused by failure to apply advanced principles of time management and resource management;
- Internal disorganization and "bottlenecks" caused by failure to assign or delegate responsibility; and
- Size problems, particularly where rapid growth has occurred, with concomitant, unperceived qualitative changes in the organization accompanying the more obvious quantitative changes.

However, some notable areas of difficulty which particularly characterize defender organizations and which arise out of their very essence as teams of trial lawyers and supportive staff engaged in a vigorous adversary process in which perhaps their principle role can be described as functioning as critics of the positions taken by law enforcement and the prosecution, and, under law, to use the judicial process to their client's advantage; they may include the following:

³For a more complete discussion of the problems of defender management, see The Defender Office: Making Managers Out of Lawyers, NLADA Briefcase, Vol. XXXIII, Number 12, October, 1975.

- Courtroom behavior is brought back to the office and infiltrates the managerial process;
- The negativism which the defense must use with such frequency toward the prosecution's position becomes a personality style which, in the office, can defeat creative management and damage interpersonal relationships within the organization;
- Management itself primarily consists of trial-lawyers-turned-administrators, usually with no management training and too often with no awareness of the contributions management science has to offer them in their new roles.

The specialized Defender Management Training Program sponsored by NCDM in 1975 was specifically tailored to address all of these problems.

B. Educational Methodology

It was determined at an early stage in planning that, since the target student group would consist for the most part of defender managers who had little or no formal education in management sciences and therefore had little to build on other than their own often limited experiences, the program objectives should stress individual management style improvement rather than rely on a lecture series in which information is conveyed. It was recognized that long-term permanent major management style improvement might require years of such training; with the knowledge of some success in the business world of effective, short-term organizational development programs application, a brief, high-impact program that would demonstrate, through the benefits to be derived from management science applications and motivate the students to explore this new realm of knowledge further, was selected.

The lecture-demonstration-application method of teaching was planned.

Students would be presented with factual data (lectures, discussions, movies), would see the managerial principles in operation in the classroom (small group dynamics, role-playing) and would put their learning into practice by either engaging in problem solving in a group setting or individually. For maximum benefit, both group and individual problems were to be those selected by the students as those constituting real defender program management problems.

C. Technology Transfer: The Use of Proven and Appropriate Approaches Developed For Business, Industry and Government

Typically, the legal profession has tended to turn to its own initiatives for expertise when education and training have been necessary. Defenders have been no exception; yet, among lawyers generally and defenders in particular, the management sciences and organizational behavior tend to be little understood and practiced in a marginally adequate manner.

Accordingly, it was decided to contract with a professional management training firm with a successful record in addressing the problems of business, industry and government to conduct the training program. With the wide spectrum of management training approaches in this field, what was needed was a firm capable of zeroing-in on the management problem areas particularly characteristic of defender programs. Because of the high degree to which such programs are affected by courtroom style of professional staff and underlying professional styles based on negativism, a firm was selected which used the principles of transactional analysis in teaching and problem solving in the management area.

PROGRAM DESIGN

A. Program Format

In order to maximize the educational impact of the program, it was decided to hold the program in two sessions. While this substantially increased student travel costs and compounded the risk of attendance attrition, it was determined that an instructional session, followed by actual practice by the students back on the job at their offices, followed by a second instructional and mutual feedback session would further assure learning; this design was used to increase student incentive to accomplish specific assignments between sessions and, on their return, have their performances in accomplishing these assignments analyzed and supplemental questions answered. Attendance attrition was low.

In order to further stimulate group and individual interaction, it was decided to make the program residential in nature. The Illinois Beach Lodge at Zion, Illinois, was selected. The daily rate for room and meals was well within the maximums allowed under Federal regulations and the site was quite remote, though pleasant and conducive to thought and reflection; it was free from the distractions which can interfere with a program of this type. Since the program site was within two hours drive from the Chicago O'Hare Airport and since the Lodge provided free transportation to and from the airport, it was possible to assemble students and faculty at the Lodge at a fairly definite time and to disperse at a fixed hour.

B. Program Approach

The faculty of the training firm designed a program in which, during its two sessions, student participants were to explore and practice a number

of practical approaches to common defender office problems. In preparation for the training program, the faculty of the training firm visited defender offices, talked to defender managers and did research into problem areas characteristic of or unique to such defender offices. Planned exploration and practice at the two sessions was designed to address, among other things, the following:

- Maintaining ways to cope with the demands for high production in the defender office without turning it into a factory to "process" its clients;
- Working with stress;
- Figuring out ways of dealing with people (both staff and clients) who have decided to be "losers" no matter what;
- Responding to rapidly-changing priorities;
- Productively organizing for the changing role of the defender manager; and
- Resolving conflicting demands on time.

The first three-day meeting was conducted from Thursday noon, September 11, 1975 through Saturday, 5 p.m., September 13, 1975, with a night session on the first day; the second two-day meeting was conducted from Wednesday noon, October 22, 1975 through Friday noon, October 24, 1975. The period between sessions was used to allow each participant an opportunity to put the information gathered by them during the first session into practice on their job. The six-week interval between sessions was felt to be long enough to permit effective problem-solving and yet short enough to prevent loss of continuity and/or attendance attrition. The second session was designed primarily for feedback by participants on their use of the techniques learned in improving their managerial skills and addressing problem areas. It also permitted them

to receive further assistance either directly from the faculty or through small or plenary group discussion based on difficulties they might have encountered in attempting to apply their learning.

The program series was designed specifically to emphasize a transference of the abilities that make a person a successful trial attorney to the current management situation of each participant in order to assist such participants in deciding what new management skills needed to be learned and practiced by them thereafter.

C. Program Content

The topics selected which were believed to be potentially helpful in improving the quality of defender office management and the quality of legal services delivered by them included the following:

- Cutting down time wasted on unproductive individual styles, both in and out of the courtroom;
- Taking a look at judge-prosecution-defender relationships to see if they encourage behavior which may, if carried into the defender office, affect office operations;
- Working with people who don't understand or appreciate the service you are providing them;
- Practicing techniques for working with people who feel insecure.
- Seeing what rewards people are out to get--both positive and negative;
- Understanding what kind of recognition people want and taking the necessary action;
- Dealing with problems caused by rapid growth;
- Enabling people to manage more by objectives than by crises;

- Questioning people to spot the real problems;
- Attracting and developing people who will be productive in a defender office;
- Organizing work to increase the opportunities of attorneys to get long term professional job satisfaction;
- Practicing a winning management style;
- Working with expanding priorities in tight money periods; and
- Looking at some techniques that one can use to manage the flow of paper.

IV

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. Student Participants; Registration

Both precedents set by the National College of Criminal Defense Lawyers and Public Defenders (NCCDLPD) and the terms of the NCDM grant award dictated a program under whose terms all or most of the participants would attend on scholarships; i.e., most of their tuition, subsistence and transportation would be paid for with grant funds. It was decided, initially, to charge a \$100 registration fee; later, after reviewing the financial circumstances of some applicants and following NCCDLPD examples, this was reduced to \$50 for all attendees. Separate accounting was maintained for such registration fees.

Because of the nature of the program and considerations of cost-effectiveness, it was decided to give first priority in terms of attendance to defender managers administering larger offices or units within offices. However, the initial applicants included managers of some smaller offices, and a number of these were included. In order to minimize travel expense, applicants were sought from states east of the Rocky Mountains. A few applications from defender managers from western offices were accepted. Prioritization was also necessary because of the contracting training firm's limitations on the number of students to a maximum of twenty-seven; this permitted five small groups of about five students each, a manageable number for the two-member faculty. One NCDM representative was also included and participated during sessions for evaluation purposes.

The average number of personnel supervised by students was thirty-eight. Their collective supervisory responsibilities, it was estimated, implied their overseeing the expenditure of utilization of an aggregate total of from \$15

to \$20 million in public funds annually. Of the nineteen offices represented, twelve had twenty or more employees and eight had fifty or more. Two had over two hundred. Of the twenty-seven registrants, twenty-five were attorneys.

B. Course Materials

At the first (September) session of the program, students were each given a copy of the following publications:

"The Effective Executive", by Peter F. Drucker
Harper and Row, New York, 1966

"Criminal Justice--The Consumer's Perspective", by
Jonathan D. Casper, U.S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA-NILE,
U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972

Students were requested to read both of these publications between sessions; classroom discussions and debate held during the second session indicated that most of them had done so.

At the close of the second session, students were each given a copy of the following publication:

"Effective Management By Objectives: The 3-D Method of MBO",
by W.J. Reddin, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.

C. First (September) Session: "Focus on Analysis"

At the opening meeting, students introduced themselves and became familiar with each other's names, offices and general backgrounds. They were grouped together at tables of about five each; group membership was changed from time to time. Candor was encouraged and was forthcoming.

