



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT

**Final Report
Fixed Price Contract
NO. AID-121-C-1100002-02
Between
CHEMONICS INTERNATIONAL INC.
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
And
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
For
The Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible
(FAIR) Judiciary Project in Ukraine
USAID PRIME CONTRACT NO. AID-121-C-11-0002**

**MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY**

**Submitted by,
Maureen E. Conner, Ph.D.
Director
Judicial Administration Program
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University**

October 26, 2015

Table of Contents

Overview of the Judicial Administration Program in the Ukraine	3-5
<i>Faculty Development Program</i>	3-4
<i>2015 Judicial Administration Certificate Program</i>	4-5
<i>Chief Judges Leadership Seminar</i>	5
Lessons Learned	6-16
Recommendations and Next Steps	17-19
<i>New 2015 Recommendations</i>	17
<i>2013 Recommendations</i>	18-19
Appendix A. Contract	20-38
Appendix B. Faculty Workshop Agenda	39-42
Appendix C. List of Ukrainian Instructors and MSU Instructor Biographical Information	43-46
MSU Instructor Biographical Information	
<i>Maureen E. Conner, Ph.D.</i>	43
<i>Timothy Dibble, LEED AP</i>	44-45
<i>Jan C. Bouch, BS, MHS, Psy.D.</i>	45-46
Appendix D. Course Agendas	47-62
<i>Leadership</i>	47-48
<i>Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts</i>	49-50
<i>Visioning and Strategic Planning</i>	51-52
<i>Resources, Budget, and Finance</i>	53
<i>Caseflow Management</i>	54-55
<i>Information Technology Management</i>	56-57
<i>Essential Components of Courts</i>	58
<i>Human Resources Management</i>	59
<i>Education, Training, and Development</i>	60
<i>Court and Community Communication</i>	61-62

Appendix E. List of Ukraine Round II Students	63-65
Appendix F. Capstone Proposal Instructions	66
Appendix G. Final Capstone Project Requirements	67-69
Appendix H. Abstracts of Student Capstone Project Papers	70-97
Appendix I. Final Graduation Program	98
Appendix J. Graduation Certificate Template	99
Appendix K. Faculty Certificate Recognition Template	100
Appendix L. Faculty Meeting Agenda	101-102
Appendix M. Needs Assessment Survey Results	103-104
Appendix N. Chief Judges Leadership Seminar Program Agenda	105-108
Appendix O. Chief Judges Leadership Seminar Instructor Biographies:	
Theodore H. Curry II and Andrea Armstrong	109-110
<i>Theodore H. Curry II</i>	<i>109-110</i>
<i>Andrea Armstrong</i>	<i>110</i>
Appendix P. Judicial Administration Certificate Program Evaluation	
Results	111-135
<i>Leadership</i>	<i>111-113</i>
<i>Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts</i>	<i>114-116</i>
<i>Visioning and Strategic Planning</i>	<i>117-118</i>
<i>Resources, Budget, and Finance</i>	<i>119-120</i>
<i>Caseflow Management</i>	<i>121-122</i>
<i>Information Technology Management</i>	<i>123-125</i>
<i>Essential Components of Courts</i>	<i>126-127</i>
<i>Human Resources Management</i>	<i>128-130</i>
<i>Education, Training, and Development</i>	<i>131-132</i>
<i>Court and Community Communication</i>	<i>133-135</i>

Appendix Q. Chief Judges Leadership Seminar Evaluation Results **136-146**

<i>Section 1: The Purposes of the Seminar</i>	<i>136-137</i>
<i>Section 2: Learning Objectives</i>	<i>137-140</i>
<i>Section 3: Faculty Instruction</i>	<i>140-142</i>
<i>Comments</i>	<i>143-145</i>
<i>Future Program Topics</i>	<i>145-146</i>

Overview of the Judicial Administration Program in Ukraine

The scope of work and deliverables were executed in compliance with the contract. See **Appendix A** for the contract.

This contract had three key events that were accomplished through the twelve deliverables— faculty development for Ukrainian instructors, the Judicial Administration Certificate Program for forty competitively selected court administrators, and a chief judges judicial administration and leadership seminar. These events built on the previous contract where MSU developed and delivered a faculty development program and the MSU Judicial Administration Certificate Program within the Ukrainian context.

