

# JUDICIAL OUTREACH AND COURT-COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

LAW LIBRARY  
SUPERIOR COURT of ARIZONA, MARICOPA COUNTY

January 2005

## CONTENTS

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION .....	2
SELECTED NEWS ARTICLES.....	10
ETHICAL ISSUES .....	11
COURT-COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROJECT WEB SITES.....	12
ADDITIONAL WEB RESOURCES .....	13

## ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

Abrahamson, Shirley S. "Involving Individual Citizens with Courts and Tribunals: Initiatives in the United States and Canada," in Stephen Gerard Coughlan and Dawn A. Russell, *Citizenship and Citizen Participation in the Administration of Justice* 35. Montréal: Éditions Thémis, c2002. Available at [http://www.themis.umontreal.ca/consultation\\_gratuite/ica2001/2\\_abrahamson.pdf](http://www.themis.umontreal.ca/consultation_gratuite/ica2001/2_abrahamson.pdf).

Justice Abrahamson argues that although the judiciary is held in high regard (a 98% approval rate in her "non-random, non-scientific" Wisconsin polls), it is critical to maintain that level of public trust and confidence in an era in which most government institutions lack it, and critical to reflect the business community's emphasis on service. Justice Abrahamson focuses on three aspects of public participation in the courts: outreach (lawyers and judges talking with the people); input (getting non-lawyers into the courts to help in the appointment of judges, lawyer discipline, judicial discipline, bar examinations, and volunteering); and communicating with the executive and judicial branches on issues of mutual concern.

Aguirre, Mary Ann. *The National Judicial College Presents the Courage to Live Program: A Judicial Outreach Program To Combat Underage Drinking and Driving, A Guidebook for Judges*. Reno, NV: National Judicial College, 2001.

The Courage to Live program is a judicial outreach program designed to combat underage drinking and driving. The program provides judges with teaching tools, resources, and other information they need to discuss the consequences of drinking and driving with young people in school. The program includes a guidebook for judges with model one-day, half-day, and one-hour curricula.

American Bar Association. Committee on State Justice Initiatives. *Summary of State and Local Justice Initiatives 2000*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, Office of Justice Initiatives, 2000. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/justice/00summary/home.html>.

The 2000 *Summary* identifies 1,035 programs or initiatives, including three categories involving non-lawyers that have increased in recent years: futures commissions (long-term scenarios for court systems), justice commissions (dealing with on-going general or specific issues), and citizen conferences (forums designed for interaction with non-lawyers). "Traditional" efforts, such as access to courts for poor and moderate income people, public education, alternative dispute resolution, and juvenile justice are identified as well. State bar and court contacts are included. The 1999 report is also available at: <http://www.abanet.org/justice/99summary/home.html>.

American Bar Association. Committee on State Justice Initiatives. *Summary of State and Local Justice Improvement Activities (2003): Bar/Court State and Local Justice Improvement Activities—2003*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, Coalition for Justice, 2003. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/justice/03summary/home.html>.

The ABA's Committee on State Justice Initiatives (now merged into the Coalition for Justice) has surveyed state and local bar associations and state supreme courts to build an information clearinghouse, and in 2001 also included selected metropolitan trial courts. The 2003 survey results show over 1,000 areas of court and bar association activities intended to improve access, combat bias, improve judicial selection, enhance jury duty, preserve judicial independence, inform the public, and make courts more user-friendly. Citizens' conferences, town hall meetings, and community forums have increased, the Utah State Courts' 27 public hearings on racial and ethnic fairness singled out as an example. Arizona is noted as providing for the largest number of special commissions, committees and task forces since 1995, focusing on technology, minorities, judicial education, probation, juvenile courts, alternate dispute resolution, judicial ethics, and limited jurisdiction courts. The ABA supports such community involvement initiatives as particularly important sources of fresh ideas, public support for reform, and strengthened public trust. The 2001 *Summary* is also available at <http://www.abanet.org/justice/01summary/home.html>.

Berman, Greg and David Anderson. *Engaging the Community: A Guide for Community Justice Planners*. New York: Center for Court Innovation, 1997. Available at [http://www.courtinnovation.org/pdf/engag\\_comm.pdf](http://www.courtinnovation.org/pdf/engag_comm.pdf).

*Engaging the Community* is intended as a guide for community justice planners seeking to build stronger links to their communities. The authors argue that community justice is about two essential things - partnerships and problem-solving – and that no single organization can solve community problems without investing significant time and energy in engaging the community. The authors cover early stages of program development, basic tools that have been successful, and potential stumbling blocks in reaching out to citizens, businesses, and community service providers.

Brown, Gary S. "Court Monitoring: A Say for Citizens in Their Justice System." 80 *Judicature* 219 (1997).

This article describes the New York courts' use of monitors to observe their local courts and record their assessments of procedures and the performance of judges and court personnel. Volunteers were recruited by the Fund for Modern Courts through press releases and local newspaper articles, contacts with volunteer agencies (such as the United Way's Retired Senior Volunteer Program) and civic groups (such as the League of Women Voters), and offices of local elected officials. Monitors attend court, use forms to comment on the efficiency and demeanor of the judges; treatment of victims, witnesses, jurors, and members of the public; apparent causes of delay in court proceedings; availability of public information; factors inhibiting fair hearings; and the courts' physical conditions.

