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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Competent, well-trained juvenile court judges are an essential element of the Illinois juvenile justice system. As a result of our desire for improved quality, changes have been made in the past decade in judicial selection, tenure, salary and removal. Recently it has been determined that many of the problems faced in court administration are a result of judicial ignorance (Sutton, 1968). Judges have no formal training in how to be a judge. Judicial ignorance that leads to mishandling of cases should not be tolerated in the Illinois juvenile justice system.

In order for the juvenile courts to contribute effectively to the Illinois juvenile justice system, judges must be qualified persons. This must mean that there be meaningful prerequisites for these positions beyond political appointment or election. Knowledge of the Illinois juvenile justice system and juvenile law should be prerequisites for positions as juvenile judges. This knowledge must not remain static but constantly be increased through continuing judicial education programs.

In the interest of improved administration of justice, one of the remedial plans for court improvement suggested judicial education (Frank, 1967). This concept of providing judicial education for those who want it is a recent idea. The concept
of mandatory judicial education is an even more recent thought.

Judicial education programs began in the late 1950's to assist judges already in service (IJA, 1977). These programs have spread from state to state within the different court levels. Initially the provision of judicial education was narrow in scope; it was directed toward appellate judges and judges of courts of limited jurisdiction that were staffed with nonlawyers. Now it is felt that education programs should be available to all judges, with special focus in their area of jurisdiction.

The United States and other common law countries are unique in their lack of professional education for judges. This is in contrast to European countries that require specific education programs for aspiring judges. France has a comprehensive pre-service and in-service training program for judges at its national school (Richert, 1973). Aspiring judges must attend this school which provides a study of the law and its relationship to the other components of the French criminal justice system. A first hand working knowledge of the entire justice system benefits the European judge by allowing him to make intelligent decisions with regard to the whole justice system. This lack of attention in providing judicial education for all judges in the United States in surprising when viewed against the highly developed professional training in the United States for physicians, lawyers, police officers and
other professionals. Public school teachers must pursue a rigid education program in their area of concentration and must be licensed by the state to teach our children. This is in contrast to the lack of judicial training for our juvenile court judges who have the power to assume jurisdiction and apply various dispositional methods to our children.

SPECIFIC NEEDS OF THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

The politically elected or appointed judge has numerous new duties thrust upon him, one of which may include duties as juvenile court judge. Duties in this capacity are quite distinct from those as an attorney or a criminal judge. The premises of the juvenile court include the *parens patriae* doctrine which gives the court the power to intervene in the life of children in order to provide for their welfare. Theoretically, the social and psychological needs of the child are studied by the juvenile court judge in order to determine the proper disposition for the juvenile. The juvenile court, with the judge acting as the kindly father figure, focuses on the rehabilitation of youth. Not only must the judge handle juvenile delinquents, or troubled youth, but he/she must also be able to find solutions to the problem of the dependent and neglected child. The judges exercise vast discretionary power in these dispositions. It is because of these discretionary powers that our juvenile court must be staffed with well-qualified and specially trained judges.

Disposition in a juvenile court is intended to serve the
best interest of the child, its parents and the public by providing treatment for the child. Because of the basic therapeutic philosophy of the court, greater latitude is given to the court in making dispositions than is given to the criminal court in cases involving adults. As a result of the wide latitude of dispositions available to the court in juvenile cases, the responsibility of the judge in determining proper dispositions is great. The judge must endeavor to ascertain real causative factors in each case brought before his court, and he must attempt to select a type of treatment which is most likely to succeed in removing the causes of the child's difficulties.

The types of treatment available for juveniles vary from area to area, depending on available institutions. Treatment exists in many forms, including the following: (1) the child may be placed on probation or supervision under terms that the court may determine, (2) the child may be committed to an institution or agency authorized to care for children, (3) the child may be placed in a suitable approved home, and (4) the child may be made a ward of the court (Illinois Statute-Chapter 37, 1987).

The jurisdiction of the juvenile court is limited to those under a specific age varying from sixteen to twenty-one years of age. The authority over these juveniles is greater than the corresponding authority of courts of general criminal jurisdiction.
The juvenile court can assume jurisdiction over a juvenile for an act which, if performed by an adult, would be a crime. However, juvenile jurisdiction extends to include jurisdiction of a juvenile who commits an act that would not be a crime if it were committed by an adult. Also, the authority of the juvenile court extends to individuals who have not committed a specific overt act but who demonstrate they pose a danger to society or to themselves. Circumstances which indicate that the child is not being properly provided for may justify the juvenile court's assuming jurisdiction.

As the foregoing discussion indicates, the duties of the juvenile court judge are distinct from the duties of judges exercising criminal or other legal jurisdictions. The separate premises of the juvenile court along with the separate responsibilities of the juvenile court judge require a specialized education program for judges with juvenile jurisdiction. The dissimilarities between the premises and duties of the criminal and juvenile court justify the necessity for separate instruction. The juvenile court process is heavily infused with concepts from the social sciences dealing with the study of juvenile delinquency. The relation of the behavioral sciences to the juvenile court process is crucial and must be understood by the judges who exercise juvenile jurisdiction. The judges must be given adequate preparation for their distinct responsibilities through proper formal training.
geared toward their duties.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Numerous studies and articles suggest that juvenile court judges should be given formal training that is geared toward their duties. It is suggested that proper training would enhance the decision making process in determining appropriate disposition of cases.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

This study will examine the relationship between the current system of educating juvenile court judges and the changes which are necessary to improve the realm of juvenile justice.

SCOPE OF STUDY

This study will describe the current education programs which are presently available for juvenile court judges in the United States. In order to provide a view of the education and experience of a group of juvenile court judges, a sample of Illinois juvenile court judges will be surveyed as to educational background, occupational experience related to youth, and attendance at national and local education programs for juvenile court judges. The findings of this study will indicate the need for education programs for juvenile court judges in Illinois.
Based upon this perceived need for judicial education programs proposals will be made for education programs that would provide and Illinois juvenile court judiciary that would be knowledgeable in socio-legal matters related to Illinois youth.

HYPOTHESIS TO BE TESTED

1. Juvenile Court Judge education requirements are met in the State of Illinois more effectively in 1988 than in 1965.

2. Judges in the State of Illinois are more aware of available educational resources in 1988 than they were in 1965.

3. State juvenile court judges are better trained today than they were fifteen years ago.

DEFINITIONS

1. **ADJUDICATORY HEARING**
   The fact finding process wherein the juvenile court determines whether or not there is sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations in a petition.

2. **APPELLATE COURT**
   A court having jurisdiction of appeal and review.

3. **DELINQUENT ACT**
   An act committed by a juvenile for which an adult could be prosecuted in a criminal court, but for which a juvenile can be adjudicated in a juvenile court.
4. **DISPOSITION HEARING**

A hearing in juvenile court, conducted after an adjudicatory hearing and subsequent receipt of the report of any predisposition investigation, to determine the most appropriate form of custody and/or treatment for a juvenile who has been adjudged a delinquent, status offender, or a dependent.

5. **JUDICIAL OFFICER**

Any person authorized by statute, constitutional provision, or court rule to exercise those powers reserved to the judicial branch of government.

6. **JUVENILE**

A person subject to juvenile court proceedings because a statutorily defined event or condition caused by or affecting that person was alleged to have occurred while his or her age was below the statutorily age limit of original jurisdiction of a juvenile court.

7. **LEGAL JURISDICTION**

The lawful authority of a court to hear or act upon a case from its beginning and to pass judgment on the law and the facts.

8. **PARENS PATRIAE**

A doctrine by which the government supervises children who are under a legal disability. It often takes the form of supervision, which is analogous to that of a parent.

9. **PROBATION**

The conditional freedom granted by a judicial officer
to an alleged or adjudged adult or juvenile offender.

10. **SENTENCE**

The penalty imposed by a court upon a person convicted of a crime.

11. **STATUTE**

An act of the legislature authorizing, commanding, or prohibiting something.

12. **SUPERVISION**

Authorized and required guidance, treatment, and/or regulation of the behavior of a person who is subject to adjudication or who has been adjudicated to be an offender, performed by a correctional agency.

13. **TRIAL JUDGE**

A judicial officer who is authorized to conduct jury and nonjury trials, and who may or may not be authorized to hear appellate cases (Black's Law Dictionary, 1968).

**ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

All assumptions from this study are based on self-reported questionnaires administered to persons who are judges. The sample is limited to fifty (50) juvenile court judges employed throughout the State of Illinois.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the litigation explosion in the United States and the ensuing overload in our courts, national attention has focused on a number of national organizations geared toward improvement of our court system. Some of these organizations deal with administration and restructuring of the court system, but many of these organizations deal with the judicial officer of the courts.

This section will provide a discussion of existing judicial education programs for juvenile judges within the United States. A brief description will be made of national judicial education programs for all judges, with a more detailed discussion of the national judicial education program for juvenile court judges. There will also be a description of federal programs that have contributed to the state judicial education programs. The availability of programs for juvenile court judges on regional and state levels will be examined including a discussion of education programs available in Illinois. Although the mode of instruction in any education program is important, this discussion will be limited to the subject matter offered by these programs and on the availability of these programs.

