

**THE JUDICIAL EDUCATION
REFERENCE, INFORMATION AND
TECHNICAL TRANSFER PROJECT
(JERITT)**

PROJECT EVALUATION

Final Report

**Laurence B. Stone
September 2001**

INTRODUCTION

The Judicial Education Reference, Information and Technical Transfer Project—The JERITT Project—was established in 1989 as a cooperative activity of the National Association of Judicial Educators (NASJE) and Michigan State University (MSU), with funding provided by the State Justice Institute (SJI). Created to serve as a national clearinghouse for information that would be of assistance to those in the field of judicial education, JERITT was designed to provide a variety of products and services, including information collection and dissemination, surveys, publications, and technical assistance to judicial education professionals at the state, national and federal levels.

The JERITT Project is the only source from which judicial branch education personnel, a relatively small group of specialized professionals, can secure accurate, timely information on matters relevant to their profession. In addition, JERITT facilitates the exchange of information and experiences among these professionals through its on-line listservers and related communication services for NASJE members and others. The products and services provided by JERITT were unavailable prior to its establishment twelve years ago, when judicial branch education personnel worked in relative isolation within their own institutions and had little interaction with peers across the country. The NASJE annual meeting then provided (and continues to provide) a limited venue for exchange of ideas, but, due to budget restraints, many members could not afford to attend. Thus, many in judicial branch education often had to “reinvent the wheel” when designing judicial education programs and presentations.

Thanks to the JERITT Project, those working in judicial branch education have a valuable, systematic and easy to use resource for innovations, concepts, course content, potential faculty members, materials, methodologies, learning theory, judicial branch education statistical information, and the exchange of ideas among those with similar responsibilities.

Over the years, JERITT's publications have defined judicial branch education and have provided those new to the field with realistic and practical guidance in how to develop and run an effective judicial education program. The JERITT databases contain a wealth of material and information on judicial branch education that is not available from any other source. JERITT's e-communication capabilities (list servers, chat rooms and threaded discussion groups), a relatively new addition to JERITT, are on the cutting edge of technology and are proving to be an extremely valuable asset. JERITT's Web site provides a portal to the databases, publications, e-communications and other resources for judicial branch educators and others.

JERITT PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Most of JERITT's products and services have been described in detail in previous evaluations, grant applications and in informal brochures and publications. In this section, products and services discussed in detail in earlier reports will be covered in a brief summary overview; products and services available since the last program evaluation in 1999 will be presented in more detail.

A. Publications.

1. JERITT Periodicals.

These reports disseminate data and information contained in the JERITT databases. The *Judicial Education Grant Awards Sourcebook*, *Judicial Education Programs Summary* and the *Judicial Education Resource Material Review* are no longer published, as the data and information contained therein are now available on the JERITT searchable databases described below.

- *Issues and Trends in Judicial Education*. This is a bi-annual publication providing an overview of judicial education programs and organizations throughout the nation. *Issues and Trends* profiles state and national judicial education organizations and gives information on staffing, budgets, salaries,

structure, and program offerings, as well as policies and practices pertaining to their delivery of educational services.

- *Judicial Branch Education Directory* (formerly *Judicial Educators Directory*). The *Directory*, which is published annually, provides names, mailing and e-mail addresses, and phone and fax numbers of the NASJE membership, along with individuals involved in judicial education in the U.S. and elsewhere. This data is also available in a searchable format on-line in the *Persons Database*, discussed below.
- *JERITT Bulletins*. These quarterly bulletins contain information on innovative programming; reviews of training aids, curricula, and programs; guest columns; and announcements of programs and publications of interest to those involved in judicial branch education. The final printed version of the *JERITT Bulletin* was distributed in mid-2000. The *Bulletin* may now be found on JERITT's Web site.

2. JERITT Monographs.

Eleven (11) JERITT monographs have been produced to inform judicial branch educators about initiatives, programming, theory and methodology, and techniques that are currently impacting the field of judicial education.

Monographs One, Two, Three, Four, Five, and Eight are designed to provide an in-depth exploration of particular topic areas, thereby offering the user an opportunity to acquire a solid understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the approach described. In addition, they are developed with practical application in mind, so that judicial branch educators can easily integrate the approach into their own professional activities. Monographs Six and Seven provide descriptive information of interest to those involved in judicial education. Monograph Nine studies perceptions and values of judicial education

professionals. Monographs Ten and Eleven deal with futures planning in the courts and judicial branch education.

- *Judicial Education Needs Assessment and Evaluation—Monograph One* (1991). This monograph discusses practical approaches to conducting educational needs assessments for judges and court personnel and the evaluation of education and training programs designed to address them.
- *Mentoring in the Judiciary—Monograph Two* (1992). This monograph explores methods and options for establishing judicial mentoring programs and for revising existing programs.
- *Education for Development: Principles and Practices in Judicial Education — Monograph Three* (1992). This monograph addresses adult education learning theory and methodology with a particular emphasis on its application to the development of judicial education curricula.
- *Curriculum, Program, and Faculty Development: Managing People, Process, and Product—Monograph Four* (1994). This publication provides a practical and comprehensive discussion of curriculum and program planning for judicial education, including needs assessment, selection of subject matter, the design of instructional activities, teaching methodologies, and faculty preparation.
- *Program Management: Managing Deadlines, Details, Activities, and People— Monograph Five* (1994). This monograph addresses program management, including program planning and implementation, faculty coordination and management, facility selection, and budget administration.
- *Education for Development: The Voices of Practitioners in the Judiciary— Monograph Six* (1995). This monograph reports reflections and observations of

former participants in the Judicial Education Leadership Institute concerning their experience in implementing the concepts learned at the Institute.

- *Professional Education and Development of NASJE Members—Monograph Seven* (1995). This monograph reports the results of a national survey of members of the National Association of State Judicial Educators to determine their professional education and development needs.
- *Ability-Based Learning and Judicial Education: An Approach to Ongoing Professional Development —Monograph Eight* (1998). This monograph explores the educational assumptions and principles of ability-based learning.
- *Claiming Status in an Emerging Occupation: A Study of State Judicial Education in America—Monograph Nine* (1998). This monograph examines what judicial educators in the United States value about their work and how they identify and claim professional status.
- *The Courts and Judicial Branch Education: Creating Their Future in the New Millennium—Monograph Ten* (1999). This monograph is a primer for individuals beginning futures planning processes in the courts and judicial branch education.
- *A National Agenda for the Future of Judicial Branch Education: A Synthesis of the Outcomes from the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education—Monograph Eleven* (2000). This monograph summarizes the processes employed and the resulting outcomes from the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education.

B. Databases.

JERITT collects information and maintains databases that offer a comprehensive description of judicial education personnel, programs, grants, products, services, and organizations throughout the United States and in other countries as well. All databases are available on-line and are searchable. Now that these databases are available on-line and far more judicial branch educators have the necessary equipment to access them, data previously available in printed form (*Judicial Education Grant Awards Sourcebook*, *Judicial Education Programs Summary* and the *Judicial Education Resource Material Review*) are no longer published.

- 1. The Persons Database.** This database contains data on persons involved in judicial branch education and recent recipients of SJI grants. The search capabilities of this database were updated and improved on May 1, 2001. Data in this database is published annually in *Judicial Branch Education Directory*.
- 2. The Programs Database.** This database maintains information (topics, subject matter, instructional methods, agendas) on over 10,000 judicial branch education programs conducted in the United States and several other countries since 1990.
- 3. The Grants Database.** This database contains information on the grants SJI has awarded since its establishment in 1987. Information on the products produced by the grants, is found in the products database.
- 4. The Products Database.** This database contains citations and abstracts of all SJI grant products, Federal Judicial Center (FJC) publications, and selected materials received by JERITT from judicial branch educators.
- 5. The Organizations Database.** This database contains information on courts and organizations involved in judicial branch education. It also includes recent recipients of SJI grants. This is a new database, added to the Web site in May

2001. Questions regarding this database were not included in the survey instrument due to its newness.

C. E-Communications.

JERITT, or any registered JERITT e-communications user, can communicate with others using list servers, chat rooms, and threaded discussions provided by JERITT. All communications using list servers and threaded discussions are moderated, which means that the moderator must edit, organize, and post the entries before they are distributed. Moderators can be from JERITT or leaders of committees, groups, or teams responsible for working on judicial branch education projects or programs. Chat rooms are for real-time meetings; thus, entries are automatically posted.

All electronic communications are secured. Users must be approved before they can enter into any electronic communications.

- 1. List Servers.** A list server is basically an E-mail list where users can contact all others on the same E-mail list. Listservers provide broadcast e-mail service to specific groups. Questions or messages of interest to groups of individuals may originate from a member of the list or from JERITT itself.
- 2. Chat Rooms.** A chat room is a real-time, unmoderated discussion group. JERITT's chat rooms provide the opportunity for individuals involved in judicial branch education to engage in on-line, real-time discussions with others who have similar interests.
- 3. Threaded Discussions.** A threaded discussion is essentially a chat room—with two exceptions. First, it is moderated, meaning someone is responsible for editing, approving, and posting all messages that are received for the discussion. Second, it is not a real-time discussion, meaning users can go to the Web and

participate in the discussion when it is convenient for them to do so. Threaded discussions provide the opportunity for groups of individuals working on a committee or project to communicate over a period of time based on their convenience and availability.

D. Web Site.

JERITT has established and maintains its own Web site at <http://jeritt.msu.edu>. The Web site provides information and access to information in the following categories: What's New (links to timely items of concern to judicial branch educators), Databases (discussed above), Publications (discussed above; ability to order on-line), Communications (discussed above), National Futures Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education (objectives, goals, agenda, etc.), Resources (links to other Web sites), JERITT Staff (information on JERITT staff members).

E. Other JERITT Activities.

- 1. Surveys.** JERITT periodically conducts surveys of judicial branch educators to gather information about conditions, developments, funding, and trends in the field of judicial branch education. This information is compiled and published on a three year cycle in *Issues and Trends in Judicial Branch Education*.
- 2. Search Requests.** The JERITT Project staff conducts customized, advanced searches of the JERITT databases to obtain detailed information for judicial branch education officers and others who have specific questions the answers to which might be secured from one or more of the databases.
- 3. Special Program Design and Presentation.** The JERITT staff participates in special programs such as the National Futures Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education, an SJI funded project about which details can be secured on the JERITT Web site.

THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS

The evaluation instrument for this grant period (1999-2001) consisted of a written survey of NASJE members and other JERITT users. This survey, more detailed than those used in prior evaluations of this project, was designed to obtain specific information as to the usefulness and ease of use of JERITT's products and services. In addition, recipients were asked what new missions, services, and/or products and services JERITT might adopt and/or provide.