Faculty Development Program

The three-day faculty development workshop was held in the Yaremche, Ivano-Frankivsk Region on January 27-30, 2015. See **Appendix B** for the faculty workshop agenda. The instructors selected by The FAIR Project met with their MSU counterparts (Dr. Maureen Conner, Dr. Jan Bouch, and Mr. Tim Dibble) for the purpose of reviewing the required subject matter content of the certificate program and identifying the necessary Ukrainian adaptations. Based on that experience, the MSU and Ukrainian instructors were able to blend the required subject matter of the Judicial Administration Program courses with the Ukrainian additions, thus creating a Ukrainian-specific program. Following the workshop, the MSU instructors and the Ukrainian instructors continued to exchange information, engaged in SKYPE calls, and used other means to create the final course materials for the March 23-April 3, 2015 program. See **Appendix C** for the list of Ukrainian instructors and the biographical information on the MSU instructors.

The difference between this faculty development program and the one completed under the first contract was that graduates of the first certificate program were invited to become instructors. They prepared for that role through attending the faculty development program in Yaremche. The Ukrainian instructors from the first certificate program were also invited to return as instructors. The goal was to expand and deepen the pool of instructors by involving both university and law school faculty with practicing court administrators and specialists from the State Judicial Administration Office. Sustainability of judicial administration education and training is more likely when there is an investment from the field of practice that can be joined with the academic community in a way that transfer of learning is immediate and relevant.

The MSU instructors were responsible for working with their Ukrainian instructor teams to prepare the teams to teach the MSU Judicial Administration Certificate Program. The process had three steps. First, MSU instructors were responsible for insuring that the required subject matter comprising the ten courses in the certificate program was covered. Second, the subject matter was reviewed and adjusted by the Ukrainian instructors to fully integrate their perspectives on the Ukrainian context. Third, the written materials were substantially altered to integrate the research that the new Ukrainian instructors conducted during a previous instructor program offered by The FAIR Project, which did not involve MSU. Consequently, the “master” MSU Judicial

Administration Program written materials changed from English to Ukrainian. The effect of this change will be discussed in the lessons learned and recommendations sections of this report.

2015 Judicial Administration Certificate Program

The Judicial Administration Certificate Program was delivered over a two-week period—March 23–April 3, 2015. The forty students were in class every day except for Sunday. See **Appendix D** for the course agendas. See **Appendix E** for the list of students.

The teaching methodologies employed by each course teaching team were interactive. The MSU instructors continued as the lead instructors insuring that the required materials were taught; however, the Ukrainian instructors assumed a larger teaching role than in the first certificate program. This had both positive and negative aspects, which will be identified in the lessons learned and recommendations sections of this report.

Within each course, the students were encouraged to engage in critical thinking, analysis, idea generation, debate, problem identification and solving, strategic issue and policy development, planning, brainstorming, mutual mentoring and coaching, and personal and professional reflection. In other words, while in the program the students were able to practice their affective skills simultaneously with applying their new content knowledge both verbally and in writing. This provided the students with a “practice run” before returning to their respective courts.

Dr. Conner determined successful completion of the certificate program via the capstone projects, which involved each student implementing a court improvement initiative. Students were required to submit capstone proposals prior to leaving Kiev. Dr. Conner read and approved each project proposal and provided guiding feedback where necessary. See **Appendix F** for the capstone proposal instructions. See **Appendix G** for the final capstone project requirements.

The capstone project is the method used by MSU to measure what the students learned; to determine whether the students can transfer learning to the workplace, thus demonstrating improved skill development and critical thinking; and to reinforce knowledge development and build confidence for leadership and management excellence.

All 40 students successfully completed their capstone projects, and they graduated on June 17, 2015 in Kiev. See **Appendix H** for an abstract of the student capstone project papers. See **Appendix I** for the student graduation program. The graduation program was an acknowledgement of the academic (classroom work) and applied research (capstone projects) achievements of the students. Each student was awarded a certificate signed by the leadership of MSU, SJA, NSJ, and The FAIR Project. See **Appendix J** for the graduation certificate template. The graduation program was also a celebration of what can be accomplished through collaboration. Thus, all of the contributing organizations were also acknowledged: USAID, SJA, NSJ, The FAIR Project, and MSU. Also of significance was that the celebration acknowledged the Ukrainian instructors who showed outstanding commitment to this educational program.