Brown, Jack L. *Judicial Division Hosts First National Judicial Outreach Conference Presented By the Judges Network*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, Judicial Division, 2004. Available at [http://www.abanet.org/jd/judgesnetwork/pdf/O4conference\\_brown.pdf](http://www.abanet.org/jd/judgesnetwork/pdf/O4conference_brown.pdf).

This is a brief report on the ABA Judicial Division's Inaugural National Judicial Outreach Conference, presented by the Judges Network April 30 - May 1, 2004, in Memphis, Tennessee; Jack L. Brown is the former Judges Network Chair. The conference included a panel of judges discussing typical ethical issues involved in judicial outreach activities; the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Partners Program created by Pennsylvania judges to meet with state legislators for dinner to discuss issues of common concern; a workshop presentation of the national issues forum program, "And Justice for All" by Hon. Louraine Arkfeld, a program sponsored by the ABA and the Kettering Foundation that addresses equal access and improving the justice system and is very popular in town hall settings and high schools; a Judges Network program on *Brown v. Board of Education*, presented at three Memphis area high schools on prior to the start of the conference; and the Tennessee SCALES Program (Tennessee Supreme Court Advancing Legal Education for Students), a multi-part program in which judges and lawyers engage high school students in interactive activities to improve their understanding of the courts.

Casey, Pamela and David B. Rottman. *Problem-Solving Courts: Models and Trends*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 2003. Available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/COMM\\_SpeProProbSolvCtsPub.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/COMM_SpeProProbSolvCtsPub.pdf).

This paper discusses problem-solving courts in four general areas: community courts, domestic violence courts, drug courts, and mental health courts. These specialized courts vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but all are found to focus on closer collaboration with the service communities in their jurisdictions and to stress a collaborative, multidisciplinary approach to the underlying issues.

Feinblatt, John, and Greg Berman. *Responding to the Community: Principles for Planning and Creating a Community Court*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of

Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997. Available at <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/bja/166821.pdf>.

This Bureau of Justice Assistance bulletin presents guidance for community justice planners, using the Midtown Community Court in New York City as a case study. The authors set out common principles for effective community courts centered on giving the community a voice in shaping restorative justice - opening dialogs with neighbors, seeking neighborhood input in developing appropriate community service projects, using community advisory boards to provide regular interaction with the judge and court administrators. Based on the Midtown Community Court's experiences, the authors identify six key goals of community justice: restoring the community, bridging the gap between communities and courts, connecting a fractured criminal justice system, helping offenders deal with their problems, providing courts with better information, and building a courthouse that fosters these goals. The authors also suggest opening social services at the court to other people in the community who might benefit from educational, job training, and counseling programs, and structuring the court as a resource for a wide range of needs and services such as Alcoholics Anonymous and English-as-a-second-language classes.

Feinblatt, John and Robert G. M. Keating. *Courts and the Community: Using Technology to Create the New Partnership*. Paper presented at the Sixth National Court Technology Conference (CTC6), Los Angeles, CA, September 1999. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 1999. Available at <http://www.ctc8.net/showarticle.asp?id=54>.

The authors argue that promoting civic involvement, enhancing the role of courts in solving some of the underlying problems that bring people to courts, and improving public confidence in the justice system begins with information, and therefore with technology. They use Center for Court Innovation demonstration projects to illustrate the use of information technology in three key ways: to help judges make more informed decisions, to increase offender accountability, and to promote collaboration.

Fruin, Richard. *Judicial Outreach on a Shoestring: A Working Manual*. Chicago: American Bar Association, 1999.

Descriptions of 17 judicial outreach projects from across the country, along with the programs' working papers and public relations materials. Projects include town hall meetings, teen courts and judge-hosted educational radio programs. Argues that programs presenting a judge's workday in an interesting fashion can be put together at little or no cost.

Garcia, Patricia. *Community Involvement: The Key to Successful Justice Reform*. Chicago: American Bar Association, Office of Justice Initiatives, 1998.

One of the Office of Justice Initiatives' "Roadmaps" series, this publication's author argues that citizen participation increases understanding of the role of the courts in individual lives, and bolsters confidence in the courts and court decisions.

Gordon, Frank X. *Survey by Vice Chief Justice Frank X. Gordon, Jr., Arizona Supreme Court, for the Courts and the Community Committee of the American Bar Association on Programs for Improving the Image of the Judiciary*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 1984.

Former Arizona Supreme Court Chief Justice Frank X. Gordon conducted this survey of state Supreme Court chief justices to identify state court efforts to improve the image of the judiciary. The survey focused primarily on information dissemination, and the responses - listed by state - lean heavily toward pamphlets and brochures, video tapes, media programs, etc., although educational efforts in the schools and court-bar programs are also listed. The survey is dated but provides a look at the state of the art in the 1980s.

*Improving Court and Community Collaboration: A National Town Hall Meeting, October 14, 1995: Conference Proceedings.* Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 1996.