The survey instrument (Appendix A), containing 123 detailed questions, was divided into five sections, four of which were directly related to JERITT products and services: Publications, Databases, E-Communications, and Web Site. The fifth section contained seven general questions. The survey instrument was also designed to encourage written comments by respondents for most questions in all sections. Using data from the JERITT Persons Database, the survey was mailed to 140 NASJE members and 165 other JERITT users who were not NAJSE members.

For most questions in the survey instrument respondents were asked to rank the usefulness (and, in many cases the ease of use) of the JERITT product or service presented by selecting a response from five options presented. Options were assigned values of from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest ranking. Mean scores for responses to each question were then computed. These scores, along with breakdowns of numbers of responses to each option are reported in the Appendix. Mean scores are also reported and discussed in the narrative portion of this report. A number of yes/no questions were also asked.

Seventy-four (74) of the 305 survey instruments mailed were completed and returned to the evaluator, for an over-all response rate of 24.3%. For purposes of this

report, respondents have been broken down into two groups, “NASJE Members” and “Other JERITT Users” for reasons detailed below.

In addition to the strong rate of return and completion of the survey instrument, respondents made a total of 224 written comments to questions. The number of written comments is quite high for a survey of this length where, for the most part, respondents are requested only to select a degree of usefulness or ease of use on a sliding scale.

NASJE Members

The membership status of the NASJE recipients of the survey included the 71 full members, the 24 associate members, and the 45 general members. The survey instrument was color coded to distinguish the membership status of the respondents.

Full members are full-time administrators and staff members of statewide or local public or non-profit organizations whose primary duties include education and training of judges and/or court personnel. Full members may attend meetings, serve on committees, vote, hold office, and participate in the affairs of the association. Associate members have the same membership criteria and enjoy the same privileges as full members except they are not eligible to hold office in the association. General members are those who are involved with or interested in judicial branch education, but do not meet the membership requirements of full or associate members. General members may participate in the affairs of the association and serve on committees, but cannot vote or hold office.

Of the 140 NASJE members receiving the instrument, 48 (34.3%) completed and returned a survey instrument. Specifically, 32 of the 71 full members (45.1%), three (3) of the 24 associate members (12.5%), and 13 of the 45 general members (28.9%) completed and returned a survey instrument. As has been the case in the past, the higher response rate by full members—those who are full-time judicial branch educators in state or local judicial education organizations—have the greatest interest in ensuring that JERITT meets their needs and therefore were probably more inclined to complete a survey instrument.

For several years, NASJE has been moving toward combining its three membership categories into a single category and, in fact, amended its bylaws in August of 2001 to that effect. Since NASJE has been moving toward this goal for some time and now has a single membership category, responses from all three membership categories will be combined in this report and reported simply as NASJE members.

Other JERITT Users

The 165 other JERITT users who received the survey were those identified by JERITT as persons who had used JERITT products or services during the grant period. Given the fact that, in all probability, repeated use of JERITT products and services by individuals in this group is quite low, the response to the 2001 survey by 26 individuals (15.76%) is quite satisfactory.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

As indicated above, the survey instrument was divided into five sections and the responses were divided into two groups, NASJE Members and Other JERITT Users. The findings will deal with each of the survey instrument sections in the order presented and the questions within those sections. Response summaries for each group will be reported for each question within each section, followed by a discussion of the response summaries for that question.

See Appendix B for breakdowns of the responses by NASJE Members and Appendix C for Other JERITT Users.

Two hundred twenty-four (224) written comments were made by respondents. All written comments to questions are included in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Section 1 Publications

Of the 48 NASJE Members responding to this section of the survey, 47 (97.9%) indicated that they receive or have access to JERITT publications.

Of the 26 Other JERIT Users responding to this section of the survey, 22 (84.6%) indicated that they receive or have access to JERITT publications.

Issues and Trends in Judicial Education

NASJE

The 39 respondents who have used this publication (83.0% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.74 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 11 respondents who have used this publication (50.0% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.45 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The percentage of NAJSE members who use this publication and the degree of usefulness by that group indicates a very heavy use of this publication, as the information contained in this publication is of considerable value to judicial branch educators for purposes of over-all program planning. Comments include: “Filled with lots of helpful info.” and “Good research.” While the percentage of other JERITT users who use this publications lower, the degree of usefulness indicates that this publication is what one might expect for this group.

Judicial Branch Education Directory

NASJE

The 43 respondents who have used this publication (91.5% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 4.21 (very—extremely useful) for this publication.

Others

The 17 respondents who have used this publication (77.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.65 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

With 91.5% of the NASJE members indicating that they use this publication, coupled with the “extremely useful” response, indicates a very heavy use of this publication, as the information contained in this publication is used frequently to contact other judicial branch educators. Comments by NASJE members include: “Excellent tool. I keep it on my desk at all times.” and “I use it daily.” The results indicate that this is also a valuable publication for other JERITT users.

JERITT Bulletin

NASJE

The 41 respondents who have used this publication (87.2% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.54 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 17 respondents who have used this publication (77.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.65 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The *Bulletin* is no longer published, but is available on-line; we assume that the responses here are for users of the printed version. The 87.2% who use this publication and the degree of usefulness of 3.54 by NASJE members indicates that this publication, in its printed form, was of considerable value and use to judicial branch educators. Comments by NASJE members include: “Excellent updates.” and “Good little nuggets of info.” Fewer other JERITT users indicated that they used this publication, but the degree of usefulness of the publication for this group is almost the same as that for NASJE members.

Judicial Education Needs Assessment and Evaluation—Monograph One (1991)

NASJE

The 36 respondents who have used this publication (77.0% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.92 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 7 respondents who have used this publication (31.8% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.29 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Again, the high percentage of use and the 3.92 degree of usefulness by NASJE members indicates that this publication is of considerable use to judicial branch educators. Comments by NASJE members include: “I use it monthly, sometimes more.” and “Unaware of publication.” The latter comment appears in response to a number of the monograph questions, indicating that one or more NASJE members responding are not fully aware of all of JERITT’s products and/or services. The other JERITT users’ percentage of use and degree of usefulness of this publication is considerably lower than that for NASJE members, probably because they are not directly involved with needs assessments and program evaluation.

Mentoring in the Judiciary—Monograph Two (1992)

NASJE

The 33 respondents who have used this publication (70.2% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.15 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 9 respondents who have used this publication (40.9% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.44 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The relatively high percentage of use and the 3.15 degree of usefulness by NASJE members indicates that this publication is of moderate use to those responding. Comments by NASJE members include: “Outstanding, comprehensive guide.” and “We give it to every mentor judge we train.” The other JERITT users’ degree of usefulness of this publication is slightly higher than that for NASJE members, possibly because they use the publication for direct supervisory purposes and some NASJE members responding may be familiar with the publication, yet do not have mentor programs of their own and therefore have not used this publication.

***Education for Development: Principles and Practices in Judicial Education—
Monograph Three (1992)***

NASJE

The 33 respondents who have used this publication (70.2% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.91 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 7 respondents who have used this publication (31.8% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.57 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Again, the relatively high percentage of use and the 3.91 degree of usefulness by NASJE members indicates that this publication is very

useful to those responding. Comments by NASJE members include: “The best single resource.” and “Refer to it for every faculty training.” The percentage of other JERITT users using the publication is considerably lower than that for NASJE members and the degree of usefulness is slightly lower for unknown reasons.

Curriculum Program, and Faculty Development: Managing People, Process and Product—Monograph Four (1994)

NASJE

The 34 respondents who have used this publication (72.3% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.97 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 6 respondents who have used this publication (27.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 4.00 (very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Again, the relatively high percentage of use by NAJSE members and the almost identical degree of usefulness by both groups indicates that this publication is very useful to those responding. Comments by NASJE members include: “My personal bible.” and “Great reference source.”

Program Management: Managing Deadlines, Details, Activities, and People—Monograph Five (1994)

NASJE

The 32 respondents who have used this publication (68.1% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.75 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 6 respondents who have used this publication (27.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.67 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Again, the relatively high percentage of use by NAJSE members and the almost identical degree of usefulness by both groups indicates that this publication is very useful to those responding. The low percentage of use by other JERITT users is perhaps due to the fact that this publication is an in-depth “how to” publication not needed by these individuals as they may not present programs. Comments by NASJE members include: “Single best resource the meeting planning & logistics side I have ever seen.” and “Great reference source.”

Education for Development: The Voices of Practitioners in the Judiciary—Monograph Six (1995)

NASJE

The 32 respondents who have used this publication (68.1% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.25 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 6 respondents who have used this publication (27.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.00 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Again, the numbers for both groups are almost identical to the previous monograph discussed. Comments by NASJE members include: “Good compilation of affirmations of Education for Development.” and “Worth it for Paul Biderman’s piece alone!”

Professional Education and Development of NASJE Members—Monograph Seven (1995)

NASJE

The 29 respondents who have used this publication (61.7% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.25 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 6 respondents who have used this publication (27.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.50 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The percentage of NASJE respondents who have used this publication is more than twice that for other JERITT users, yet, the NASJE respondents' degree of usefulness is .25 less than for the other JERITT users group. This is somewhat surprising, as the publication is obviously of interest primarily to NASJE members. One of the comments from the NASJE group, "Excellent service to NASJE education committee," tends to indicate that this publication may have particular interest to the committee indicated, as opposed to members in general.

Ability-Based Learning and Judicial Education: An Approach to Ongoing Professional Education—Monograph Eight (1998)

NASJE

The 32 respondents who have used this publication (68.1% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.44 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 7 respondents who have used this publication (31.8% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.43 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

Once again, the numbers for both groups are almost identical to the previous monograph discussed. Comment by NASJE member: “I use this monograph frequently in job task analysis and in helping HR and management to understand importance of judicial education in survey design.”

Claiming Status in an Emerging Occupation: A Study of State Judicial Education in America—Monograph Nine (1999)

NASJE

The 31 respondents who have used this publication (66.0% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.26 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 6 respondents who have used this publication (27.3% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.33 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The numbers for both groups again show remarkable consistency with those for previous monographs. Comments by NASJE members include: “Excellent work.” and “Interesting project; has been on my mind in addressing NASJE issues.”

The Courts and Judicial Branch Education: Creating Their Future in the New Millennium—Monograph Ten (1999)

NASJE

The 33 respondents who have used this publication (70.2% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.42 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 8 respondents who have used this publication (36.4% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.50 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The percentage of NASJE respondents who have used this publication (70.2%), coupled with the degree of usefulness (3.42) attests to the value of this publication. Though the percentage of other JERITT users using this publication is lower, the degree of usefulness (3.50) indicates that this group also finds the publication of considerable value. Comments by NASJE members include: “Nice follow up to symposium.” and “Full of good ideas.”

