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I. Summary of Participant Evaluation Responses

A. Overview of Evaluation Comments

B. Summary and Recommendations

Workshop Sessions

Section One: Rate the Following Aspects of This Workshop

Relevance and Usefulness of the Information Presented
Effectiveness of the Instruction/Presentation
Opportunities for Participation/Involvement
Utility of the Workbook Materials
Overall Organization of the Workshop
Overall Rating of the Workshop

Section Two: Comments

Part One:

Question 1: Was there an appropriate balance of presentation of information and interchange?

Question 2: The length of the training in relation to the content covered was:

Question 3: Through this workshop, did you gain/obtain new information and/or ideas that will assist your jurisdiction in improving its management of the criminal caseflow?

Part Two:

Question 4: Before attending the workshop, how would you have rated your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management as presented at the workshop?

Figure 2.1

Question 5: After attending the workshop, how would you rate your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management?

Figure 2.2

Part Three:

Question 6: Do you think you will be able to put into practice any of the strategies discussed at the workshop to improve the management of criminal cases?

Question 7: What actions, if any, will you take within the next three months as a result of attending this workshop?

Question 8: The best aspects of this workshop were:

Question 9: The workshop could have been improved by:

Question 10: Suggestions for topics to be covered in the next

I. SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION RESPONSES

A. Overview of Evaluation Comments

The following is a synopsis of the evaluation responses from the workshop conducted by the BJA Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project “Improving Criminal (and Civil) Case Management” held in Murfreesboro, TN, on October 22-23, 2009. This workshop, for which CLE credits were given, was conducted in conjunction with the Tennessee Judicial Conference, as an optional session at the end of the four-day conference. It started after lunch on the last day of the conference and adjourned at 10:30 am the following day – clearly not an optimal time slot for scheduling this type of workshop.

Sixty-six participants registered for the workshop. However, it appeared that between 50 and 60 people were in attendance at the start of the session and then seemed to come and go throughout, making it difficult to count the number of people that actually attended. With each successive presentation, the number of people in the room appeared to decrease, until by Friday morning, only 20-25 participants were present.

That said, between Thursday’s adjournment and reconvening on Friday morning, there was an informal gathering of faculty and conference attendees in an individual room at the conference hotel. This gathering provided the attendees an opportunity to ask the faculty individual questions, most of which surrounded jurisdiction-specific questions about the implementation of Differentiated Case Management (DCM) or other caseflow management initiatives. It was also beneficial for the faculty, because it allowed them an opportunity to hear some of the different issues facing judges in Tennessee.

Ultimately though, only 16 people completed a participant evaluation form at the end of the workshop. The 16 respondents were all judges representing different parts of the state of Tennessee and varying in jurisdiction. Of the 16 judges to complete a participant evaluation form:

- 6 (37.5%) had civil jurisdiction only;
- 3 (18.8%) had criminal jurisdiction only; and
- 7 (43.7%) had both civil and criminal jurisdiction

Thirteen (81.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had been on the bench for over five years. The other 3 (18.7%) respondents had been on the bench between two and five years. The fact that such a large majority of the judges had been on the bench for over
five years and stayed for the entire workshop suggests the importance of the topic of caseflow management to them, even though their numbers were relatively small.¹

Overall, the responses provided very positive feedback about the value of all of the workshop sessions. Respondents placed the most emphasis on the introductory presentations explaining the basic principles of caseflow management. The high ratings of these sessions are especially intriguing, given that the largest number of people who attended the workshop were present at the beginning sessions. The high ratings given to these introductory sessions suggest that either people felt they had learned enough to implement the practices on their own, or that, had people stayed passed these introductory presentations, they would have been able to gain an understanding about how to apply the information presented in more practical ways and delved further into the topic of case management. Along the same lines, not only were these introductory presentations the highest rated, but some of the comments indicated that participants were going to begin to implement case management conferences and settlement conferences – strategies that had been discussed at these sessions.