The faculty gave an overview of the principles and terminology of transactional analysis as relevant to business/service organizational functions, and encouraged the students to become comfortable with transactional analysis (TA) terminology, (parent-adult-child communication levels, positive and

negative stroking and the various "Bernian games" commonly found in employment situations). A motion picture, "Transactional Analysis and Management" (CRM Productions) was shown to illustrate typical work situations in which "game playing" impaired effectiveness and productivity.

The dynamics of the "Victim-Persecutor-Rescuer" role perception and its application in organizations was discussed and illustrated.

Discussions of communication methodology and techniques followed. The Peter F. Drucker Productions film, "Time Management," was shown and discussion of the relevance of the points illustrated in the movie, which featured the harried, non-delegating executive, to typical defender office operations was explored.

Students had been requested in advance of their attendance at the first (September) session to bring three things with them: a copy of their office's current budget, a copy of its table of organization and a management problem they had which they would like to work on as part of the program. During unstructured discussion periods, budgets and tables of organization were compared and commented upon, and "personal management problems" were posted in the classroom for both private, written and oral comment and subsequent group discussion.

Faculty, during the three day session, also engaged in personal counseling of students who had listed problems.

A list of the individual management problems listed by students is contained in Appendix B; for obvious reasons, anonymity has been preserved.

Many of the problems cited involved difficulties centering on interpersonal relationships between individuals at different management levels. Situations were explored through role-playing, with students performing spontaneously in the parts of the two or more managers or staff involved.

Significantly, a number of the students concluded during the first session that they in large part were the problem, and sought direction for self-improvement in areas of difficulty. However, given the propensity of criminal defense lawyers to adopt negativistic postures, the faculty emphasized that such self-awareness could not be allowed to rest as a final assessment but had to be utilized as a starting point for positive achievement*.

In accordance with the program design, the concluding position of the first session consisted of the enumeration of a series of generally recognized defender management problems and the selection by each five-member group of one of these for "analysis" and report-back to the plenary session. Each group was asked to analyze its chosen problem and to ask itself why the causes thereof tended to persist. Copies of selected problems and group worksheets are to be found in Appendix C of this report.

Several of the groups attempted to "leap" from problem identification to solutions without going through the analysis phase; this may be illustrative of a common problem relating to managerial problem-solving in the defender office. This phenomenon was discussed at the final plenary meeting of the first session.

D. Between Sessions

Between the first (September) and second (October) sessions, the training firm and NCDM staff maintained communication with students, furnished them with a list of suggested reading matter (see Appendix D) and transmitted reminders to students to complete their assignments prior to the second session.

E. Second (October) Session: "Focus on Implementation"

The second session theme appeared to follow noted management expert Peter Drucker's maxim, "Build on strengths; render weaknesses irrelevant."

The attendance attrition between the first and second sessions was low for defender programs. Of the twenty-seven original registrants, twenty-three returned and completed the program. Much of the second session was occupied with student reports on their problem-solving efforts, with respect to their selected problems, between the two sessions. The vast majority of them had clearly engaged in such problem-solving, using analytical approaches and techniques learned at the first session. Time was also allotted to student feedback as to what they had learned about their own areas of managerial strengths, and how they intended to build upon these.

During the late afternoon and evening prior to the final day of the second session, most of the students agreed to individually tape-recorded evaluation reports in which they discussed in varying degrees of detail the applications they had made of principles learned in the program. Transcripts of these taped interviews are contained in Appendix E of this report.

F. The Training Program as Technical Assistance to Defender Offices

A review of the transcripts of taped interviews of students contained in Appendix E of this report indicates that this training program substantially exceeded its original goal of simply providing education for defender managers. It appeared to effectively furnish actual technical assistance to many or most of the nineteen defender organizations represented at the sessions, at a fraction of the cost required to send consultant teams to the various offices to achieve the same results.

APPENDIX A
Program Announcement

Specialized Defender
Management Training Program

September 11-13 and October 22-24, 1975
Illinois Beach Lodge, Zion, Illinois



National Center for
Defense Management

a project of

The National Legal Aid
and Defender Association
2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 452-0620

(Program leaders are Dru Scott Associates, San Francisco, consultants to management. NCDM and program funding provided by a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice.)

NIADA
NCDM
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

First Class

APPLICATION TO ATTEND PROGRAM

Name _____	Position in Office _____
Name of Office _____	
Address of Office _____	
City _____ State _____ Zip _____	
Number of Staff in Office (Organization) _____	Number of Staff Supervised by Me _____
Summary of Managerial Duties _____	

I am accepted as a student in this program. I agree to attend all parts of both sessions (September 11-13, October 22-24) in person, and to participate fully in such programs including conference with the management training consultants in the performance of assignments required by them before, during, and after the above dates. I will also pay the \$100 registration fee required of all applicants. I understand that if my application is not accepted at the time, this fee will be refunded. If my application is not accepted at this time, I wish to be considered for "standby" or "alternate" status and possibly recontacted if a scholarship to this program becomes available.

Date _____ Signature _____

APPENDIX B
Managerial Problems or Areas of Interest
of Students Discussed

Managerial Problems or Areas of Interest
of Students Discussed

How to develop a case reporting system

Case management/weighting

How do you provide constructive criticism
without negative stroking?

Problem of incurring communication and sense
of community among staff located in geograph-
ically separated offices

A supervising attorney who has great
potential is not leading, setting examples,
etc. What to do?

Interrelationship between top management,
middle management and staff lawyers.

Improving staff morale so that attorney
effectiveness is delivered by way of excellent
legal services to the client

How to implement continuity of representation

The small office: How to structure assign-
ment of caseloads

How to limit the cases in your office so you
have an acceptable caseload consistent with
the current staff

Morale and enthusiasm; how to develop

Conflicting desires on my part

- (a) to interfere in matters delegated to
others, and
- (b) when I don't interfere, to be hypercritical
when something is (perhaps predictably)
done wrong (pulling chestnuts out of the
fire)

Determining what rewards need to be given to
attorneys and how to promote; i.e., seniority
vs. merit

How to establish attorney effectiveness
measurements

How to break out of the "harried executive"
syndrome; how to achieve staff motivation

Time management; caseload management;
delegation of responsibilities

How to achieve measurement of effective
representation

Providing adequate supervision to provide
quality control

Motivating staff attorneys to achieve
maximum effectiveness and efficiency to
(a) provide best possible representation of
clients, and
(b) function as a team member vis-a-vis the
tracking and scheduling of cases

How to determine effectiveness of representation

Improving the morale of the investigator

Motivation of attorneys to remain on staff
(most specifically, setting proper "positive"
tone in the office)

Case management

How to delegate the handling of emergency court-
related problems with general guidelines

How to effectively utilize staff and reduce the
increasing volume of paperwork

Data collection

How to avoid playing the game of "harried executive?"
Can I be a supervisor and a practicing attorney at
the same time?

APPENDIX C

Classroom Outlines of Typical
Defender Management Problem Areas
Identified and Discussed by Groups

GROUP DISCUSSION REPORT-BACK OUTLINE: PROBLEM 1

I. OFFICE MORALE IS AFFECTED BY:

- (1) Compensation
- (2) Physical Plant
- (3) Hours
- (4) Supervisor/Lawyer Relationship
- (5) What Assistance Available
- (6) Peer Group Relationship
- (7) Travel Time
- (8) Time for Preparation
- (9) Work Distribution
- (10) Win/Lose Syndrome
- (11) Reporting Requirements
- (12) Emotional Release
- (13) Participation in Decision Making
- (14) Promotion Possibilities
- (15) External Acceptance

II. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

- (1), (2), (3) Comparable or better than D.A. or Private Bar
- (4) Stroke for Stroke
- (5) Awareness of Needs and Resources
- (6) Be Aware of Cliques and Relationships
- (7) Minimize Logistical Problem
- (8) Plan Into Schedule
- (9) Show Your Recognition
- (10) P/R - Stroking - Counseling
- (11) Keep to Absolute Minimum
- (12) Social Functions
- (13) Staff Meetings Regularly
Inform
- (14) Select System and Inform
- (15) P/R and Peer Loyalty

GROUP DISCUSSION REPORT-BACK OUTLINE 2

EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION, MOTIVATION & DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF FOR THE
SMALL PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE

I. MOTIVATION

- A. Involvement and Exposure of Support Staff to Criminal Justice System
- B. Creating Team Spirit
- C. Meaningful Communication
- D. Recognition

II. DEVELOPMENT & UTILIZATION

- A. Training Program by Example and Observation
- B. Attendance at Professional Seminars
- C. Setting Attainable Goals
- D. Cross Assignment of Support Staff
- E. Increased Responsibility with Increased Development
- F. Staff Meetings