A National Agenda for the Future of Judicial Branch Education: a Synthesis of Outcomes from the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education—Monograph Eleven (2000)

NASJE

The 33 respondents who have used this publication (70.2% of the 47 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.27 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Others

The 9 respondents who have used this publication (40.9% of the 22 who receive or have access to JERITT publications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.11 (moderately—very useful) for this publication.

Discussion

The numbers for both groups again show remarkable consistency with those for previous monographs. Comments by NASJE members include: “Excellent synthesis.” and “Full of good ideas.”

Future Topics for Publications

NASJE

Fifteen (15), or 31.9%, of the 47 NASJE respondents who receive or have access to JERITT publications provided suggestions for future topics for publications, from a simple “distance learning” to a lengthy general comment:

“General comment on monographs: I am highly respected in my field, largely, I think because I have studied every monograph carefully and “appear” to be of more of an expert than I am. These monographs are essentially practice aids, all of them! I do not think it is an exaggeration to say I owe my career advancement to the monograph series!”

See Appendix B for all comments by NASJE respondents.

Others

Two (2) other JERITT users also suggested eight different topics to be covered in future publications. See Appendix C for all comments by other JERITT users.

Discussion

This evaluator is impressed and encouraged by the respondents' comments/topic suggestions made to this final question in this section of the survey. Having 31% of respondents from the NASJE group—the primary targets for JERITT publications—take the time and effort to respond to this question in such a thoughtful and considerate manner is indeed gratifying. The comments/topic suggestions provide valuable food for thought for the JERITT staff.

Section 2 Databases

Of the 48 NASJE Members responding to this section of the survey, 47 (97.9%) indicated that they have access to JERITT on-line databases.

Of the 24 Other JERIT Users responding to this section of the survey, 23 (95.8%) indicated that they receive or have access to JERITT on-line databases.

The Persons Database

NASJE

The 18 respondents who have used this database (38.3% of the 47 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 4.06 (very—extremely useful) for the information in this database. Sixteen (16) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.19 (very—extremely easy to use).

Others

The nine (9) respondents who have used this database (39.1% of the 23 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.56 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Nine (9) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this

database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.78 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

The percentage of NAJSE members and other JERITT users who use this database, 38.3% and 39.1% indicates a very satisfactory level of use of this database. The mean findings for usefulness of information and ease of use are extremely favorable, indicating that the information provided is very valuable to the respondents and easy to find.

When asked why they didn't use the database, 23 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that they "use the printed *Directory of Judicial Branch Education*," followed by "didn't know it was available." Fifteen (15) other JERITT users who didn't use the database indicated most frequently that they "use the printed *Directory of Judicial Branch Education*," followed by "haven't had time."

Seventy percent (70%) of the 17 NASJE respondents and 66% of nine other JERITT user respondents indicated that their last use of this database was after May 1, 2001, the last time this database was modified. This positive response shows the users find the database in its present form to be easy to use and the information contained therein to be useful.

NASJE member comments on the Person Database include: "I do not have as many occasions to use it as before, and the printed *Directory* is easy to use and sits on my desk." and "Just saw it this week. Good source for JBE." Other JERITT user comments: "Very helpful." and "Have not made looking at this database a priority."

The Programs Database

NASJE

The 22 respondents who have used this database (46.8% of the 47 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.75 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Nineteen (19) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.47 (moderately—very easy to use).

Others

The six (6) respondents who have used this database (26.1% of the 23 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.33 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Six (6) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.33 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

Almost half (46.8%) of NAJSE members responding to the survey and over a quarter (26.1%) other JERITT users responding who have access to on-line databases use this database. The lower use rate by other JERITT users can be expected, as this database is primarily for use by judicial branch educators.

When asked why they didn't use the database, 16 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that they "haven't had time," followed by "didn't know it was available." Seventeen (17) other JERITT users who didn't use the database indicated that they "haven't had time," followed by "didn't know it was available."

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the 21 NASJE respondents and 100% of four other JERITT user respondents indicated that their last use of this database was after May 1, 2001, the last time this database was modified. It would be hoped that, as a result of the changes made in how this database functions, the 61% of NASJE users who have not used the

database since May 1, 2001 will find it more useful and easier to use than indicated above.

NASJE member comments on the Person Database include: “When we are doing program planning this is extremely important information.” and “(1) I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently; (2) I am not too familiar with JERITT. In fact, because I did not know much about the project, I just recently sent in several months worth of information on the activities/ programs of my institute.” Other JERITT user comments: “. . . it was good to see what is being offered.” and “Have not made looking at this database a priority.”

The Grants Database

NASJE

The 12 respondents who have used this database (25.5% of the 47 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.75 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Twelve (12) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.75 (moderately—very easy to use).

Others

The four (4) respondents who have used this database (17.4% of the 23 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 2.75 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Four (4) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.75 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

With only 25.5% of NAJSE members responding to the survey and 17.4% of other JERITT users responding who have access to on-line databases

using this data base, it is the least used of all JERITT databases, other than the new Organizations Database (discussed below). This lower rate of use can be expected, as this database would be of primary interest to those developing SJI grants and/or performing general research functions—duties which are presumably the responsibility of relatively few individuals.

When asked why they didn't use the database, 23 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that they "haven't had time," followed by "don't need it in my position." Twenty (20) other JERITT users who didn't use the database indicated that they "don't need it in my position," with an identical number responding "didn't know it was available."

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of 13 NASJE respondents and 75% of four (4) other JERITT user respondents indicated that their last use of this database was after May 1, 2001, the last time this database was modified.

NASJE member comments on the Grants Database include: "I enjoy looking at the grant database. It helps me not have to reinvent the wheel if others have done similar things." and "Helpful to check out grants funded, specifically for curriculum adaptation projects."

The Products Database

NASJE

The 13 respondents who have used this database (27.7% of the 47 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.92 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Twelve (12) responded to the question as to the ease of use of

this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.08 (very—extremely easy to use).

Others

The four (4) respondents who have used this database (17.4% of the 23 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 4.00 (very useful) for the information in this database. Four (4) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.00 (very easy to use).

Discussion

The relatively low number of NAJSE members (27.7%) indicating that they use this database is somewhat surprising, but may be due to the fact that this information was previously published in printed form and NASJE members have not had time to use this database or didn't know it was available (see comments below). The same holds true for other JERITT users. The mean findings for usefulness of information and ease of use are extremely favorable, indicating that the information provided is very valuable to the respondents and easy to find.

When asked why they didn't use the database, 25 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that they "haven't had time," followed by "didn't know it was available." Nineteen (19) other JERITT users who didn't use the database indicated that they "haven't had time," followed by "new to field."

Forty-six percent (46%) of 13 NASJE respondents and 100% of four (4) other JERITT user respondents indicated that their last use of this database was after May 1, 2001, the last time this database was modified.

NASJE member comments on the Products Database include: "Useful to find out what's being developed." and "I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and

efficiently.” JERITT user comment: ”Not enough information on the product to know if we could use it.”

The Organizations Database

NASJE

The four respondents who have used this database (8.5% of the 47 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.50 (moderately—very useful) for the information in this database. Three (3) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.33 (moderately—very easy to use).

Others

The two (2) respondents who have used this database (8.7% of the 23 who have access to JERITT on-line databases) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.00 (moderately useful) for the information in this database. Two (2) responded to the question as to the ease of use of this database, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.50 (very—extremely easy to use).

Discussion

The relatively low number of respondents from both groups indicating that they use this database is consistent with the fact that this database went on-line in May of 2001; we can expect few users due to its recent introduction. However, the mean findings for usefulness of information and ease of use by those who have used it are quite encouraging.

When asked why they didn’t use the database, 29 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that they “haven’t had time,” followed by “didn’t know it was available.” Nineteen (19) other JERITT users who didn’t use the database indicated that they “haven’t had time,” followed by “didn’t know it was available.”

Addition of Other Databases

Only one (1), or 2.1%, of the 47 NASJE respondents who have access to JERITT databases provided a suggestion for other databases which might be added: "International JBE—can we do under SJI funding? Perhaps judicial educators in U.S. who are serving as consultants—short term—in other countries."

Two (2) of the other JERITT users also suggested additional databases which might be added: "A general faculty database broken down by topic." and "Move database to easier Web engine."

The low response rate to this question indicates that most NASJE members and other JERITT users who use the databases are probably satisfied with the databases provided. The suggestion for a faculty database is under development by the JERITT staff and should be available soon.

See Appendix B and Appendix C for comments and suggestions for all questions in this section.

Section 3 E-Communications

Of the 47 NASJE Members responding to this section of the survey, 43 (91.5%) indicated that they have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications.

Of the 25 Other JERITT Users responding to this section of the survey, 14 (56.0%) indicated that they have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications.

List Servers

NASJE

The 34 respondents who have received e-mails from a JERITT list server(s) (79.0% of the 43 who have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.85 (moderately—very useful). Thirty-four (34) responded to the question as to the ease of use of list servers, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.03 (very—extremely easy to use).

Others

The eight respondents who have received e-mails from a JERITT list server(s) (57.0% of the 14 who have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.25 (moderately—very useful). Eight (8) responded to the question as to the ease of use of list servers, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.88 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

The percentage of NAJSE members (79.0%) and other JERITT users (57.0%) who receive e-mails from JERITT's list server(s) is what one might expect. Most current JERITT list servers are for NASJE members and are automatically sent to all members or specific groups of members. There are proportionally fewer other JERITT users on list serve lists.

The mean findings for usefulness of list servers and ease of use are extremely favorable, indicating that the information provided is very valuable to the respondents and extremely easy to find.

When asked why they didn't participate in an e-mail group, one NASJE member responded, indicating that there was "no need in my position." Seven (7) other JERITT users who didn't participate in an e-mail group indicated that they "haven't had time," followed by "not a member of a list server."

Other JERITT user comments on the List Servers include: “ I love this! It is like having your own ‘think tank’ to get help from.” and “Extremely helpful.”

Chat Rooms

NASJE

The three respondents who have participated in a JERITT chat room(s) (7.0% of the 43 who have sent or received messages via JERITT’s E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 4.33 (very—extremely useful). Three (3) responded to the question as to the ease of use of chat rooms, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.33 (very—extremely easy to use).

Others

The one respondent who has participated in a JERITT chat room(s) (7.1% of the 14 who have sent or received messages via JERITT’s E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 2.00 (somewhat useful). Eight (8) responded to the question as to the ease of use of chat rooms, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.88 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

The low usage of a chat room(s) by all respondents indicates that this JERITT service is not receiving widespread use.