A comparison of available programs for juvenile court
judges will be made with regard to mode of instruction, scope of subject material, and availability of the program to judges. Most states have neglected planning judicial education programs for their judiciary. National programs are heavily relied on for training of juvenile court judges with few states providing specific instruction for their juvenile court judges.

Another purpose of this review of judicial education programs is to provide a study and comparison of existing education programs to allow an information base from which future judicial education programs may be patterned. The failures and inadequacies of each program may be observed and discarded in modeling a viable education program for the state's judiciary.

Recognition to the need to train judicial personnel was first manifested on the national level (Marsden, 1973). National organizations created programs to train the judicial personnel of the nation's courts. These organizations vary not only in the type of judicial personnel they train, but also in their method of instruction and subject matter deemed essential for the varying judicial personnel. These programs are of great value since many states incorporate these national programs in their judicial education structure along with the state's special judicial education programs (Franklin, 1980).

There is only one national organization, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, dealing
specifically with the training of the nation's juvenile court judges (Block, 1977). Although not all of these national programs deal with the juvenile court judge specifically, many programs offered to general trial judges include sessions on the judges' role as juvenile court judge. Also, many other sessions contain valuable information for the judge in managing his court, whether with juvenile or other jurisdictions. Because most juvenile court judges exercise some general trial jurisdiction, a description of the national program for general trial judges will also be included. A more detailed discussion of the National Council to Juvenile and Family Court Judges will follow a brief description of the other judicial education programs for judges of varying jurisdictions.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR JUDICIAL IMPROVEMENT

Developments on the national level have given impetus to providing judicial education programs within the states. These advancements at the federal level have aided the state courts by serving as models and by providing services to the state.

The Federal Judicial Center, created by Congress in 1967 (U.S.C.A., 1970) provides training for federal judges and is also actively engaged in researching the operation of federal courts (Marsden, 1973). The Center, located in Washington D.C., is charged specifically with the duty to conduct research and study of the federal court system and to stimulate research on
the part of public and private agencies. The Federal Judicial Center also creates, develops, and conducts programs of continuing education and training for those in the judicial branch of government. The value of the Center lies not only in the much needed training it provides for the federal judges, but also in the research results it provides the states. This availability of competent research aids the state judicial systems in planning curricula for their education programs.

In 1971 the position of Circuit Executive was created for the federal courts (U.S.C.A., 1976). This is the first time management specialists were brought to work on a day-to-day level to improve the operation of the federal courts.

To aid the states in providing education programs for their judges, the National Center for State Courts was created in 1971; the need for such a Center was suggested by Chief Justice Burger and President Nixon at a National Conference on the State Judiciary held in Williamsburg, Virginia in March, 1971 (Marsden, 1973). Established to provide a clearinghouse of information and advice for state judicial systems, the Center assists the courts in improving procedures and learning modern techniques in court management (Marsden, 1973). Representative of the Center's work in providing research for the state courts, a State Judicial Training Profile was prepared by the Center (Franklin, 1980). This profile provided a description of each states' training programs for all levels of courts.
This concise report enables one to evaluate the education program of each of the states. Reference will later be made to findings made in this report with regard to judicial education programs for juvenile court judges within the states.

The beginning of continuing legal education for judges originated with the first appellate judges' seminar in 1956 (Leflar, 1967). The Appellate Judges' Seminar conducted summer sessions that consisted of two weeks of instruction (Franklin, 1980). The topics and curricula were chosen by the judges themselves and they tended to be the same year after year. Among the most requested topics were: opinion writing, nature of the appellate judicial process, state-federal relationships, the interpretation of statutes, and trends in negligence law (Franklin, 1980).

Because of the perceived value of the appellate seminar and the deep satisfaction it engendered, a seminar for judges of intermediate appellate courts was held under the same auspices of the Appellate Judges' Seminar in 1959 (Karlen, 1965). This program was patterned after the New York seminars and was guided by the judges who participated in the New York Program (Karlen, 1965).

Since the educational needs of the appellate judge are quite distinct from those of circuit or juvenile court judges, their education programs differ in scope from the types of programs needed by juvenile court judges. However, appellate judges must also keep current on recent developments in
juvenile law in order to function as appellate court judges. Topics discussed in the Appellate Judges' Seminar included:

recent Developments in Constitutional Law; Rights of Juveniles; Prisoners' Rights, recent Developments in Conflicts of Law; and Obscenity.

The Institute of Judicial Administration located in New York City, also conducts summer training programs for appellate judges of the state courts. The Institute's programs, conducted in seminar form, discusses topics similar to the Appellate Judges' Seminar. The Institute also conducts programs of general and special research. Representative of the programs conducted by the Institute is the exchange program between American and foreign jurists (Marsden, 1973). The Institute studied the creation of early judicial education programs. This study, which was published in 1965, provides a comprehensive description of early education programs for judges (I.J.A., 1965).

The training needs of the judge with limited and special jurisdiction are partially met by the American Academy of Judicial Education. This organization, located in Washington, D.C., conducts courses on a national level as well as local programs within the state (Franklin, 1980). The areas discussed by the Academy included topics of interest for judges with limited or special jurisdiction. Topics discussed in the past have included; Search and Seizure; Evidence Problems; How to Issue an Arrest Warrant; Sentencing; Pretrial and Trial Identification Problems; Preliminary Hearing and Presentment; Preliminary Hearing and Presentment;
and guilty Pleas (Franklin, 1980).

The Institute for Court Management was organized in 1970 under the joint sponsorship of the American Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, and the Institute for Judicial Administration (Franklin, 1980). This professional education program for administrators of the court is located in Denver, Colorado. These programs available to judges and court administrators on a regional as well as national level deal with the aspects of efficient court operation. Discussion topics include: Management Theory; Information Systems; Case Flow Management; Budgeting and Planning; and the Act and Function of the Court (Franklin, 1980).

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF THE STATE JUDICIARY

If any one man should receive credit for furthering judicial education it should be the founder of the National College of the State Judiciary, former Supreme Court Associate Tom C. Clark. Justice Clark worked within the section of Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association from 1957 to 1967 furthering the need for judicial programs. The section of Judicial Administration had as its goal the improvement of the effectiveness and efficiency of judicial administration in the United States.

Justice Clark felt trial judges needed a program that would educate them in pretrial methods, publish rules of court, help achieve standard instructions for jurors, and be available
for the interchange of ideas. Such a program would allow the judges to keep abreast of legal and social issues. It was apparent that some kind of national organization for trial judges was necessary; so the National Conference of State Trial Judges was created by the American Bar Association at a 1958 meeting (Rosenberg, 1966).

The Joint Committee for the Effective Administration of Justice was set up for a three year period (1961-1964) to coordinate the different education activities going on and to see that there was no waste of energy or money due to any overlap (Frank, 1967).

The National College program originated in 1963 when the Joint Committee distributed a prospectus of what might be accomplished by the College (Frank, 1967). The ABA Board of Governors adopted a resolution authorizing the Section of Judicial Administration to create a college of judges. The summer of 1964 was the first functioning of the National College at Boulder, Colorado where it stayed for its first three years (Franklin, 1980). As a result of a substantial grant from the Fleischman Foundation, the College moved to Reno, Nevada as part of the conditions of its funding (I.J.A.R., 1973).

Building upon the experience of the Joint Committee seminars, the National College of the State Judiciary employs the seminar system with emphasis on problem analysis and decision-making. The curriculum consists of 190 hours in four weeks, of which 110 are in class and 80 in study (ABA News,
The subject matters include such subjects as: Preceedings Before Trial; Court Administration; Jury Selection; Community Relations; Evidence; Criminal Law; Problems of the Judge in the Judicial Function; Domestic Relations; Sentencing; and Probation (ABA News, 1974). The college also uses some educational techniques borrowed from sensitivity training and group dynamics (I.J.A.R., 1973). Discussion of what the role of the judge should be gives the participants a chance to hear other judges' views on how they see their own role and how it affects their actions with others. Judges' instructions to the jury have been videotaped so that an instant replay can show the judge how to improve his communication with the jury.

The attendance at the College has continued to increase dramatically. It is evident that there is an interest and a perceived need for the program by trial judges throughout the United States. The National College, in recent years, has changed its curricula by offering programs for judges of special courts; such as traffic, probate, juvenile, and other courts of limited jurisdiction (I.J.A.R., 1973).

Much of the value of the program cannot be measured, for it cannot be exactly known what changes have resulted in the behavior of the thousands of judges who have been to the College. However, one success of the College can be seen by the many improvements and innovations throughout the country that the National College's graduates have initiated. A comment from
a judge who attended the first program in 1964 expresses this thought of innovation:

The value of the program to me was to give an overall picture of my new responsibilities. One of the most concrete results for me was to make me realize the need to save time for all judges by obtaining uniform jury instructions. I came back sold on this idea and spent two years working on it with my fellow judges, an effort that was directly triggered off by my experiences at the College. Now this country does have uniform jury instructions. In that connection it was particularly helpful to learn in detail what the State of Illinois had done in the field and as well to have followed their example (Frank, 1967).