This is an overview of the 1995 National Town Hall Meeting sponsored by the National Center for State Courts, American Judicature Society and State Justice Institute. The Town Hall was intended to explore ways in which courts and communities may collaborate to improve justice system and the public's trust and confidence in it, by establishing a sustained, two-way commitment to communication and participation. Promising strategies presented and evaluated included the Alabama Judicial College, Los Angeles's Coalition for Justice and Monroe High School Partnership programs, Cook County's Court Watchers program, Virginia's Consumer Research & Service Development Project, and the New Jersey volunteers program.

*Judges Network Survey Report.* Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, Judicial Division, 2002. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/jd/judgesnetwork/pdf/surveyreportaugust2002.pdf>.

The ABA Judicial Division's Judges Network Survey was mailed to all judge members of the Division and judges involved in the Appellate Judges Conference. Over 500 surveys (12%) were returned. 86% of the respondents said that they had been involved in judicial outreach in the last three years. The survey defined "outreach" as an activity in which the judge talks about his or her experiences as a judge or discusses the judicial process with members of the community, and provided specific categories including bench/media conferences, cross cultural initiatives, literacy initiatives, senior citizen legal topics, speakers' bureaus, substance abuse, and teen legal topics. The most frequently cited were bench/media conferences (17%), teen legal topics (15%), and speakers' bureaus (14%); however, a large percentage of respondents did not place at least one outreach experience within those categories, and "other" accounted for over 17%. Schools (31%) and courthouses (29%) were the most frequent settings.

Judicial Council of California. Special Task Force on Court/Community Outreach. *Report of the Special Task Force.* San Francisco, CA: Judicial Council of California, 1999. Available at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/community/outreach/report.htm>.

This Task Force report notes that public opinion surveys in California and across the nation have documented that fewer than half the public have a generally positive opinion of their local court systems. Many believe that the courts are not consistently fair; while many have more confidence in the courts than in other government institutions, the courts still are not viewed with overwhelming confidence. Fewer than half the public understand basic legal principles and the role of courts, and most receive information about the court system from the news media. The report urges institutionalization of court and community collaboration by adopting standards of judicial administration and amended rules of court, and adoption of a community-focused planning committee to provide oversight of ongoing court and community collaboration programs, interaction with state education agencies, liaison with the California Judges Association and the Commission on Judicial Performance on community outreach ethics guidelines, and collaboration with the Center for Judicial Education and Research to provide training to judges and court staff on court and community collaboration.

*Judicial Role in Public Information.* Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Judicial Council, September 1999. Available at <http://www.cjc-ccm.gc.ca/article.asp?id=2364>.

This is a Canadian Judicial Council report on the need to support federal judges in increasing public and media understanding of the court system. The report recommends that the Council encourage individual courts to develop local public information plans consistent with the national framework and tailored to needs and opportunities in their communities, implement court-media committees in all jurisdictions, and adopt approaches for "setting the public record straight in appropriate circumstances." Appendices include suggested sample speech excerpts, a Canadian Bar Association paper on Public Legal Education, and background on the initiatives of the Law

Courts Education Society of British Columbia.

Justice Management Institute. *Courts As Collaborators: Opportunities and Issues for Courts Involved In Justice System Innovations*. Washington, DC: Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, American University, 2000. Available at <http://spa.american.edu/justice/publications/CourtsCollab.pdf>.

Courts have benefited from systemic planning within the justice system – with police, prosecutors, defense counsel, pretrial and probation services, and corrections agencies – recognizing that reducing delay, for example, is a process involving non-court issues such as excessive police overtime in court and jail overcrowding. More often now, interdependency as a strategic goal is recognized as vital to accomplishing the courts' institutional purposes, and obtaining the resources needed to do so. Using as examples the experiences of the Multnomah County (Portland, OR) and Hartford (CT) community courts, Hennepin County (Minneapolis, MN) Experimental Community Court, and Ventura County (Oxnard, CA) Satellite Self Help Legal Access Center, this report argues that collaboration exposes tensions fundamental to the adjudicative process, and requires a more intensive and ongoing commitment from the courts.

Kritzer, Herbert M. and John Voelker. "Familiarity Breeds Respect: How Wisconsin Citizens View Their Courts." 82 *Judicature* 58 (1998). Available at <http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/users/kritzer/research/courteval/judicature.htm>.

In 1995, the Wisconsin Supreme Court conducted a consumer-oriented survey to assess the quality of service in Wisconsin courts and to identify areas for improvement, using both mail and exit surveys. The surveys addressed the areas of case processing, safety and convenience, courtesy, responsiveness, and respect, court decisions, and public perception of proceedings. The survey results were overwhelmingly positive in tone of the evaluations reported on. Only two items had a majority of negative responses; 25 of 35 had a majority positive response. There was no identifiable subset of respondents who had generally negative evaluations of the courts. Analysis showed that respondents to the exit survey were consistently more positive than were the respondents to the mail survey, suggesting a need to reevaluate the conventional belief that contact with the courts tends to lead citizens to view the courts less positively.

Lovko, Rae. *Court-Community Relations Survey: Final Report*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, Information Service, 1994. Available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS\\_CtCommRelSurv.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CtCommRelSurv.pdf).