Additionally, everyone who completed an evaluation form felt that they increased their knowledge of the fundamental principles of caseflow management beyond a level of general acquaintance. Respondents rated their average knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management before attending the workshop as a 3.25; after the workshop, their knowledge rating increased by almost an entire point, to 4.19. Again, this raises the question of how much knowledge those the rest of the participants that registered but were not present for the entire of the workshop might have gained.

Equally intriguing, is the fact that the most common suggestion for improvements from the completed participant evaluation forms, was the need to lengthen the workshop. As a matter of fact, when asked to rate, “The length of the training in relation to the content covered,” 5 of the 16 respondents (31%), answered “Too Short”. Moreover, of the respondents who felt the training was too short, one noted that he had been on the bench for 25 years. Although it must be taken into consideration that a significant portion of the original participants left early, these responses speak to the importance of judicial trainings about caseflow management.

The following sections of this report present a summary and detailed analysis of the responses provided by participants who completed evaluation forms.

B. **Summary and Recommendations**

¹ Admittedly, the small number of participant evaluations raises questions about how much can be extrapolated from them.

Workshop Sessions

The training workshop consisted of six sessions which included PowerPoint presentations, role playing, an acted out case management and settlement conference scenario, and question and answer discussion.

Section One: Rate the Following Aspects of This Workshop

Section one of the participant evaluation form asked participants to rate each workshop session based on the relevance and usefulness of the information presented, the effectiveness of each of the presentations, the opportunities for participation and involvement, the usefulness of the workbook materials, the overall organization of the workshop, and also asked them to provide an overall rating for the workshop, all on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

Relevance and Usefulness of the Information Presented:

The average rating for the sessions under the question entitled “Relevance and Usefulness of the Information Presented” ranged from 3.81 to 4.31, with the Applying Caseflow Management Principles to Practical Situations: Role Play and the Discussion of Role Play, Practical Issues Raised, and Potential Application of DCM Concepts sessions garnering the lowest average ratings (both receiving 3.81), and the Necessary Conditions for Controlling the Caseflow and Reducing the Backlog session receiving the highest average rating (4.31). These ratings are interesting considering that both later in the completed participant evaluation forms, and in conversations between participants and faculty, the role play was frequently mentioned as one of the strongest points of the entire workshop. That said, the Necessary Conditions for Controlling the Caseflow and Reducing the Backlog session was one of the sessions that explained the principles of caseflow management, which could be one of the explanations for its favorable rating.

Effectiveness of the Instruction/Presentations

The average ratings for the question regarding “Effectiveness of the instruction/presentations” ranged from 3.94 to 4.71, with the session Applying Differentiated Case Management (DCM) to the Criminal and Civil Docket being rated as the least effective, and Establishing the Frame of Reference being rated the most effective. Speaking to the effectiveness of the initial sessions, one respondent noted, “I learned in the first 3 hours of the 1st day, about what I learned in another 4 day program a year or so ago.”

Opportunities for Participation/Involvement

In general, participants were also very pleased with the opportunities they had to participate—through asking questions of both the faculty and one another and through the individual planning session—as is indicated by the average rating of 4.25 on the statement entitled “Opportunities for Participation/Involvement.”

Utility of the Workbook Materials

Respondents were also generally pleased with the utility of the workbook materials. Of the 16 participant evaluation forms that were completed, 12 (75%) rated the “Utility of the Workbook Materials” either a four or a five, with the average rating was 3.94.

Overall Organization of the Workshop

Along the same lines, the respondents were very positive when evaluating the statement “Overall Organization of the Workshop.” Overall, 13 (81.3%) of the 16 respondents rated the organization of the workshop as a whole at either a four or a five. Only one respondent rated the organization of the workshop a three; two participants did not fill in a response.

Overall Rating of the Workshop

Finally, participants were asked for an overall rating of the workshop. The average rating was a 4.64, with 9 (56.3%) respondents rating the workshop a five, and another 5 (31.3%) rating the workshop a four. The remaining two respondents did not provide an answer for this question.