The instructors were invited to attend a faculty meeting the day before the student graduation to discuss their role in the 2015 certificate program and garner their impressions of the teaching and learning that took place. This event further solidified their sense of importance, expertise,

and commitment to the development of the judicial administration profession in Ukraine. It also included a faculty certificate bestowment ceremony. See **Appendix K** for the faculty certificate recognition template and **Appendix L** for the faculty meeting agenda.

Chief Judges Leadership Seminar

New to this contract was a leadership seminar for chief judges. Forty chief judges participated in the seminar, which was held in Kiev on September 29-October 1, 2015. The seminar was 17.5 contact hours, i.e., instructional hours. (Note: The contract requirements were for 15 chief judges and 15.0 contact hours.) The intent of the seminar was to further the professional administration of the courts by exposing chief judges to a select number of judicial administration tenets stressing leadership development, building an executive team, managing the human capital of the courts, expanding internal and external communications, and developing a proactive electronic presence using traditional technology methods and social media. The topics were chosen based on the feedback received by the graduates of the two certificate programs and the results of a brief needs assessment survey developed by Dr. Conner and administered by David Vaughn during a chief judge meeting. Please see **Appendix M** for the survey results.

The guiding purpose for the seminar was to provide the chief judges with the knowledge and skill necessary to build the public's trust in expertly managed courts, which fulfill their constitutional mandates. The belief that drove the seminar topic selections was that with a highly functioning chief judge and court administrator executive team, the courts will be more prepared to change court operations for the better, thus reducing the extremely poor view that the public has of the courts. It is important to note that this is only the first step in what will be a long process in building sustainable high-functioning courts. Please see **Appendix N** for the program agenda.

The MSU instructors for the program were Dr. Conner, Professor Terry Curry, and Adjunct Professor Andrea Armstrong. See the biographies for Theodore Curry and Andrea Armstrong in **Appendix O**. Chief judges from the United States and Canada, for the purpose of providing judge-perspective on the subject matter, joined the MSU professors. (Note: The chief judges were not covered under the MSU contract, though they were integrated by MSU into the substantive presentations.)

Lessons Learned

Several lessons were learned during this contract period.

First, further developing Ukrainian faculty expertise for the teaching of the Judicial Administration Certificate Program subject matter is a challenging, long-term process.

In an effort to expand the numbers and deepen the knowledge of the Ukrainian judicial administration instructor pool, the 2015 faculty development program included previous instructors and graduates from the 2013 certificate program. Thus, there was a mix of individuals who had taught the subject matter and individuals who were recipients of the subject matter. Those two groups came together to comprise the faculty for the 2015 certificate program. The MSU faculty remained the same from 2013 to 2015.

Compounding the problem of blending experienced instructors with new instructors was the fact that the instructor pool for the 2015 certificate program had attended a train-the-trainer program with a Ukrainian NGO. Through that program, the 2015 instructors were taught a variety of teaching techniques. They applied those techniques to developing subject matter they expected to use in the 2015 certificate program. Thus, they came to the faculty development program in Yaremche with the expectation that they would use their newly developed materials. The contract between The FAIR Project and MSU was to use the same teaching materials from the 2013 program with modest updates to account for the changes taking place in the administrative and governance structures of the Ukrainian judicial branch. This caused an immediate problem between which materials would prevail and how to meet the MSU subject matter requirements while also addressing the Ukrainian context.

Managing expectations, enthusiasm, and the contractual realities became the top priority on the first day of the faculty development program and continued throughout the delivery of the certificate program. Five other complicating factors were in play. First, the ratio of instructors to content and teaching time was too large for most of the classes; consequently, not all instructors were able to make meaningful contributions. Second, the three MSU instructors had multiple teaching teams to work with during the faculty development program, which made it extremely difficult to provide in-depth guidance to the teams. This resulted in some weaknesses in both the materials and the teaching, which will be covered in more detail related to the delivery of the certificate program. Third, because the expectations of the Ukrainian instructors were that all of the materials they developed during their train-the-trainer program would be used in the 2015 certificate program, the MSU materials were significantly changed from 2013 to 2015. The reason that their expectations were accommodated was because Dr. Conner and David Vaughn made a decision that deepening the knowledge, skill, and experience of the Ukrainian instructors was a significant factor in building long-term sustainability of judicial administration training in Ukraine. Because of that decision, the fourth complicating factor emerged—the certificate material master copy became Ukrainian and not English. Thus, there was little time to correct any problems with the materials until they were being taught because the turn-around time between material development, translation, and teaching was limited, as this factor was not contemplated at the time the contract was written. The fifth factor was that there was no faculty

development mandatory attendance requirement set by The FAIR Project. This resulted in instructors joining the teaching teams without the benefit of the planning that took place in Yaremche, which, in some cases, resulted in either disjointed presentations or materials that were covered multiple times within the same program because the Ukrainian instructors were not experienced enough to adapt while in the teaching mode. This is not surprising, as they are still new at both material development and teaching.