This NCSC mail survey was distributed primarily to state court administrative offices; responses were received from 45 states and the District of Columbia. Each section of the report is devoted to one specific type of court-community relations activity - courthouse tours, citizen guides, speaker's bureaus and meet-your-judge programs, school outreach efforts, media outreach efforts, citizen advisory committees, public opinion surveys, volunteer programs, and court-watching programs. A copy of the survey instrument is included as an appendix.

Mackenzie, Brian W. "A Community Based Approach to Domestic Violence." 73 *Michigan Bar Journal* 936 (1994).

Describes a domestic violence pilot program of the 52-1 District Court in conjunction with HAVEN, a women's shelter, and the police departments of Walled Lake, Wixom, and Milford, MI. The program was based on the premise that the best approach to domestic assault, a societal problem, is a broad-based community response.

National Association for Court Management. *Community, Creativity, Collaboration: A Community Dialogue for the Courts*. Williamsburg, VA: National Association for Court Management, 2001.

One in the National Association for Court Management (NACM) Mini-Guide series, this publication is based on the premise that communities welcome court involvement and believe they have better access to the courts when they know they are being listened to and see their needs and concerns addressed, while courts gain increased trust, confidence, respect and support by initiating outreach and collaboration. The publication provides examples of state court programs in the areas of ADR, mobile self-help center, and cultural liaison programs, and a roadmap for working through obstacles and planning outreach strategies and objectives.

National Association for Court Management. Comprehensive Public Information Programs Subcommittee. *Developing Comprehensive Public Information Programs for Courts*. Williamsburg, VA: National Association for Court Management, 1996.

This NACM publication catalogs public information and outreach program possibilities in the areas of elementary and high school outreach, community outreach, reaching out to court customers, and public information programs. "Reaching out to kids" examples include tours, school presentations, mock trials and skits, and the teen court model. "Reaching out to the community" covers meet-your-judges and judicial ride-along programs, judicial speaker bureaus, Law Day programs, and annual reports, while programs for court customers include juror orientations, brochures, courthouse displays, and multimedia – kiosks, Web sites, videos, etc. The section on public information emphasizes planning, public information officers and volunteers, training and funding. A good appendix of resources, programs and contacts is included.

Olson, Susan M. and David A. Huth. "Explaining Public Attitudes Toward Local Courts." 20 *Justice System Journal* 41 (1998).

The authors argue that the nature and levels of public support for state and local courts should be different than that for the U.S. Supreme Court (on which most studies of public support for courts had been based), since citizens are much more likely to have personal experience with their local courts. Based on survey data from the Utah courts, the authors conclude that the perception of fairness is most important for citizens who have had such experience, and generalized confidence in government for those who have not had personal experience with their local courts.

Orchard, Dennis. "Involving Citizens with Courts and Tribunals: Initiatives in Canada," in Stephen Gerard Coughlan and Dawn A. Russell, *Citizenship and Citizen Participation in the Administration of Justice* 45. Montréal: Éditions Thémis, c2002. Available at [http://www.themis.umontreal.ca/consultation\\_gratuite/icaj2001/3\\_orchard.pdf](http://www.themis.umontreal.ca/consultation_gratuite/icaj2001/3_orchard.pdf).

The author gives an overview of the Canadian Judicial Council's recommendations for court communications and outreach initiatives in three areas: educational initiatives at all levels of the education system, public initiatives that engage groups representative of the community, and reaching providing a forum for constructive discussion with the media about reporting of justice issues. A survey of superior courts showed that nine courts had set up communications or media relations committees and that educational programs were increasing. Ontario superior and provincial courts established a committee of judges, legal educators, teachers, lawyers and provincial ministries to promote courthouse and classroom visits; more than 200 judges volunteered. British Columbia was a clear leader in public education and outreach programs – the Law Courts Education Society, a non-profit organization working with the Ministry of Attorney General, the Ministry of Education, the Judiciary, the Canadian Bar Association, schools and communities, has been delivering legal education programs in schools and the community for more than 20 years, providing education programs for thousands of students and others annually, hundreds of educational visits to the courts, and curricula and programs for the primary intermediate and secondary grades in Law, Social Studies, First Nations Studies, and career and personal planning.

Paik, Leslie. *Surveying Communities: Resource for Community Justice Planners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2003. Available at

[http://www.courtinnovation.org/pdf/surveying\\_communities\\_bja.pdf](http://www.courtinnovation.org/pdf/surveying_communities_bja.pdf).

Argues that approaches to identifying community concerns such as interviewing neighborhood leaders (clergy, business groups, school principals) and conducting focus groups (teenagers, single mothers, ethnic groups) reach only small segments of a community – community surveys provide a more complete picture. This publication gives an overview of constructing and conducting a community survey.

Rottman, David B. "On Public Trust and Confidence: Does Experience with the Courts Promote or Diminish It?" 35 *Court Review* 14 (Winter 1998). Available at <http://aja.ncsc.dni.us/courtrv/cr35-4/CR35-4Rottman.pdf>.