Section Two: Comments

Section two of the participant evaluation form comprised three parts. The first part asked participants to check one of the provided answers to questions regarding the overall design of the workshop and the degree to which they gained new information from it. The second part was designed to measure the degree to which the participants had increased their knowledge of the fundamental principles of caseflow management as a result of attending the workshop. The final part focused on what, if any, immediate steps the participant planned to take as a result of attending the workshop. The questions, a chart with both the frequency and percentage of each answer, and additional written comments provided are reported verbatim, below:

Part One:

1. Was there an appropriate balance of presentation of information and interchange?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from individuals that answered “No” to this question:

- “Make it more practical and simple”

Comments from individuals that did not answer this question:

- “Ok”

2. The length of the training in relation to the content covered was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Long</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Short</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment from an individual that answered “About Right” to this question:

- “But should have demonstration much earlier in presentation—start with mock demo-then present small amount of explanation.”

3. Through this workshop, did you gain/obtain new information and/or ideas that will assist your jurisdiction in improving its management of the criminal Caseflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from individuals that answered “No” to this question:

- “Most judges are already aware of problem—looking for solutions”

Comments from individuals that did not answer this question:

Part Two:

Questions four and five in this section were designed the participants’ knowledge of the fundamental principles of caseflow management before and after the workshop. The average rating for the question “Before attending the workshop, how would you have rated your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management as presented at this workshop?” was 3.25. This number increased by .94, to an average rating of 4.19 for the question asking about the participant’s knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow after attending the workshop.

Figure 2.1 represents the frequency of answers to the question “Before attending the workshop, how would you have rated your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management as presented at this workshop?” As can be seen, the mode was 3, indicating that the respondents felt their knowledge was average. Figure 2.2 (on the next page), shows the increase in knowledge prevalent at the end of the workshop, with the mode overwhelmingly shifting from threes and fours, to fours and fives.

Figure 2.1
Part Three:

6. Do you think you will be able to put into practice any of the strategies discussed at the workshop to improve the management of criminal cases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from individuals that answered “Yes” to this question:

- “Scheduling conferences for “significant event” situations”
- “Case management conferences”
- “Focus on plea conferences as opposed to trial dates”
- “DCM”
- “Implement settlement conferences in criminal cases”
- “Case management (strategies) conferences. Review “old” cases not tried and refiled cases (D/R; W/C)”

“My judicial district needs more structure on the conferences. Also need more follow-up. A need to “hold feet to fire” of attys.”

“Earlier intervention in my cases”

“CMC with my big felony cases”

Comments from individuals that answered “No” to this question:

“I have civil only jurisdiction no criminal, no domestic, no med-mal, just big money and gov’t cases”

Comments from individuals that did not answer this question:

“Some multi-county rotation makes it tough (no)”

7. What actions, if any, will you take within the next three months as a result of attending this workshop?

“Gather data, assess the problem, form study group to develop DCM procedures”

“I will stop setting trial dates on arraignment”

“Do more civil scheduling conferences—I often deal with issues the atty’s have in such a way that gives them a forecast of what I might consider in the divorce case that helps them settle the case”

“Getting all my case lists”

“Case mgt. conference”

“Focus on plea conf as opposed to trial date”

“I will try to “fast track” every case that is filed”

“Discuss with other judges, ways to develop settlement conferences in criminal cases”

“Get a list of all cases pending; check age of each case; and push old cases to settle or trial”

“Talk to fellow chancellors and discuss each type of case and how to manage each better”

“Maybe meet with colleagues and discuss moving up date to review status”

“Schedule some case management conferences”

“Start case management conferences and also set a list by oldest case”

“Begin practicing what you have preached”

8. The best aspects of this workshop were:

• “New ideas”
• “Good information. Presenters with no ego problems”
• “Sharing ideas”
• “Faculty were knowledgeable and enthusiastic”
• “Discussion/Offering of various options”
• “Just bringing about awareness on how a case can be better arranged by the litigants and the courts”
• “Experience of speakers—Ability to ask questions”
• “Role play—the role play of the conference helped to show what to say and how to say it”
• “Role playing”
• “Interaction”
• “The presenters have “been there done that” so they were credible and knowledgeable”
• “I learned in the first 3 hours of the 1st day, about what I learned in another 4 day program a year or so ago. It could be that the previous program had prepared me to grasp your program more readily”