When asked why they didn’t participate in a chat room, 31 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that “haven’t had time,” followed by “not a member of a chat room.” Eighteen (18) other JERITT users also indicated most frequently that they “haven’t had time,” followed by “not a member of a list server.”

NASJE member comments on the Chat Rooms include: “I type slowly. I think I’d rather pick up the phone and call someone, e-mail someone, or e-mail through the server.” and “Don’t get much out of these. Plus there is one on NASJE News site.”

Threaded Discussion

NASJE

The six respondents who have participated in a JERITT threaded discussion (14.0% of the 43 who have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.80 (moderately—very useful). Four (4) responded to the question as to the ease of use of a threaded discussion, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 4.25 (very—extremely easy to use).

Others

The four respondents who has participated in a JERITT threaded discussion (28.6% of the 14 who have sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications) yielded a mean degree of usefulness of 3.75 (moderately—very useful). Four (4) responded to the question as to the ease of use of threaded discussions, yielding a mean degree of ease of use of 3.75 (moderately—very easy to use).

Discussion

The low usage of a threaded discussion by all respondents, coupled with the stated reasons for non-use (below) indicates that this new JERITT service is under used at this time. However, the relative high mean degrees of usefulness and ease of use indicate that this technology has considerable promise as an ongoing JERITT service. It should be emphasized here that participants in a threaded discussion are asked to participate by a group leader, as opposed to voluntary participation in a chat room. As more groups and committees recognize the value of threaded discussions, use of this technology will undoubtedly increase.

When asked why they didn't participate in a threaded discussion, 29 NASJE members responded, indicating most frequently that "haven't had time," followed by "not a member of a threaded discussion." Fifteen (15) other JERITT users also

indicated most frequently that they “haven’t had time,” with an identical number responding “not a member of a threaded discussion.”

A NASJE member comment on Threaded Discussions: “All are generally cumbersome for users, but this one is easier than others.” Other JERITT users comments: “. . . I am on the California Training Coordinators list and have used it and love it!” and “ I moderate one threaded discussion. It would be simpler if I could post messages from the moderator’s page.”

Addition of Other Electronic Communication Features

None (0) of the 43 NASJE members who have sent or received messages via JERITT’s E-Communications provided suggestions for other electronic communication features which might be added.

One (1) (8.3%) of the 14 other JERITT users who have sent or received messages via JERITT’s E-Communications indicated that he/she would like to see electronic communication features added but failed to indicate what that addition might be.

We can conclude that most respondents seem quite pleased with the JERITT electronic communication features available.

Section 4 Web Site

Of the 46 NASJE Members responding to this section of the survey, 39 (84.8%) indicated that they have visited the JERITT Web site.

Of the 25 Other JERITT Users responding to this section of the survey, 20 (66.7%) indicated that they have visited the JERITT Web site.

NASJE

The 33 respondents who responded to the question regarding the attractiveness of the Web site (84.6% of the 39 who have visited the JERITT Web site) yielded a mean degree of attractiveness of 3.79 (moderately—very attractive). Thirty-three (34) responded to the question as to the ease of navigation of the Web site, yielding a mean degree of ease of navigation of 3.88 (moderately—very easy to navigate).

Others

The 19 respondents who responded to the question regarding the attractiveness of the Web site (95.0% of the 20 who have visited the JERITT Web site) yielded a mean degree of attractiveness of 3.47 (moderately—very attractive). Nineteen (19) responded to the question as to the ease of navigation of the Web site, yielding a mean degree of ease of navigation of 3.37 (moderately—very easy to navigate).

Discussion

When asked to indicate the areas of the Web site visited, 34 NASJE members responded, listing “What’s New” and “Publications” as the areas most visited, followed by “Databases” and “National Futures Symposium.”

When asked to indicate the areas of the Web site visited, 19 other JERITT users responded, listing “Publications” as the area most visited, followed by “Communications” and “What’s New/Databases.”

When asked to indicate why they haven’t visited the Web site, five (5) NASJE respondents listed most frequently “no need in my position,” followed by “haven’t had time” and “new to field.” Three (3) other JERITT users who haven’t visited the Web site indicated that they “haven’t had time,” followed by “new to field.”

See Appendix B for a breakdown of JERITT Web site areas visited the most by NASJE members; Appendix C for other JERITT users.

NASJE member comments on the Web site include: “Very appealing. Easy to use.” and “JERITT is an extremely valuable asset to the courts, their education and operation. Thank you SJI.” Other JERITT users comments: “Extremely valuable.” and “Keep connected nationally to issues with other courts.”

Section 5 General Questions

JERITT’s Effectiveness

Forty-four (44) (91.7% of the 48 completing the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a question regarding how effectively JERITT is in fulfilling its core function of serving as the national clearinghouse on continuing education for judges/judicial branch personnel and to provide judicial branch educators immediate access to latest information on judicial education programming, yielding a mean degree of effectiveness of 4.05 (very—highly effectively). Comments included: “It is difficult to imagine life as a judicial educator without JERITT as a resource.” and “I need to use it more!”

Twenty (20) (76.9% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to this question with a mean degree of effectiveness of 3.65 (moderately—very effectively). Comments include: “Advertise more. I stumbled across the Web site.” and “Just needs a little more exposure. I was unaware of JERITT’s existence until June 2001.”

The responses to this question clearly indicate that JERITT is indeed effective in fulfilling its core function, especially with NASJE members, JERITT’s primary target audience. The responses from both groups suggest that JERITT needs to do more to inform new NASJE members and others of its existence, products, and services.

JERITT's Role in Facilitating Networking

Forty-three (43) (89.6% of the 48 completing the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a question regarding the degree to which JERITT facilitates networking among professionals in judicial branch education, yielding a mean degree of facilitation provided of 3.67 (moderate—high degree).

Comments included: "I am not too familiar with JERITT, as I am relatively new to the field . . . I think JERITT is a wonderful concept and one I'd like to take advantage of." and "Most networking is done through NASJE"

Eighteen (18) (69.2% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to this question with a mean degree of facilitation provided of 3.00 (moderate degree). Comments include: "Just getting started so haven't had a lot of time yet." and "Haven't used it enough."

The responses to this question clearly indicate that JERITT is playing a strong role in facilitating networking among judicial branch educators. As is the case with the previous question, the responses from both groups suggest that JERITT needs to do more to inform new NASJE members and others of its existence, products, and services, including networking options.

JERITT's Value to Judicial Branch Education in United States

Forty-two (42) (87.5% of the 48 completing the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a question requesting them to rate JERITT's value to judicial branch education in the United States, yielding a mean degree of value of 4.24 (high—very high value). Comments included: "JERITT's services, particularly the monographs, have contributed to JBE in the U.S." and "Its potential is high."

Nineteen (19) (73.1% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to this question with a mean degree of value of 4.11 (high—very high value). Comments include: "I believe your service is invaluable. It is a

resource that enables the user to receive information on what other states are implementing in judicial education.” and “Need more folks to be aware of it and use it.”

The responses to this question clearly indicate that JERITT is indeed valued very highly by those using it.

Effect if JERITT Were Terminated

Forty-five (45) (93.8% of the 48 responding to the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a question requesting them to rate the effect on judicial branch education should JERITT be terminated, yielding a mean degree of effect of 4.16 (negative—very negative effect) Comments included: “For most JBEs, this is the only source for professional specific information.” and “Without JERITT, our communications would suffer and preparing new staff would be much harder. In a profession as small, unique and isolated as this, this would be a terrible setback for development.”

Twenty-three (23) (88.5% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to this question with a mean degree of effect of 3.74 (moderate negative effect—negative effect). Comment: ”Would tend to isolate judicial educators.”

The responses to this question clearly indicate that if JERITT were terminated, there would be considerable negative effect on judicial branch education.

Continued JERITT Funding by SJI

Forty-six (46) (95.8% of the 48 responding to the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a yes/no question asking if JERITT funding by SJI should continue. Only one person responded in the negative. Comments included: “Absolutely! I believe state judicial branch educators would be less unified, cohesive and less competent without it!” and “JERITT provides a unique and

invaluable resource for judicial educators nationally that allows us to enhance quality programming, exchange ideas, and prepare new staff for program development.” See Appendix B, question 26 for additional comments.

Twenty-two (22) (84.6% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to a yes/no question asking if JERITT funding by SJI should continue. Again, only one person responded in the negative. Comments included: ”Absolutely needed.” and “Without a doubt!”

The responses to this question clearly indicate that if JERITT were terminated, there would be considerable negative effect on judicial branch education.

Interest in Purchase of a CD of One or More JERITT Databases

Forty-two (42) (87.5% of the 48 responding to the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a yes/no question asking if the respondent would be interested in purchasing a CD of one or more JERITT databases should such CD copies be made available. Seventeen (17) (40.5%) answered in the affirmative. Comments included: “Possibly.” and “Possibly, depending on its currency (sic).” While 40.5% answered yes to this question, it is clear from the many comments to this question that a number the respondents have reservations about this. See Appendix B, question 27 for all comments.

Twenty-three (23) (88.5% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to a yes/no question asking if the respondent would be interested in purchasing a CD of one or more JERITT databases should such CD copies be made available. Eleven (11) (47.8%) responded affirmatively. Comments included: “Yes, but how would I fund that. My resources are short.” and “Depends on cost.”

This question was included in the survey instrument at the request of JERITT staff in order to gauge interest in providing such CDs. Further study by JERITT staff on this matter is called for.

JERITT’s Role in Networking Local, State, National and International Judicial Branch Education Providers

Forty (40) (83.3% of the 48 responding to the survey instrument) NASJE Members responded to a yes/no question asking if JERITT should expand its networking function to include international judicial branch education providers. Thirty-two (32) (80.0%) answered in the affirmative. Comments included: “Start small and see what happens.” and “I see this as a natural step toward building this profession.” While 80.0% answered yes to this question, it is clear from the many comments to this question that a number the respondents have reservations about this. See Appendix B, question 28 for all comments.

Twenty-one (21) (80.8% of the 26 completing the survey instrument) Other JERITT Users responded to a yes/no asking if JERITT should expand its networking function to include international judicial branch education providers. Eighteen (18) (85.7%) responded affirmatively. Comments included: “JERITT would help to provide leadership in an area where there has been minimal coordination.” and “Would be very hard.”

