



for the

Second Quarter 2015

RECORD

NEWS FOR THE OHIO COURTS

DIRECTIONS

MARK R. SCHWEIKERT
DIRECTOR, OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

I'm happy to report that later this year, after a wait of almost eight years, judges will receive a market adjustment to their compensation. The adjustment is the result of the passage of House Bill 64, the state's biennial budget bill that was signed by the Governor in June. The first of four five percent adjustments will begin on September 29, 2015 with three additional five percent adjustments scheduled to begin on January 1, 2017, 2018, and 2019. The inclusion of this in the final version of the bill took place after lengthy discussions between the Chief Justice, the Governor, the House, and the Senate, who all deserve credit for their work and leadership on this issue. We owe a debt of gratitude to our Chief Justice, whose own leadership kept the debate about the need for a market adjustment alive when she included it in her budget request early this year.

Unfortunately, the passage of the budget bill also created a new issue of immediate concern for the judiciary. The bill reduced funding for the Ohio Judicial Conference to seventy-five percent of what was requested and eliminates our funding entirely as of December 31, 2016. This was apparently done due to concerns about the Judicial Conference model and questions about why the Conference is funded through General Revenue Funds. The Conference Officers are currently working on a proposal that will ensure the continued operations of the Conference and hope to present the plan to our Executive Committee at its meeting in September.

Another hot topic right now is the collection of justice system data. In many meetings that I have attended at the Supreme Court, the Sentencing Commission, the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, and elsewhere during the last six months, stakeholders regularly raise the need for better data to support decisions relative to budgets, legislation, and justice system management. This comes up most often in the area of sentencing. As our courts become more automated the needed data elements are becoming more accessible. There are of course, concerns about how court data will be interpreted or misinterpreted. As this debate continues, however, and the push for data gets stronger judges should start to think about how best to collect data, who does the collection, where it's going and where it's stored, and who does the analysis. Judges need to maintain a continued role in the conversation.

In This Issue...

<i>Ohio Judicial News.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Rethinking School Discipline.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Ohio Judicial Conference Website.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2015 Judicial College Schedule.....</i>	<i>9</i>

<i>2015 Annual Meeting Reminder.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Marijuana Legalization.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Ideological Biases in Judicial Decision-Making.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Ohio Judicial Conference Staff.....</i>	<i>14</i>

OHIO JUDICIAL NEWS

Judges Can Count National Judicial College Instruction for Ohio Requirement

The Ohio Supreme Court has adopted a new way for judges to earn judicial continuing legal education (CLE) credit.

The amendment to Gov.Bar R. IV, Sec. 5(G) allows the Supreme Court Commission on Continuing Legal Education to permit judges to receive up to one Ohio Judicial College credit hour for each hour of instruction through the [National Judicial College](#) for a maximum of 10 Judicial College credit hours. The [new amendment](#) takes effect Aug. 17.

All Ohio judges must complete 40 CLE credit hours every two years. Ten of those 40 CLE hours are required to come from instruction offered by the [Ohio Supreme Court Judicial College](#). Those 10 hours can now also be offered by the National Judicial College.



JUDGE DELLICK AND SUPERINTENDENT JENNIFER MERRITT ATTEND GATHERING AT WHITE HOUSE FOCUSED ON RETHINKING SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

FOREWORD BY JUDGE JIM D. JAMES

"Zero tolerance rules have flooded the Juvenile Courts with cases that traditionally would have been handled by the schools. While judges are supportive of their schools and want to assist them, the policies of different school districts can result in disproportionate and discriminatory treatment. The initiative is an important step toward addressing this issue and keeping inappropriate cases out of the courtroom. Teaming judges with school officials to find the right resolution is critical.

-Judge Jim D. James, Stark Co. Family Court"

Mahoning County Juvenile Judge Theresa Dellick and Mahoning County High School Superintendent, Jennifer Merritt, joined a group of other teams of superintendents, principals, and teachers from across the country at a gathering of educators hosted by the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. The event, "Rethink Discipline," was a day-long conference at the White House that focused on helping school districts to create positive school climates and implement effective discipline practices.