GROUP DISCUSSION REPORT-BACK OUTLINE 3

ORGANIZING LIMITED RESOURCES TO HANDLE EXCESSIVE CASELOAD

I. WHY?

- A. Relieve Administrators
- B. Create More Responsible Attorneys
- C. Provide More Effective Representation
- D. Maximizing Efficiency of Attorneys

II. HOW TO

A. Recognizing Resources

- 1. Physical makeup of office, i.e., number of lawyers, funding etc.
- 2. Load carrying capacity
- 3. Experience
- 4. Nature of caseload/#s
- 5. Source of caseload
- 6. Cost study in office
- 7. Time analysis/dead time
- 8. Existing org/structure
- 9. Standards of effectiveness
- 10. Outside resources, i.e., law schools, etc.
- 11. Client input
- 12. Nature of client

B. Recognizing Problems

- 1. Need for outside resources
- 2. Staff resistance
- 3. Administrator-manager resistance
- 4. Judicial-prosecutor resistance
- 5. Personnel problems
- 6. Client resistance
- 7. Efficiency rather than effectiveness
- 8. Funding agency resistance

C. Recognizing Conditions Which Perpetuate Problems

- 1. Lack of expertise/lack of resource/inertia
- 2. Viewed as attack on competency/attempt to dominate/outside/outsiders/fear of exposure/failure to let them provide input
- 3. Insecurity/loss of power base/personal interest in maintaining own system/attack on administrator's way of dealing with problem

4. a) Inertia/additional work/loss of control/pointing out incompetency/becoming more effective b) same
5. Staff fears loss of jobs/resent outsiders/inability to pay salaries/bad reputation of office
6. Temporary need to shift attorneys/possibly bigger caseload, i.e., less personal contact
7. Lack of interest in quality representation/mistrust of what's going on, real goals
8. Lack of sympathy for and comprehension of goals/pressure by electorate/financial priorities

GROUP DISCUSSION REPORT-BACK OUTLINE 4

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF MOTIVATED ATTORNEY

- (1) Gets to Work on Time
- (2) Appears Alert
- (3) Positive Attitude
- (4) Knows and Studies the Law
- (5) Client Concern
- (6) Completes All Steps in Handling Cases
- (7) Independent
- (8) Takes Criticism
- (9) Works Well in Oppressive System
- (10) Stays On Job for a Long Time
- (11) Realistic Instead of Messianic
- (12) Seeks Advice and Utilizes Channels

II. MEANS FOR ACHIEVING MOTIVATION

<u>MEANS</u>	<u>ACTION STEPS</u>
(1) Salary/Pension	
(2) Training	
(3) Working Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Caseloadsb. Office spacec. Adequate resource tools	
(4) Career incentives	
(5) Promotional and assignment opportunities	
(6) Adequate supervision <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Quality controlb. Fair and consistent criticism and feedbackc. Open and known lines of communication, up and down	
(7) Non-tangible recognition	
(8) Small team identity	
(9) Flexibility of management	
(10) Ability to effect law reform	

GROUP DISCUSSION REPORT-BACK OUTLINE 5

I. COMPARATIVE* STATISTICS

- A. Won-Loss Trial Record
- B. Percentage of Pleas
- C. Percentage of Pretrial Dismissals. (Preliminary Hearings, Dismissals, Motions)
- D. Percentage of Trials of Total Caseload
- E. Percentage of Cases Sentenced to Prison
- F. Percentage of Wins on Appeal
- G. Percentage of Clients on Pretrial Release (Bail, O.R. etc.) Compared to Other National, State, Regional Defender Programs
- H. Cost Comparison with Private Bar

II. REPUTATION

- A. Group Attitudes
 - 1. Community
 - 2. Clients
 - 3. Private bar
 - 4. Judges
 - 5. Prosecutors
 - 6. Staff
 - 7. Court attaches and police & corrections
- B. Surveys
 - 1. Professional objective evaluation
 - 2. Supervisor's contacts with groups
 - 3. Non-supervisory staff conducted surveys of administration

III. INTERNAL SYSTEMS

- A. % of Turn Over or Burn Out
- B. % of Lawyers Who Want to Return
- C. Number of Extremely Qualified Applicants
- D. Pending Back Log & Disposition Rate
- E. # of Law Reform Successes
- F. Discriminatory Handling of Cases
- G. Supervisory Evaluation

*Compared to private bar unless otherwise indicated

APPENDIX D
Bibliography of Recommended
Readings for Students

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Affirmative Action For Women: A Practical Guide for Women and Management
Dorothy Jongeward and Dru Scott
2. Beyond Freedom and Dignity
B.F. Skinner
3. Born to Win: Transactional Analysis with Gestalt Experiment
Muriel James and Dorothy Jongeward
4. Changing Organizations
Warren Bennis
5. Effective Business and Technical Presentations
George L. Morrissey
6. Every Employee A Manager
M. Scott Myers
7. Excellence
John Gardner
8. How To Get Control of Your Time and Your Life
Alan Lakein
9. How To Get More Done in Less Time
Joseph D. Cooper
10. Integrating the Individual and the Organization
Chris Argyris
11. Lateral Thinking for Management
Edward de Bono
12. Management by Objectives and Results in the Public Sector
George L. Morrissey (to be published in 1976)
13. Management-Minded Supervision
Bradford B. Boyd
14. Management - Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices
Peter F. Drucker
15. Managerial Accounting
Robert Anthony
16. Managerial Finance
Weston Brigham
17. Managerial Psychology
Harold J. Leavitt

18. Motivation and Personality
Abraham Maslow
19. New Patterns of Management
Rensis Likert
20. Personality and Organization
Chris Argyris
21. Preparing Instructional Objectives
Robert F. Mager
22. Profits, Growth, and Planning
Edward L. Summers
23. Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society
John Gardner
24. Success Through Transactional Analysis
Jut Meininger
25. Techniques of Financial Analysis
Erich A. Helfert
26. The Eco Spasm Report
Alvin Toffler
27. The Effective Executive
Peter F. Drucker
28. The Human Side of Enterprise
Douglas McGregor
29. The Professional Manager
Douglas McGregor
30. The Rational Manager
Charles Kepner
31. Theories of Management
Raymond Miles
32. Time and Management
Ross A. Webber
33. Women as Winners: Change Through Transactional Analysis
Dorothy Jongeward and Dru Scott (to be published in 1976)
34. Work and the Nature of Man
Frederick Herzberg
35. Working
Studs Terkel

APPENDIX E

Student Feedback:
Comments and Observations
of Defender Managers in Attendance
Regarding Program and Their
Applications of Principles Learned

(The following student evaluations are juxtapositioned; an *** symbol identifies the end of one student narrative and the beginning of another)

The program did much to help me to improve the efficiency and will do much to help me in improving the efficiency of my office in the delivery of defender services to the indigent criminally accused. It allowed me to apply the latest management techniques to improve the efficiency of my staff and my supervisors, to cut out wasted time in connection with such things as recognizing the psychological hangups that people have, their need for supportive actions or comments and discussions avoiding or minimizing and/or channeling these into constructive activities which will result in a much more efficient time-saving operation. It will also inspire and motivate the members of the staff.

One of the very definite assets of this program is to help us to help the lawyers improve the relationships that they have with clients and recognize the importance of maintaining client satisfaction and to deal with these problems in an organizational way in order to help them operate at maximum efficiency and at the same time to satisfy the needs of the client. The more that we can have in the way of the kind of programming that has been offered to us in this seminar the more we can utilize and translate and transform and apply these things, the better we can be, the better our lawyers can operate, the more efficient they will be and this will benefit the entire system. One specific example of the sort of things that I've been discussing here is the matter of sharing or giving our lawyers a positive recognition in a group setting, not just "Joe, you did fine and you really did a nice job" but in a group setting, at a meeting, an office meeting, where we can have our lawyers or investigators or whoever in the office, law students, report on their successes and share them with others and derive positive recognition from them. This will boost morale in the environment that I mentioned where there are these negative things you're going on and it will help maintain,

by virtue of that boosted morale, a high productivity and a high motivation for client satisfaction and achievement.

It was very beneficial to come into contact in this context, in this program, with management people in defender programs from all over the country, in a setting away from my office and away from their offices, away from distractions which our day-to-day operations entail, where we could relax and concentrate on the program at hand and derive a benefit of discussing various problems that each of us has and to hear those problems dealt with and analyzed by the professional expertise that's made available through the program. I found this very beneficial and it will help me to go back and to analyze the problems that I am confronted with much more effectively.