The responses to this question deserve detailed study, but appear to indicate that, provided it is within the purview of SJI and JERITT (and if adequate funding is available), consideration should be given to expanding JERITT’s products and services to include international judicial branch education.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The response rate to the survey instrument by NASJE members and other JERITT users, coupled with the respondents’ responses to the questions clearly demonstrates that the JERITT Project is continuing to make a significant contribution to judicial branch education. As detailed above and in the Appendix, respondents consistently indicated that JERITT products and services are of considerable value and are easy to use. The written comments support this view, and a number of them indicate that the respondents realize that JERITT is unique in its ability to provide these products and services. There simply is no other source for this type of support for judicial branch educators and others interested in judicial branch education.

Publications

Respondents clearly indicate that the publications, especially the *Directory, Issues and Trends*, and the monographs are of immense value to judicial branch educators and others interested in judicial branch education. A number of NASJE members’ written comments attest to the value of the publications and the degree they depend upon them.

The suggestions they provided for possible future monographs are indeed worthy of consideration.

This evaluator was somewhat surprised to find that some members of both groups (presumably new to judicial branch education) were unaware of a number of the publications.

JERITT should continue to make available the *Directory, Issues and Trends* and all monographs available and should research and produce additional monographs of interest to judicial branch educators.

Databases

As indicated elsewhere in this report, since the last evaluation, JERITT has ceased printing and distributing a number of publications. Information and data previously provided by those publications are now available on-line at the JERITT Web site. The databases are searchable and therefore much easier to use and provide current information than previously. Fortunately, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of NASJE members and others who have access to the Web and JERITT's on-line services. The responses to the questions regarding the databases support this view.

The decision to eliminate the printing of a number of the publications and provide on-line access to the databases which made up the content of these publications was a good one. The databases already on-line, plus those in preparation, appear to fully meet the needs of judicial branch educators at this time.

E-Communications

JERITT's E-communications abilities have increased dramatically since the last evaluation, as have the ability of NASJE members and other JERITT users to take advantage of these techniques. As shown in the *Directory*, virtually all persons listed have an e-mail address and are potential users of JERITT's e-communications. The ability of judicial branch educators to communicate rapidly with others through the list

servers is impressive and of great value. As a former judicial branch educator, this evaluator often called other NASJE members to ask a question or to inquire as to how they were handling a problem. This worked to some degree, but with the list servers, the same inquiries can be made to large groups of individuals quickly and with increased efficiency. This evaluator participates in a JERITT list server and has seen first hand the value of this technique, an observation supported by the survey results.

The results show that JERITT's chat rooms are easy to use, but few individuals are currently participating in a chat room. The responses indicate that, until judicial branch educators have more time, low chat room usage can be expected. However, since maintaining chat room service is relatively easy (and a password is needed to participate), JERITT should continue to sponsor chat rooms for those judicial branch educators who wish to participate.

The use of JERITT's threaded discussions is growing markedly, though relatively few respondents indicated that they are members of a threaded discussion group. At this writing, there are seven threaded discussions on JERITT's Web site. The responses of those that are members of threaded discussions show that it is an effective and easy to use technique. It is anticipated that many more NASJE members and other JERITT users will be participating in threaded discussions in the future.

This evaluator anticipates that judicial branch educators will be pleased and impressed with the additional e-communication capabilities being added by JERITT.

Web Site

JERITT has built an outstanding Web site, one which is attractive, informative, and easy to navigate through. The responses of both NASJE members and other JERITT users support this view. As indicated above, the databases and e-communications are based on the Web site, where they are easy to access and use. Usage and appreciation of the JERITT Web site should continue to grow.

General Questions

The responses to the question regarding JERITT's effectiveness in fulfilling its core functions show that JERITT is very effective in meeting this goal, with mean responses of 4.05 for NASJE members and 3.65 for other JERITT users. The written comments indicate, however, that more needs to be done to make potential JERITT users aware of JERITT and its products and services.

Again, the responses to the question regarding the degree to which JERITT facilitates networking among judicial branch educators and others interested in the field, indicate quite strongly that JERITT is also accomplishing this goal.

With "high—very high value" responses from both groups for JERITT's value to judicial branch education, it is clear that JERITT is meeting the needs of judicial branch educators. Similar responses were found when respondents were asked if JERITT were terminated and if SJI funding for JERITT was not continued. Respondents overwhelmingly support JERITT and its need for funding from SJI. It is the only resource of its type available where information on judicial branch education can be accessed and where there is forum for the immediate exchange of ideas. Given the status of most state budgets, it is doubtful that an entity such as JERITT could be funded from these sources.

Responses to two prospective questions regarding the interest in securing CDs containing JERITT databases and the possibility of expanding JERITT to include international judicial branch education information are unclear and further study needs to be done in both of these potential areas.

General Comments

The strides made by JERITT since the last evaluation have been remarkable, including the fact that all of the databases have gone on-line, are searchable, and have been updated as to their operation and the e-communications options have been established, are highly functional, and receiving increasing use. These major steps have been taken while JERITT has continued to provide publications, both old and new, and

maintain the databases. In addition, JERITT played a major role in the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education. These accomplishments could not have been achieved without the leadership of Dr. Maureen Conner. Dr. Conner continues to diplomatically cultivate the ongoing relationship between JERITT and NASJE, a task that is sometimes not easy. Her credibility with NASJE members and others is justifiably high and the JERITT Project is fortunate to have her as its executive director.

JERITT's budget should continue to permit Dr. Conner to attend appropriate meetings and conferences on judicial branch education and participate actively in the affairs of NASJE and other organizations such as the National Association for Court Management—to do otherwise might seriously limit JERITT's ability to maintain its leadership in providing needed products and services to judicial branch education providers.

The results of this evaluation clearly indicates a need for JERITT to establish an information/public relations component which will increase the knowledge of JERITT and its products and services. In the past several years there has been a marked turnover of individuals in judicial branch education and it appears that at least some of them are unfamiliar with JERITT. Consideration should be given to providing an updated information packet on JERITT to all NASJE members and appropriate other JERITT users to increase JERITT's presence in judicial branch education. To paraphrase the quote from *Field of Dreams*: "If they know it is there, they will use it."

A number of respondents indicated that they "haven't had time" to utilize a number of JERITT's on-line services and databases. We can assume that what this really means is that they cannot afford the time to learn how to use these services and databases. Therefore, consideration should be given to developing on-line tutorials to assist new (and experienced) users to access the information in the databases in the most efficient and effective manner.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**APPENDIX B
NASJE MEMBERS—RESPONSES**

NASJE MEMBERS—RESPONSES

SECTION 1: PUBLICATIONS

1. Do you receive or have access to JERITT publications?

Count of responses 48
 Yes 47 97.9%
 No 1 2.1%

2. Indicate the usefulness of each of JERITT’s publications..

- a. *Issues and Trends in Judicial Education*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	6
1	Not at all useful	2
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	10
4	Very useful	15
5	Extremely useful	10

Count of responses other than zero 39
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.74
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Filled with lots of very helpful info.
- Just used it intensely a few weeks ago to train foreign judicial educators; I refer to it occasionally as a need arises for report, comparisons, etc.
- Good Research

b. *Judicial Branch Education Directory*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	2
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	3
3	Moderately useful	7
4	Very useful	11
5	Extremely useful	22

Count of responses other than zero 43
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 4.21
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Primary way to connect with colleagues
- Excellent tool. I keep on my desk at all times.
- I use it daily.
- Use it frequently to contact colleagues.

c. *JERITT Bulletin*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	4
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	6
3	Moderately useful	14
4	Very useful	14
5	Extremely useful	7

Count of responses other than zero 41
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.54
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Excellent updates
- Good little nuggets of info.
- Always find it interesting

d. *Judicial Education Needs Assessment and Evaluation (1991)*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	8
1	Not at all useful	1
2	Somewhat useful	4
3	Moderately useful	5
4	Very useful	13
5	Extremely useful	13

Count of responses other than zero 36
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.92
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- I use it at least monthly, sometimes more. I am a member of ASTD and have access to their literature. It does not compare!
- Have used it since our program's inception for our own program and faculty training
- Unaware of publication.

e. *Mentoring in the Judiciary* (1992)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	11
1	Not at all useful	5
2	Somewhat useful	6
3	Moderately useful	8
4	Very useful	7
5	Extremely useful	7

Count of responses other than zero 33
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.15
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Outstanding, comprehensive guide.
- We give it to every mentor judge we train
- Unaware of publication.

f. *Education for Development: Principles and Practices in Judicial Education* (1992)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	11
1	Not at all useful	1
2	Somewhat useful	3
3	Moderately useful	6
4	Very useful	11
5	Extremely useful	12

Count of responses other than zero 33
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.91
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- The best single resource
- Refer to it for every faculty training. Just got permission to reprint parts for foreign judicial education training.
- Unaware of publication.

g. *Curriculum, Program, and Faculty Development: Managing People, Process and Product* (1994)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	9
1	Not at all useful	3
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	6
4	Very useful	11
5	Extremely useful	12

Count of responses other than zero 34
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.97
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- I tell new judicial branch educators, actually, any new adult educator I meet, that if they can have only one book on their shelf, this is it.
- My personal bible.
- Great reference source.
- Unaware of publication, but interested in it

h. *Program Management: Managing Deadlines, Details, Activities, and People* (1994)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	1
2	Somewhat useful	5
3	Moderately useful	6
4	Very useful	9
5	Extremely useful	11

Count of responses other than zero 32

Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.75
(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Single best resource the meeting planning & logistics side that I have ever seen.
- Great reference source.
- Unaware of publication, but interested in it

i. *Education for Development: The Voices of Practitioners in the Judiciary* (1995)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	3
2	Somewhat useful	5
3	Moderately useful	7
4	Very useful	15
5	Extremely useful	2

Count of responses other than zero 32

Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.25
(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Worth it for Paul Biderman's piece alone!
- Good compilation of affirmations of Education for Development
- Unaware of resource.

j. *Professional Education and Development of NASJE Members (1995)*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	14
1	Not at all useful	4
2	Somewhat useful	6
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	10
5	Extremely useful	5

Count of responses other than zero 29
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.21
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Excellent service to NASJE education committee!
- Influenced my thinking on our field.
- Unaware of resource.

k. *Ability-Based Learning and Judicial Education: An Approach to Ongoing Professional Education (1998)*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	3
2	Somewhat useful	6
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	12
5	Extremely useful	7

Count of responses other than zero 32
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.44
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- I use this monograph frequently in job task analysis and in helping HR and management to understand importance of judicial education in survey design.
- A bit too theoretical for me, but I read it through and am trying to apply lessons.
- Unaware of resource.