"School suspensions and expulsions often lead students down a path to involvement with the juvenile justice system. It is the responsibility of the Court to work with educators in the community to dedicate resources to keep students on a path to graduation and keep them from becoming involved in the justice system." – Judge Theresa Dellick, Mahoning County Juvenile Court

"Creating and sustaining safe, supportive schools is absolutely essential to ensuring students can engage in the rich learning experiences they need for success in college, work and life –that's why rethinking school discipline is critical to boosting student achievement and improving school outcomes. Today's conference shows that there are leaders across the country that is committed to doing this work. We are proud to stand as partners with these educators to say that we have to continue to do better for all of our students," said U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan.

According to data from the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC), the number of students losing critical learning time due to out of school suspensions and expulsions is staggering. Over 3 million students are suspended or expelled every year.

"When students are removed from school for infractions that are a result of underlying issues, the root cause of the behaviors are overlooked and remain un-addressed. Suspensions only further remove them from social contacts, put our students further behind in their academics and continue the disenfranchisement from school. For our population, it is about the relationships they have with their teachers and staff at the school that will make them feel connected."- Jennifer Merritt, Superintendent Mahoning County High School

At the event, Judge Dellick and Superintendent Merritt and other district and state leaders learned more about new maps created from CRDC data illustrating out-of-school suspensions across the country to help educators and communities understand the extent of this practice. The maps illustrated:

- Percent of all students who have received one or more out-of-school suspensions by district and,
- Percent of students with disabilities who have received one or more out-of-school suspensions by district.

New resources and initiatives were announced to assist school leaders in their efforts to reduce suspensions and expulsions and provide safe and supportive school environments. The resources are:

Addressing the Root Causes of Disciplinary Disparities: An Educator's Action Planning Guide: This new resource from the Department's National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments provides a guide to assist schools and districts

in identifying the root causes of disparities in the outcomes of school discipline through an analysis of student-level discipline data. Addressing the Root Cause of School Discipline Disparities provides a practical, action-oriented method for schools and districts to develop an action plan to address the roots causes of discipline disparities. The Guide includes a Disciplinary Disparities Risk Assessment Tool to aid in data gathering and analysis, templates to help plan and facilitate communication among stakeholders, real world examples from schools and districts already experiencing success and much more tools and information.

Rethink School Discipline: Resource Guide for Superintendent Action: This Resource Guide offers a set of seven potential action items to help school leaders implement safe, supportive school climate and discipline by engaging stakeholders, assessing the results and history of existing school climate and discipline systems and practices; implementing reform; and monitoring progress. Also included in the Resource Guide are links to federal guidance and resources as well as postcard templates that districts may use to support local educator and parent and family engagement in the district's school discipline reform efforts.

Support for State and Local Educational Leaders and Partners from Other Systems: On July 27, the U.S. Department of Justice is launching the National Resource Center for School Justice Partnerships to advance school discipline reform efforts across the nation. In addition to serving as a dynamic resource hub, the center will also serve as a training and technical assistance portal for juvenile courts, schools, law enforcement agencies, and others to support school discipline reform efforts at the local level. Among its many responsibilities, the Center will support the Supportive School Discipline Training and Technical Assistance Collaborative, an effort by the U.S. Departments of Justice, Education, and Health and Human Services to coordinate resources and provide strategic support to schools and school communities in areas such as building safe and supportive learning environments and addressing disparities in discipline for students of color and students with disabilities.

#RethinkDiscipline Public Awareness Campaign: In the weeks and months following the conference, the U.S. Department of Education will continue to use social media events, blogs, and other approaches to engage the field about new tools and resources to help school communities to improve school climate and discipline.