Our office operates on a \$2,000,000 budget and has 50 lawyers in five offices throughout the state. I have found this program to be extremely helpful particularly in the ability which it provides a manager to analyze problems. I came to this conference with a particular problem of excessive caseload and gained great insight in learning how traditional management experts tackle problem solving. One of the preconceptions I had was to turn down cases thereby denying service to people who needed it and, through attendance at this conference, I've recognized that there were other methods that could be used to solve the problem that we were experiencing. This provided great insight to our office and probably will provide representation to our clients. It will save the counties in the state money since the counties currently don't give sufficient funds to pay for the representation of indigents on appeal. If we were to turn down cases, the counties would have been forced to pay. However, if our office continues the representation, those costs will be absorbed by the state government instead of turning down cases. We are

thereby handling more cases. In addition to that, we're redistributing the workload so that those offices which don't have such a high backlog can assist the ones that do, thereby avoiding the denial of service. One of the benefits that the entire criminal justice system could derive by using these management techniques is to provide more efficient service and to better improve the perspective which those people who pass through the system have of the way the system tricks them. I think that for a long time the criminal justice system has lagged behind both business and some other areas of government in their use of these management techniques and to come to a conference where we could be trained by real experts is a great advantage for me and for many of the other defenders who I talked to who attended the conference. In short, I feel that the program has helped us provide a more cost-effective service and, at the same time, improve the quality of representation which we provide. ***

It is my belief that, as a result of the techniques utilized and learned at this seminar, that the cost savings, while not directly attributable to the defender office budget, certainly would accrue to the total dollar outlay for the criminal justice system in the sense that it has already enabled earlier and more prompt dispositions short of trial court.

I came to this conference with the idea of transferring the technology that I would learn here through the Regional Planning Unit to a number of criminal justice agencies in my community. I have experienced at this conference considerable education and a number of things which will benefit the local system. Management is one of the greatest single areas of possible improvement for the criminal justice system; particularly for defender agencies since defender services are relatively new. I believe that judges, prosecutors, police, courts and corrections personnel could benefit from the techniques that we learned at this conference. Problem solving and analysis is certainly one of the things that is needed badly in the criminal justice

system. The techniques that are available through seminars such as this would be valuable in that regard. With regard to specific changes that have occurred in my office since the initial session of this management conference, we have instituted a system with the existing personnel, with no change in cost, to deliver services to indigent accused earlier in the process of a case. We can get a defender to a client very shortly after that accused is arrested and we've found that that cuts the to the ultimate disposition in the case. The earlier that the attorney is present in the case, the earlier that case is disposed of thereby saving considerable time and money to the criminal justice system in general. We've found that the earlier a defender gets into a case, the earlier the facts and circumstances surrounding that particular case can be evaluated and the case is much more susceptible to a negotiated settlement which is fair to all parties concerned. Attitudes have not hardened with regard to the prosecution. There are no specific charges as yet made against the defendant, and if the defendant has a lawyer existing in the process at this point, those matters can be considered and negotiated between the various agencies of the criminal justice system and a much more fair, just, reasonable and prompt settlement can be expected in most cases. As a result of the session, and realizing that there was a problem with our office's inability to greatly effect the outcome of a case other than through traditional measures, we had a staff meeting at which all the lawyers involved sat down and analyzed the methods by which we might be able to enter a case earlier. After analyzing this problem from all aspects and particularly those aspects which were important to those attorneys that were operating in those several courts, it was decided that one investigator would be assigned on a fulltime basis to all the jails who would, immediately upon the booking of an individual, call an on-duty lawyer who would then appear in the jail cell way before formal charge papers are even filed on the individual and consult with him. Then he would

consult with the prosecutor who also must review the prospective charge before the formal charge papers can be assigned and we were able to negotiate a number of cases.

I have observed, in my many years of experience, that defender offices are abysmally wanting in terms of sound personnel management principles and concepts. I came to this seminar thinking that I had it all in a nutshell. I didn't think that I could have derived anything meaningful as a result of attending this conference, but always wondering whether or not I really, really know it all as I had always perceived that I did. I came strictly out of curiosity and I am the first to admit that I have received a very liberal education as a result of this experience. I was made to realize, as a result of this experience. I was made to realize, as a result of coldly, coolly, objectively evaluating my performance over the past eight years with the very genuinely, warmly, knowledgeably, articulated, sound principles of personnel management that I had been in the dark all of these years. As a result of the opportunity to share experiences with lawyers from throughout America, I'm finding out that the problems of defender offices are generally and pretty much the same throughout America. As a result of this empathy for the day-to-day problems that we all seem to share that we have in common notwithstanding the particular idiosyncracies of our particular geography that there is a need, a very compelling need, for LEAA to change its priorities and as opposed to investing millions and millions into police departments for guns and tanks and barbed wire and other instruments of oppression, in educating judges, corrections people and court personnel. My query is "Is the defense function an integral part of our so-called criminal justice system?" That question, I don't think that I need answer. LEAA, over the years, has been benignly neglectful of the defense function. This, I think, is criminal because if the system, as a whole, is to work efficiently

and effectively and at a minimal cost to the taxpayers of America, there is a need to make certain that this integral part of the system (the defense function and those who are functioning in that capacity) be very knowledgeable about sound personnel management principles and concepts. Only this way can we get maximum, or hope to get, maximum productivity out of the available legal resources functioning in the poverty law area. Only then can the system be made whole and only then can it be perceived by the citizenry of America who have come to believe that this concept that we openly and notoriously articulate "equal justice for all under law" will ever become a meaningful reality as opposed to lip-service that the poor of America have become accustomed to.

As a result of this experience I went back to my office and, as opposed to being removed and sort of aloof from my staff, I began to talk to them and to find out what their concerns were; how they felt that the services rendered by the office might be improved. I found this a very enlightening experience. Having been one who functioned from the base that "no news is good news" and not having received or been the beneficiary of any input from staff, I perceived that the office was well and thriving. I found as a result of the information and the awareness that I was exposed to and that was engendered and stimulated as a result of the conference, that there was a need to go back and to inquire of staff as to whether they really thought that what they were doing was what the defense function should be all about. I inquired as to how I, as the chief defender of the defender office, could make it a more meaningful experience for our clients and a more meaningful experience for the lawyers and other supportive personnel in the office. I found as a result of talking with the entire staff, on an individual basis and once collectively, that I have been functioning from a base of dismal ignorance. That situation today no longer exists. I am talking with my staff and

receiving input from them, to the extent that their suggestions and recommendations will enhance the quality of the legal representation being afforded our clients and concomittantly to the extent that those suggestions and recommendations can enhance the cost-effectiveness of our operation. I am dealing into them on a day-to-day basis.

I supervise the public defender program as well as the legal aid program within a county of about 85,000 people. We have a total budget of about \$120,000; three attorneys, 2 secretaries, legal interns and we hire parttime investigatory help. This program has benefited our criminal justice system. After coming to this program I decided that we were not getting into our cases quickly enough. When I returned we initiated an early-morning-checking-the-police-station type system. After the first session I decided that I had a real problem with my secretary. I have since suggested she find other employment and she has. After she left I found that some of the problems she was having with the various court workers, which, of course, was cutting down the efficiency between the court and my office significantly. I had not been aware of this. However, the court personnel informed me of it. With regard to this program in helping the efficiency in delivery of defender services to the indigent, it was important in handling staff to really learn how to praise the good things and capitalize on the strengths of each staff member. Most of the interaction and direction of the program resulted in making me a better executive. Meeting people here in a central location; one of the fringe benefits of this particular program was meeting the people here. Anytime you get defenders together there is this real feeling of commitment which is true of all groups. However, this group is especially interesting because we're all probably at the same level of development as managers, and I can see within this group that this will probably be the vanguard of the best defender programs coming in the next ten years. Just getting to know

the group will provide a great deal of support between the various offices throughout the country. I can see a real lasting effect on the relationships that we have maintained here. Anytime you can make a phone call to get the answer to a question because you know where the answer is going to be (we have shared budgets and statistics) means that much less time is going to be taken out of your budget and hiring that kind of consultants. Right now, I feel I have an entry into about 20 offices across the country, some of which have been developed longer, statewide (mine is new). It's just an unbelievable resource which I feel will be available to me for at least the next ten, fifteen years that I'll be in the movement.

I am Administrator-Director for an LEAA-funded program with a budget of approximately \$202,000; four attorneys, five investigators, two secretaries, one law student, myself and other resources that we pick on from time to time in the community. The program benefits our office especially in helping us to develop or helping myself to be able to develop a system of data-collection which we now use in our office and I hope will be very effective and in a few months we'll be able to determine that. The data system allows us to know when we get our clients, where they come from, how many are pending, how many we close and what those dispositions are. This helps us then to effectively divide the time of attorneys or channel their efforts into the different areas of the court process that we use right now. It not only benefits us, it also benefits the criminal justice system in that our program is an alternative program to our present defender system and by example, we have shown that the things that we have in our project are useful and necessary to the criminal justice system. Maybe it's helpful to point out that LEAA has cited us an exemplary project.