The belief that experience with a court reduces a person's confidence in the courts stems from *The Public Image of the Courts*, a landmark 1977 public opinion survey. The report concluded that those having knowledge and experience with the courts voiced the greatest dissatisfaction and criticism of them. Rottman examines more recent public opinion surveys to determine whether the "greater experience, less confidence" judgment still applies. He finds that in statewide opinion surveys since 1977, the extent and nature of public contact with courts has changed dramatically, suggesting that "undifferentiated" experience with a court is not in itself related to public opinion – it is particular kinds of experience that tend to increase or reduce public confidence. Negative images of trial courts in the mass media appear to be influential, and are not readily changed by positive contact. Efforts to improve public support for courts based on expanding public knowledge about the courts' role and court procedures through judicial outreach – such as educational programs, newsletters, and court visitor programs – are too limited. Surveys suggest that an emphasis on allowing for more direct participation by litigants and more meaningful involvement by the public in court programs will improve the public's experiences and confidence. Programs that improve access to justice are critical to strengthening public support, but courts also need tools to promote a positive image among infrequent and non-users.

Rottman, David B., Hillery S. Efke and Pamela Casey. *A Guide to Court and Community Collaboration*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 1998. Available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/Res\\_CtComm\\_CFCCGuidePub.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/Res_CtComm_CFCCGuidePub.pdf).

The focus of this guide is on lessons learned in established court-community collaborations. The discussion is based primarily on eight collaborations studied in detail, with the experiences of another dozen considered as well. Particular attention is paid to the role of education in fostering court-community collaboration objectives. The authors find that collaboration arises most consistently in juvenile and family jurisdictions, but that programs can be found in most areas of criminal justice, including substance abuse, firearm-related offenses, drunk driving, and quality-of-life misdemeanors. What defines the success of these courts is a commitment to treat the public as real partners in improving the administration of justice. Civil justice disputes, however, have received less consideration to date, although innovations in landlord/tenant cases and community mediation suggest a significant potential for a community focus in the civil arena as well.

Rottman, David B., Hillery Efke, Randall Hansen and Shelley Stump. *A Leadership Guide to Statewide Court and Community Collaboration*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 2002. Available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/Res\\_CtComm\\_CFCLeadershipGuidePub.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/Res_CtComm_CFCLeadershipGuidePub.pdf).

This *Leadership Guide* is intended for state court chief justices, judicial council members, and court administrators. It is a companion to the 1998 *Guide to Court and Community Collaboration*, which focused more on experimenting with local collaborations. A commitment to solving community problems is the hallmark of successful community-focused courts in general and an essential element of any court-community collaboration. The community must be part of a two-way consultation about how a court should operate rather than merely a recipient of information or services from the court, and true court-community collaboration requires that community involvement become a regular part of the court's operation, rather than a one-time effort to reach



out for community input or support. The appendix includes site reports on court-community collaboration in California, Massachusetts' *Reinventing Justice* initiative, and New York's Center for Court Innovation.

"Shall We Dance? The Courts, the Community, and the News Media (Panel Discussion)." 80 *Judicature* 30 (1996).

This is a transcript of a panel discussion held at the American Judicature Society's 1996 midyear meeting. The questions examined include: is the public getting accurate information about courts? Is it getting complete information? To what extent does media coverage affect public trust and confidence in the courts? How can courts learn more about how the public views them? To what extent can or should courts become involved in community and news media outreach? What information should be conveyed? Who should speak for the courts? What are the areas of tension in the relationship between courts and the news media, and how can they be resolved?

Stump, Shelley *et al.* *Dialogue: Courts Reaching Out To Their Communities: A Handbook for Creating and Enhancing Court and Community Collaboration*. San Francisco, CA: Judicial Council of California, 1998. Available at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/community/handbook.htm>.

In 1999, the Judicial Council of California approved the recommendations of the Special Task Force on Court/Community Outreach. This handbook, one of the Task Force's primary products, is intended to introduce the concepts associated with court and community collaboration (e.g., court community outreach, community-focused courts, community courts, restorative justice, etc.) and the steps necessary to achieving a community-oriented court. The Handbook covers effective communication with the community, building productive relationships with partners and volunteers, developing initiatives to resolve community problems, identifying ethical considerations arising from judicial officer involvement, and promoting creativity and innovation in a changing environment.

Sviridoff, Michele *et al.* *Dispensing Justice Locally*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation, 1997. Available at [http://www.communityjustice.org/pdf/disp\\_just\\_loc.pdf](http://www.communityjustice.org/pdf/disp_just_loc.pdf).

An evaluation of the Midtown Community Court over its first 18 months of operation. Key objectives were to make justice visible in the community where crimes take place, and to marshal local residents, organizations and businesses to collaborate on developing community and social services. Court staff worked closely with community groups to identify local quality-of-life problems and address these problems through community restitution. Project staff recruited community-based partners to supervise neighborhood community services — substance-abuse counseling, health education classes for prostitutes and their customers, G.E.D. classes, English as a second language classes, medical testing — that were based at the courthouse itself.

Sweeney, John J., Richard Fruin and Rebecca J. Fanning. "Courts Connecting with Their Communities: Judicial Outreach Comes of Age," in *The Improvement of the Administration of Justice*, 7th ed., Ch. 33. Gordon M. Griller and E. Keith Stott, Jr., eds. Chicago, IL: Lawyers Conference, Judicial Division, American Bar Association, 2002.