The White House Rethink Discipline conference builds on the work of the President's My Brother's Keeper Initiative (MBK) to the White House Council on Women and Girls (CWG), and the Supportive School Discipline Initiative— a collaboration between the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice launched in 2011 to support the use of school discipline practices that foster safe, supportive, and productive learning environments while keeping students in school.

For more information about the Administration's work on school climate and discipline go to www.ed.gov/school-discipline.

WANT TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE NEXT EDITION OF FOR THE RECORD?

OJC ALWAYS NEEDS TIMELY AND RELEVANT ARTICLES TO PUBLISH.

CONTACT [JEFF JABLONKA](mailto:JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV) AT THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV

MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION AND THE NOVEMBER BALLOT

MARTA MUDRI, ESQ.
LEGISLATIVE SERVICES COUNSEL, OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

This fall, several issues will appear on the ballot, but none has gotten as much media attention as a citizen-initiated ballot issue to legalize marijuana. ResponsibleOhio, a political action group interested in legalizing recreational marijuana use in Ohio, has been collecting petition signatures to submit the issue for a popular vote in November. Other pro-marijuana groups, such as Better for Ohio, also worked to collect signatures, but ResponsibleOhio was the only group that submitted enough signatures to the Secretary of State by the July 2015 deadline. Because of a verification rate of only about 41%, it turned out that the submission was at least 30,000 signatures short of the required number. The group was given an additional 10 days to collect more, which it did. The Secretary of State is currently tallying and verifying those signatures; at this time, it has not yet been confirmed whether this issue will make it on the ballot. The Secretary of State is also investigating the possibility of election fraud, due to discrepancies between written and electronic petitions.

In the meantime, a legislature-initiated ballot issue introduced as HJR 4 (Reps. Curtin, Smith) passed the legislature successfully, and was filed with the Secretary of State on June 30, 2015. The ballot issue prohibits any constitutional amendment that would commercially benefit a person or group or create a monopoly or cartel (with an exception for monopolies already in the Constitution) and creates a process for constitutional amendments that have been certified but are considered by the Ballot Board to violate the prohibition. Because ResponsibleOhio's amendment would commercially benefit a small group of investors, this prompts the question: what happens if both ballot initiatives pass? Under the Ohio Constitution Article II Sec. 1b, in the event two conflicting ballot issues pass, the one with the most votes goes into effect – this suggests no severability and a complete defeat of the issue that gets fewer votes. The Secretary of State has stated that a successful legislature-initiated ballot item goes into effect at least 30 days sooner than a citizen-initiated one, which suggests that it is possible that both items would go into effect and only the conflicting provisions would be struck based on which item went into effect first. A last-minute change made by the Senate to HJR 4 requires that, if successful, HJR 4 would entirely supersede any ballot initiative that creates a commercial interest but was not subject to the new Ballot Board procedure, despite any severability clause and despite number of votes. The enforceability of this last change has been questioned, as it will not have been part of the Constitution at the time the amendments will be adopted.

Lastly, on July 15, 2015, ResponsibleOhio was given approval to start circulating petitions to get a citizen-initiated statute before the legislature for consideration in 2016. The initiated statute, if approved by the legislature, would allow people with past marijuana convictions to expunge those convictions, but only if marijuana is legalized.

Summary of “ResponsibleOhio” Amendment

Sec. 12 of Article VX of the Ohio Constitution would allow the following:

- Any person older than 21 can possess, transport, use, and share (with someone else over 21) marijuana, marijuana-infused products, and marijuana accessories; the amount of marijuana in possession or use should be no more than 1 ounce.
- A person may not operate a vehicle while under the influence of marijuana. Additionally, a person may not use marijuana in a public place, on the grounds of a school, daycare center, library, correctional facil-

Continued on next page...