The National College, its materials and methods of instruction provide a model for states that want to create their own education programs. As Chief Justice Roger Traynor of California State:

...the National College of State Trial Judges evolved as a result of the activities of Mr. Justice Clark's Joint Committee for the Effective Administration of Justice. The Conference of California Judges has inaugurated its own judicial college, California College of Trial Judges, and used as its prototype the National College. The California College has concluded a two-week session that is reported to have been very successful. Because of the influence of Mr. Justice Clark on judicial education, the College has adopted as a regular item one lecture or series of lectures named for him, at which matters of importance to judges will be presented (Frank, 1967).

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE COURT JUDGES

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges was created in 1937 to provide a forum for the nation's juvenile
court judges (Block, 1977). Among the Council's goals were to improve the standards, practices and effectiveness of the juvenile and family courts. The Council attempted to do this through the work of annual meetings, the on-going work of committees, collaboration with other national organizations and with federal agencies in the development of written standards and through the publication of a Juvenile Court Judge's Journal. The Council was concerned with the basic philosophy of the juvenile court, i.e., to provide a separate judicial forum with differential treatment for children. In order for judges to come closer to the ideal of the highly qualified juvenile judge familiar with the philosophy of the juvenile court and the sciences involved in administering juvenile justice, the Council felt juvenile judges needed a professional organization to help them realize this concept.

In 1961, the offices of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges were moved to Chicago with the aim of providing a national clearinghouse for the nation's juvenile court judge (Lippitt and McCune, 1963). Training sessions for juvenile and family court judges began in 1961 with the Annual Conference (Lippitt and McCune, 1963). Eight years later the National College of Juvenile Justice was created as the training arm of the Council (N.C.J.C.J.B., 1973). A grant from the Max C. Fleischman Foundation enabled the creation of the National College located at the University of Nevada at Reno. Consequently, the headquarters of the National Council of
Juvenile Court Judges moved from Chicago to Reno, to provide closer coordination of the entire juvenile court training and administrative process (Frank, 1967).

Though the National College provides intensive training programs for the nation's juvenile court judge, the Council also provides relevant literature for its members. Three periodicals: *Juvenile Justice*, *Juvenile Court Digest*, and *Juvenile Court Newsletter*, along with a juvenile court directory are provided for the members of the National Council (NCJCJ, 1973). The National College also publishes a textbook series. The texts in print prior to January, 1984, include: *Supreme Court Decisions and Juvenile Justice* (Weinstein, 1981), *Handbook for New Juvenile Court Judges* (Garff, 1983), *Child Neglect and Dependency--A Digest of Case Law* (Brown, 1978), and *Handbook for Volunteers in Juvenile Court* (Fox, 1976).

**PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM**

In order to better understand the philosophy of the National College and training programs geared toward these philosophies, a study of the pilot training program in 1961 serves as a valuable insight into intended accomplishments of the National College. The pilot training program was made possible by a grant from the Mental Health Institute (Block, 1977). The carefully planned and instituted pilot institute consisted of twenty-seven judges from states all over the United States (Block, 1977). Content material for the program
was based on replies to a questionnaire sent to 150 juvenile court judges (Block, 1977). It was determined from these responses that the nation's juvenile court judge was deficient in information in the behavioral sciences.

The pilot institute program prepared an interdisciplinary approach to the training of the juvenile court judge. The National Training Laboratories, a division of the National Education Association, and the George Washington University Center for the Behavioral Sciences were contracted to work with the Council in providing an interdisciplinary program (Block, 1977). National Training Laboratories, took the responsibility of providing curricula and faculty while evaluation of the project was performed by the George Washington Center for Behavioral Sciences.

Specifically, the goals of the pilot institute were listed as follows: (1) The need for the juvenile court judge to understand himself and his working relations with others, and how he as an individual affects court operation and decision making. (2) The need for the juvenile court judge to understand the functions of the court staff team and how such a team can be developed and used most effectively. (3) The need for the juvenile court judge to understand the community and its resources and the relationship between the court and the community. (4) The need for the juvenile court judge to understand children, the processes of growing up and the processes by which children sometimes become alienated from
their world and develop anti-social behavior. (5) The need for the juvenile court judge to think of the role of the court as it continues to develop in society, the problems of professional growth, the means by which professional growth can be furthered, and the place of the national organization in furthering such growth (Block, 1977).

Since the focus of the educational needs were seen to be in the behavioral sciences area as opposed to a study of juvenile law, the basic training unit was the Sensitivity Training Group (T Group) (Block, 1977). Two T Groups were formed by the judges in the pilot program. As defined by the National Council, a T Group is "a group formed for individual learning purposes where the data are created and analyzed by the group rather than fed in from outside and interpreted by a teacher, where learning is a group task entered into jointly, where the trainer allows the group members the experience of creating and maintaining their own group even though this experience will be difficult and may produce anxiety and where the motivation for learning comes from the high degree of emotional involvement of its members (Block, 1977). The T Group sessions were intended to provide the judges with a better understanding of their own behavior and of the processes involved in decision-making.

Role playing was also considered a significant learning experience for the judge. Each "took the role of the other" by portraying the various members involved in determining the
disposition of the juvenile. Taking the role of the parents, teacher, minister, police officer, probation officer and the juvenile himself helped the judge to understand the feelings of all the participants involved in juvenile hearings. Since all judges participated in the role playing, each judge was confronted with opposing views by his fellow judges. This enabled the judges to understand possible alternative methods of dealing with the juvenile.

In addition to involving judges as active participants in the learning process, lectures were given by competent professionals. A psychiatrist and sociologist examined the growth of the juvenile, both psychologically and socially (Block, 1977). These lectures intended to provide the judge with a better understanding of why the juvenile "is in trouble." Also, with a better understanding of the creation of the juveniles' inability to assimilate societal goals, it was hoped that the judge would be more involved in providing rehabilitative and preventive programs to juvenile delinquents.

Extensive evaluation followed the one week pilot institute. Judges were queried as to the aspects of the Institute they deemed least valuable and conversely, those perceived as being of great value (Block, 1977). The Institute was widely praised by the participants who evaluated the program. The judges responded that their self-awareness was greatly increased as a result of the sensitivity group unit, utilizing role playing as an instructional tool.
Recognizing the need for judicial education for the nation's judge with juvenile jurisdiction, along with the great acceptance of the demonstration training program, the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges created the National College for Juvenile Justice in 1969 for the purpose of providing regular high quality programs for the nation's judiciary (NCJCJ, 1982).

The college not only offers training for the juvenile court judge, but includes programs for other juvenile court-related personnel. Training is also available for probation officers; parole officers; law enforcement personnel; prosecuting attorneys; juvenile court services administration; juvenile justice management personnel; welfare education, and social services personnel; and community representatives (NCJCJ, 1982).

The two-week program for juvenile judges is a combination of group discussion and lecture, with legal and behavioral topics equally presented. Instruction keeps abreast of changes in the juvenile justice fields by offering courses on current problems in juvenile justice. A core curriculum designed to provide a wide base of information for the juvenile judge is offered in every session. The following list includes the core courses offered by the National College with a description of course content:

- Review of Recent Supreme Court Decisions
  discussion of implications of juvenile court landmark decisions as: Kent v U.S., In re Gault,
Pretrial; Intake; Hearings; Adjudication—practical solutions are sought to solving problems in these areas.

Dependency and Neglect; Termination of Parental Rights; Adoptions; Child Abuse—discussion includes information on the Child Protective Services, study of the "battered child syndrome," and termination of parental rights.

Evidence and Procedure—evidence rules are reviewed with particular emphasis on the rules in juvenile court.

Disposition—discussion of social histories, hearings, treatment options, acquiring facilities, and follow-up reports.

Psychology of the Violent Offender—discusses theoretical approaches to violence and aggression.

Behavioral Science Applications in the Juvenile Justice System—roles as managers, decision-makers, and community leaders are examined through self-awareness training.

Drug Use and Abuse—discussion includes a study of rehabilitative programs available for offenders.

Institutions and Their Alternatives—discussion of forms of institutions, explanation of varied treatment approaches, diversion and institutional alternatives, and how a judge might evaluate an institution.

Rights of the Child—legal rights of the juvenile are discussed.

Inherent Power of the Court—discussion of the legal procedures through which the inherent powers of the court can be used.

Juvenile Court Data Retrieval and Information System—a study of computers and their function in court settings, along with current information regarding successes of computer systems already established.
Clinical Services—the role of the psychologist and/or psychiatrist in the juvenile court is discussed, and Court Services Administration—discussion of formulation of policies and procedures, maintenance of standards of service, etc. (NCJCJ, 1982).