9. The workshop could have been improved by:

• “More attention to civil cases”
• “Possibly longer sessions”
• “More civil case mgt techniques”
• “Talk about case lists, how to work calendar different ways to set cases. Number of days for office work under advisements, and trial work”
• “Longer time for workshop”
• “More help with civil cases”
• “Talking more about civil cases”
• “More time”
• “Revising the order of presentation. Put demo 1st—minimize overhead presentation to on hour—go to interactive review requests at third break”
• “More practical solution for rural districts”
• “Less material in the notebook, concentrate on more practical application (forms, etc.)”
• “Anything is subject to improvement, but I was well satisfied with your program”

10. Suggestions for topics to be covered in the next training workshop:

- “Interacting with clerks”
- “Talk more about managing civil caseloads”
- “More role play—with participants”

Additional Suggestions and Comments:

- “Your role play took approximately 15 minutes or 4 cases per hour. Can you satisfy due process and the defendants’ rights in a shorter period of time? I had anticipated about 5 minutes”
- “Emphasize that everyone has a CMS—even if it involves a completely hands off methodology…the docket is either in control of you or you are in control of your docket.”
- “1—Change slides—use blue and white—easier on the eyes and easier to read (studies have been done on this). Impossible to read black background and white text
  o Use bigger fonts and less words
  o Split up slides if you need to include all information
    o Put some humor into slide by using a photo every now and then (slides should not be lots of text—they are for visual aides—bullets are better than typed text)”

Section Three: Background of Respondent:

Section three of the evaluation focused on two specific pieces of background information: the job function of the participant and the number of years the participant has been in that current role.

1. Background of Respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Civil Only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Criminal Only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Civil and Criminal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Years in position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the small number of participant evaluation responses raises questions about how much can be extrapolated from them. Though the evaluation forms that were completed were very positive, there is something to be said about the fact that less than one-third of the registrants were present by the conclusion of the workshop.

The overall responses provided in the evaluations indicate that the participants were pleased with the presenters and the information that was provided. In general, participants felt significantly more knowledgeable about the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management as a result of the workshop. Many felt the information was so beneficial that they indicated that they planned to take steps to implement some of the principles in their courts during the next few months.

The fact that the most common suggestion for improvements from the completed participant evaluation forms was the need to lengthen the workshop, speaks to the importance of information covered in the session for those who stayed to complete it. Had the workshop been scheduled earlier in the conference or been made mandatory, it is possible that participation would have been much larger and that the presentations made would have had a wider impact. The fact that 5 of the 16 respondents (31%), felt the conference was too short indicates that, given the amount of information presented and the importance of its application, it would have been desirable to have more time for the session. Similarly, the fact that such a large portion of those who stayed for the entire workshop had been on the bench for over five years illustrates the value of caseflow management to even the seasoned judge.

In terms of overall observations regarding the session, we offer the following:

(1) the content covered requires a minimum of six-seven hours of focused presentation; we were given only five hours, broken up over two days;

(2) the decision of AOC staff to expand the focus of the workshop to include civil cases and judges with exclusively civil jurisdiction to attract more participants may have dissipated the focus for the session – e.g., criminal caseflow management – and left attendees with civil-only jurisdiction somewhat frustrated, as reflected in their comments, even though they found the session useful. While the caseflow management concepts can be presented for both criminal and civil, the inclusion of the civil component within a session focusing on criminal cases needs to be in the context of the criminal and this focus needs to be communicated to

potential participants beforehand so they know what to expect at the session;

(3) although we believe we made appropriate modifications once the session began, had we realized that only 20 – 25 judges would be attending rather than the 50-60 we had anticipated, we would have modified our approach with more interactive segments, using case studies, role plays, etc.; and

(4) having judicial leadership (chief justice/presiding judges) and support for these initiatives is extremely important so that they become a reflection of the way the court does business rather than being attributed to an isolated judge left on his/her own to take on a static and ingrained process.