- ity, or community corrections facility, or in a vehicle, aircraft, train, or motorboat. The General Assembly is required to pass laws making it Child Endangerment to provide marijuana to someone younger than 21.
- Marijuana cultivation is expected to occur in facilities and to be regulated. Home growers are allowed up to 4 flowering plants and 8 oz. of usable marijuana at a time. Home growers must obtain a license; it costs \$50 to register annually.
- An MGCE is a grow site; it grows, cultivates, and extracts marijuana. There are 10 allowable grow sites, in named counties. An MPM manufactures marijuana-infused products. Each facility must be annually licensed (\$50,000 for an MGCE and \$25,000 for an MPM).
- A facility cannot be located within 1000 feet of a house of worship, school, daycare center, or library, and in some cases, a playground.
- All marijuana, including products and accessories, are to be sold at Retail Marijuana Stores (RMSs). RMSs are to be licensed, their numbers are limited, and they are prohibited from selling anything other than marijuana and related products. They are required to purchase marijuana from a licensed MGCE and marijuana-infused products from a licensed MPM.
- Medical marijuana can be obtained from medical marijuana dispensaries (MMDs), which are licensed and not-for-profit. MGCEs and MPMs are required to sell medical marijuana to MMDs at the lowest wholesale prices and in sufficient supply to meet demand. Acquisition, administration, purchase, possession, transportation, and use of medical marijuana are legal for patients with debilitating medical conditions and their licensed caregivers. There is no age restriction for use of medical marijuana, but for people younger than 18, informed consent of a guardian is required.
- Marijuana Testing Facilities (MTFs), licensed by the Commission, will research safety and potency of marijuana in Ohio. They are required to be in at least six named counties, near colleges.
- The Marijuana Control Commission is a body of seven Ohio citizens, appointed by the Governor. It will regulate, license, and audit marijuana cultivation, manufacture, and sales. It is to be funded using 15% of the special flat tax on marijuana.

Summary of HJR 4

Amend Section 1e of Article II to state the following:

- Electors may not use an initiative petition to propose a constitutional amendment that would grant or create a monopoly, oligopoly, or cartel, specify or determine a tax rate, or confer a commercial interest to any person or entity if it is not also available to other similarly situated persons or entities.
- If the Ohio Ballot Board believes that a proposed amendment does create a monopoly, oligopoly, cartel, or commercial interest, it must publish the proposal on the ballot with a preceding question, which asks specifically whether electors believe a monopoly, oligopoly, cartel, or commercial interest should be created – followed by the question of whether the amendment itself should pass; this type of amendment cannot pass unless electors vote affirmatively in response to both questions.
- If, at the election at which the anti-monopoly proposal appears on the ballot, the electors approve an initiated constitutional amendment that creates a monopoly, oligopoly or cartel for the sale, distribution, or other use of any federal Schedule 1 controlled substance, the entire amendment that creates the monopoly will not take effect.
- The Ohio Supreme Court has original, exclusive jurisdiction in any action that relates to enforcement of the new provision.
- Current provisions of the Ohio Constitution are exempted from the prohibition against constitutional monopolies.

Continued on next page...

2016 Responsible Ohio Expungement Proposal “Fresh Start Act”

- Marijuana offenses can be expunged, if marijuana becomes legal.
- If offenders are still subject to sanctions, such as prison, fines, or community control, the offender can petition the court for relief from those sanctions.
- People and agencies that conduct background checks, including consumer reporting agencies, and have acquired records of conviction or adjudication as a delinquent child, must update their records by deleting records of convictions and adjudications that have been expunged.
- A person may not be questioned in any application for employment, license or other right or privilege, about a conviction or adjudication that has been expunged under the “Fresh Start Act.”