It can be noted, the scope of the training is broad, covering all aspects of the juvenile hearing, legal decisions involving the rights of the child, and the institutions that are available for juveniles.

AUXILIARY TRAINING PROGRAMS

In addition to the basic two-week program for juvenile judges on the Nevada campus the National College also implements a variety of other programs for states and regions requesting them. These programs conducted by the College include the Traveling Team programs, the community advocate team project, and the juvenile management institutes (NCJCJ, 1982).

Short term sessions are provided by the Traveling Team programs. These programs provided for selected communities center on one specific topic that the National College and representatives of that community feel necessary. The Traveling Team Institutes are funded by the individual communities and states with additional resources from the National College of Juvenile Justice (NCJCJ, 1982). These institutions, lasting one or two days, provide an opportunity for the juvenile judge along with probation officers, attorneys, and social and welfare personnel to attend shortened sessions
focused on a particular area of interest. The value of this program is that it provides topical information for those who may be unable to attend an extended judicial education program.

Administrators of juvenile courts are assisted with the Juvenile Justice Management Institute, created in 1971 (NCJCJ, 1982) to train the management personnel in the juvenile justice field. These courses offered in these three and one-half day institutes focus on managerial aspects of the juvenile court, stressing the latest innovations in court management. Other topics include current legal developments in juvenile law. The Juvenile Justice Management Institutes is another example of the College's interest in providing education for professionals in the juvenile court.

In providing professional education programs, the College works with several other national organizations. Among these are: The National College of District Attorneys, the National District Attorney's Association, the Practicing Law Institute, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

THE NATIONAL CENTER OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, from which the National College was initiated in 1969, has also led to the creation of other supporting branches of the Council (NCJCJ, 1982). The Center, located on the University of Pittsburgh campus, has as its goal the research and dissemination of information
which may have a significant impact on the juvenile judge.

Through the work of the Center, improvements in the juvenile justice system as a result of research are expected to become a reality.

THE NATIONAL JUVENILE COURT FOUNDATION

The National Juvenile Court Foundation is involved in funding existing and proposed programs initiated by the National Council. Implemented in 1950, the Foundation's primary purpose was to stimulate and conduct research and educational activities relating to the work of juvenile courts (NCJCJ, 1982). The Center for Juvenile Justice now takes on these activities, while the foundation works closely with citizens, corporations, and foundations that desire to assist in combating the problems facing the juvenile and family courts in the United States today.

IN-STATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR JUVENILE COURT JUDGES

A study by the National Center for State Courts conducted in October 1984, reveals that only twelve states have any in-state training programs for their juvenile court judges; California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin (Franklin, 1980). This is in contrast to thirty-one states that offer training programs for judges with general trial jurisdiction (Franklin, 1980). Juvenile programs vary widely from state to state, with some states offering extensive programs while other states merely
offer one-day orientation programs. A brief look at the states offering programs for juvenile court judges will reveal various methods of educating their state judges, but all with the same goal--the increased professionalization of their judiciary.

California. The California Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) was created in 1973 to provide the California judiciary with a professional education program (Lee, 1974). The California Center is a joint project of the Judicial Council of California and the Conference of California Judges. One of the programs offered by the Center is the Juvenile Institute for California Juvenile Court Judges and Referees. This one-and-a-half-day program discusses topics dealing with dispositions of juveniles, recent legal decisions regarding juvenile rights, treatment of the disturbed child and other topics relevant to the operation of the juvenile court.

The California Center offers an annual two-week in-residence program for new trial judges. This orientation program, held at the University of California at Berkley, provides extensive courses and materials covering topics as Evidence; Developments in Civil Procedure; Search and Seizure; Contempt; Judicial Ethics; The Juvenile Court; and many more (Franklin, 1980).

Also available for new trial judges in California is the Advisor Judge Orientation Program (Lee and Coe, 1974). This program pairs a new trial judge with a highly experienced judge
who orients the new judge in his judicial duties. The advisor judge may sit on the Bench with the new trial judge as an observer. The value of this one-to-one relationship in orienting a new judge is that it provides the novice with the experience of a judge whose duties are similar to his.

The California Center for Judicial Education and Research is presently working on many projects to assist the new trial judge in his orientation on the Bench.

Connecticut. Connecticut offers two hours of in-service training for its probation and detention personnel from Juvenile Court, Circuit Court, Family Relations Officers, and Superior Court Domestic Relations Officers (Franklin, 1980). Proposals have been made to provide two-week orientation programs for each of these groups dealing with juvenile matters. Also, the development of a Juvenile Court manual has been implemented to serve as a training tool. Several seminars are also held yearly, dealing with various topics. Included in these seminars are two one-day seminars for Juvenile Court judges on neglect cases and conflict law problems.

Idaho. Judicial education in Idaho consists of seminars provided by the National College of Juvenile Justice. The seminars for Idaho juvenile court judges include: Juvenile Justice; and Institute for Juvenile Justice Management Seminar; both conducted by the National College of Juvenile Justice (Franklin, 1980). The planned attendance for the Institute for Juvenile
Justice Management Seminar was listed as one judge of an urban district who primarily handles juvenile cases (Franklin, 1980).

Maryland. Maryland judges are required to attend the two and one-half day Annual Judicial Conference (Franklin, 1980). A portion of each conference is devoted to judicial education through the use of seminars, workshops, and lectures.

Michigan. Michigan not only offers annual Judicial and Regional Conferences, but is also offers Probate and Juvenile Court Training Programs (Franklin, 1980). The juvenile court training program prepared by the Center for the Administration of Justice of Wayne State University, consists of three parts (Franklin, 1980). The first series, lasting five days, deals with the Basic Law and Treatment. Part two, a four-day series—State-wide Training Program—trains local personnel in techniques of in-service training; and the last session, Regional Juvenile Courts Training Programs, of six days duration, rounds out the juvenile court training program of Michigan. A host of other seminars are available for the Michigan judiciary covering topics as: Mentally Ill Offenders Seminar; and Seminars for Newly-Elected Judges (Franklin, 1980).

Mississippi. Mississippi offers seminars for its appellate court judges, justices of the peace, probation and parole personnel, court reporters, bailiffs, municipal judges, and juvenile court judges and referees. The seminar for juvenile court judges and referees consists of one program on juvenile matters (Franklin, 1980). The use of out-of-state programs is being
formulated by Mississippi.

**New Jersey.** A two-day seminar is offered yearly for judges handling juvenile matters (Franklin, 1980). Seminars are offered for trial court administrators, court reporters, and other court-related personnel. A four-day orientation program is available for newly-appointed judges.

**Ohio.** Ohio's Probate and Juvenile Judges' Association has an annual meeting usually lasting one-half day (Franklin, 1980). Besides this Association's half-day program, juvenile judges are able to attend the two and one-half day Ohio Judicial Conference and the two and one-half day New Judges' Conference (Franklin, 1980). The subject matter of the New Judges Conference is dependent on the number of judges from each court attending.

**Oregon.** Oregon's Juvenile Court Judges Association offers a Juvenile Court Judges' Summer Institute and a sentencing Institute.

**Utah.** An annual Judicial conference is held with programs dealing with various topics presented from year to year. Training for Utah's Juvenile Court judges is handled through the Office of the Juvenile Court Administrator.

**Wisconsin.** Wisconsin offers a Juvenile Court Conference for its Juvenile Court Judges (Franklin, 1980). Other education programs include the Wisconsin Judicial Conference and the Wisconsin Judicial College.

**Illinois.** Three types of educational programs are offered each year to all Illinois judges through the Illinois Judicial
Conference and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. These are the annual meeting, the regional seminars and the new judge seminars. They provide a variety of formats for continuing education, for both mandatory and optional programs.

Each Illinois judge must attend one of two annual meetings offered by the Illinois Judicial Conference. The principle function of both two-day annual meetings is to inform judges of recent developments in the many areas of the law (Franklin, 1980). Typically, five or six topics are offered on an elective basis, which allows judges with different types of court calls to hear presentations which are most closely relevant to their work. Ten hours of continuing education are now required of each Illinois judge.

Currently, six regional seminars are offered each year at different locations throughout Illinois. The seminars, lasting two and one-half days, discuss current judicial topics, including issues effecting juvenile judges. Attendance at regional seminars is entirely voluntary. In many respects, the regional seminars are an expanded version of the sessions given at the annual meeting (Franklin, 1980).

Since the late 1970's, Illinois has offered a training program for newly elected or appointed judges on approximately an annual basis. Over the past few years, the program has been expanded to four and one-half days long. Attendance is mandatory, and the Illinois Supreme Court assures that all new judges attend. Because the judges come from a wide
diversity of backgrounds, and will hear many different types of calls, the emphasis of this seminar is on topics common to all judges (Franklin, 1980).

All of the information on in-state programs is taken from the National Center for State Courts' report on state training programs. Many of the states did not include descriptions of what their program included.

