



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on September 24, 2019

Title

Judicial Branch Education: Report on
Compliance with Education Rules for
Justices and Judges

Agenda Item Type

Information Only

Date of Report

August 16, 2019

Submitted by

Judicial Council staff
Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director

Contact

Karene Alvarado, Director
Center for Judicial Education and Research
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 2016–2018 education cycle, which concluded on December 31, 2018.

Relevant Previous Council 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 2016–2018 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 2016–2018 education cycle for the Supreme Court and appellate courts. In summary, the completion rate was 98 percent during the 2016–2018 education cycle—the same as for the 2013–2015 education cycle.

Compliance With Continuing Education Hour Requirement During 2016–2018 Education Cycle

Court	Number of Justices Who Completed Hours	Number of Justices Who Did Not Complete Hours
Supreme Court	7	0
First District Court of Appeal	20	0
Second District Court of Appeal	32	0
Third District Court of Appeal	10	1
Fourth District Court of Appeal	26	0
Fifth District Court of Appeal	10	0
Sixth District Court of Appeal	6	1

Trial courts

Below is a breakdown of the reporting compliance of the continuing education hour expectation for the 2016–2018 education cycle for the trial courts. In summary, of those reporting, approximately 96 percent of trial court judicial officers completed their continuing education hour expectation during the 2016–2018 education cycle. This figure represents an increase from the 95 percent completion rate of trial court judicial officers from the 2013–2015 education cycle.

1. All of the 58 superior courts submitted the aggregate reporting form.
2. 41 of the courts reported that all the judicial officers who had continuing education hours expectations fulfilled their hours.

3. Out of 1,908 judicial officers statewide, 80 (approximately 4 percent) did not fully complete their continuing education hours.
4. Statewide, 17 judicial officers were granted an extension of time in which to fulfill their continuing education expectations.

Compliance With Continuing Education Hour Requirement During 2016–2018 Education Cycle

Court	Percentage of Judicial Officers Compliant with the Rules
Alameda	81%
Alpine	100%
Amador	100%
Butte	100%
Calaveras	100%
Colusa	100%
Contra Costa	87%
Del Norte	100%
El Dorado	100%
Fresno	100%
Glenn	100%
Humboldt	100%
Imperial	100%
Inyo	100%
Kern	98%
Kings	100%
Lake	100%
Lassen	100%
Los Angeles	100%
Madera	90%
Marin	100%
Mariposa	100%
Mendocino	100%
Merced	67%
Modoc	100%
Mono	0%
Monterey	100%
Napa	100%
Nevada	100%
Orange	88%
Placer	100%

Plumas	100%
Riverside	100%
Sacramento	99%
San Benito	100%
San Bernardino	99%
San Diego	100%
San Francisco	98%
San Joaquin	90%
San Luis Obispo	86%
San Mateo	83%
Santa Barbara	91%
Santa Clara	97%
Santa Cruz	100%
Shasta	100%
Sierra	100%
Siskiyou	100%
Solano	100%
Sonoma	100%
Stanislaus	100%
Sutter	100%
Tehama	100%
Trinity	100%
Tulare	100%
Tuolumne	100%
Ventura	47%
Yolo	100%
Yuba	100%

Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications

N/A.

Attachments and Links

1. Link A: Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.452(d)(6) and (e)(7),
www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=ten&linkid=rule10_452