PLEASE VISIT THE OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE WEBSITE

WWW.OHIOJUDGES.ORG

CONTACT JEFF JABLONKA AT THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE FOR LOGIN ASSISTANCE

JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV

OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE



HOME

ABOUT US

RESOURCES

LEGISLATIVE

COMMITTEES

DIRECTORY

WELCOME

WEEKLY FYI:



NATIONAL NEWS:

- Renting Judges for Secret Rulings
- Supreme Court rules in favor of broad protections for whistleblowers
- Feds to end roadside breath testing without permission
- New Jersey moves to shut down Tesla sales despite protests



STATE NEWS:

- Too Many Requests for Public Records Rejected, Officials Say
- Keeping Courthouse Safe is Important Job
- Ohio Judicial Conference Legislation Status Sheet
- Jumping the Retirement Hurdle (Seminar)

Citizens Guide Brochure Series

The Ohio Judicial Conference has created a series of brochures to help judges inform the public about Ohio's judicial system. The series consists of eight tri-fold brochures with general information regarding aspects of the judicial system as well as one 25-page guide to small claims court.



Print



MEMBER LOGIN

User Name:

Password:

[Forgot Password?](#)



LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS



PUBLICATIONS



DIRECTORY



OTHER LINKS



CONTACT US



FAQS

EVIDENCE SUBMITTED: JUDGES DO RESIST THEIR OWN IDEOLOGICAL BIASES IN JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING

JUDGE EUGENE A. LUCCI
LAKE COUNTY COMMON PLEAS COURT

Public confidence in the judiciary as an independent, co-equal branch of government depends upon the public's perception that judicial decisions are made by judges who are not just "politicians in robes."

Indeed, the principle of judicial independence is a bulwark of the rule of law, and one of the core values of the justice system. Judicial independence has institutional and decisional dimensions. Institutional independence concerns the capacity of the judiciary as a separate branch of government to resist encroachments from the political branches and thereby preserve the separation of powers. Decisional independence, in contrast, concerns the capacity of individual judges to decide cases without threats, intimidation, or undue influences from outside agents who are acting upon partisan or special-interest motivations that could interfere with their capacity to be impartial and uphold the rule of law.

Decisional independence includes not only freedom from the adverse influences of politics and public pressures, but also freedom from, or at least a resistance to, the judge's own ideological, religious, or political worldviews.

A recent two-year study lends evidence to support the proposition that judges are not just politicians in robes, and that judges by and large are able to exercise professional judgment and reach consensus on disputes that polarize the general public. About to be published in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review is a paper entitled, "'Ideology' or 'Situation Sense'? An Experimental Investigation of Motivated Reasoning and Professional Judgment," 163 U. Pa. L. Rev. ____ (2015).

In the study, the subjects, a group of 800 members of the public, 284 law students, 217 lawyers, and 253 state judges play the role of judge in two hypothetical cases of statutory interpretation.

Both cases featured statutory ambiguities: in one, whether leaving reusable plastic water bottles in the desert constituted "depositing debris" (littering) in a protected wildlife preserve; and in the other, whether a police officer, who knew he was releasing confidential investigatory information but didn't realize doing so was illegal, "knowingly violated" a law against making such disclosures.

There were the experimental manipulations, and subjects were randomly presented one of them in each of the two scenarios. In the littering scenario, the alleged violator was either: (1) a group of construction workers on the border, who left the bottles in the desert to drink water from as they build a fence to keep undocumented immigrants from illegally crossing the Mexico-U.S. border, or (2) an immigrant-aid group who put the bottles in the desert in anticipation that the water would be consumed by the illegal immigrants. In the disclosure scenario, the party receiving the leaked information was either: (1) a family-planning center counseling individuals on where to obtain abortions (the pro-choice version), or (2) a religious family-planning center counseling individuals on alternatives to abortion (the pro-life version).

Those experimental manipulations were ones irrelevant to a proper interpretation of the statutes at issue. However, they were ones that could still provoke the sort of bias associated with motivated reasoning or cultural cognition, which could be expected to bias the decision-makers' interpretations toward finding violations where such outcomes were consistent with, rather than contrary to, their own cultural values.

The study found exactly that pattern of biased decision-making in members of the public, but not in the judges. The judges converged on outcomes (specifically, no violation in the littering scenario, and a violation in the disclosure scenario) regardless of which version of the problem they considered and regardless of their cultural values.