The authors describe the state of judicial outreach at the outset of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They believe that judicial outreach has moved from "project" or "judicial hobby" status to become a core function of courts – outreach as part of the court's mission is a powerful and critical means of changing attitudes, softening cynicism, building trust, and addressing real problems. The authors emphasize concepts of education, understanding, investment and involvement in designing, implementing and evaluation outreach programs, and the value and necessity of long-term commitment to community interaction.

Tyler, Tom R. "Public Trust and Confidence in Legal Authorities: What Do Majority and

Minority Group Members Want from the Law and Legal Institutions?" 19 *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* 215 (2001).

The author argues that public trust and confidence in the courts and justice system is linked more to perceived treatment of the public than to the public's evaluation of outcomes and perceptions of cost and delay - that is, to the public's evaluation of the fairness of the courts' procedures and exercise of authority. The article discusses the procedural factors most important to public perceptions of fairness and trust.

*Volunteers in the Courts: A Partnership for Justice*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Supreme Court, 2000. Available at <http://www.courts.state.wi.us/services/volunteer/docs/volunteer.pdf>.

The Wisconsin courts' Volunteers in the Courts Program started in February 1996. This overview describes the Volunteers in the Courts' program catalog of over 200 existing programs statewide, and four general program areas: CASA programs, teen courts, mediation programs and community service programs.

## SELECTED NEWS ARTICLES

"BBA, MA Bankruptcy Court Announce Financial Literacy Partnership." 12 *Metropolitan Corporate Counsel* 66 (December 2004).

This article describes the Joint Bankruptcy Court/BBA Task Force on Financial Literacy for Students, a partnership to develop a financial literacy program for high school seniors throughout Massachusetts, announced by Chief Judge Joan Feeney of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Massachusetts and M. Ellen. Carpenter, president of the Boston Bar Association. A curriculum focusing on budgeting, managing bank accounts, taxes, and responsible use of credit cards is expected to be completed by February 2005. The five bankruptcy judges in the Massachusetts District have volunteered to teach the course, along with volunteer lawyers recruited by the Boston Bar Association.

Berry, Jahna. "Courting the Classroom: Eighth-Graders Get Personal Lesson From Judge Dorado." *The Recorder (San Francisco)* 1 (March 16, 2001).

An account of Alameda County (CA) Superior Court Judge Leopoldo Dorado's class visit with middle school students in Castro Valley, one of several Bay Area programs that are part of the California Judicial Council's community outreach initiatives. The goal of the classroom program is to match the judges' class visits to the students' learning about the U.S. Constitution and the branches of government.

Goldstein, Matthew. "Courts, Foundation Team Up to Try New Strategies." 217 *New York Law Journal* 1 (February 6, 1997).

This article recounts the New York court system's initial partnership with the Fund for the City of New York, a private foundation, in developing the Center for Court Innovation as a joint venture to assist judges in devising strategies and technologies for improving the judicial system. The Center was intended as a "judicial incubator" that would develop and evaluate new approaches to administering justice. The Center would be jointly operated by the court system and the Fund.

Morales, Cynthia. "Young Lawyers Meet Newly Elected Judges." 77 *Miami Daily Business Review* S6 (December 5, 2002).

The Judicial Outreach Committee of the Dade County Bar Association's Young Lawyer's Section holds regular opportunities for the local judiciary to interact with young lawyers. The Committee sponsors monthly "Meet the Judges" luncheons, allowing judges and young lawyers to meet

together in an open and relaxed atmosphere.

Neal, Traci. "Courts Treat Minorities Differently, Poll Finds: Judicial Branch Tries To Address Issue and Become User-Friendly." 25 *Connecticut Law Tribune* 5 (June 28, 1999).

A majority of Connecticut respondents to a Hartford Courant/University of Connecticut Center for Survey Research and Analysis opinion poll believe minorities are treated differently by this state's courts. Only 67 percent believe men and women are treated equally in the courts. The poll results were similar to a 1998 poll in which 45.5% said Connecticut courts discriminate against minorities, including 43.4% percent of whites, 68.1% of African-Americans and 47.8% of Hispanics. Among the Connecticut courts' outreach efforts are judges speaking to school groups and civic organizations, Saturday open-courthouses (including courthouse tours, music, dancing and food), public service television spots, and a focus on hiring more interpreters.

Stowe, Daniel. "Court System Is Reaching Out To Residents." 26 *Connecticut Law Tribune* 20 (October 23, 2000).

The Connecticut Judicial Branch has a Judicial Community Outreach Program coordinator, appointed by Judge Aaron Ment, who created the program as a statewide educational effort to improve public trust and confidence in the state court system. The program coordinator arranges visits to court facilities to allow the public to observe court hearings and other courtroom proceedings, tour juvenile detention facilities, or meet with Superior Court judges and court personnel.

## ETHICAL ISSUES

Gray, Cynthia. *When Judges Speak Up: Ethics, the Public, & the Media*. Chicago, IL: American Judicature Society, 1998.

A multimedia curriculum (video and self-study guide) designed to help judges resolve conflicts between demands for their observations on cases and controversial legal issues and their commitment to maintaining public confidence in the judiciary.