This, at least in our county, has affected the delivery of defender services in that the county defender has now taken on some of the ideas in

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

our project such as separating court appointment from the defender process. The defender now handles that. A board selects a defender and the defender now is paid directly from the county and not from the court budget. The defender now has an administrator who is just involved in administration, because one of our emphasis was that an attorney could not effectively be involved in cases, trials, as well as administration. All of this has contributed to the cost effectiveness of not only our program but the programs in our county. It has caused our defender system to realize that they should go from a parttime system to a fulltime system because at present the parttime system actually costs more to operate than the fulltime system.

By helping our agency operate more effectively (and it has helped us promote our ideas to the county) I guess we've had these ideas all along. But we will be able to show much better effectiveness of our program and thus how the counties should more effectively run their own. One of the fringe benefits is having met people from large offices and medium offices, and finding out the problems that they have, the problems that they haven't thought about. My office is different from most offices here, but it's helped me to realize and to analyze some of the things that go on in our office to make it run better.

We are a private non-profit organization consisting of a staff of approximately 80 with 35 attorneys. I am the chief administrative attorney in the office. Our budget is about \$1,200,000 a year and we are underfunded. I think it was very important that the conference was held in the boondocks. I know that if we had held this conference regionally or in big cities, I would have definitely played the "harried executive". I was very pessimistic when I came to this program. I'd read the brochures about the use of transactional analysis tools and I was very reluctant to come. I thought it was going to be another one of these panacea sessions where there is one answer for everything and I'm delighted to say that I think I've learned a tremendous amount. The tools that I've been taught and learned I've attempted to apply in the situation with some success. The most important thing I learned was the necessity for having purposes and goals for an organization that are stated and understood. I will use the tools that I developed in this program to reorient our organization and to, once again, establish the goal that we are only there because of our clients and that every decision that I make as an administrator, I make on the basis of one criteria alone and that is what is in the best interest of our clients. I think this is a decided change from the history of our organization. I think the end result would be definitely cost-effective, as client satisfaction minimizes the cost of the criminal justice system in general. Satisfied clients are less apt to appeal. Satisfied clients are less apt to create problems in the jail. Satisfied clients are less apt to write letters to the judges which take judges time and, I think, that's very good. The goal is not to keep the pressure off the other parts of the system. The goal is to deliver the best services. But I think that's a corollary result. I think one of the most valuable things I learned in the conference also will have cost-effective implications is the necessity

to reanalyze problems; problems analysis which I knew something about. But it was always good to hear it again, and once again, has forced me to reanalyze problems. Every time I've done that I've come up with a different problem than I had originally perceived, which is very important to me. For instance, a specific example that I think is now solved: I felt we had a supervising attorney who was not doing certain things and that was true but that was not the problem. The problem was basically a lack of direction, leadership and faith by top-level people. And that problem appears to have been solved. I think this seminar has helped me reinforce in my mind something I believe in and that is common sense. Basically, all the tools and techniques and everything that you've taught us can be boiled down to common sense. Which people in professions really have to be reminded of constantly. I think that if some miracle were to occur and you were able to do this kind of session with judges, police correctional officers and prosecutors, that there would be a dramatic impact on the system in general. One of the ideas we learned, and I believe in strongly, is the fact that you really have to analyze "largeness" and whether you really think you should have a large organization. Stated more simply--whether you think you need as many people as you presently have. I've applied that kind of thinking to my situation and have come to the conclusion that we do not need all the people that we have. There are a number of people who are not doing their work and should not be there or should be in some way convinced that they should do their work. These people actually create work for people that do their work and thereby make our operation less efficient and effective. I have used some of the techniques I've learned here to get rid of or to rechannel people in the office who need turning aside who were creating problems for us and who made our operation more costly. The most important thing I learned and probably applied in this course is that I was

able to convince the board of directors of our organization that if we continued to increase our costs without any increase in caseload (which we've been doing traditionally) in other words, not doing any more work but going in every year and asking for a 30% to 40% increase in our budget, we would be committing suicide. I finally convinced them of that and the necessity for becoming cost-effective and at the same time delivering quality services; I don't think they're mutually inconsistent. That's a myth. As soon as you say it, it is accepted. I've learned here that we've got to do away with some of those myths. I've learned a lot of that. I think there is a myth that there is some way you can scientifically calculate whether you are delivering excellent services as a defender. I think that's impossible. I agree with Drucker that external things are impossible to quantify. It is very, very frustrating for very gifted people, to spend a lot of their time in those areas. Those energies would be much better spent internally determining "well, this person obviously can be more effective by getting discovery earlier." Our whole system could be more effective by establishing a new system. Those types of things are much more important than the external things. The myth that the good trial attorney cannot be a good administrator; I think there is a reason for that myth, but to say that they are always mutually exclusive is wrong. I used to feel very guilty about realizing late at night that I really liked what I was doing as an administrator and that since I was a competent trial attorney I felt guilty about finding that I liked being an administrator which I used to do before. People make excuses for being administrators and the fact that they miss the courtroom, and I think they're not that sincere. They are throwing that out because they know trial attorneys don't like administrators, especially ones they deal with in the criminal area because we're always in favor of the downtrodden and administrators are never the downtrodden; it's always the workers.

There is some of that, so you always make excuses; 'well, I'm an administrator but I'm really a trial attorney at heart'. And I think that's wrong.

I learned from people here that dealing with people in an honest way, in and upfront way, is a good administrative tool. For four years my primary problem (which I realized wasn't his problem, it was more or less mine and the defenders' problem) was that there was a supervising attorney who'd been a supervising attorney for four years and had never been told what he was supposed to do and had never been told that we expected him to be a thinker rather than a lying person and a conceptualizer. Therefore, he was incredibly frustrated. For four years people in my position and people in defenders positions had always put off talking to this person about anything. Which is true of any personnel problem in our office. The philosophy was 'kick it under the rug and the problem will go away or move him somewhere else and it will go away'. As a result of this course, I started being very, very honest with people as far as what I felt others were feeling about them and trying to resolve problems before they became problems. It seems to have worked incredibly. I really do disagree with some of the people here who feel that you should not get people together where they have a disagreement. I think people should be honest with one another and you should get those things out or they will be much more dangerous. We were getting no consideration out of him for the salary we were paying him. He was doing nothing other than sitting in his office. He was very frustrated and everyone else was very frustrated so he was really just dead weight. He was not doing anything to earn his salary. Now he is doing more than two or three people in similar positions, which I always knew he was capable of. It was just letting him know what I expected of him; telling him to do things on his own initiative and not look for approval from myself as a defender. We always found ways not to give that person things. Now I'm consciously finding ways to give that person things to do. As a result, the

people that work underneath him are much happier and their attitude with their client is much better. They have more time--they don't have to do administrative things and they don't have to complain if things are getting done. So they can spend more time trying cases and developing relationships with clients.

I mentioned earlier that I no longer make apologies for liking administration and now I really feel comfortable being an administrator and enjoying that role. There is an opening in our office for a public defender who is the person who runs the office. I was very reluctant to apply for that position because I was sold on the concept that I was a trial lawyer and should not be an administrator, even though I knew that I felt as comfortable being an administrator as I did being a trial attorney. In some instances more. I felt that I got more done and the challenge was more in administration than it was in the courtroom. That's the real reason I liked the courtroom, because of the challenge.

I think I made the point earlier in my presentation, that our organizational structure created problems and the way I did that was by analyzing it by using problem analysis. A lot of the tools that I was taught here to analyze that structure and came to the conclusion that it was glaring. It was so obvious that our structure encouraged people to manipulate rather than to do. I haven't been able to change the structure of the organization yet, but I hope that I can. I've learned by problem analysis, and a lot of other things, that the system we had was very ineffective and it didn't allow people an opportunity to get things done.

I couldn't really articulate the most valuable thing this program has done, but it has given us the tools to eliminate burnout, the number one problem affecting defender associations throughout the 50 year history of

defender associations. I just keep thinking, if there are administrators in defender offices who had benefit of this program in the past, they probably would not have burned out. These people and their organizations would have been a lot better. I feel this is really cost-effective because the most costly thing in any organization is a high rate of turnover. You have to retrain, and I feel that is probably the most valuable.