SUMMARY

The initial push for education programs for judges began with the realization that our courts were not operating effectively. One area of concern was seen as the ineffective handling of judicial matters by the judicial personnel of our court system. Unlike West European countries where judges receive professional training and experience before assuming judicial duties, the American judge is expected to assimilate judicial duties with the acquisition of the judicial robe. Other professions within the United States require extensive training of those wishing to enter those professions. Qualifying exams must be passed to enter most professions to show that the aspiring professional possesses a certain standard of competence. Political election or appointment being the only prerequisite to judicial office, it became cognizant to members of our criminal justice system that the courts could not operate more effectively until they were staffed with professional judges who understand their function in the court system. Judicial education programs grew out of this perceived need to improve court personnel.
Law School preparation is no longer considered adequate training for judicial positions by the judges who promote judicial education. The duties of a judge require more than a understanding of the law. Judges must also be knowledgeable in staffing and managing a court.

The call for continuing education programs for the nation's judiciary has been reflected in standards of both the American Bar Association and the National Advisory Committee Report on Standards and Goals. Both standards espouse the need for in-state continuing education programs for judges and separate orientation programs for new judges. The need for these programs has been recognized, it is now the implementation of these programs that is necessary. To fit the specific training needs of judges various methods of instruction have been employed. Lectures with an inter-disciplinary approach to subject matter, seminars and workshops are among the instructional methods utilized presently.

As it can be noted from the foregoing discussion of judicial education programs in the United States, there is a reliance on national programs to meet the need of the nation's judiciary at all levels. Some states have recently created a training unit within their state for judges of general trial jurisdiction. The availability of judicial education programs for juvenile court judges is to a greater extent dependent on the national program. Of the few states that offer any in-state training for its judges with juvenile jurisdiction many have
only half-day or day-long orientation sessions. Any further training must be received by one of the national college programs.

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, upon its creation, had as its primary goal the actualization of the juvenile court concept of individualized treatment for juveniles by professional juvenile court judges. The Council through its College training program and its publications provides the nation's juvenile court judge with basic information about the juvenile court and a better understanding of the role of juvenile court judge. However, the National College did not intend to supplant state judicial education programs for juvenile judges, but rather intended to serve as a model for state education programs.

The need for judicial education programs has been accepted by most jurists. The need is not only in providing programs for all levels of judges, but also in providing programs suitable for the specific needs of each state. The national programs may serve as model education programs but they cannot fulfill the needs of each state's judiciary.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

REVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

This section will report the findings of a biographical survey conducted in the winter of 1987-1988. If judges must be knowledgable in their particular area and judicial education, programs must exist for the improvement of judicial functioning, then knowledge of presently existing conditions must first be understood before plans for improvement (where needed) can be formulated. The purpose of this section is to review the responses to this judicial biographical survey and thereby provide a basis for later comment on possible alternatives for improvement in the handling of juvenile matters in Illinois. Following a description of the judicial responses to the survey, there will be a review of their responses along with a discussion of the educational status of the Illinois juvenile court judge.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In order to determine the kind of qualifications the Illinois judge possess, a biographical survey was mailed in December, 1987, to the members of the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. A copy of this biographical survey can be found in the Appendix. The questions in this survey provided a comprehensive profile of the Illinois juvenile judge concerning such background data as age, education, prior work experience, and other statistical data.
Questions were posed in a closed-ended manner, thereby permitting the busy respondent to take minimal time to complete the survey questionnaire. It was presumed that this method of questioning would lead to a substantial prompt response. A cover letter (Appendix) explaining the purpose of the survey accompanied the biographical data sheet. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for convenience in responding.

POPULATION FOR THE STUDY

A total of 58 letters and surveys were mailed to members of the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. The list of names was obtained from the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges 1987 directory. A comparison with other information, collected from the 1965 survey, will examine differences concerning such background data as age, education, prior work experience, and other statistical data.

SEARCH FOR DATA

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

The data obtained for this survey is examined and analyzed according to its content. Re-evaluation of the problem was conducted to determine the relevance of the data collected. The original design of this survey was developed by Gordon L. Lippitt and Shirley D. McCune in June of 1963, at the George Washington University - Center for the Behavioral Sciences.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

JUDICIAL EDUCATION: 1965 STUDY VS. 1987 STUDY

The initial 58 letters and surveys mailed out brought in 31 responses. Several respondents indicated that they had no juvenile jurisdiction and, therefore, they could not complete the survey as requested. In an effort to obtain a greater response and, thereby, provide a larger data for study, a second letter and an accompanying survey were mailed to the nonresponding judges. This was done with the purpose of eliciting responses from judges who may have not responded initially because of their lack of juvenile jurisdiction. This second letter (Appendix) was mailed in January, 1988, and it explained the importance of a response, if only to indicate lack of juvenile jurisdiction. Another 11 responses were received after this second mailing.

It is from these 42 responses that certain observations and comments on the Illinois judge with juvenile jurisdiction will be made in the following sections. There was a 72 percent return on the survey, with a 34 percent response from associate court judges. Of the 42 judges that responded to the survey, forty-one of these, or 98 percent of those responding had juvenile jurisdiction. This base of forty-one is used in the following analysis. It is felt that this number is a large
enough response to provide a representative sample of the Illinois judge with juvenile jurisdiction.

The questions posed were general in nature, intending to provide only a broad view of the current Illinois judge with juvenile jurisdiction and not intended to furnish exacting statistical data on the Illinois judiciary. The findings of the survey which are of special concern to this thesis include such areas as educational background, previous occupational experience in matters related to youth, and attendance at judicial conferences or seminars in the juvenile area. Comparisons between juvenile judges will be made with regard to education, age, and other relevant information. Upon completion of a review of the information provided by the Illinois judges, a summary on the status of the Illinois judge will follow.

SURVEY RESULTS

AGE OF THE JUDGES

The mean or average age of Illinois juvenile judges studied was fifty years and the median age was forty-eight years. The distribution of judges in each age category is shown in Table 1.

Fifty-nine percent of the sample fall below fifty years. This can be compared with a study completed by the Center for the Behavioral Sciences of the George Washington University in 1965, Profile of the Nation's Juvenile Court Judges, by Shirley McCune, a study of the nation's juvenile court judges from a sample of 1564 judges with juvenile jurisdiction. The mean age of judges
studied in this group was fifty-three years. This study also revealed that in 1965 almost 60 percent of the sample was over fifty years of age. In this 1987 sample of Illinois juvenile judges, 39.0 percent of them are over fifty years of age. There was a 21 percent decrease in age between this Illinois sample of juvenile judges in 1987 and the national sample in 1965.

TABLE I

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ILLINOIS JUVENILE JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 &amp; over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED AS JUVENILE JUDGE

In order to determine the length of time judges had exercised juvenile jurisdiction, the sample was queried as to the number of years they had juvenile jurisdiction. The distribution of responses may be seen in Table 2.

The mean number of years served with juvenile jurisdiction by the sample was eight years, with the median at seven years. Since a majority of the respondents with juvenile jurisdiction are circuit court judges, as opposed to associate court judges, their length of service as judges with juvenile jurisdiction would correspond with their length in their position as circuit court judge. In some counties, because of shifting juvenile
jurisdiction or a reorganization of the courts, some judges may have attained juvenile jurisdiction after several years in office, therefore, not corresponding with length of time in office.

TABLE 2
YEARS SERVED AS JUVENILE JUDGE BY ILLINOIS JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the national survey undertaken by the Center of Behavioral Sciences in 1965, the mean number of years served as juvenile court judge was seven (McCune, 1965). Sixty-six percent of their national sample had served ten years or less.

COUNTY SIZE

Since the Illinois judiciary's geographic jurisdiction is based on counties, a question on the biographical data sheet dealt with county size. The following information on county population size provides useful information relative to the volume of work that these judges handle.
### TABLE 3

**COUNTY SIZE OF JUVENILE JUDGES IN ILLINOIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pop. of County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and under</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000-50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,000-100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101,000-150,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151,000-200,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents have juvenile jurisdiction of a county with a population over 200,000. The next largest percentage of judges—14 percent—have jurisdiction in the following two county size, 151,000-200,000 and 21,000-50,000 in population. The amount of time spent on juvenile matters varies from county to county depending on various characteristics such as the population size of the county, the number of urban areas in the county, the number of juvenile detentions, and the number of out of court handling of juvenile matters in that county.

#### AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT ON JUVENILE MATTERS

Judges with juvenile jurisdiction in Illinois were queried as to the amount of time spent on juvenile matters. This question and its subsequent answer is a highly subjective one. Judges answered this question on the amount of time they perceived they spent on juvenile matters, or perhaps on the
amount of time they felt they should spend on juvenile matters. Table 4 is a breakdown of the perceptions of Illinois judges on their allocation of time to juvenile matters. As noted, the majority of Illinois judges with juvenile jurisdiction spend half or less of their time on juvenile matters.

TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME ILLINOIS JUDGES SPEND ON JUVENILE MATTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than quarter-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF THE ILLINOIS JUVENILE JUDGES

In order to better understand the educational background that judges bring with them to the bench, a question on the biographical survey dealt with the area of study in college. The areas of college study were broken down into broad categories. A breakdown of the areas of study given by respondents is listed in Table 5.
TABLE 5

AREAS OF STUDY IN WHICH ILLINOIS JUDGES RECEIVED COLLEGE DEGREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total not given because many judges responded to two areas, indicating a major and minor areas of study.

None of the respondents lacked a college degree. This is in contrast to the 1965 study on the nation's juvenile court judges, where 295 out of 1564 judges, or 18.9 percent, had not earned an undergraduate degree (McCune, 1965). The largest number of degrees was received in the social sciences area. Those judges with degrees in the behavioral sciences, including psychology and sociology, would be in this category. The national study of juvenile judges in 1965 indicated that only 8.2 percent of their respondents had received degrees in the behavioral sciences (McCune, 1965). Only one judge indicated that he had an M.A. in the Education area. The remaining judges went on to receive a law degree and did not pursue any non-legal graduate degree.

This is in contrast to the national sample of judges taken in 1965. One hundred twenty-seven, or eight percent of the
sample had completed non-legal graduate education (McCune, 1965). The largest number of these non-legal post-graduate degrees were in Education, with twenty-one respondents in this category. The next largest number of degrees was in the Business Administration area. The remaining respondents received post-graduate degrees in a wide array of subjects including social work, sociology, psychology, and International Law. Forty-five respondents in the national sample indicated they had non-legal post-graduate degrees, but did not specify the area.

LEGAL EDUCATION OF ILLINOIS JUDGES

All respondents in the sample hold law degrees. In the national sample of juvenile court judges completed twenty-three years ago, 437 judges from a sample group of 1564 had not attended law school (McCune, 1965). This accounted for 25 percent of the national sample. Illinois judges who were queried as to type of law degree responded in this manner: thirty-two received J.D. degrees, while seven received L.L.B. degrees. One judge has an L.L.M. degree.

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

The jurisdiction of most Illinois judges with juvenile jurisdiction is wide. Most judges in Illinois with juvenile jurisdiction must also handle all other regular duties of the court. When queried as to the extent of their juvenile jurisdiction, judges were given a list of juvenile and family
Almost all of the respondents indicated that their jurisdiction extended beyond those listed in the Biographical Data Sheet. Where asked to specify other jurisdiction, judges responded with specifics such as: criminal, traffic, probate, and civil matters. Other judges were less specific and merely stated that they handle "all other" matters of the court.

There were some judges, however, who did not have jurisdiction in a few of the areas described. A small number of courts indicated that they had no jurisdiction in matters such as: divorce and separation, nonsupport, adoption, and custody and guardianship. These areas were provided by another court.

PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE RELATED TO YOUTH

In order to determine the kinds of youth-related experience juvenile judges brought to the bench, a question on the biographical survey requested information regarding previous occupational experience related to youth. A large variety of responses were given, ranging from "fatherhood" to police officer. The largest number of responses were for practicing attorney. Six judges did not respond to this question and twenty-one respondents stated that they had no previous occupational experience related to youth.

The variety of responses to this question included the
following occupations: practicing attorney (handling some juvenile cases), prosecuting attorney, teacher, school board member, and police officer. Other judges responded that they had certain experience in youth related activities or possessed important qualities essential in dealing with youth such as: fatherhood, active in Boy Scouts, civic group activities, and baseball coach.

ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES

The number of conferences available in juvenile matters has grown considerably. Realizing a great need in this area, many states offer conferences on the handling of juveniles for their judges with juvenile jurisdiction. The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges offers regional seminars for judges with juvenile jurisdiction, along with summer sessions of various lengths for juvenile judges. The value of these conferences is that they provide an opportunity for juvenile judges to discuss their difficulties in dealing with juvenile matters.

In order to ascertain the number of Illinois judges with juvenile jurisdiction that have taken advantage of these conferences, a question on the biographical survey dealt with attendance at juvenile conferences. A majority of the sample indicated that they had attended some conference or seminar dealing with juvenile jurisdiction, with 97.6 percent responding
"yes" to conference attendance. Of the forty-one judges stating they had attended a conference, twenty-nine indicated that they attended sessions through the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, thirty judges attended sessions sponsored by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, with the remaining judges indicating other conferences such as state and regional conferences, judicial conferences, and workshops. Many of the respondents indicating they had attended conferences, had multiple experiences, attending national programs as well as regional and state programs. University programs were also listed as a source of educational seminars on juvenile matters. This large attendance at judicial conferences, expressing an interest in education programs, is encouraging to proponents of judicial education.

PUBLICATIONS HELPFUL TO THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

Interest in the alarming increase of juvenile delinquency has led to the publication of a large number of books that attempt to explain the underlying causes of delinquency and also attempt to create solutions. Criticisms of courts' handling of juvenile-related offenses has resulted in publications dealing with judge/juvenile relations in court. Though there are many sociological works on the evolution of juvenile delinquency and "solutions," there is very little written professional material that aids the judge in the assimilation of the information he must be aware of in order
to function effectively. A question included in the survey dealt with publications that were perceived beneficial by judges. This question was included to see which publications were deemed beneficial by respondents and to appraise the extent of their use.

As was anticipated, there were few publications listed as beneficial in dealing with juvenile jurisdiction. Fifteen respondents did not even respond to this question and six judges responded that there were not publications beneficial to their work. Of the remaining 49 percent of the sample, there was little consensus on helpful written material. Publications by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, which includes the Juvenile and Family Law Digest, were stated by eleven respondents as offering useful information. Among the other choices of publications deemed helpful were the Juvenile and Family Court Judges' Journal, Federal Probation, and the Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education Handbook for Juvenile Law.

The reading of statutes and reported cases was listed by a few judges as the only valuable reading material. These judges stated that they had read various articles and questioned their value. One judge stated that "all (publications) seem helpful, in that they show juvenile everywhere to be similar" and the "their solutions are few." This is the attitude of judges that NCJC publications attempt to correct.
MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

When questioned as to membership in any state or local association of juvenile judges, forty Illinois judges indicated that they are members of one or more professional associations. Membership among juvenile associations included the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Illinois Juvenile Judges' Association, and the Illinois Judicial Conference. Only one member of the sample indicated noninvolvement in any association.

GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES THAT WORK WITH THE JUVENILE JUDGES

The juvenile court deals with various governmental and community agencies. Although these agencies vary from county to county, most Illinois judges listed similar community agencies as being beneficial in their dealing with juvenile matters. The Department of Children and Family Services was deemed highly valuable in dealing with juvenile matters. The county probation department was vaunted as a crucial tool in dealing with juvenile matters.

Among the other governmental agencies listed by the respondents were all facets of law enforcement, particularly police, sheriffs, and prosecutors. Other government agencies listed as beneficial were the public schools (teachers, and counselors cited as helpful) and public defenders.
In community services, the use of mental health clinics was widely praised. Also, in the area of counseling, child guidance clinics, and alcohol and drug counseling were cited as tools for the juvenile judges' use. A wide array of other helpful community groups listed included boys' and girls' clubs, YMCA, YWCA, ministerial associations, Catholic Charities, boy and girl scouts, youth church groups, local doctors and psychiatrists, and the press. The aforementioned service varied from county to county, with some areas relying heavily on specific groups, i.e., church groups and guidance clinics.

The above data indicates that the juvenile judge relies heavily on auxiliary groups in the performance of his duties. The interaction of governmental and community groups working with the juvenile judge are essential for effective handling of juvenile matters.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Numerous studies and articles suggest that juvenile court judges should be given formal training that is geared toward their duties. Proper training would enhance the decision making process in determining appropriate disposition of cases.

The biographical data survey was an attempt to learn more about the judicial officers who serve the Illinois juvenile courts. The purpose of the study was not only to assess the general characteristics of the Illinois juvenile judge, but also to pay particular attention to the educational background and experience of current juvenile judges. The national study on juvenile judges which was conducted in 1965 revealed that, nationally, juvenile judges were an over-worked and undereducated group. At that time few educational seminars were available in the juvenile area. Less than one-third of the judges in the national sample had attended any judicial conference or seminar (McCune, 1965).

The results of the Illinois Juvenile Justice Survey revealed that the "average" Illinois judge is male, is in his late forties-early fifties, possesses both a college and a law degree, and has exercised juvenile jurisdiction for at least eight years. His jurisdiction, however, in most cases, also
includes criminal matters, with 61 percent of the respondents indicating that they spent half of their time, or less, on juvenile matters.

This study, taken twenty-two years later than the national sample, reveals that 98 percent of the responding Illinois judges had attended some type of conference. Many of these judges attended sessions with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. In contrast to the 1965 figures, this is an encouraging increase in conference attendance. Illinois judges not only fared better in conference attendance, but their educational qualifications were also higher than the national sample. This is a reflection of the trend for higher education in all areas and the trend to require legal training for all judicial positions. A large number of college degrees in the social sciences exhibit an increase of study in this area prior to law school entry. Since the juvenile judge's duties require that he have some knowledge of sociological implications of society upon the juvenile, and psychological implications of his role as judge, this course of study is beneficial to the juvenile judge.