In other words, the judges decided the cases free of the sort of influences that, the study showed, could be expected

Continued on next page...

to generate group-favoring biases in ordinary citizens. The judges resisted that bias, moreover, even though in another part of the study, the judges divided along exactly the same cultural lines as members of the public on the risks of climate change, marijuana legalization, and a host of other issues.

The resistance the judges displayed to cultural cognition, then, was very specific to their legal reasoning. Lawyers were almost identical to judges in their responses to both the legal reasoning and risk-perception portions of the study, lending credence to the idea that “professionalization” was in play. Law students were in between the members of the public (who again, were biased in both types of responses), on the one hand, and the lawyers and judges, on the other.

“The experimental results furnished evidence strongly at odds with the conclusion that judges are influenced by political predispositions when they engage in legal reasoning,” the study said. “Judges of diverse cultural outlooks—ones polarized on their views of the risks of marijuana legalization, climate change, and other contested issues—converged on results in cases that strongly divided comparably diverse members of the public.” In other words, judges, by and large, are able to exercise professional judgment and reach consensus on disputes that polarize the general public.

Of course, each of the participants in the study was deciding the issues on his or her own, the functional equivalent of the trial judge. Accordingly, the study did not deal with the other types of judicial decision-making—multi-judge appellate and supreme courts—which may be affected by various group dynamics, collegiality, prerogatives for policy-making or error-correction, and other considerations.

This study is good news for judges and a reassurance for the lawyers who practice before them. However, judges not only have to exercise decisional independence, but have to appear to the public to exercise it. Judges must do a better job at conveying to the public the basic truth that their decisions are free from their own personal ideological predilections. Perhaps what is needed is a serious study of the craft of judging, including what methods of rendering judgments would better demonstrate to the public the decisional independence of the judiciary, and be more likely to engender public confidence in the legitimacy of those judgments.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO JUDICIAL COLLEGE COURSE SCHEDULE

(for Judges, Magistrates, Acting Judges, Court Personnel, Judicial Candidates, and Guardians ad Litem)

Judicial College Online self-study courses are available by visiting the direct link below.

<http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/Boards/Judcollege/calendars/13selfstudy.pdf>

Note: Listed judicial conduct hours are projections. Refer to course announcements for final and approved CLE/CJE hours. Judicial conduct credit hours will apply toward the professional conduct requirement for magistrates.

<u>DATE</u>		<u>COURSE</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
August 2015				
20	Thu	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Dayton/Beavercreek
25	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Columbus
27	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy
28	Fri	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy

September 2015

1	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Dayton/Beavercreek
2	Wed	Ohio Courts of Appeals Judges Association (OCAJA) Fall Conference (Judicial Conduct hours will be requested)	Judges*	Columbus
3	Thu	Official Court Reporters Course	Court Reporters	Columbus
3 - 4	Thu - Fri	Ohio Judicial Conference (OJC) Annual Meeting (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges*	Columbus
9	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (7 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Boardman/Youngstown
9	Wed	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Toledo/Perrysburg
9 - 11	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2016, Mod. IV: Managing Technology Projects & Technology Resources	CMP 2016 Class	Columbus
10	Thu	Criminal Procedure for Acting Judges (2 of 4) (Judicial Conduct hours will be requested)	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Strongsville/Cleveland
11	Fri	Abuse, Neglect & Dependency Web Conference	Judges & Magistrates	Web Conference
14	Mon	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Toledo/Perrysburg
15	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Toledo/Perrysburg
15	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Akron/Fairlawn
16	Wed	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Ashland
16 - 18	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2017 Level II Module II	CMP 2017 Class	Columbus
17	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Ashland
18	Fri	Criminal Procedure By the Numbers Part III	Judges & Magistrates	Columbus
22	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Columbus
23	Wed	Supervisor Series: Coaching and Motivating Employees (1 of 2)	Court Supervisors	Columbus
24	Thu	Supervisor Series: Coaching and Motivating Employees (2 of 2)	Court Supervisors	Columbus
25	Fri	Traffic Law (1 of 2)	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Columbus
30 - 2	Wed - Fri	Ohio Association of Magistrates (OAM) Fall Conference (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Magistrates*	Columbus