Gray, Cynthia. *Ethics and Judges' Evolving Roles off the Bench: Serving on Governmental Commissions*. Chicago, IL: American Judicature Society, 2002.

One in the American Judicature Society's *Key Issues in Judicial Ethics* series, this pamphlet sets out the applicable analysis for judicial involvement in government-related organizations: does the work concern "the improvement of the law, the legal system, or administration of justice?" Would membership "cast reasonable doubt" on a judge's ability to act impartially? What are the implications and extent of offering judicial expertise? An index of state judicial ethics advisory opinions is included.

Gray, Cynthia. *A Judge's Attendance at Social Events, Bar Association Functions, Civic and Charitable Functions, and Political Gatherings*, rev. ed. Chicago, IL: American Judicature Society, 1998.

This brief monograph discusses issues that may arise under Canons 4 and 5 of the ABA's Model Code of Judicial Conduct when judges interact with the community. Covered are issues relating to social events, bar association functions, civic and charitable activities, and political gatherings. Emphasis is on balancing activities intended to improve the law, the legal system and administration of justice, and avoiding isolation from the community, versus the appearance of integrity and impartiality.

## COURT-COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROJECT WEB SITES

California Court and Community Collaboration.

<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/community/index.htm>.

The California judicial branch site includes information on community-focused court planning projects and two general areas of court-community outreach programs: public education programs and community justice initiatives. Includes the publication *Dialogue, Courts Reaching Out to Their Communities, A Handbook for Creating and Enhancing Court and Community Collaboration*.

Hawai`i State Judiciary - Community Outreach.

[http://www.courts.state.hi.us/page\\_server/Outreach/71DED53B1F21073FEC3F376766.html](http://www.courts.state.hi.us/page_server/Outreach/71DED53B1F21073FEC3F376766.html).

Information on outreach and community participation programs within the Hawai`i judicial system in the areas of History Center, Speakers Bureau, volunteer opportunities, court tours and judges in the classroom.

Massachusetts Court System - Reinventing Justice Initiative.

<http://www.mass.gov/courts/admin/planning/rijitro.html>

Provides information on the trial, district and special court projects developed as a result of the Massachusetts Commission on the Future of the Court's 1992 report, *Reinventing Justice: 2022*, and its vision of a 21st century court system that would be more accessible, affordable, accountable and user-friendly. These court/community initiatives include court/community councils or collaboration boards, open houses, education programs, development of court-specific brochures (translated into the languages of the community the courts serve), volunteer-staffed information booths at courthouses, restorative justice panels, and town meetings. The programs were to be designed in such a way as to be incorporated into the courts' ongoing activities, rather than requiring continued funding.

Michigan Supreme Court - Learning Center. <http://courts.michigan.gov/plc/index.htm>.

The Michigan Supreme Court's Learning Center is well-designed for students and adults. The site includes volunteer opportunities, a gallery of exhibits, and educational resources. The physical gallery includes introductory videos, computer programs, push-button programs and traditional wall text panels.

Oregon Court of Appeals – School and Community Outreach.

<http://www.ojd.state.or.us/courts/coa/PublicOutreach.htm>.

This site describes the Oregon Court of Appeals' School and Community Outreach program, in which judges and staff regularly travel throughout the state to hear oral arguments in cases and talk with high school and college students and community groups about the Court and the state's court system.

New York State Unified Court System - Community Outreach Initiative.

[http://www.nycourts.gov/Community\\_Outreach/](http://www.nycourts.gov/Community_Outreach/).

Essentially a modified version of the New York court system's web sites, with court user guides, court history, "Visit a Courthouse" and "Virtual Courthouse Tour" features along with other public information pages such as press releases, directories, publications and links.

Superior Court of California, Santa Barbara County - Community Outreach Programs.

[http://www.sbcourts.org/special\\_programs/comm\\_outreach.htm](http://www.sbcourts.org/special_programs/comm_outreach.htm).

Provides information on courthouse tours, court-administered dispute resolution programs, Family Court services, Substance Abuse Treatment Court, and state judicial branch resources on community outreach programs in California.

Superior Court of California, Ventura County – Community Outreach Online Survey.

[http://courts.countyofventura.org/com\\_outreach\\_survey.asp](http://courts.countyofventura.org/com_outreach_survey.asp).

A good example of an online community survey form.

*Utah Judicial Council Rules of Judicial Administration*, Rule 3-114, “Judicial Outreach.”

Available at <http://www.utcourts.gov/resources/rules/ucja/ch03/3-114.htm>.

This unique Utah court rule became effective November 1, 2004. The stated intent is to foster a greater role for judges in service to the community, provide leadership and resources for outreach, and improve public trust and confidence in the judiciary. The rule establishes a Committee on Judicial Outreach, which is to: create and promote model outreach programs; promote local outreach programs; develop policies and rules that encourage judicial participation in outreach programs; work with educators to incorporate civic education into school curriculums; work with the Utah State Bar to develop joint outreach programs; and communicate judicial outreach efforts.

Wisconsin Court System - Educational Resources.

<http://www.courts.state.wi.us/about/resources/index.htm>.