With regard to prior experience related to youth, Illinois juvenile judges responded with a variety of youth-related occupations and activities. The types of previous occupational experience that judges acquired were generally legal in nature. Most respondents listed practicing attorney and prosecuting
as previous occupational experience related to youth. Since the individual types of legal practice were not described by the judges, it is difficult to state whether those indicating practicing attorney as occupational experience had real experience in dealing with youth.

At first, it appears as though the judiciary is well-versed in the needs of the delinquent youth in Illinois society. However, with further study of these child-related experiences, it can be noted that the respondents dealing with youth in such activities as Boy Scout leaders or baseball coaches may not be dealing with the types of juveniles that would come before him as juvenile judge. Colored by his image of what youth "should be like" through his experiences with middle class children, perhaps his youth-related experiences are not as beneficial in his role as juvenile judge as they may seem initially. Other youth-related experiences in occupations as attorneys and prosecutors also may not actually by experiences that aid the judge in his understanding of youth and its problems.

A majority of Illinois judges have attended educational conferences and seminars of some sort. Since attendance at conferences is a voluntary action on the part of the participating judges, it can be inferred that most judges desire additional help in performing their duties to their best capability. Many judges indicated that they had had
numerous experiences with conferences, again indicating a desire to deal professionally with their duties as juvenile judge.

Not only did judges indicate their desire to learn from conferences, but they also indicated a need for supportive agencies. When queried as to governmental and community agencies that were beneficial to their work as a juvenile judge, most judges responded with the same small number of available agencies. Many judges expressed a need for more supportive help.

Several judges in response to the survey also included an additional letter which explained their jurisdiction as juvenile judge. Invariably these letters stressed how busy their courts were in dealing with criminal and administrative matters, along with juvenile matters.

The foregoing discussion of the characteristics of the Illinois juvenile judge does not intend to imply that the Illinois juvenile judge is atypical, but rather it is presented in an attempt to assess the characteristics of Illinois judges. The purpose of the Illinois study was to provide specific data on the Illinois judiciary with special emphasis on the educational background of judges and their use of continuing education programs. Now that the status of the Illinois judge with juvenile jurisdiction is clearly relevant, comments can be made for the improvement of an educational system for Illinois juvenile judges.
RESTATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study examines the relationship between the current system of educating juvenile court judges and the changes which are necessary to improve the realm of juvenile justice.

RESTATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

1. Juvenile Court Judge education requirements are met in the State of Illinois more effectively in 1988 than in 1965.

2. Judges in the State of Illinois are more aware of available educational resources in 1988 than they were in 1965.

3. Juvenile court judges are better trained today than they were fifteen years ago.

CONCLUSIONS

RESEARCH QUESTION I

Juvenile Court Judge educational requirements are met in the State of Illinois more effectively in 1988 than in 1965. Law school preparation is no longer considered adequate training for judicial positions by the judges who promote judicial education. Initially the provision of judicial education was narrow in scope, it was directed toward appellate judges and judges of courts of limited jurisdiction that were staffed with
nonlawyers. Now it is felt that education programs should be available to all judges, with special focus in their area of jurisdiction.

The call for continuing education programs for the nation's judiciary has been reflected in standards of both the American Bar Association and the National Advisory Committee Report on Standards and Goals. To fit the specific training needs of judges various methods of instruction have been employed. Lectures with inter-disciplinary approach to subject matter, seminars and workshops are among the instructional methods utilized presently. Every Illinois judge must complete ten hours of continuing education each year.

Since the late 1970's, Illinois has offered a training program for newly elected or appointed judges on approximately an annual basis. Attendance is mandatory, and the Illinois Supreme Court assures that all new judges attend.

RESEARCH QUESTION II

Judges in the State of Illinois are more aware of available educational resources in 1988 than in 1965. As a result of the litigation explosion in the United States and the ensuing overload in our courts, national attention has focused on a number of national organizations geared toward improvement in our court system. These organizations vary not only in the type of judicial personnel they train but also in their method of instruction and subject matter deemed essential for the
varying judicial personnel. These programs are of great value since many states incorporate these national programs in their judicial education structure along with the state's special judicial education programs.

To aid the states in providing education programs for their judges, the National Center for State Courts was created in 1971; the need for such a Center was suggested by Chief Justice Burger and President Nixon at a National Conference on the State Judiciary. Established to provide a clearinghouse of information and advice for state judicial systems, the Center assists the Courts in improving procedures and learning modern techniques in court management.

RESEARCH QUESTION III

Juvenile court judges are better trained today than they were fifteen years ago. Over the past four years, the training program for newly elected or appointed judges has been expanded from two days to four and one-half days long. Each Illinois judge must attend one of two annual meetings offered by the Illinois Judicial Conference.

Within the last five years the training needs of the judge, with limited and special jurisdiction, are being partially met by the American Academy of Judicial Education. This organization, located in Washington, D.C., conducts courses on a national level as well as local programs within the state.

Three types of education programs are also offered
each year to all Illinois judges through the Illinois Judicial
Conference and the Administrative Office of the Illinois
Courts.

The National College of Juvenile Justice was created as
the training arm of the National Council of Juvenile Court
Judges. The National College provides intensive training
programs for the nation's juvenile court judge.
CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS

Just because the procedure (of the juvenile court) is flexible and the scope for personal discretion and individualization of treatment is so great, it is imperative that the judges who sit in these courts be exceptionally qualified.

Roscoe Pound

Upon the review of national and state education programs for juvenile court judges and the lack of programs for juvenile court judges, the following discussion will dwell on the needs of the Illinois juvenile court and how they may be met through educational programming. The acquisition of information regarding the proper handling of juvenile duties surfaced with the creation of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges in 1938 and it has continued to grow, as evidenced by the National Council’s growth and expansion. The fact that judges banded together on their own initiative to form the Council reflects the seriousness of the judges in their desire to improve their performance as juvenile court judge. The inadequacies of existing state education programs for juvenile court judges were described in chapter 2. Recognizing the deficiency in this area, several states have formulated orientation programs and workshops for judges with juvenile jurisdiction. These programs, as described in Chapter 2, only scratch the surface of judicial education for juvenile
judges and do not penetrate the underlying needs of the juvenile court judiciary.

In order to alleviate the shortcomings of the Illinois juvenile court judiciary, proposals will be made for the provision of both initial and continuing education programs. The preceding discussion of the Illinois judiciary, and the review of national and state judicial education programs was included to provide a format from which to formulate education programs for the Illinois judge with juvenile jurisdiction. This section will deal with proposals for the educational and increased professionalization of the Illinois juvenile court judge. These proposals are based on the recognition of the need for such programs and the inadequacy of available education programs within Illinois.

INITIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Illinois clearly needs an initial education program for all newly appointed juvenile judges to prepare these judges for their new responsibilities. The following discussion will suggest a program which will assist in meeting the needs of the judges in Illinois.

The needs of the new juvenile court judge in Illinois could be met by providing a two-week training program similar to the summer session available by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. In order to provide adequate
time for lectures, seminars, and other instructional methods, a two-week session for all new juvenile judges would be necessary.

The course content of the program should be carefully planned in order to provide pertinent information for the judge with juvenile jurisdiction. An examination of the programs offered by the National College of Juvenile Justice in Reno reveals a wide array of topics that juvenile court judges themselves have expressed as necessary areas of instruction. Once a program is established, future curricula may be developed by obtaining feedback from the judges that attended past programs. Constantly up-dating the program to keep abreast of new developments will be essential to maintain the quality of the education program.

Since all attendants at the initial education program will have had experience as lawyers or judges, focus of the program should rest on the behavioral sciences as they relate to juvenile delinquency and juvenile law. An interdisciplinary approach to the program could be created through the use of professionals from many fields including sociologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social welfare personnel, physicians, etc. Although stressing the behavioral sciences, an understanding of the juvenile court procedure and disposition of juveniles should be a large part of the program. Discussion of available institutions and their facilities, alternatives to
institutionalization, and a study of psychological disorders of juveniles should be among the topics discussed.

Representative of topics that could be offered during the two-week session are: Materials on Juvenile Court Law, a comprehensive analysis of laws and procedures in the Juvenile Court; Understanding Delinquent Behavior, a study of the development of personality through adolescence with a study of major theories of causation; Communications, a study of the nature of, and barrier to, communications between judges and those that appear before him; Organization of Court Services, information on the efficient organization of courts to provide services required to perform juvenile court functions; Juvenile Justice System--Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, an examination of the history and purposes of the juvenile justice system, its deficiencies and its relationship to society; and Special Presentations, selected subjects of concern to the juvenile justice system, as sessions on narcotics, psychiatric information and in-service methods and programs. A study of community organizations available to judges would benefit the juvenile court by informing judges of funding procedures available to these organizations. These topics would give the juvenile court judge a better understanding of the youth that come before him, the procedures he may use to alter their behavior and the proper use of detention, probation, institutional programs, and alternatives to
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commitment. The judge should also be instructed in the art of evaluating research so that the judges can continue their studies when back at their courts.