Even given all of the problems, MSU and The FAIR Project were able to expand the pool of Ukrainian instructors for future programs on judicial administration. With further encouragement, training, and opportunity, the Ukrainian instructors can become a seasoned group of judicial administration subject matter experts who can be called upon to teach and further develop the judicial administration profession in Ukraine. They, however, do need to further their conceptual understanding of the judicial administration knowledge base and how it is practiced. Without that, they will not be able to lead change through education. At its core, education is about change. Therefore, the Ukrainian instructors must be developed to that higher level of thinking, analysis, and practice. This type of faculty development is necessary in order to create Ukrainian instructors who excel at advanced teaching and learning methodologies.

Second, the Judicial Administration Certificate Program has utility to Ukrainian court administrators regardless of their years of experience. Rigorous requirements must be maintained to reinforce the seriousness of the certificate program regardless of how accomplished the student group believes they are.

The forty participants in the 2015 certificate program had more years of experience than the 2013 participants. However, the increased experience did not translate into more knowledge about the principles, practices, and models of the court administration profession. Thus, the subject matter remained relevant even to this more seasoned group. See **Appendix P** for evaluation results.

Though the content remained relevant and was rated high by the participants, the 2015 participant group had far more members who were not attentive, did not adhere to the schedule, and left for portions of the program. This resulted in David Vaughn and Dr. Conner devising make-up sessions and assignments that had to be completed before the end of the two-week program. Students were informed that failure to complete the make-up requirements would result in them being designated ineligible to start the capstone projects. Without a capstone project, successful completion of the program was not possible.

David Vaughn and Dr. Conner did not waiver on the make-up requirements. Consequently, all forty students completed the classroom work, submitted capstone proposals, and completed their court improvement projects; thus, making them eligible for graduation.

Further evidence of the difference between the 2013 and 2015 group was this—the majority of the capstone project papers submitted by the 2015 students were not as rigorous as those submitted by the 2013 group. Meaning that the 2015 projects did not appear to involve the same intensity of application of the principles and practices of judicial administration nor problem solving to overcome the obstacles that they faced. Nonetheless, they conducted court

improvement projects and reported progress toward meeting their goals. Therefore, they were successful.

In considering how to account for the difference in rigor between the two groups, several explanations can be considered. First, the difference may be accounted for by an imbalance between contextualization and higher-level conceptualization that is outside of the current and historical Ukrainian context, which resulted in less ability to analyze and problem-solve workplace dynamics. Second, the changes in the roles and responsibilities of the court administrators may have given them more confidence. This confidence could have resulted in them believing that they had more abilities than they actually had when compared to the knowledge base of judicial administration. Third, the explanation may just be that the 2015 student group simply had a different personality, if you will, than the 2013 group. The 2013 group saw themselves as pioneers. The 2015 group did not express that same sentiment. The 2015 group was post the Revolution of Dignity.

Third, the 2013 and 2015 capstone projects showed a difference in emphasis, but the two groups had shared values related to desired outcomes. The comparison between the 2013 and 2015 capstones also suggested that the Revolution of Dignity, and all that followed in the judicial branch, had a positive impact on judicial administration.

Dr. Conner conducted a qualitative comparative analysis of the student evaluations; capstone project themes, outcomes, primary approaches and methods; and lessons learned from 2013 to 2015. The mean evaluation results were slightly higher in 2015, but the difference between years was not statistically significant. Both groups rated the certificate program as very/highly useful or important.

There were some differences between the themes from 2013 and 2015. There were also some differences in approaches and methods. However, the two groups shared common visions and outcomes for the courts. Thus, they are in a strong position to advance their profession because of their shared values. The results and lessons learned presentation delivered at the 2015 graduation, which further elaborates these findings, is offered here.

