



# Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No.: 25-119*

For business meeting on October 24, 2025

---

**Title**

Judicial Council Update: Report on  
Compliance With Education Rules for  
Justices and Judges

**Report Type**

Information

**Date of Report**

September 25, 2025

**Submitted by**

Michelle Curran, Administrative Director  
Judicial Council

**Contact**

Karene Alvarado, Director  
Center for Judicial Education and Resources  
415-865-7761  
[karene.alvarado@jud.ca.gov](mailto:karene.alvarado@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts have submitted to the Judicial Council cumulative records of participation in education by their benches, as required under California Rules of Court, rule 10.452(d)(6) and (e)(7), for the 2022–2024 education cycle, which concluded on December 31, 2024.

### Relevant Previous Reporting or Action

The Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2007, adopted education rules for justices and judges. Rule 10.452(d)(6) and (e)(7) specifically pertain to the responsibilities of the Chief Justice, administrative presiding justices, and trial court presiding judges to collect records of participation on education of their benches and report to the Judicial Council on that participation after the end of every education cycle.

### Analysis/Rationale

Rules 10.461(e) and 10.462(f) require all justices and trial court judges, respectively, to track their participation in education activity and to submit those participation records to their courts annually. At the end of every three-year education cycle, those justices and judges must submit to their courts a cumulative history of their education for the entire education cycle. As stated

above, the Chief Justice, administrative presiding justices, and trial court presiding judges must in turn report that cumulative data to the Judicial Council following the conclusion of every education cycle.

As required under the rules, Judicial Council staff have received the aggregate education reporting forms for the 2022–2024 education cycle. These forms reflect compliance with the rules for continuing education hours by justices and judges. Experienced justices were required and experienced judges were expected to complete 30 hours of continuing education during the three-year education cycle. New justices were required and new judges were expected to complete a pro rata amount of continuing education hours, depending on the year they entered the education cycle as an experienced justice or judge (i.e., 30 hours for three years, 20 for two years, or 10 for one year). Following is a broad analysis of these submissions with respect to compliance under the education rules.

### **Supreme and appellate courts**

The table below provides the breakdown of the reporting compliance, by court, of the continuing education hour requirement for the 2022–2024 education cycle for the Supreme Court and appellate courts. In summary, the completion rate was 100 percent during the 2022–2024 education cycle—an increase from the 2019–2021 cycle.

**Compliance With Continuing Education Hour Requirement During 2022–2024 Education Cycle**

| <b>Court</b>                               | <b>Number of Justices Who Completed Hours</b> | <b>Number of Justices Who Did Not Complete Hours</b> |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Supreme Court                              | 7                                             | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, First Appellate District  | 18                                            | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District | 31                                            | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District  | 10                                            | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District | 26                                            | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District  | 10                                            | 0                                                    |
| Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District  | 7                                             | 0                                                    |

### **Trial courts**

Below is a breakdown of the reporting compliance of the continuing education hour expectation for the 2022–2024 education cycle for the trial courts. In summary, of those reporting, approximately 99 percent of trial court judicial officers completed their continuing education hour expectation during the 2022–2024 education cycle. This figure is consistent with the 99 percent completion rate of trial court judicial officers from the 2019–2021 education cycle.

- Fifty-eight of the 58 superior courts submitted the aggregate reporting form.
- Forty-seven of the courts reported that all the judicial officers who had continuing education hours expectations fulfilled their hours.

- Out of 2,047 judicial officers statewide, 21 (approximately 1 percent) did not fully complete their continuing education hours.
- Statewide, 71 judicial officers were granted an extension of time in which to fulfill their continuing education expectations.<sup>1</sup>

#### Compliance With Continuing Education Hour Requirement During 2022–2024 Education Cycle

| Court        | % of Judicial Officers Compliant With the Rules |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Alameda      | 97                                              |
| Alpine       | 100                                             |
| Amador       | 100                                             |
| Butte        | 100                                             |
| Calaveras    | 100                                             |
| Colusa       | 100                                             |
| Contra Costa | 95                                              |
| Del Norte    | 100                                             |
| El Dorado    | 100                                             |
| Fresno       | 98                                              |
| Glenn        | 100                                             |
| Humboldt     | 100                                             |
| Imperial     | 100                                             |
| Inyo         | 100                                             |
| Kern         | 100                                             |
| Kings        | 100                                             |
| Lake         | 100                                             |
| Lassen       | 100                                             |
| Los Angeles  | 99                                              |
| Madera       | 100                                             |
| Marin        | 85                                              |
| Mariposa     | 100                                             |
| Mendocino    | 100                                             |
| Merced       | 100                                             |
| Modoc        | 100                                             |
| Mono         | 100                                             |
| Monterey     | 100                                             |
| Napa         | 100                                             |
| Nevada       | 100                                             |

| Court           | % of Judicial Officers Compliant With the Rules |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Orange          | 99                                              |
| Placer          | 100                                             |
| Plumas          | 100                                             |
| Riverside       | 100                                             |
| Sacramento      | 100                                             |
| San Benito      | 100                                             |
| San Bernardino  | 99                                              |
| San Diego       | 100                                             |
| San Francisco   | 85                                              |
| San Joaquin     | 100                                             |
| San Luis Obispo | 100                                             |
| San Mateo       | 100                                             |
| Santa Barbara   | 95                                              |
| Santa Clara     | 100                                             |
| Santa Cruz      | 92                                              |
| Shasta          | 100                                             |
| Sierra          | 100                                             |
| Siskiyou        | 100                                             |
| Solano          | 100                                             |
| Sonoma          | 100                                             |
| Stanislaus      | 96                                              |
| Sutter          | 100                                             |
| Tehama          | 100                                             |
| Trinity         | 100                                             |
| Tulare          | 100                                             |
| Tuolumne        | 100                                             |
| Ventura         | 100                                             |
| Yolo            | 100                                             |
| Yuba            | 100                                             |

<sup>1</sup> The number of extensions in this cycle resulted from the high volume of new judicial appointments during the cycle, and the limited number of seats available at the B. E. Witkin Judicial College program, which the rules require all new judicial officers to attend.

**Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications**

None.

**Attachments and Links**

1. Link A: Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.452,  
[courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=ten&linkid=rule10\\_452](https://courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=ten&linkid=rule10_452)