

# Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

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

#### Submitted by

Michelle Curran, Administrative Director Judicial Council

#### **Report Type**

Information

### Date of Report

September 25, 2025

#### Contact

Karene Alvarado, Director Center for Judicial Education and Resources 415-865-7761 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

Court	Number of Justices Who Completed Hours	Number of Justices Who Did Not Complete Hours
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>&</sup>lt;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