**2015 Ukraine
Judicial Administration
Certificate Program:
Results and Lessons Learned**

Maureen E. Conner, Ph.D.
Michigan State University

Evaluation Results: Grand Means

2013	2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Leadership: 4.85 ■ Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts: 4.68 ■ Visioning and Strategic Planning: 4.70 ■ Resources, Budget, Finance: 4.44 ■ Caseflow Management: 4.85 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Leadership: 4.94 ■ Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts: 4.84 ■ Visioning and Strategic Planning: 4.99 ■ Resources, Budget, Finance: 4.78 ■ Caseflow Management: 4.78

Evaluation Results: Grand Means

2013	2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Information Technology Management: 4.74 ■ Essential Components of Courts: 4.74 ■ Human Resources Management: 4.83 ■ Education, Training, Development: 4.76 ■ Court Community Communications: 5.00 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Information Technology Management: 4.90 ■ Essential Components of Courts: 4.94 ■ Human Resources Management: 4.92 ■ Education, Training, Development: 4.94 ■ Court Community Communications: 4.83

2015 Capstone Project Review: Assessing Impact

A Case Study of How Change Occurs

Three Overarching Themes

Theme 1

- Building the public's trust and confidence in the courts; thus, increasing respect for and reliance on the judicial branch in protecting rights granted under the constitution (also identified by the 2013 graduates)
- **Origin:** Increased knowledge and skill resulted in empowerment and action

Theme 2

- Preparing Ukraine Courts to meet European standards
- **Origin:** Ukraine Maidan—the revolution and the events that followed triggered change in the judiciary and public expectations

Desired Outcomes: 2013 and 2015 Graduates Shared Vision for the Courts

The Building of Common Cause and a Profession

Outcomes and Visions Expressed

- Improved positive media coverage
- Increased community outreach, education, and information dissemination by the court
- Increased respect for judges and court decisions

Desired Outcomes Continued

- Increased respect for the administration of justice transforming the courts into an employer of choice, resulting in the ability to recruit the best and brightest candidates
- Increased salary and compensation packages reflective of the duties and responsibilities of the positions

Desired Outcomes Continued

- Increased funding for court operations reflective of the mandates and workload
- Improved court services through utilizing traditional methods and new technologies

Desired Outcomes Continued

- Reduced operating costs through employing advanced technologies
- Changed management structures that provide for separation of duties, responsibilities, and authorities between the chief judge and chief of staff; thus, allowing for a clear delineation of tasks resulting in efficient and effective management of the courts

2013 Primary Methods and Approaches

- **Public outreach and communication** (n=12, 30.0%)
- **Technology** (n=8, 20.0%)
- **Employee development** (n=7, 17.5%)
- **Management infrastructure** (n=5, 12.5%)
- **Physical structure** (n=3, 7.5%)
- **Adjudication and enforcement of decisions** (n=2, 5.0%)
- **Performance operations standards** (n=2, 5.0%)
- **Delay reduction** (n=1, 2.5%)

2015 Primary Methods and Approaches

- **Human resources management**—job classifications and descriptions; performance management and appraisal; education, training and development; and employee motivation, including pay for performance and facilities improvement (n=22/ 55.0%)
- **Access to justice** (n=9/22.5%)
- **Public outreach and communication** (n=6/15.0%)
- **Caseflow management** (n=2/5.0%)
- **Technology** (n=1/2.5%)

Lessons Learned: 2013 and 2015

- The knowledge and skill base of judicial administration is universal
- Application of the knowledge and skill base must be aligned to the legal and judicial traditions and practices of the country and its systems
- Passion for the missions and mandates of the courts is present in Ukraine court administrators

Lessons Learned Continued

- Chief judges and court administrators need joint training on the principles and practices of judicial administration for a strong court executive component
- Sustainability can be achieved through continuing professional education and training
- Specialized knowledge specific to administration is required for court operation, outreach with the public and policy-makers, and strategic advancement of the judicial branch

Lessons Learned: From 2013- 2015

You Can Change A System And Realize Your Dreams

Fourth, chief judges are eager to learn more knowledge, information, and skills related to leadership and management.