Various methods of instruction should include lectures and seminars led by experienced judges, law professors, and scholars from the behavioral sciences. The program should include field trips to Illinois juvenile institutions, allowing judges to talk with correctional officers of these institutions. Role-playing sessions may be valuable in providing the juvenile court judge with a better understanding of his role in relation to the juvenile, parents, police officers, probation officers, community services personnel, and other juvenile justice related personnel.

Interdisciplinary seminars with juvenile police officers, probation officers, correctional officers, community services personnel, and mental health personnel would allow the judge and other members of the seminar to realize the difficulties encountered by the other officers in fulfilling their role. With a better understanding of their inter-relationship, perhaps a smoother working relationship among these participants would facilitate their striving toward the common goal of an improved juvenile justice system.

Experimentation with different types of programs with an evaluation of the different methodologies employed would result in an education program that would keep abreast of the latest
developments in educational training. This would be an advantage to the judges attending such programs, with long-range benefits to the entire criminal justice system.

The interdisciplinary approach toward education for the juvenile court judge is perhaps more crucial than similar programs for judges of other jurisdictions. Proper awareness of the causes of juvenile delinquency with concurrent improved disposition of juveniles may result in a substantial decrease in the recidivism rate among juveniles and therefore decrease their criminal potential as adults. The importance of sentencing in the juvenile court is great because of the juvenile court philosophy of treatment and rehabilitation rather than punishment or retribution. In order to approach this ideal, education programs for judges with juvenile jurisdiction will need to stress the different premises of the juvenile court and the resultant different treatment of juveniles.

Continuing education programs must not stop with this initial education program for there are constant changes in juvenile law and in theories of dealing with juvenile delinquency. Every two years judges should be provided with a three-day continuing education session. This would enable juvenile court judges to catch up on developments since their orientation session. Sponsored by the same training organization of the state that implements the initial education program; the abbreviated format of the refresher course should
consist of lectures by jurists and law professors in areas or current legal and social concern in the juvenile justice area. Seminars should also be held to allow the exchange of ideas and experiences of judges during their first year as juvenile court judge. Evaluations of the conference with suggested areas of improvement from the attending judges would allow future programs to be formulated according to the perceived need of the judges themselves.

Attendance at national programs should also be encouraged. Attendance at national and regional programs would allow juvenile court judges to discourse with judges from different areas of the nation and would therefore allow a broader base for exchange of ideas. Specific components of the national program may be deemed so successful by the judges that they may want to see them adopted by their state program. The national education program for juvenile judges would also be able to attract scholars and jurists from across the nation that the state program would not be able to do.

The realization of the juvenile court concept and the professionalization of the juvenile court judiciary should be the goal of the initial and continuing education program for juvenile court judges. With continuing research regarding the benefits of such a program, education for juvenile court judges could improve and become an established area of judicial office.

The success of any such in-service training program can
only be measured by the subtle improvements in juvenile justice in the courts of those judges who attended. However, the desire to learn has been expressed by the judges themselves, so by fulfilling this area of need, education programs are providing a service that judges themselves have requested. The long range goal of a better educated judiciary would be to improve the Illinois juvenile justice system—a benefit that would be shared by all members of the state.

SUMMARY

The results of the Biographical Survey sent to all Illinois judges with juvenile jurisdiction revealed that a large percentage of Illinois judges have attended national education programs sponsored by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, as well as other related courses. This large attendance reflects the interest the Illinois judiciary has in functioning knowledgeably in the Illinois criminal justice system. The availability of the National programs should not, however, deter states from forming their own education programs. The national colleges themselves realize that they cannot fulfill the need of the entire nation's judiciary and are willing to work with the states in providing their own educational systems.

Juvenile court judges have in the past been neglected by judicial education programs on a state level. Programs for appellate and general trial judges are increasing with
little or no improvement in providing judicial education for juvenile court judges.

The foregoing discussion has expressed the need for some sort of initial and continuing education programs for judges with juvenile jurisdiction. These changes and the acceptance of these ideas will not come easily, but they are necessary changes. The risks of continuing to deny a specialized program for Illinois juvenile court judges are greater than the risks of providing some sort of education program for judges. The cost of such programs is a cost that must be borne as part of the cost of providing adequate judicial services to Illinois citizens.
Dear Judge;

I am a graduate student of the Business and Public Administration Department at Governors State University. I am currently working on my Masters thesis entitled: Illinois Juvenile Judges: Judicial Educational Development. I propose to devise a model training program that will be responsive to the needs of Illinois for Illinois juvenile judges.

Part of my work entails the description of Illinois juvenile judges and the number of judges with juvenile jurisdiction. It is for this purpose that I am sending a survey to all members of the Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Would you please take the time to complete the enclosed survey and return it to me in the self-addressed envelope provided.

The information that you provide will enable me to prepare a profile of the Illinois juvenile judge.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jerry T. Cyrkiel
Dear Judge;

I am a graduate student of the Business and Public Administration Department at Governors State University doing research on Illinois juvenile court judges.

In December I sent out a survey to all Illinois Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. I have not received a survey from you.

Enclosed is an additional survey. Would you please take the time to fill it out and mail it back to me? If you do not have juvenile jurisdiction please indicate so to me.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in responding. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Gerald T. Cyrkiel
BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

1. NAME______________________________

2. COURT______________________________

3. HOME ADDRESS ____________________________
   Street __________________________________________
   City __________________________ State __________________________

4. Age_______ 4.1 Religious Affiliation(if any):________________________

5. Marital Status: 5.1 Single___________ 5.2 Married___________
   5.3 Widower____________ 5.4 Divorced___________

6. Children(if any): Number___________ Ages:________________________

7. POSITION TITLE______________________________
   7.1 Are you a full-time judge? (yes or no)________________________
      If not, indicate other positions held____________________________

8. How much of your total judicial time (court and administrative) is
devoted to juvenile matters?
   8.1 Full-time__________ 8.2 Half-time_______ 8.3 Quarter-time_______
   8.4 Less__________ 8.5 If less than full-time, indicate other
      judicial duties________________________

9. Indicate the approximate population within the jurisdiction of your court.
   9.1 20,000 or under_______ 9.2 20,000-34,999_____________________
   9.3 50,000-99,999__________ 9.4 100,000-150,999____________
   9.5 150,000-299,999_______ 9.6 Over 300,000_____________________
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10. Please indicate whether your juvenile or family court jurisdiction includes the following: (Please check where appropriate)

10.1 Delinquency
10.2 Neglect
10.3 Dependency
10.4 Divorce and Separation
10.5 Paternity
10.6 Non-support
10.7 Adoption
10.8 Custody and Guardianship
10.9 Contributing to Delinquency
10.10 Other (Specify)

11. What staff, if any, do you have to aid in Juvenile Cases?
   (Give number in each category). Please indicate if they are not full-time employees of the court staff.

11.1 Clerk
11.2 Probation Officer
11.3 Social Worker
11.4 Psychologist
11.5 Psychiatrist
11.6 Other

12. What annual salary do you receive for your judicial duties?

12.1 Under $10,000
12.2 $10,000-$15,000
12.3 $15,000-$20,000
12.4 Over $20,000

13. Years served as a Juvenile Judge

14. Previous legal experience as a lawyer or judge (Please specify):

   ___________________________________________________________
15. Previous occupational experience in matters related to youth:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

16. How and why did you become a Juvenile Court Judge?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

17. In what work is your predecessor presently engaged?

________________________________________________________________________

18. What college and universities did you attend. (Undergraduate work)
   Indicate the number of years attended.

18.1 What degrees, if any, did you receive?

18.2 What were your major and minor subjects?

________________________________________________________________________

19. What Law school did you attend?

19.1 Number of years attended

19.2 Did you graduate? 19.3 Do you have any post-graduate law education?

19.4 Other post-graduation education?

________________________________________________________________________

20. Year admitted to the bar

21. Have you attended any institutes, work conferences, or study programs in recent years concerning juvenile and family court matters?

21.1 Yes 21.2 No

21.3 If yes, please describe briefly

________________________________________________________________________
22. Please list any local or state association of Juvenile or Family Court Judges or any other judicial associations or conferences of which you are a member. (Indicate offices held, if any)


23. Please list any other Professional Organizations to which you belong. (Indicate offices held, if any)


24. Please list the Community Organizations to which you belong and in which you have been active in the last ten years.


25. What other public offices have you held?


26. What publications (books or journals), if any, have you found to be helpful in your work as a Juvenile Court Judge?


27. What are the principal Governmental and Community agencies with which you work most frequently as Juvenile Court Judge?

Governmental


Community
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