We appreciated the opportunity to conduct this training program, to work with Judge Holloway, Judge Corlew and Chancellor Bryant in planning the session, and to meet the judges who attended.

Limited additional technical assistance services are available from BJA’s Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project to assist courts with implementing the criminal caseflow management concepts discussed at the session.
CLE: Improving Criminal (and Civil) Case Management: Workshop Conducted by the Bureau of Justice (BJA) Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, American University, in conjunction with the Tennessee Judicial Conference

Judge Jeffrey H. Coker (Ret.)

Problems and Solutions in Inter-facility Transfers

- Gary Kremarik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm to 1:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to the Workshop:</strong> Judge Jeffrey H. Coker (Ret.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:45 pm to 2:30 pm  | **Presentation:** Establishing the Frame of Reference: The Definition of Caseflow Management: What Are We Talking About?: Gary Krcmarik and Judge Ronald Taylor (Ret.)  
**Caseflow Management As Time Management: Supervising the Time between Case Events and Setting Lawyers’ Expectations**  
**Another Way to Think about the Flow of Cases - The Ernie Friesen Reverse Telescope**  
**Why Do We Tend to Manage All Cases as Though They Will be Tried?**                                                                 |
| 2:30 pm to 2:45 pm  | **BREAK**                                                               |
| 2:45 pm to 3:45 pm  | **Presentation and Discussion:** Necessary Conditions for Controlling the Caseflow and Reducing Case Backlog: Judge Jeffrey Coker (Ret.) and Gary Krcmarik  
**The Essential Ingredient: Judicial Leadership**  
**Early Judicial Involvement in Case Progress Decisions – Why?**  
**Credible Hearing and Trial Dates – What Problems are Created When Lawyers Cannot Rely on Dates?**  
**Limitation of Continuances – How Can A Judge Do This?**  
**What Should A Written Continuance Policy Contain?**  
**Time Standards and Goals for Case Disposition – Are These Helpful or An Annoyance?**  
**Information System That Supports Case Progress Decisions - What Do You Need to Know to Manage Case Progress?**                                                                 |
| 3:45 pm to 4:30 pm  | 1. Applying Differentiated Case Management (DCM) to the Criminal and Civil Docket: Judge Ronald Taylor (Ret.) |
| 4:30 pm to 5:00 pm  | 2. Applying Caseflow Management Principles to Practical Situations: Role Play: Judge Jeffrey Coker (ret.), Gary Krcmarik, Judge Ronald Taylor (ret.) |

### FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2009

**CLE: Improving Criminal (and Civil) Case Management:** Workshop Conducted by the Bureau of Justice (BJA) Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, American University, in conjunction with the Tennessee Judicial Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>• <strong>Summing Up and Overview of Next Day's Session:</strong> Judge Jeffrey Coker (ret.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning Committee</strong> Judge Jeff Stewart, presiding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLE: Improving Criminal (and Civil) Case Management

- **8:30 am to 9:30 am** (1.00 General)
  - **Discussion of Role Play/Practical Issues Raised/ Potential Application of DCM Concepts:** Judge Ronald Taylor (Ret.), Judge Jeffrey Coker, and Gary Krcmarik

- **9:30 am to 9:45 am**
  - **Identifying a Proposed Change in Caseflow Management Practice to Consider Implementing in Your Court** (individual assignment)

- **9:45 am to 10:15 am** (1.00 General)
  - **Report Back on Plans: Prioritizing Areas for Change in the Criminal and Civil Case Process**

- **10:15 -10:30**
  - **Summing Up and Next Steps**

- **10:30**
  - **Adjournment**
IMPROVING CRIMINAL (AND CIVIL) CASE MANAGEMENT

A Workshop Conducted by
The Bureau of Justice Assistance Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project
at American University

In Conjunction with the Tennessee Judicial Conference
Murfreesboro, Tennessee
October 22-23, 2009

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Please rate the following aspects of this workshop, with “1” representing “poor” and “5” representing “excellent.”