Under this contract, a chief judges seminar was developed and delivered. The intent was to reinforce the principles and practices of contemporary judicial administration with a focus on leadership. The leadership framework was largely unfamiliar to the chief judges. The foundations of leadership are having a vision and being forward-looking; modeling the behavior and actions the leader wants to see in others; encouraging employees to innovate and take risks to improve the organization; creating a culture of open communication, trust, and team work; giving feedback and celebrating outstanding performance; and engaging in public outreach, thus, establishing and maintaining a public image of trust and confidence. This framework was the theme of the seminar. Though the framework was unfamiliar, the chief judges were willing to implement ideas from the seminar. Their openness to new ideas suggested that a culture change within the courts can be further cultivated with ongoing education, technical assistance, and support.

Each chief judge completed an action plan. The FAIR Project will follow up with the chief judges to see what additional assistance they may need. This transfer of learning tool will allow The FAIR Project to collect further needs assessment information about how to assist chief judges, and it extends the value of the education to the workplace. See **Appendix Q** for the evaluation results, which indicated that the objectives were met and the information was helpful to a great degree.

With both chief judges and court administrators practicing effective leadership and strong judicial administration skills, the courts have a better chance of meeting their mandates and improving the public's confidence in them.

Fifth, delivering the Judicial Administration Certificate Program within the Ukrainian context exceeds what is contracted for by CHEMONICS and is necessary for the immediate application to the courts.

The amount of time required to contextualize education for long-term impact is neither sufficiently calculated nor funded. This lesson learned was also reported in the first contract and still holds true. The one-and-done approach often anticipated in international work is quite different from the sustainable approach expected by The FAIR Project. One could conclude that is why The FAIR Project is successful in creating the conditions for sustainable change.

Multiple iterations of materials had to be checked and finalized by all of the instructors and Cathy White at MSU. Further compounding the time commitment was changing the master copy from English to Ukrainian, as previously mentioned. Also, MSU was managing the translation process under this contract. When that was agreed to, the expectation was that the master copy would be in English. MSU could only exert minimal quality control over the materials when the master copy became Ukrainian. The MSU instructors were not fully satisfied with the product produced by the Ukrainian instructors, as the subject matter was not fully addressed to the level required by MSU. Therefore, the MSU instructors were left with attempting to compensate for the weaknesses as the courses were being taught. Regardless of the difficulties, the students completed the program with knowledge, ideas, and skills that they didn't have when they entered the program.

The test of whether the subject matter was immediately applicable was the capstone project. The capstone project required the students to develop an abbreviated strategic plan to address a court improvement need. They had approximately one month to develop the plan. This resulted in immediate application of what they learned. Additionally, it had the benefit of transferring their new knowledge to chief judges, court staff, and stakeholders who would be involved in implementing the plans.

Sixth, achieving sustainability is a goal of all development work. The new graduates and the Ukrainian instructors are central to reaching the sustainability tipping point.

The students and instructors involved in the 2013 and 2015 certificate and faculty development programs can be organized as leaders and advocates for the profession of judicial administration. In that role, they can become the founding members of a judicial institute—as board members,

advisory committees, teachers, researchers, mentors, and so forth. Sustainability requires both structure and people. Ukraine now has both.

Recommendations and Next Steps

There are three recommendations listed below resulting from the 2015 contract. The recommendations from the 2013 report remain, as there is much more infrastructure work to be done to support the fledgling judicial administration profession with its associated practices. The difference now is that there is a “fledgling judicial administration profession.” It did not exist in a recognizable way prior to The FAIR Project’s investment in it.

This core group of court administrators and chief judges can be used as ambassadors for change, though they will need continual support and resources in order to be successful. They will also need more “converts” as nothing speaks louder than voices demanding change, as evidenced by the Revolution of Dignity. Culture is hard to change. It is a long-term proposition. If The FAIR Project via USAID is not in it for the long haul, business as usual will continue. Change has begun and the hope of giving the Ukrainian people the judicial branch they deserve is attainable. The MSU Judicial Administration Program is honored to be an actor in this change movement.

New 2015 Recommendations

First: The judicial administration teaching materials and methods of presentation need to be reviewed to ensure that the higher-level conceptualization of the judicial administration knowledge base is intact and has not been lost to contextualization. The role of education is to probe thinking, to offer new knowledge that may at first seem unusable to the student, and to challenge students to apply the new concepts and methods in ways not previously tried. The opinion of the MSU faculty members is that there was an imbalance in the 2015 program. In an effort to further contextualization and to use more Ukrainian instructors, who themselves are still learning the concepts, the topics were offered in a way that reflected more of “what is” rather than “what can be.” This imbalance needs to be corrected in future offerings of the judicial administration certificate program.