October 2015

2	Fri	Sex Offender Management	Probation Officers	Columbus
6	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Cleveland

October 2015

6	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Dayton/Beavercreek
7	Wed	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Dayton/Beavercreek
7	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Cleveland
8	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Dayton/Beavercreek
9	Fri	Juvenile Traffic Web Conference	Judges & Magistrates	Web Conference
13	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Toledo/Perrysburg
16	Fri	A Practical Look at Contempt in Municipal/Common Pleas Courts Web Conference	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Web Conference
20	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Akron/Fairlawn
21	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (8 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Cleveland
22	Thu	Traffic Law (2 of 2)	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Cleveland
23	Fri	Judicial Conduct Course (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges & Magistrates	Cleveland
27	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Boardman/Youngstown
27	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Columbus
28	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Boardman/Youngstown
29	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy
30	Fri	Evidence	Judges & Magistrates	Columbus
30	Fri	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy
30	Fri	Pretrial Services	Judges, Magistrates & Court Personnel	Columbus

November 2015

3	Tue	Basic Defensive Tactics (2 of 2)	Probation Officers	London
3	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Dayton/Beavercreek
4	Wed	Advanced Defensive Tactics (2 of 2)	Probation Officers	London
4	Wed	Interpreter Course: Law and Literature plus Interpreter Rule Update (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges, Magistrates & Court Personnel	Columbus
5	Thu	Domestic Relations Winter Meeting (precedes Association of Family and Conciliation Courts Regional Conference) (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges & Magistrates	Columbus

November 2015

10	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Toledo/Perrysburg
13	Fri	Criminal Procedure for Acting Judges (3 of 4) (Judicial Conduct hours will be requested)	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Dayton/Beavercreek
13	Fri	Paternity, Custody & Child Support Web Conference	Judges & Magistrates	Web Conference
17	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Cincinnati
17	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Akron/Fairlawn
18	Wed	2015 Probate Web Conference	Judges & Magistrates	Web Conference
18	Wed	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Columbus
18	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Cincinnati
18 - 19	Wed - Thu	Court Executive Team Seminar, Part II	Judges & Court Personnel	Columbus
19	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Columbus
19	Thu	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Columbus

December 2015

1	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (9 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Columbus
1	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Dayton/Beavercreek
2	Wed	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Akron
2 - 4	Wed - Fri	Ohio Common Pleas Judges Association (OCPJA) Winter Conference (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges*	Columbus
3	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Akron
3 - 4	Thu - Fri	Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges (OAJCJ) Winter Conference (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges*	Columbus
7 - 10	Mon - Thu	New Judges Orientation, Part I (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	New Judges	Columbus
8	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Toledo/Perrysburg
9 - 11	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2017 Level I, Module 1	CMP 2017 Class	Columbus
11	Fri	Judicial Conduct Web Conference (Judicial conduct hours will be requested)	Judges & Magistrates	Web Conference
15	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Columbus
15	Tue	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Akron/Fairlawn

December 2015

16	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Columbus
17	Thu	Criminal Procedure for Acting Judges (4 of 4) (Judicial Conduct will be requested)	Judges, Magistrates & Acting Judges	Columbus
17	Thu	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Laypersons	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy
17	Thu	Probation Officer Training Program	Probation Officers	Columbus
18	Fri	Fundamentals of Adult Guardianship Courses BROADCAST - Professionals	Adult Guardians	Sites available statewide, see Judicial eCademy

PLEASE NOTE:

This schedule is SUBJECT TO CHANGE. View the Judicial College homepage for course schedule updates, brochures, and additional information, via www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/Boards/judCollege/default.aspx.