1. *Claiming Status in an Emerging Occupation: A Study of State Judicial Education in America* (1999)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	3
2	Somewhat useful	6
3	Moderately useful	7
4	Very useful	10
5	Extremely useful	5

Count of responses other than zero 31
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.26
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Excellent work!
- Helped me to secure a salary increase two years ahead!
- Interesting project; has been on my mind in addressing NASJE issues.
- Would like to see this one!
- Unaware of resource.

m. *The Courts and Judicial Branch Education: Creating Their Future in the New Millennium* (1999)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	11
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	7
3	Moderately useful	9
4	Very useful	13
5	Extremely useful	4

Count of responses other than zero 33
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.42
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Nice follow up to symposium
- Full of good ideas.

- Would like to see this one!
- Unaware of resource.

n. *A National Agenda for the Future of Judicial Branch Education: A Synthesis of Outcomes from the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education* (2000)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	10
1	Not at all useful	4
2	Somewhat useful	4
3	Moderately useful	10
4	Very useful	9
5	Extremely useful	6

Count of responses other than zero 33
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.27
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Excellent synthesis
- Full of good ideas.
- Unaware of resource, but interested in it

3. Identify topics you would like JERITT to explore in future publications.

- Distance learning, motivating users to use DL.
- (1) A survey and analysis of new judge orientation programs across the country;
 (2) A study about court personnel education – best practices.
- Successful strategic planning and systems thinking approach to building and monitoring performance. Would like something on implementing Level 3 evaluations and evaluating soft skills training.
- 1. NACM's core competencies and how to develop programs based upon them;
 2. Distance learning practices in JBE; 3 Websites related to JBE

- Continue in the 'how to do it' mode of publication
- Distance learning; Web programming
- Public outreach/education; Working with international programs
- Distance learning
- Like to see more work done on forecasting trends and issues that will affect courts next 3-5 years
- (1) Grand development and administration (beyond regular suspects like SJI); (2) Distance learning use, costs, pitfalls: (3) How to revitalize planning committees
- (1) Update older publications, i.e., curriculum development; (2) Training managers - collaboration in and outside system
- What judges would like to see in JBE for themselves and their staff/court.
- Structure and organization (e.g., AOC-based v. university-based) of judicial branch education.
- General comments on monographs: I am highly respected in my field, largely, I think because I have studied every monograph carefully and "appear" to be more of an expert than I am. These monographs are essential practice aids, all of them! I do not think it an exaggeration to say I owe my career advancement to the monograph series!
- Have read all monographs – good information. Were especially useful when I first became a judicial educator.

SECTION 2 — DATABASES

4. Do you have access to JERITT on-line databases?

Count of responses 48

Yes 47 97.9%

No 1 2.1%

Comments:

The Persons Database

5. Have you used this database

Count of responses 45

Yes 18 40.0%

No 27 60.0%

Reasons for not using this database (23 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Use the printed Judicial Educators Directory	11
Didn't know it was available	7
Haven't had time	6
Don't know how to use it	5
Other	3
No need in my position	1
New to field	1

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 17

Yes 12 70.6%

No 5 29.4%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	8
5	Extremely useful	5

Count of responses 16

Degree of Usefulness 4.06

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0

3	Moderately easy	2
4	Very easy	9
5	Extremely easy	5

Count of responses 16
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.19
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comment on Persons Database:

- I do not have as many occasions to use it as before, and the printed Directory is easy to use and sits on my desk.
- Just saw it this week. Good source for JBE. Any possibility of getting list of judicial education committees (with password access if necessary for security reasons)?
- Only to input my own info. as a consultant/educator
- Never thought to use it.
- I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently.

The Programs Database

6. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 45

Yes 22 48.9%

No 23 51.1%

Reasons for not using this database (16 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	8
Didn't know it was available	5
No need in my position	4
Don't know how to use it	2
Other	1
New to field	0

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 21

Yes 8 38.1%

No 13 61.9%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	3
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	12
5	Extremely useful	3

Count of responses 20

Degree of Usefulness 3.75

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	1
2	Somewhat easy	3
3	Moderately easy	5
4	Very easy	6
5	Extremely easy	4

Count of responses 19

Degree of Ease of Use 3.47

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments:

Comments on Programs Database:

- When we are doing program planning this is extremely important information
- Too many clicks to get what you want. Needless "cover pages."
- Will look at it.
- (1) I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently; (2) I am not too familiar with JERITT. In fact, because I did not know much about the project, I just recently sent in several months worth of information on the activities/programs of my institute.

The Grants Database

7. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 46

Yes 13 28.3%

No 33 71.7%

Reasons for not using this database (23 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	13
No need in my position	7
Didn't know it was available	4
Don't know how to use it	2
Other	2
New to field	0

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 13

Yes 5 38.5%

No 8 61.5%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	4
5	Extremely useful	3

Count of responses 12

Degree of Usefulness 3.75

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	4
4	Very easy	7
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 12
 Degree of Ease of Use 3.75
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comments on Grants Database:

- I enjoy looking at the grant database. It helps me not have to recreate the wheel if others have done similar things.
- Helpful to check out grants funded, specifically for curriculum adaptation projects
- Haven't used, though I need to do
- I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently.

The Products Database

8. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 46
 Yes 13 28.3%
 No 33 71.7%

Reasons for not using this database (25 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	13
Didn't know it was available	8
No need in my position	5
Don't know how to use it	1
Other	2
New to field	0

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 13
 Yes 6 46.2%
 No 7 53.8%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	6
5	Extremely useful	3

Count of responses 12
 Degree of Usefulness 3.92
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	2
4	Very easy	7
5	Extremely easy	3

Count of responses 12
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.08
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comments on Products Database:

- I enjoy looking at the database. It helps me not have to recreate the wheel if others have done similar things.
- Useful to find out what's being developed.
- I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently.

The Organizations Database

9. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 45
 Yes 4 8.9%
 No 41 91.1%

Reasons for not using this database (29 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	14
Didn't know it was available	12
No need in my position	5
Other	2
Don't know how to use it	1
New to field	0

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	0
4	Very useful	3
5	Extremely useful	0

Count of responses 4
 Degree of Usefulness 3.50
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

b. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	1
3	Moderately easy	0
4	Very easy	2
5	Extremely easy	0

Count of responses 3
 Degree of Ease of Use 3.33
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comments on Organizations Database:

- Not really worth the effort
- [Didn't know it was available] I'll check into it.

- Don't like databases.
- I will check it out.
- I was only recently made aware of the databases and do not yet know how to use them effectively and efficiently.

10. Would you like to see any other databases added?

Count of responses 11

Yes 1 9.1%

No 10 90.9%

- Not that I know of, but I do plan to use the existing databases.
- International JBE – can we do under SJI funding? Perhaps judicial educators in U.S. who are serving as consultants – short term – in other countries.
- I'm open, but don't know what.

SECTION 3 — E-COMMUNICATIONS

11. Have you sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications?

Count of responses 47

Yes 43 91.5%

No 4 8.5%

List Servers

12. Do you receive e-mails from a JERITT list server(s) (i.e., NASJE members list Directors list, etc.)?

Count of responses 42

Yes 40 95.2%

No 2 4.8%

Reasons for not participating in an e-mail group (1 respondent; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
No need in my position	1
Haven't had time	0
Didn't know it was available	0
Not a member of a list server	0
Don't know how to use it	0
New to field	0

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the list server(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	4
3	Moderately useful	8
4	Very useful	11
5	Extremely useful	11

Count of responses 34
 Degree of Usefulness 3.85
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

b. How easy was the listserver(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	7
4	Very easy	19
5	Extremely easy	8

Count of responses 34
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.03
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on List Servers:

- I love this! It is like having your own "think tank" to get help from.

- Sometimes I have to figure out what a message is in response to, what particular question, because the questions aren't in all the emails.
- Actually find the ever-increasing number of messages (all of them "who's got the name of . . .") ever-increasingly annoying.
- Extremely helpful
- Too much junk
- Some replies do not indicate where another is from
- Too many coming through each day. Prefer the original NASJE listserv (smaller group, this one has so many people including consultants, etc.)
- Good way to exchange information quickly—is useful—DO NOT discontinue

Chat Rooms

13. Have you participated in a JERITT chat room(s)?

Count of responses 43

Yes 3 7.0%

No 40 93.0%

Reasons for not participating in a chat room(s) (31 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	17
Not a member of a chat room	10
Didn't know it was available	6
No need in my position	3
Don't know how to use it	1
New to field	1

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the chat room(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	0
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses 3

Degree of Usefulness 4.33

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

b. How easy was the chat room(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	0
4	Very easy	2
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 3

Degree of Ease of Use 4.33

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on Chat Rooms:

- I type slowly. I think I'd rather pick up the phone and call someone, email someone, or email through the server.
- Don't get much out of these. Plus there is one on NASJE News site.

Threaded Discussion

14. Have you participated in a JERITT threaded discussion?

Count of responses 42

Yes 6 14.3%

No 36 85.7%

Reasons for not participating in a threaded discussion (29 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	11
Not a member of a threaded disc.	10
Didn't know it was available	8
No need in my position	2
Don't know how to use it	2
New to field	1

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the threaded discussion(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	1
4	Very useful	1
5	Extremely useful	2

Count of responses 6

Degree of Usefulness 3.80

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

b. How easy was the threaded discussion(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	1
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	2

Count of responses 4
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.25
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on Threaded Discussions:

- All are generally cumbersome for users, but this one is easier than others.

15. Would you like any other electronic communication features added?

Count of responses 18

Yes 0 0.0%

No 18 100.0%

- Prefer services that are delivered via technology – much more inclined to use them when delivered in paper. (sic.)
- So far as I know, this covers it.
- Haven't thought about it

SECTION 4 — WEB SITE

16. Have you ever visited the JERITT Web site?

Count of responses 46

Yes 39 84.8%

No 7 15.2%

Reasons for not visiting the Web site (5 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
No need in my position	3
Haven't had time	1
New to field	1
Don't have Internet access	0

Didn't know it was available	0
Don't know how to access it	0

17. Did you find the JERITT Web site attractive?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all attractive	0
2	Somewhat attractive	1
3	Moderately attractive	12
4	Very attractive	13
5	Extremely attractive	7

Count of responses	33
Degree of Attractiveness	3.79
(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely attractive)	
Comments:	

18. Did you find the JERITT Web site easy to navigate?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	10
4	Very easy	17
5	Extremely easy	6

Count of responses	33
Degree of Ease of Navigating	3.88
(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)	

19. Indicate the areas of the Web site you have visited by checking all that apply.

(34 respondents)

What's New	23
Databases	21
Publications	23
Communications	18
Natural Futures Symposium	19
Resources	14
JERITT Staff Information	14

20. Indicate the three areas you visit the most.

a. (foremost) (18 respondents)	
What's New	2
Databases	4
Publications	7
Communications	3
Natural Futures Symposium	0
Resources	1
JERITT Staff Information	1
b. (second most) (16 respondents)	
What's New	4
Databases	4
Publications	2
Communications	3
Natural Futures Symposium	1
Resources	2
JERITT Staff Information	0
c. (third most) (13 respondents)	
What's New	3
Databases	2
Publications	3
Communications	1
Natural Futures Symposium	2
Resources	2
JERITT Staff Information	0

Comments on JERITT Web site:

- I only visited the [Website] twice just to see it. If I need something I'll use the list serve or pick up the phone.
- Very helpful.
- Only looked once.
- Very appealing. Easy to use.
- A few items take a little effort to find, e.g. NASJE Principles and Standards of Judicial Education, if you don't understand the logic.
- Helpful. Links of interest = good feature.