A subset of the Wisconsin Court System’s “About the Courts” web pages, this Educational Resources page includes: *Connecting to the Courts: A Teacher’s Guide to the Wisconsin Courts*, Case of the Month, Court with Class (a program that allows classes to listen to oral arguments, see behind-the-scenes activities of the Supreme Court and talk with a Supreme Court justice in an informal, question-and-answer session), Justice Teaching Institute (a two and a half day professional development program for high school teachers), speakers bureau, Law Day planning kit, court history tools, and an online children’s activity book, *What’s Happening in Court?*

Wisconsin Court System - Volunteers in the Courts Program.

<http://www.courts.state.wi.us/services/volunteer/index.htm>.

Descriptions of court-related volunteer programs in the areas of Court-Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), teen courts, mediation programs and community service programs for minor offenders.

## **ADDITIONAL WEB RESOURCES**

American Bar Association - Coalition for Justice. <http://www.abanet.org/justice/home.html>.

The mission of the American Bar Association’s Coalition for Justice is to build public trust and confidence in the justice system and the legal profession through partnerships with the public. The Coalition has conducted and published a series of surveys of state and local court and bar association activities designed to improve public trust and confidence in the justice system, and publishes the *Roadmaps* series on topics such as problem solving courts, litigants without lawyers, and youth courts.

American Bar Association - Division for Public Education. <http://www.abanet.org/publiced/>.

The mission of the American Bar Association’s Division for Public Education is to promote public

understanding of the law and its role in American society. The Division's emphasis is on information and policy for the public, both as "consumers" and educated citizens, educators, students, the media, and lawyers and judges (with tips for client newsletters, opportunities for volunteering, etc.).

Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation - Community Justice Programs. [http://www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org/psi\\_cjp/index.shtml](http://www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org/psi_cjp/index.shtml).

Community justice promotes offender supervision, accountability, and treatment within a community context and fosters partnerships between the criminal justice system and the community. This BJA web site provides information on and evaluation of community justice initiatives including problem-solving and specialized courts, victim services, and community planning and mobilization.

Center for Court Innovation - Community Justice Exchange. [http://www.courtinnovation.org/national\\_1cje.html](http://www.courtinnovation.org/national_1cje.html).

The Community Justice Exchange site provides a source of information about community justice programs nationwide and assistance in developing such programs. The Exchange answers questions about planning and running community justice initiatives; offers individualized support for community justice planning issues such as engaging the community, crafting community service and social services sanctions, developing effective partnerships, fund-raising and technology; and conducts workshops, regional meetings and online forums. The site also provides the text of Center for Court Innovation publications.

Community Justice Exchange. <http://www.communityjustice.org/exchange.asp>.

Also a Center for Court Innovation produced site, this site is more extensive, offering best practices; a planning guide; access to a national database of community justice programs from around the country, searchable by program type, location or focus; and an online library of publications.

National Association for Court Management - Core Competency Curriculum Guidelines. Court Community Communication Curriculum Guidelines Summary: What Court Leaders Need to Know and Be Able to Do. [http://www.nacmnet.org/CCCG/cccg\\_5\\_corecompetency\\_publicmedia\\_cgsummary.html](http://www.nacmnet.org/CCCG/cccg_5_corecompetency_publicmedia_cgsummary.html).

Part of NACM's Core Competencies initiative, this Court Community Communication segment addresses the six areas of competency in court-community communications, including understandable courts, community outreach, public information, and media relations. For each area, the goals and required knowledge, skills and abilities are presented.

National Center for State Courts – Court-Community Initiatives. [http://www.ncsconline.org/WCDS/Topics/topic1.asp?search\\_value=Court-Community%20Initiatives](http://www.ncsconline.org/WCDS/Topics/topic1.asp?search_value=Court-Community%20Initiatives).

Part of the NCSC's CourTopics database, this section provides an overview of court-community collaboration, a Resource Guide, FAQs and the full text of NCSC-published or sponsored documents. Focus is on the premise that joint initiatives by trial courts and community groups and comprehensive judicial outreach efforts - community outreach efforts, community courts, volunteer service programs, court-community advisory councils, and court-community planning - are gradually replacing traditional programs that rest on bringing the public into the courthouse as volunteers or observers.

National Center for State Courts, Knowledge & Information Services. *Court and Community Initiatives: Resource Guide*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts, 2004.

Available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Education/KIS\\_CtCommGuide.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Education/KIS_CtCommGuide.pdf).

A guide to print resources, online publications and selected web sites on court-community initiatives.

National Center for State Courts - Public Trust and Confidence Programs: Lack of Public Understanding, Public Trust and Confidence Programs.  
[http://www.ncsconline.org/Projects\\_Initiatives/PTC/PublicUnderstand.htm](http://www.ncsconline.org/Projects_Initiatives/PTC/PublicUnderstand.htm).

This section of the NCSC's Public Trust and Confidence web site addresses public education efforts in the state courts, giving examples of programs in the areas of citizen advisory committees, court sessions on the road or in the schools, other educational programs, pro se and self-help materials, media coverage, "meet your judges" and speakers bureau programs, volunteers programs, web site enhancement, and improving understanding between the judiciary and legislatures.