I was really astonished that after a short session of three days I got back to the office and I found that much of what I had not realized was all that important was very usable and much of it worked in a way that I would never have expected it to. I don't think that I made any deliberate efforts to stroke people nicely or this sort of thing--positive strokes. I became more aware of what I was doing; not necessarily in my relationships with staff people in a one-to-one basis because that I think I've always been very conscious of. But more of the effect of my dealing with one person on other people who might be around and whether they felt that I wasn't paying attention to them or peripheral things that I didn't notice out of the corner of my eye. I've become very aware of that. I think that this is a very blind spot that I had had. I also found that I had a weakness as far as--well, I suppose everybody has this weakness--facing the fact that you have somebody who should be fired or who should be demoted. But, you're aware of it. And I can't say why this did make me come back and say "by God, I'm gonna meet with this problem" but I did. As a result, two clerical people who should have been fired were. A supervisor who had become a supervisor before my time by happenstance was put back on staff and although it wasn't really for me to do the actual mechanical handling of it--I had to be there when it happened. I am very proud of the fact and I'm not sure I could have handled it before. He has elected to stay in this office as a trial lawyer because he was told

he could go wherever he wanted. We don't feel there is any unpleasantness or any embarrassment and he didn't feel that at all. So I feel that I handled it right and I think that I can certainly relate it to what happened here without being able to specifically tell you without taking 49 hours how it actually worked but it did work. That, I found to be very impressive. Over and beyond the obvious things that one gets out of this that were planned is what maybe what wasn't planned. What I would call a fringe benefit. That is, the meeting of so many people who would seem to be in an altogether different situation. Yet, I can see that the problems that I have as an administrator or supervisor are not all that different even though I'm in the middle echelon. But, it's still a relation up and it's a relation down. In my case I even have the extra thing of not being in the top echelon, but yet, being on top of a whole bunch of supervisors under me, apart from the staff. It's the sort of thing that there's no exact parallel because ours is a unique situation. But yet, it's not all that different and I don't know any way that I could have become aware of this. I could meet these people at a thousand conventions and a thousand other types of meetings where I never would know exactly what's going on in their organizations because it came out without their meaning to tell. It's the sort of thing that you're dealing with from a different area. . .that you're not even aware you're telling. I don't know whether this was planned or it wasn't planned. It probably wasn't but it doesn't matter. The fact is, I don't know any other way we would have gotten this type of relationship and an understanding of the similarities of the problem, which is all part of what we talk about when we say criminal justice system.

The initial awareness that one has to recognize as a part of this course

is the fact that a person may be a decent trial attorney in no way means that he's a decent administrator. We are in no way programmed with the tools necessary to be effective managers. The concept of rewards and the concept of isolating problems and how to deal with them were basically pie-in-the-sky ideas until I came here and really began to face them with other people. I realized there were practical solutions not only to personal problems of people in the office, but to their professional responsibility and the way they handled the problems themselves. Before I came, I actually thought I had an exemplary office. I had no problems whatsoever. My main purpose in coming here was to gain some insight of the problems of other offices, particularly larger offices in conjunction with my work to devise a statewide public defender system. The committee working on this was bogged down because of our lack of ability to proceed with ultimate conclusions into the exact type of program we wanted. The input was there and everyone knew there was a problem. There was an impasse as far as arriving at specific conclusions and recommendations for a statewide system. As a direct result of the program as far as going to the bottom line and deciding what you ultimately want as far as being goal-oriented and working out the details later was of immense importance, not only to me, but ultimately to the committee in being able to finally grasp the issues and recognize what we needed to do was not on a step-by-step basis and figure out the reasons why this wouldn't work. But, to go to the bottom line, decide the type of program we actually wanted and instead of deciding the reasons why it wouldn't work, to decide on how we could overcome the obstacles that we would have to overcome. There is no question that it was a direct result of reinforcement and management tools that I gained from this seminar.

In my office, I went back and decided that even though I thought the

office was completely open and everyone discussed everything, I gave a questionnaire. The questions on it were items that had been brought up in the discussion here, particularly the problem areas. This was not only to make the people aware of their situation in the office, but to give me some feedback. I found out that I was creating an atmosphere wherein the attorneys themselves believed that they should not be there longer than two years instead of creating a career type orientation. Also, the investigators wanted more guidance and they wanted more leadership from me. There was great willingness on the part of the attorneys to assist me in some of the duties that I had and at the same time, they recognized some of the problems that I had were a direct result of not delegating these responsibilities. So, through the simple process of nothing other than a questionnaire and discussing the questionnaire with people in the office, a lot of the problems worked themselves out. A basic lack of communication existed that I had no idea existed until I asked them about it. It was something that simple and I would never have thought to do it except through the interaction that I got through the seminar.

I see implications beyond the office. I believe there is a great need in the criminal justice system to recognize the fact that the weaknesses in the criminal justice system are inherent weaknesses because of the closed society that we've created. Those of us that are responsible for administrating and the belief that non-lawyer types will not be beneficial. There has got to be a realization that outside help, whether through consultant work or through cost-effective techniques, would be of immense value in not only isolating the problem but in giving basic management tools to cope with it. An attorney is not an administrator simply because he is an attorney. He's got to receive the tools first before he can administrate and that's what's lacking. I don't think there is any question

that these tools would be certainly helpful and beneficial.

I've been to about seven or eight national conferences. I have gained more from this conference in terms of viable tools in defense management than in all of the others put together. The concept that a person can be spoon-fed information and then relate this into meaningful programs in his own office, I think, is just a joke. The interplay between people, the challenging concepts that are held, the discussion and implementation of various management tools which came forth in this conference, using the method of teaching, we gained working knowledge. I believe therein lies the primary value to me as a manager and that in leaving here and going back to my office, I'm taking with me concepts that can be easily transferred into action, instead of wishful thinking, platitudes and handouts on worn out defense strategies.

My experience here has been extremely beneficial and I hope it can continue to be beneficial to myself personally and to those people for whom I am responsible as far as management. I think that one of the ironies of my having observed this entire process is that prior to having attended this conference, I think the entire thrust of my work as a manager, and as an attorney, was so absorbed in the immediacy of the solution of day-to-day problems that there was no time to stand back and look at the more broad difficulties and concepts of what the defense bar, particularly the indigent defense bar, is all about. Ironically, it was only by, in effect, shutting down the entire system and standing back and taking a long hard look at this for a short period of time that the entire system was made to run more effectively, at least as far as my own operations go. Having examined the system as "coldly and analytically" as possible, I was able to come up with some solutions for resolving personal problems that I had as far as dealing with myself as a manager, practicing attorney and for my staff. Specially, I implemented a

program about two weeks after the completion of the first phase of this conference in which I changed and streamlined the entire process of representation of clients on appeal. My primary concern in devising this system was to provide a means to adequately represent and continue to effectively represent every client and yet figure out a way, at the same time, to deal with the overwhelming problem. In my particular office, dealing with a caseload that was well beyond the control of the attorneys-- a problem, imposed on us by sort of outside forces beyond our control and which we could have controlled very easily simply by withdrawing from cases. But that was not a remedy which I found to be either politically or personally feasible in light of my analysis of the problem. I felt that withdrawal was not a solution of the client's problem, which is my greatest concern. Withdrawal from the case in my office means that private counsel would be appointed instead of our agency. In the experience of the court and the experience I've had with private attorneys who are appointed in place of our office, I found that the effectiveness of representation, in fact, goes down. I felt that, also, it didn't solve the court's problem; the case was still pending before the court. It didn't solve the prosecution's problem because they still had to write a brief from their side. So, that withdrawal was really a way of making cases disappear from before my eyes, but not to solve any of the problems for other parties that are involved in the entire process. I devised a system for the accelerated disposition of cases in which a remedy was easily drafted and quickly drafted and where it had the most impact with those clients who were serving short prison terms and who could derive the most benefit from an immediate disposition of their case. It is still in the process now but, I feel that it's got a good deal of potential and is something that has never been tried in our agency. I don't think in any way it would have been possible for me to arrive at the conclusions arrived at in this entire process

without having had the tools provided to me in the course and the techniques learned through the conference. With regard to how those solutions affected my staff, after having implemented this program, they assumed there are cases which are very difficult to find winning issues and many of them were going to have to ultimately withdraw as counsel on appeal because the appeal is frivolous. And yet, the attorneys felt a tremendous amount of motivation. To be involved in a program like this where we were striking out and trying a new system that had never been tried. Because we were coming to grips with the problem that was common to the entire staff. In the long run this entire thing is going to hit where it does the most good, for the legislature and the taxpayer. It saves money. It's the kind of a program where we could dispose (in pretty frank terms) we can dispose of cases at less expense per case. I think there is little doubt that the immediate impact and long term impact of this kind of solution is going to result in saving money to the agency. With regard to the question of whether this kind of a process has application outside of the defender system has more broad application in the criminal justice system, this kind of a program is of great importance and could be extremely beneficial, particularly with regard to management skills. Every judge is a manager in effect in his courtroom. At least the heads of prosecution bar, promotions to managerial positions are made as a result of your skill as an attorney rather than your skill as a manager. They make some sort of value judgment that because you're a good attorney you'll make a good manager. I don't think there is necessarily a complete correlation between the two. In fact, my own feeling is that many attorneys who are good in the sense that they succeeded in law school and they are succeeding in practice may not make very good managers at all. They are taught in law school to perform tasks of memorizing vast amounts of knowledge for use in their