Second: A small core of Ukrainian instructors should be identified for advanced faculty development so that their conceptualization skills can be increased. Without that kind of development the Ukrainian instructors cannot hope to move their students to higher levels of knowledge, understanding, and thinking. Advanced conceptualization skills can only be taught by instructors who have advanced teaching skills. The Ukrainian instructors need both. This means that the Ukrainian instructors need to be exposed to the subject matter in an intense setting with the MSU faculty members. The Ukrainian instructors in their feedback session with the MSU faculty members indicated that they wanted and needed more time with intense treatment of the subject matter. However, they don’t know what they “don’t know,” so it needs to be the responsibility of the MSU faculty members to set the agenda for such an event.

Third: If MSU is to retain the ability to check materials for substance and continuity, the master copies must be in English, then translated into Ukrainian for the Ukrainian instructors and students.

2013 Recommendations

First: To sustain momentum and build a cadre of professional court administrators, more Judicial Administration Certificate Programs should be offered to build a critical mass of court administrators educated in the judicial administration knowledge and skill base.

Second: Chief Judges (*and those being groomed to be chief judges*) should also be trained in the judicial administration subject matter so that chief judges and court administrators build strong and vibrant leadership teams. Chief Judges should be offered two types of administration educational experiences. One offering should be just for chief judges so that they can discuss court administration issues as well as the management of other judges in a judicially-focused environment. The other educational experience should be one that is shared with court administrators, allowing the two to come together as a team for the purpose of building a better organizational response to court management and leadership issues.

Third: Mentoring programs should be developed and implemented for both court administrators and chief judges to further extend the value of what is taught in the classroom and to ensure ongoing professional development, support, and networking.

Fourth: Distance learning options should be added so that educational opportunities could be expanded to reach a larger audience and offer on-going education to those students who complete the Judicial Administration Certificate Program.

Fifth: The above four items should be offered within a comprehensive curriculum framework that develops judges and court administrators (*and staff*) for their entire careers, starting with new-career professionals all the way to advanced career professionals. Such an approach also sets the stage for succession planning.

Sixth: To expand the educational opportunities through all of the above means, more faculty development programs need to be developed and offered. Such programs should span subject matter related to instructional methods, program development, and effective online instruction. Attendees should include university faculty, current court administrators, staff from State Court Administration, and others identified by the aforementioned groups.

Seventh: For further educational advancement, Ukrainian academic institutions should offer advanced degrees in judicial administration. MSU has a partnership model that would allow MSU and Ukrainian universities to work together to develop and implement such educational programs that could result in either dual or joint degrees.

Eighth: A Ukrainian Court Administration Association needs to be developed so as to encourage the networking and professional growth of court administrators across the country. Such associations are one of the hallmarks of a profession, as are advanced degrees focusing on specialized knowledge that is accompanied by multiple career opportunities and increased salaries.

Ninth: A longer planning and delivery horizon needs to be used if the MSU Judicial Administration Certificate Program is offered again. Increased time would allow the opportunity

for MSU to more fully integrate the Ukrainian instructors and materials into the courses. Also, a longer time horizon would provide students more time to do their capstone projects and, thus allow the projects to be more fully developed before they have to be submitted for review.

Tenth: The MSU instructors should be increased from three to five. Each instructor would have two courses rather than the three to four currently assigned. Increasing the MSU instructor base would allow more in-depth preparatory work with the Ukrainian instructors and reduce the fatigue factor involved with multiple days of consecutive instruction using interpreters.

Eleventh: Selected student capstone projects should be funded for full implementation and follow-up should be conducted on all of the capstone projects to determine what the level of implementation was, lessons learned, and identification of facilitators and detractors of the capstone project's success.

Twelfth: Outstanding student performance should be supported by offering tuition reimbursement for students to gain a master's degree in judicial administration.

Thirteenth: The efforts to build the judicial administration profession in Ukraine could gain more strength if it were organized and operated out of a judicial institute. Such an institute would have the responsibility for setting the professional standards, best practices, and educational goals for the profession, for the purpose of advancing the Ukrainian judicial branch and those who work in it.