- Division staff use the web site to a higher degree than I do.
- JERITT is an extremely valuable asset to the courts, their education and operation. Thank you SJI.
- It looks like the printed JERITT materials. I like it! Very common sensical.
- I am not too familiar with it, as I am relatively new to the field and have not had the opportunity to review and navigate the site or JERITT's resources.

21. Would you like other features included on JERITT's Web site? If so, please describe.

Count of responses 16

Yes 2 12.5%

No 14 87.5%

- I don't care as I don't use it.
- Looking forward to consultant directory that's underway.
- Maybe it is already there and I have overlooked it, but it would be great to have hyperlinks to all other state JBE web sites.

SECTION FIVE—GENERAL QUESTIONS

22. JERITT's principal function is to serve as the national clearinghouse on continuing education for judges and judicial branch personnel and to provide judicial branch educators immediate access to the latest information on judicial education programming. In your view, how effectively is JERITT fulfilling this core function?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Highly effectively	16
4	Very effectively	14
3	Moderately effectively	14
2	Poorly	0
1	Not at all	0

Count of responses 44
 Degree of Effectiveness 4.05
 (5-point scale; 5.00=highly effectively)

Comments:

- It is difficult to imagine life as a judicial educator without JERITT as a resource.
- Sometimes products feel unwieldy.
- I need to use it more!
- *Has circled the word “the” in the first sentence describing JERITT “as the national clearinghouse...”* THE is presumptuous. It certainly is one important clearinghouse and should be satisfied with that.
- I am not too familiar with JERITT, as I am relatively new to the field and have not had the opportunity to review and navigate the resources. I think JERITT is a wonderful concept and one I'd like to take advantage of.
- Do not know. Am retired.

23. To what degree does JERITT help facilitate your networking with other professionals in judicial branch education?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very high degree	13
4	High degree	11
3	Moderate degree	13
2	Low degree	4
1	Not at all	2

Count of responses 43
 Degree of Facilitating Networking 3.67
 (5-point scale; 5.00=very high degree)

Comments:

- Most networking is done through NASJE.
- Not my preferred style (to use a database)

- I am not too familiar with JERITT, as I am relatively new to the field and have not had the opportunity to review and navigate the resources. I think JERITT is a wonderful concept and one I'd like to take advantage of.
- Retired. No need to know.

24. Overall, how would you rate the value of JERITT to judicial branch education in the United States?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very high value	18
4	High value	17
3	Moderate value	6
2	Low value	1
1	No value	0

Count of responses 42
 Degree of Value 4.24
 (5-point scale; 5.00=very high value)

Comments:

- JERITT's services, particularly the monographs have contributed to JBE in the U.S.
- Has addressed issues when paged, just don't think of JERITT as resource – often call others
- Its potential is high.
- Retired. Do not know.
- I live in Australia.

25. What would be the effect if JERITT were terminated?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very negative effect	20
4	Negative effect	16
3	Moderately negative effect	6
2	Low effect	2
1	No effect	1

Count of responses 45
 Degree of Effect 4.16
 (5-point scale; 5.00=very negative effect)

Comments:

- For most of us, JBEs, this is the only source for professional specific information.
- It is critical to NASJE both educationally and for networking with other members. NASJE could not provide the services without JERITT.
- JERITT is one of the lifelines of anyone working in JBE.
- Without JERITT, our communications would suffer and preparing new staff would be much harder. In a profession as small, unique and isolated as this, this would be a terrible set back for development.
- Potential exists to be of greater value – is reference to many

- Other organizations (e.g., National Center for State Courts) likely would fill gap, but doing so would take time and may not be successful.
- As NASJE itself matures, it won't really need "big brother" national organizations – NASJE will offer resources
- Not sure.

26. Should the State Justice Institute continue funding JERITT?

Count of responses 46

Yes 45 97.8%

No 1 2.2%

Comments:

- Absolutely! I believe state judicial branch educators would be less unified, cohesive, and less competent without it!
- This is one of the wisest investments of SJI. JERITT's services reach across state boundaries with significant results.
- But not to expand – to "maintain" current functions until NASJE can take them.
- JERITT provides a unique and invaluable resource for judicial educators nationally that allows us to enhance quality programming, exchange ideas, and prepare new staff for program development.
- JERITT is a very important resource to JBE and deserves the support.
- Absolutely, don't even consider discontinuing JERITT.
- Up to SJI

27. Would you be interested in purchasing a CD of one or more of the JERITT databases if such CD copies were made available?

Count of responses 42

Yes 17 40.5%

No 25 59.5%

Comments:

- Possibly.
- Possibly, depending on its currency (sic).
- Since info. changes so much I am unsure of the usefulness of a CD. I would purchase one that has all their publications on it.
- Not if I could assume there would still be a Website.
- Prefer online
- Should be web-based, maybe with subscription fee if needed to support maintenance costs.
- CDs, like any publication, can become outdated so quickly. I prefer online databases that are updated frequently and maintained professionally.
- Publications important
- Too much free stuff available online already and more likely to come in future (e.g., individual court system websites).
- No, if it is available online.
- Unsure at this time.

28. Should JERITT undertake the responsibility of networking local, state, national, and international judicial branch education providers?

Count of responses 40

Yes 32 80.0%

No 8 20.0%

Comments:

- If that is established as high priority.
- I see this as a natural step toward building this profession.
- It should continue its networking function. Increasing that function would be an added benefit.
- Not sure how this could work effectively beyond the listserve and chat rooms, but I would use it if available.
- Someone needs to do it. JERITT has the knowledge and relationships to do it most efficiently, although it should be in partnership with NCSC to reduce/avoid duplicate efforts.

- Would be nice to have a solid database.
- JERITT is already doing so through its Communications links. As NASJE grows, networking needs become more complex and important. NASJE's web site, of course, is also engaged in such efforts, and coordination is both very possible and important.
- Thanks to JERITT for its invaluable service; our field is so much stronger because of it.
- As indicated by my answer to question 23, JERITT's ability to facilitate networking and the flow of information is its highest purpose. Collecting data is important, but sharing the data and allowing the data to help others is what gives it its worth.
- Start small and see what happens.
- This is a good idea, if done in conjunction with NASJE to leverage resources and collaborate with NASJE to better network the variety and number of such organizations.
- Why not.
- What a HUGE undertaking for a small organization.
- Unsure
- Good?—possibly!

APPENDIX C
OTHER JERITT USERS—RESPONSES

OTHER JERITT USERS—RESPONSES

SECTION 1: PUBLICATIONS

1. Do you receive or have access to JERITT publications?

Count of responses 26

Yes 22 84.6%

No 4 15.4%

2. Indicate the usefulness of each of JERITT's publications..

- a. *Issues and Trends in Judicial Education*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	9
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	3
4	Very useful	5
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 11

Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.45

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- I have not received this publication and did not know howto access it.

- b. *Judicial Branch Education Directory*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	5
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	5
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	4
5	Extremely useful	6

Count of responses other than zero 17

Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.65

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. *JERITT Bulletin*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	5
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	6
4	Very useful	8
5	Extremely useful	2

Count of responses other than zero 17
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.65
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

d. *Judicial Education Needs Assessment and Evaluation (1991)*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 7
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.29
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

e. *Mentoring in the Judiciary (1992)*

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	1
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	3
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 9

Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.44
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

f. *Education for Development: Principles and Practices in Judicial Education* (1992)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 7
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.57
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

g. *Curriculum, Program, and Faculty Development: Managing People, Process and Product* (1994)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	13
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	1
4	Very useful	4
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 6
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 4.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

h. *Program Management: Managing Deadlines, Details, Activities, and People* (1994)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	13
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0

3	Moderately useful	3
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 6
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.67
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Would like a copy.

i. *Education for Development: The Voices of Practitioners in the Judiciary* (1995)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	13
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	1
5	Extremely useful	0

Count of responses other than zero 6
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

j. *Professional Education and Development of NASJE Members* (1995)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	13
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 6
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.50
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

k. *Ability-Based Learning and Judicial Education: An Approach to Ongoing Professional Education* (1998)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	12
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	3
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 7
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.43
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Would like a copy.

1. *Claiming Status in an Emerging Occupation: A Study of State Judicial Education in America* (1999)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	13
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	3
4	Very useful	1
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 6
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.33
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

m. *The Courts and Judicial Branch Education: Creating Their Future in the New Millennium* (1999)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	11
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	2

Count of responses other than zero 8
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.50
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Would like a copy.

n. *A National Agenda for the Future of Judicial Branch Education: A Synthesis of Outcomes from the National Symposium on the Future of Judicial Branch Education* (2000)

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
0	Have not used	10
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	3
3	Moderately useful	3
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses other than zero 9
 Degree of Usefulness (by those who have used) 3.11
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

- Would like a copy.

3. Identify topics you would like JERITT to explore in future publications.

- Technology; Jurisprudence; Judicial Process
- Employee development topics: organizational development, management development program, succession planning, training policy models, formal educational plan model, etc.

SECTION 2 — DATABASES

4. Do you have access to JERITT on-line databases?

Count of responses 24
 Yes 23 95.8%

No 1 24.2%
 Comments:

The Persons Database

5. Have you used this database

Count of responses 24
 Yes 9 37.5%
 No 15 62.5%

Reasons for not using this database (15 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Use the printed Judicial Educators Directory	5
Haven't had time	4
New to field	4
No need in my position	3
Other	3
Didn't know it was available	2
Don't know how to use it	1

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 9
 Yes 6 66.7%
 No 3 33.3%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	4
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	2

Count of responses 9
 Degree of Usefulness 3.56
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	5
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	3

Count of responses 9

Degree of Ease of Use 3.78

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments:

Comments on Persons Database:

- I just perused it to see what was available that pertained to my court.
- Very helpful
- Have not made looking at the database a priority.