profession and the test of success in law school is your ability to absorb and recall. The lawyer, when he comes away from law school has learned a good deal of facts and may have learned how to use those facts logically. But, he also comes out of law school almost totally anonymous and almost totally dehumanized. He moves into the system and spends absolutely no time in the law school process and, in fact, it's totally antithetical to all the goals of learning. The entire law school process is antithetical to learning concepts. Note: there's no supportive atmosphere in law school. There is no feedback and as a result it creates individuals who are good human beings despite the fact they are lawyers. I don't say that with any bitterness toward law school in particular; I think it's just an inherent aspect of the learning process which seems to be in law schools today. As far as this process applies to these attorneys, I feel it's a process that teaches them to analyze themselves and their strengths and to look to the strengths that are in other people. With that, I believe, it tends to humanize the entire process of giving the individual involved in management a good deal more sensitivity to what's going on around him. This holds true for police and corrections officials who are, in the words I believe of the author of the report on "Criminal Justice from the Consumer's Perspective", which states the police were workers, people whose job it was to arrest criminals. And corrections officials, by the same token, are people whose job it is to keep criminals in prison. This kind of process tends to take one away from the sort of worker role, and look at the more broad question of what the entire criminal justice system is all about. Whether we are going to talk about what is best for the defendant, himself, the criminal accused, or talk about what's best for society. Are we going to just put him away forever or are we going to make him a useful member of society?

As far as this program applies to those attorneys, I feel it's a process that teaches them to analyze themselves and their strengths and to look to the strengths that are in other people. With that, I believe, it tends to sensitize the entire process; giving the individual involved in management a good deal more sensitivity to what's going on around him.

I have benefited from this seminar in many ways. This program will help to improve the efficiency of all the services that I give as the public defender. The exercises we went through were initially concerning time. I went back to my office and put them into use. I've learned the difference between positive time and negative time, which I really didn't understand before. I looked at my own schedule and asked myself "just what am I doing and why am I doing it?" and "is it positive to things I want to accomplish or is it negative time?" I found a great part of my activity has been using negative time, as well as other members of our office. I now have a portion of my day to sit down and do things I have deemed the most important. I write down "deemed to be most important to my job" and I found in little time (I've even gone as short as a half hour, but basically an hour or 90 minutes) I accomplish more. I have used this and I take my lunch now instead of going out for lunch and I've found that I can eat my lunch in a matter of 10 or 15 minutes and use the rest of the time productively, or, to relax. In the area of cost-effectiveness I think it's obvious that time is money and especially when you're dealing with 17 other attorneys in your office. Their time is money to the office and, with the amount of case work that each of us has, if each individual member of the office were to use their time productively and to make it positive instead of negative time, the amount of cases we could move would be well within the area of saving, perhaps 25% to 50% of that time. This does not mean that I don't think we are going to let any attorneys go. But as the caseload increases, as it does every year at least in the office we are in;

crime increased in my community last year by 34%, I think we would be able to handle and achieve more happily and more effectively. Therefore, it is cost-effectiveness in the final analysis. Client satisfaction is one thing this course has helped me with and this is the area that I wanted to be accomplished in the past weeks--client satisfaction--at least the attorney-client relationship part of that client satisfaction. I understand the client better. When talking to my client in jail, he sometimes plays games. I am now able to see those games and sometimes talk him out of them, if he is the kind of client I can talk to. This saves me costly time, I feel better toward my client and do more for him than if I had to play his game and cost me time. I've leveled with some of my clients and told them what they were asking me to do, I can't. . .at least I shouldn't because of costly time I can't afford to take, and recommend what I feel is more effective. I feel better about my representation than I would have because I recognized the game he was playing. I think we better understand my job and his position and therefore, we can save each other a lot of heartache and I don't get frustrated.

How can this benefit the justice system as a whole? I have found out about the little bit of frustration I must undergo in this area because judges, prosecutors, police correction people don't understand all of the implications that this recently found knowledge that I have. However, I feel they can see a difference in me (an easier-going person who doesn't get frustrated). I wish they had the benefit of having knowledge of this cost-saving, energy-saving and thought-saving analysis. Again, I think that the whole system could generally benefit.

To be perfectly honest, before I came to this seminar, I was rather skeptical as to whether or not I would get anything from this, having attended other conferences over the past two years. More particularly, I'm very concerned with how the other defenders around the country would be relating to what I had to say where I was coming from in relationship to my job. I'm quite happy with the results I have received from attending this seminar. One of the main primary goals I've achieved is the ability to concentrate more on long-range planning as opposed to merely responding to crisis situations. From discussions that we have had, both formally, during classes and informally within small groups, I really have begun to focus on the types of changes I must institute. The types of goals I'm going to concentrate on and the managerial techniques of achieving those--such as blocking out certain time periods during my day which I have up to now had a hard time doing. I still have a hard time doing it but I really realize and recognize now for the first time the real importance of long-range planning. Some of the concepts touched on in this seminar are really very helpful to me, both professionally and personally. The whole concept of stroking--of giving people positive feedback--as a method of motivating them to do their jobs is a technique which is very rarely, if ever, in my organization utilized. I can, for the first time, really see the great need for this kind of reinforcement and strengthening of peoples' egos and attitudes who work for me. Obviously, the bottom line there would be that a happy and ego satisfied employee will be a more productive and better employee. Up until I attended the conference also in September, my main concentration was, rather than on client satisfaction, on attorney satisfaction. I always viewed my lawyers as

my clients and more or less left them alone when they were dealing with their clients. From the discussions with the other defenders at the conference, it's become apparent again, a bottom line goal of the organization is client satisfaction and I plan on making a more strenuous effort towards achieving that goal. By client satisfaction I mean having a client actually feel that he or she has received a competent adequate legal representation and not merely measure satisfaction on wins or losses. Most organizations are not people oriented. Mine is not, and from this seminar I have gotten a greater awareness of that in order to be more effective with what we are doing. We have to really concentrate on the people in our organization. Making them happier, creating an environment they feel they can achieve, attainable goals within a system that normally people feel they cannot achieve, attainable goals and really try to make our clients happier with the service we are providing--rather than learning managerial techniques per se such as, how to do a budget, how to write an annual report. I really picked up a number of ways in which to motivate attorneys and other people in my office to do a better job and be more productive. As a result, the office will be much more efficient. Meeting the other defenders throughout the duration of this conference has also been enlightening. In talking to them, it has become very obvious that our problems are similar. It was very interesting and very, very helpful to hear how different people from around the country have solved, or at least tried to approach, different problems which I am now attempting to deal with as a result of the way the conference was run, and the methods employed--a more humanistic approach as opposed to a more business approach. I really feel a closer bond with those doing my kind of work. It is a reaffirmation of my job when I can at least relate better to those people who are doing the same jobs.

This program will help improve the efficiency of the defender offices services to the indigent criminals. It is the first program I have seen which provides a forum or a method whereby the administrators of the office have to realize they are administrators first and lawyers second because, in order to be a good administrator and improve the system, it has to come from within, which means the attorneys who have worked in the system on a lower level, some of them must make the decision to improve the system. This means giving up going into court and devoting their energies to being effective administrators. This program is first putting the emphasis on being a good administrator, and understanding all the workings within your office. If you are a good administrator, you'll get more productive time out of the attorneys, better results and more efficiency in their performance. The case cost would be reduced because you'll be turning more cases for the same amount of time and the attorneys' production will give better results which will satisfy the client. In other words, it will be a process of filtering all the way down through the client. If you can make the attorneys happy, and administer your offices in an efficient manner, you get more production from your attorneys. Attorneys will be providing better services and results for the indigent and therefore have client satisfaction. This program has also brought attorneys to thinking as administrators of their offices, people are more important than programs. This applies not only to their staff attorneys but also the clients. It also provides a forum to exchange ideas among all the various defender offices throughout the country and by sharing these ideas, we can go back and make our offices more productive. This management seminar can benefit the criminal justice system, including the courts, prosecution and defense as well as corrections in that we are a vital part of that whole system and if we can improve our act and efficiency, it's going to force the district attorneys and

courts to improve. We can relate to them and share our experiences and become more of an integral part of the whole system. One of the specific examples of what I have learned at this seminar is some of the principles of management leadership in changing a person's attitude and apply them to one attorney in our office and change his attitude toward the office and the office's attitude towards him.