To register for a Judicial College course or to view a course announcement, please visit our online registration site at www.judicialedcademy.ohio.gov.

- 1. Every two years, as part of the required 40 hours of CJE/CLE, full-time judges, part-time judges, and retired judges eligible for assignment are required to obtain a minimum of 10 hours of instruction from the Judicial College, to include 3.0 hours of instruction in judicial conduct. (Gov.Jud. R. IV, §3 A-C) (effective 1.1.14)*
- 2. Every two years, magistrates are required to obtain 24 hours of CLE. Of the 24 hours of CLE, magistrates must obtain a minimum of 10 hours of instruction from the Judicial College and 2.5 hours of instruction in professional conduct. Magistrates may obtain professional conduct hours from the Judicial College or another approved provider. (Gov.Bar R. X, §12) (effective 1.1.14)*
- 3. Every two years, acting judges are required to obtain 24 hours of CLE. Of the 24 hours of CLE, acting judges must obtain a minimum of 10 hours of instruction from the Judicial College. Acting judges may obtain their 2.5 professional conduct hours from the Judicial College or another approved provider. (Gov.Bar R. X, §11) (effective 1.1.14)*
- 4. Full-day courses typically consist of 5.5 CJE/CLE credit hours and are from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., unless otherwise noted. Video Teleconferences are now referred to as Web Conferences, typically consist of 2.5 CJE/CLE credit hours, and are from 1:00 p.m. - 3:45 p.m., unless otherwise noted.*

Please refer to the course announcement for the approved CJE/CLE credit hours and for course registration information.
- 5. The Judicial College cannot accept registration for courses until the course announcement has been e-mailed and online registration opened through Judicial eCademy.*
- 6. (*) Indicates course registration through an association. Please check the course announcement when it is distributed to confirm the credit hours to be offered.*
- 7. For all non-association courses, please check the Judicial College course announcement when it is emailed to confirm whether judicial and/or professional conduct hours will be offered.*
- 8. (**) Indicates no pre-registration or tuition for the Judicial Candidates Seminars; simply attend the session of your choice.*

Abbreviations: AJ = Acting Judge; CJE = Continuing Judicial Education; CLE = Continuing Legal Education; CM = Court Managers; CMP = Court Management Program; CP = Court Personnel; GAL = Guardian ad Litem; J = Judges; JC = Judicial Candidates; JCC = Juvenile Court Clerks; JCP = Juvenile Court Personnel; M = Magistrates; NJs = New Judges; OAM = Ohio Association of Magistrates; OPOTA = Ohio Peace Officers Training Academy; POs = Probation Officers; TBD = To be Determined

Ohio Judicial Conference Staff

Executive Director

Hon. Mark R. Schweikert, Retired 614-387-9750
Mark.Schweikert@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Counsel

Marta Mudri, Esq. 614-387-9764
Marta.Mudri@sc.ohio.gov

Judicial Services Counsel

Louis Tobin, Esq. 614-387-9763
Louis.Tobin@sc.ohio.gov

Judicial Services Specialist

Trina Bennington 614-387-9761
Trina.Bennington@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Services Assistant

Justin Long 614-387-9756
Justin.Long@sc.ohio.gov

Project Specialist

Jeff Jablonka 614-387-9753
Jeff.Jablonka@sc.ohio.gov

Program Specialist

Alyssa Guthrie 614-387-9766
Alyssa.Guthrie@sc.ohio.gov

Deputy Legislative Counsel

Joshua Williams, Esq. 614-387-9767
Joshua.Williams@sc.ohio.gov

Deputy Legislative Counsel

John Ryan, Esq. 614-387-9765
John.Ryan@sc.ohio.gov

Fiscal Officer

Jayma Umbstaetter 614-387-9757
Jayma.Umbstaetter@sc.ohio.gov