1. Relevance and Usefulness of the Information Presented

   a. Establishing the Frame of Reference

   b. Necessary Conditions for Controlling the Caseflow and Reducing

*Appendix B*
2. Effectiveness of the instruction/presentations

   a. Establishing the Frame of Reference  1 2 3 4  5

   b. Necessary Conditions for Controlling the Caseflow and Reducing Case Backlog  1 2 3 4  5

   c. Applying Differentiated Case Management (DCM) to the Criminal and Civil Docket  1 2 3 4  5

   d. Applying Caseflow Management Principles to Practical Situations: Role Play  1 2 3 4  5

   e. Discussion of Role Play, Practical Issues Raised, and Potential Application of DCM Concepts  1 2 3 4  5

   f. Identifying a Proposed Change in Caseflow Management To Consider Implementing in Your Court  1 2 3 4  5
3. Opportunities for Participation/Involvement 1 2 3 4 5

4. Utility of the Workbook Materials 1 2 3 4 5

5. Overall Organization of the Workshop 1 2 3 4 5

6. Overall Rating of the Workshop 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Please give brief reactions/comments indicating your thoughts about the following.

1. Was there an appropriate balance of presentation of information and interchange?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If “No”, please describe how this could have been improved.

2. The length of the training in relation to the content covered was:

☐ about right  ☐ too long  ☐ too short

3. Through this workshop, did you gain obtain new information and/or ideas that will assist your jurisdiction in improving its management of the criminal caseflow?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

4. Before attending the workshop, how would you have rated your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management as presented at this workshop? (“1” representing “not at all knowledgeable” and “5” representing “very knowledgeable”)

1 2 3 4 5

5. After attending the workshop, how would you rate your knowledge of the fundamental principles of criminal caseflow management (“1” representing “not at all knowledgeable” and “5”

representing “very knowledgeable”)

1  2  3  4  5

6. Do you think you will be able to put into practice any of the strategies discussed at the workshop to improve the management of criminal cases?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If “Yes”, which strategies?

If “No,” why not?

7. What actions, if any, will you take within the next three months as a result of attending this workshop?

8. The best aspects of this workshop were:

9. The workshop could have been improved by:

10. Suggestions for topics to be covered in the next training workshop:

Background of Respondent:

_____ Judge/Civil Jurisdiction Only  _____ Judge/Civil and Criminal Jurisdiction

_____ Judge/Criminal Jurisdiction Only  _____ Other (please describe)

Years in position:

_____ under 2  _____ 2-5  _____ over 5

Is there any technical assistance or information you would like to receive in follow up to this session? Would you or any other attendees from your court like to be contacted about technical assistance to assist your jurisdiction in improving criminal case management? If so, please complete the Technical Assistance Form.

Request Form or provide us with a contact name, agency, phone number and e-mail address or contact Caroline Cooper at American University, justice@american.edu (202-885-2875).

Name: 
Agency: 
Telephone: 
E-mail: 

Additional suggestions and comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS!

BJA CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Technical Assistance Request Form

1. CONTACT INFORMATION

Point of Contact for discussion of this request:

Name_________________________________________________________

Agency_______________________________________________________

Telephone ____________________________________________________

E-mail________________________________________________________

2. AGENCY REQUESTING TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

3. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OR TRAINING REQUESTED

Please describe the nature of the technical assistance or training you are requesting:

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

4. TA/TRAINING OBJECTIVES

How do you anticipate that the requested TA/Training will assist your agency?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

5. TIME LINE

What is the proposed time frame for receiving these services? Please provide dates, along with any special circumstances (e.g., time constraints due to local agency work/availability schedules):

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

NAME ____________________________________   DATE: ______________

Telephone: ____________________________________   email: ______________

Please submit this request, via e-mail, or fax, to:

Caroline S. Cooper or Joseph A. Trotter, BJA Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, American University justice@american.edu (fax: 202/885-2885)