The Programs Database

6. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 24

Yes 6 25.0%

No 18 75.0%

Reasons for not using this database (17 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	7
Didn't know it was available	5
New to field	5
No need in my position	2
Other	2
Don't know how to use it	1

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 4

Yes 4 100.0%

No 0 0.0%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	1
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses 6

Degree of Usefulness 3.33

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	1
3	Moderately easy	3
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 6
 Degree of Ease of Use 3.33
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments:

Comments on Programs Database:

- Not much listed for California, but it was good to see what is being offered.
- I find that working my way through database and trying to retrieve information is too convoluted.
- Have not made looking at the database a priority.

The Grants Database

7. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 24

Yes 4 16.7%

No 20 83.3%

Reasons for not using this database (20 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
No need in my position	6
Didn't know it was available	6
Haven't had time	5
New to field	2
Don't know how to use it	1
Other	1

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 4

Yes 3 75.0%

No 1 25.0%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	1
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	1
5	Extremely useful	0

Count of responses 4
 Degree of Usefulness 2.75
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	1
4	Very easy	3
5	Extremely easy	0

Count of responses 4
 Degree of Ease of Use 3.75
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comments on Grants Database:

- Nothing seems to be listed.

The Products Database

8. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 24

Yes 4 16.7%

No 20 83.3%

Reasons for not using this database (19 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	8
New to field	5
Didn't know it was available	4
Other	3
No need in my position	2
Don't know how to use it	1

a. Was your last use of this database after May 1, 2001

Count of responses 4

Yes 4 100.0%

No 0 0.0%

b. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	1
4	Very useful	2
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses 4

Degree of Usefulness 4.00

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

c. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	1
3	Moderately easy	0
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	2

Count of responses 4
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments:

Comments on Products Database:

- Not enough information on the product to know if we could use it.

The Organizations Database

9. Have you used this database?

Count of responses 24
 Yes 2 8.3%
 No 20 91.7%

Reasons for not using this database (20 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	6
Didn't know it was available	6
New to field	5
No need in my position	3
Other	3
Don't know how to use it	0

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the information in this database:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	1
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	0
4	Very useful	0
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses 2
 Degree of Usefulness 3.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

b. How easy was this database to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	0
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 2
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.50
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)
 Comments:

Comments on Organizations Database:

- Only keyword search was available. If I'm looking and not sure who I need?
 (sic)

10. Would you like to see any other databases added? If so, please describe.

Count of responses 6
 Yes 2 33.3%
 No 4 67.7%

- More linkages with NACM Core Competencies
- A general faculty database broken down by topic.
- Move database to easier web engine

SECTION 3 — E-COMMUNICATIONS

11. Have you sent or received messages via JERITT's E-Communications?

Count of responses 25
 Yes 14 56.0%

No 11 44.0%

List Servers

12. Do you receive e-mails from a JERITT list server(s) (i.e., NASJE members list Directors list, etc.)?

Count of responses 22

Yes 12 54.5%

No 10 45.5%

Reasons for not participating in an e-mail group (7 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	4
Not a member of a list server	2
No need in my position	1
New to field	1
Don't know how to use it	0
Didn't know it was available	0

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the list server(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	2
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	4
5	Extremely useful	0

Count of responses 8
 Degree of Usefulness 3.25
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

b. How easy was the listserver(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	2
4	Very easy	5
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 8
 Degree of Ease of Use 3.88
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on List Servers:

Chat Rooms

13. Have you participated in a JERITT chat room(s)?

Count of responses 22
 Yes 1 4.5%
 No 21 95.5%

Reasons for not participating in a chat room(s) (18 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	7
Not a member of a chat room	6
Didn't know it was available	2
No need in my position	2
Don't know how to use it	2
New to field	2

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the chat room(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	1
3	Moderately useful	0
4	Very useful	0
5	Extremely useful	0

Count of responses 1
 Degree of Usefulness 2.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)
 Comments:

b. How easy was the chat room(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	0
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	0

Count of responses 1
 Degree of Ease of Use 4.00
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on Chat Rooms:

Threaded Discussion

14. Have you participated in a JERITT threaded discussion?

Count of responses 22
 Yes 5 22.7%
 No 17 77.3%

Reasons for not participating in a threaded discussion (15 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	4
Not a member of a threaded disc.	4
Didn't know it was available	3
Don't know how to use it	3
No need in my position	2
New to field	2

a. Indicate the level of usefulness of the threaded discussion(s):

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all useful	0
2	Somewhat useful	0
3	Moderately useful	2
4	Very useful	1
5	Extremely useful	1

Count of responses 4

Degree of Usefulness 3.75

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely useful)

Comments:

b. How easy was the threaded discussion(s) to use?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	0
3	Moderately easy	2
4	Very easy	1
5	Extremely easy	1

Count of responses 4

Degree of Ease of Use 3.75

(5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

Comments on Threaded Discussions:

- Read listed comments
- I put a request out there, but no one responded. Also I am on the California Training Coordinators list and have used that and love it!
- I moderate one threaded discussion. It would be simpler if I could post messages from the moderator's page.

15. Would you like any other electronic communication features added?

Count of responses 6
 Yes 1 16.7%
 No 5 83.3%

SECTION 4 — WEB SITE

16. Have you ever visited the JERITT Web site?

Count of responses 25
 Yes 20 66.7%
 No 5 33.3%

Reasons for not visiting the Web site (3 respondents; may check more than one reason)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>
Haven't had time	2
New to field	1
No need in my position	0
Don't have Internet access	0
Didn't know it was available	0
Don't know how to access it	0

17. Did you find the JERITT Web site attractive?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all attractive	0
2	Somewhat attractive	0
3	Moderately attractive	10
4	Very attractive	9
5	Extremely attractive	0

Count of responses 19
 Degree of Attractiveness 3.47
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely attractive)
 Comments:

18. Did you find the JERITT Web site easy to navigate?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
1	Not at all easy	0
2	Somewhat easy	1
3	Moderately easy	10
4	Very easy	8
5	Extremely easy	0

Count of responses 19
 Degree of Ease of Navigating 3.37
 (5-point scale; 5.00=extremely easy)

19. Indicate the areas of the Web site you have visited by checking all that apply.

(19 respondents)

What's New	9
Databases	9
Publications	15
Communications	12
Natural Futures Symposium	2
Resources	8
JERITT Staff Information	7

20. Indicate the three areas you visit the most.

a. (foremost) (11 respondents)

What's New	0
Databases	3
Publications	3
Communications	5
Natural Futures Symposium	0
Resources	0
JERITT Staff Information	0

b. (second most) (8 respondents)	
What's New	1
Databases	1
Publications	1
Communications	2
Natural Futures Symposium	0
Resources	3
JERITT Staff Information	0
c. (third most) (6 respondents)	
What's New	1
Databases	1
Publications	0
Communications	1
Natural Futures Symposium	0
Resources	1
JERITT Staff Information	2

21. Would you like other features included on JERITT's Web site?

Count of responses 8

Yes 1 12.5%

No 7 87.5%

Comments on JERITT Web site:

- Just looked around.
- Extremely valuable.
- Keep connected nationally to issues with other courts.
- I'll get back to you.

SECTION FIVE—GENERAL QUESTIONS

22. JERITT’s principal function is to serve as the national clearinghouse on continuing education for judges and judicial branch personnel and to provide judicial branch educators immediate access to the latest information on judicial education programming. In your view, how effectively is JERITT fulfilling this core function?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Highly effectively	1
4	Very effectively	12
3	Moderately effectively	6
2	Poorly	1
1	Not at all	0

Count of responses	20
Degree of Effectiveness (5-point scale; 5.00=highly effectively)	3.65

Comments:

- Advertise more. I stumbled across the Website.
- Just needs a little more exposure. I was unaware of JERITT's existence until June 2001.
- Does not give enough information related to other judicial branch personnel (other than judges).
- As a court administrator, I would like to see more information provided to me and my colleagues.
- Cannot evaluate at this time.

23. To what degree does JERITT help facilitate your networking with other professionals in judicial branch education?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very high degree	1
4	High degree	3
3	Moderate degree	10
2	Low degree	3
1	Not at all	1

Count of responses 18

Degree of Facilitating Networking 3.00

(5-point scale; 5.00=very high degree)

Comments:

- Just getting started so haven't had a lot of time yet.
- Haven't used it enough
- Not that this has to do with your services. It has more to do with time constraints on my part.
- Not applicable.
- Not used yet.
- Too new to this field to judge.

24. Overall, how would you rate the value of JERITT to judicial branch education in the United States?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very high value	4
4	High value	13
3	Moderate value	2
2	Low value	0
1	No value	0

Count of responses 19

Degree of Value 4.11

(5-point scale; 5.00=very high value)

Comments:

- !
- I believe your service is invaluable. It is a resource that enables the user to receive information on what other states are implementing in judicial education.
- I'm thinking it will be a great resource.
- Need to get more folks to be aware of it and use it.
- Cannot rate at this time.
- Too new to judge, but colleagues speak highly of JERITT's value.

25. What would be the effect if JERITT were terminated?

<u>Value</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
5	Very negative effect	5
4	Negative effect	11
3	Moderately negative effect	4
2	Low effect	2
1	No effect	1

Count of responses 23
 Degree of Effect 3.74
 (5-point scale; 5.00=very negative effect)

Comments:

- Would tend to isolate judicial educators

26. Should the State Justice Institute continue funding JERITT?

Count of responses 22
 Yes 21 95.5%
 No 1 4.5%

Comments:

- Please continue to provide this valuable resource. I try to access it when I can but it seems the Internet is just not a habit yet and I do not make the time to use it like I should. I feel like it is a luxury to be able to navigate to sites without any interruptions here at the court. I do have JERITT in my favorites and plan to use it more.

- Absolutely needed
- Without a doubt!
- SJI should be seed money, not on-going funding.
- Depends on what isn't funded because JERITT is. Can't answer this in a vacuum on information.

27. Would you be interested in purchasing a CD of one or more of the JERITT databases if such CD copies were made available?

Count of responses 23

Yes 11 42.8%

No 12 52.2%

Comments:

- Yes, but how would I fund that. My resources are short.
- Depends on cost.
- Prefer to go to Web site to get most current data.
- They should remain on the Web.
- Not if I can get it online.

28. Should JERITT undertake the responsibility of networking local, state, national, and international judicial branch education providers?

Count of responses 21

Yes 18 85.7%

No 3 14.3%

Comments:

- Please, we need to work together.
- AJA is very interesting test.
- JERITT would help to provide leadership in an area where there has been minimal coordination.
- That would be very helpful.
- Somewhat.
- It would give us a national pool of judicial educators and program offerings. Could move from state to state.

- Would be very hard.
- Not sure exactly what this entails, or if resources are available, or if others are already doing so.