As a result of this program, I was able to apply some techniques and skills in the office and with the attorneys with whom I work which I think enabled me and my attorneys to do more and better work more quickly. Of primary importance were the techniques that I learned about time management, which enabled me to schedule my own time better, to waste less time and to use more of my time constructively. This, in turn, enabled me to do a better job of supervising, guiding and training my attorneys ultimately the result of which will make me more responsible and have more productive attorneys more quickly. I also have been able to teach some of the time management techniques to the attorneys that they independently and individually learn about how to use their time more effectively and get more work done in the same period of time. The program, in addition to giving some suggestions with respect to organizational techniques and systems management, I believe, will increase morale, will enable me to do better planning and formulate policies--all of which will help the office work more efficiently as well as more effectively. There is less wasted time since I've been able to attend this program and I believe that this will continue as more and more techniques are applied. I felt that the techniques learned during the program are easily transferable for use by any organization, be it a prosecutor's office, a judicial system, a correctional system, as well as the standard use. The techniques were also easily transferable by me to other offices in my defender system as well as to

other offices through contacts that I have through personal friendships. Therefore, what I learned can be used by many of the people with whom I come in contact.

The program is the first exposure that I, as an attorney, have ever had with the technique of management and the learning of management skills. Most attorneys do not have any idea of what it takes to be an effective manager. The program has instructed me how to deal with attorneys on a level which will necessarily improve effectiveness. In other words, efficiency and effectiveness have been brought into an area where we as attorneys can deal with them and improve those concepts in the representation of indigents. The matter of how the increasing of efficiency and effectiveness in representing indigent defendants will benefit society, I believe is very clear. On the other hand, by increasing effectiveness, the attorneys on our staff will be able to serve the community on a cost-effective basis more than a disorganized unmotivated group of attorneys would without proper morale and motivation. Secondly, and probably more importantly, the more effective an attorney becomes, the greater the impact on the community. The primary objective of any defender organization is to relate to the community that the persons from the community who are accused of crime will be receiving as good or better representation than people who are accused of crime and who have unlimited funds. The program is extremely effective in the realm of its relationship to judges, prosecutors, corrections personnel, and court personnel because the entire criminal justice administration system is tightly funded, its funds are tightly scrutinized, its productivity is carefully scrutinized. There is a great deal of thinking in the legal community today which is pointing towards implementing business procedures. By business, I mean to say profit and loss, how to achieve the maximum effectiveness with the given number of personnel, given budgets that each of the various agencies have. Increasing productivity,

efficiency and effectiveness. If this were done in each of the areas affecting the administration of the criminal justice system, I believe that it would be a very short period of time before the criticism of the system, as it exists today, would evolve into a development of a new program which would probably be more in tune with the conditions of society in the twentieth century.

In my own office the application of the various principles taught in this seminar resulted in a higher morale among the attorneys, and a feeling of greater productivity in each attorney. Each attorney feels more willing to go out and represent the clients of the society in my community. It has been a generally positive effect.

The techniques I have learned in this program have helped me to increase the efficiency of "my own productivity and the productivity of my office". I have utilized the time savings techniques--how to better organize my time, how to save time, in order to make my own hours spent on the job more efficient and more productive. I have also passed on these techniques to members of my staff. I think the efficiency of my whole office has improved as a result. One procedure I implemented was to set aside certain times of the day I was not to be disturbed. I screened out phone calls, except for emergency phone calls. I even went to the extent of having my secretary move her desk in front of my office where she could make sure nobody bothered me during that time. I told each of the attorneys and investigators they could implement the same procedure. I found my productivity when not disturbed increased fantastically. When considering an office like ours with a heavy caseload, your ability to provide much more effective representation is going to be greatly increased when you can make your limited time more efficient. Secondly, some techniques in handling personnel and its problems. For example, I had a loner in my office. I solved the problem by using techniques I learned from the seminar. The seminar taught

us about the concepts of stroking, positive recognition and the benefits of getting productivity by being motivated yourself. From the seminar I acquired this awareness. I went looking for times when I've been genuinely applying positive recognition to accomplishments. I found the staff performance and office morale has improved. Even the loner has come around because of specific things I have done to try to give him recognition, to set myself as an example of positive strokes. All of which he has done. Now we have a much more cohesive unit. We are able to ride the storm together a lot better. The most important awareness received is the concepts applied in the personnel management. Those can be applied to not only defender offices but any type of office a number of people manage. That could be a prosecutor's office, corrections people, the court personnel in relationship with them. These techniques could apply throughout the court system. I've tried to do that too. Positive stroking to the clerks of the court, judges' secretaries, prosecutors' secretaries, corrections people, jail guards--it works all the way down the line. You find once you get the hang of it, it applies in almost every aspect of life because it's a basic principle. I found it very effective in helping me to increase the ability of myself and my staff personnel to do the job that we have set out to do. I think that is really one of the greatest achievements I have obtained from this seminar.

This seminar has been beneficial in the operation of my office. We had had problems, previously, dealing with the allocation of our caseload between attorneys in our office. Suggestions were made to me in the last session. I have expanded on those suggestions. We've structured an effective system for handling the allocation of our caseload which includes this part of the problem which I'm going to speak on. We have established a weekly meeting where we

distribute the cases. This enables us to overcome a morale problem I didn't realize I had, merely by positive stroking of the attorneys in the office. Just the very basic ideas we took in the last time, I was able to utilize. Once involved in an idea of the problem solving process, it filters throughout the entire office. When the person at the top starts doing something it filters down and permeates the entire office; that is just what happened in our office. It has built up confidence in my staff by positive stroking. It is more of a one-on-one working thing now, rather than a boss-associate type; it's a partnership and it's working out much better.

The first session helped me as a lawyer running the office to be more personnel conscious. In other words, we were talking about the stroking, talking a lot in this session about ourselves. I went back and discovered that morale was missing. I have a small office with five people and only one investigator. I couldn't find out what the problem was until this seminar-- somehow avoiding it, not knowing quite how to deal with it. The investigator works on his own. He's not in court. He doesn't get the victories in court. He's not there when it happens. So, I went back to the idea of getting him more involved. What goes on in court goes on in the office. Include him in activities. He is working on his own going on interviews all the time. I have just fairly begun the process I want but it's the plus that I was looking for. I started with automatically starting to do the things that I set out to do. Even though I only picked up on him. I found myself unconsciously going into the other offices and doing the same thing. Where they really didn't have a different morale, I didn't think, but maybe they did. It's been a help as far as the program effecting the overall system--as far as efficiency as far as our clients. We have good attitudes, good morale. We hope that this will rub off on the client, possibly on the correction system, and on the courts too.

We were talking about when morale is low, staff wastes more time, it takes longer to do things. Where if it is a positive thing, you seem more ready to attack problems. This is what the last session helped me with. I found that my attacking problems, problems that didn't have to deal with personnel; my desk was clear. Just in the last three or four weeks, I was concentrating more on the office. Things seemed to be going better and I was doing things as an administrator. One final thing, since I've gone back I have looked at other departments, county departments of government. I've seen other heads of departments making mistakes, personnel mistakes, that this seminar could help. Now, I think I like being an administrator. There are challenges and things to be accomplished. I'm experiencing the rewards of being an administrator as I did in being an attorney.

I have been impressed with this program because, in the first place, as a lawyer, I know the problems of dealing with the administration and in being in charge of several lawyers and investigators and secretaries. There are many things administrators should know about office management. For some reason lawyers just don't seem to gain this knowledge in their experience as a lawyer or from law school classes. I first became aware of myself in that role; I was totally unprepared for it--trying to effectively run and operate a public defender's office. One of the first things I learned was some insight into being able to recognize certain problems that would be detrimental to the office. After the second meeting, I became aware of my own problems in terms of personality in trying to be an effective administrator. After being made aware of the valuable time lost by administrators I set up a time schedule. The schedule enabled me to accomplish more. I was not aware of the amount of time wasted which could have contributed to effectiveness of representation.

Also, I was able to convey this idea to the other branch offices who apparently had not been made aware of these problems. We gained substantial results from the simple awareness of these matters. Another thing I attempted was to get more statistical data on all the areas of our operation in order to effectively evaluate just what we were doing, the amount of time involved and whether we were overstaffed or understaffed. We have not gotten all of the statistical data we would need. However, we now know in order to properly hire or reduce personnel this data is necessary. This is the only tool by which you are able to measure your effectiveness and whether or not additional persons are needed to accomplish adequate representation in a job. Another thing certainly gained was the exchange of ideas with attorneys from all over the country. In many ways we share common problems and experiences. In listening to their talks and finding solutions to these problems I have been greatly helped with problems in my office. The program would be very beneficial to judges, police officers and all persons involved in the criminal justice system. I feel in order to effectively administer any type of program or performance one must understand himself and those he works with. This program gave us a sort of outside stimulus as to how to effectively represent indigents, which I feel could not be obtained unless through a seminar like this.

END