

PROJECT REPORT:
**DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE PRO SE
ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Report on a Prototype Workshop

with

Curriculum Materials

October 2001



**The Justice Management Institute
1888 Sherman Street, Suite 410
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: 303-831-7564 Fax: 303-831-4564**

PROJECT REPORT:
**DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE PRO SE
ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Report on a Prototype Workshop

with

Curriculum Materials

October 2001



**The Justice Management Institute
1888 Sherman Street, Suite 410
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: 303-831-7564 Fax: 303-831-4564**

This document has been prepared pursuant to grants from the State Justice Institute (Award No. SJI-00-N-005) and the Open Society Institute. Points of view expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the State Justice Institute or the Open Society Institute.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Foreword and Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1
I. Background	2
II. Planning for the Prototype Workshop	3
III. Workshop Sessions	6
IV. Follow-Up Activities	8
V. Implementing the Action Plans	9
VI. Future Education and Training Programs	11
APPENDICES – CURRICULUM MATERIALS	
Appendix A – Workshop Agendas	13
A.1 Agenda for JMI Workshop on <i>Developing Effective Pro Se Litigation Programs –</i> Minneapolis, May 22-24, 2000	
A.2 Agenda for a 2-Day Single State or Regional Workshop for Jurisdictional Teams	
Appendix B –Guidelines for Team and Small Group Sessions	19
Appendix C – Selected Bibliography and Web Sites	27
Appendix D –Workshop Evaluation Form	28
Appendix E—Workshop Faculty	32

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Report is the final product of a project conducted by the Justice Management Institute (JMI) that has focused on helping state court systems and local trial courts develop programs that will help unrepresented litigants gain meaningful access to justice. The primary activity of the project was the presentation of a prototype workshop on *Developing Effective Pro Se Litigation Programs* that was conducted in May 2000 for teams from ten jurisdictions. The report provides information about the workshop, about other project activities, and about the accomplishments of the participating teams in the months that followed the workshop.

The workshop evaluation results, coupled with information acquired through follow-up phone calls with members of the teams that participated in the workshop, provide strong indications that the project has been successful in achieving its primary objectives. Participants learned about how to develop effective pro se assistance programs, and they have used what they learned to design and implement programs tailored for their own jurisdictions. Additionally, JMI and the organizations that collaborated with JMI in presenting the workshop have learned more about how to present good quality educational programs in this critically important area, and we have produced curriculum materials that can be used in the design and presentation of future workshops.

A number of individuals and organizations have helped make this project a success. Initial planning for the project was helped enormously by insights and ideas provided by members of the project's Advisory Committee: Martha Bergmark, Vice President of Programs at the National Legal Aid and Defender Association; John Greacen, then the Director of the New Mexico Administrative Office of the Courts, and author of two leading articles on providing services to unrepresented litigants; Gordy Griller, Court Administrator of the Superior Court of Arizona in Maricopa County (greater Phoenix area), who played a key role in development of that Court's innovative Self-Help Center; Mary Ryan, a member of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Delivery of Legal Services; Kate Sampson, Senior Program Associate with the American Judicature Society, who served as project director for the November 1999 National Conference on Pro Se Litigation; and Richard Zorza, a consultant who has special expertise in technology and the delivery of legal services.

The members of the faculty for the prototype workshop – Judge Rebecca Albrecht, Mary Durkin, Julie Hodges, Susan Ledray, Carmen Ramirez, Linda Ridge, Kate Sampson, Harvey Solomon, and Richard Zorza – were excellent as presenters and facilitators at the Minneapolis program. They worked effectively as a faculty team, and their ideas, perspectives, energy, and dedication were critical to the success of the workshop.

Mary Durkin, who served as JMI's project director from November 1999 through October 2000, was responsible for the organization of the Minneapolis workshop, led the process of selecting teams to participate, brought together the faculty, and served as a

faculty member herself. She deserves special recognition for outstanding work on all of these tasks. More recently, Gayle Hegele of the JMI staff has provided excellent administrative support for the project, including typing successive drafts of this report.

Chelle Uecker, the project evaluator, was a knowledgeable observer of the workshop, a conscientious interviewer of workshop participants, and the thoughtful author of a valuable project evaluation report. Her work as the evaluator helped keep the project on course and provided very helpful feedback.

The project was made possible by grants to JMI from two organizations: The State Justice Institute (SJI) and the Open Society Institute (OSI). Staff from both organizations – Kathy Schwartz and Cheryl Reynolds of SJI; Catherine Samuels, Raquiba Labrie, and John Kowal of OSI – have been helpful and supportive throughout the project. We would like to particularly acknowledge the very thoughtful and constructive suggestions made by Cheryl Reynolds in her review of an earlier draft of this report.

The work of the members of the teams from the ten jurisdictions that participated in the prototype workshop – both at the workshop and, even more important, in the months that have followed – is especially gratifying. They were actively engaged in the learning process while they were at the Minneapolis program, and they have worked hard at implementing the action plans they developed. They are turning ideas into reality, and contributing to an improved quality of justice for all.

For me, it has been a privilege to have been involved in this project and to have worked with the funding organizations, the faculty, and the workshop participants. The process has been collaborative and effective, and we have already started to see some positive results. JMI, and I personally, look forward to continuing collaborative work in this area. Hopefully, this report will be helpful to all who are interested in improving the ways in which courts and justice systems meet the needs of self-represented litigants.

Barry Mahoney
President
The Justice Management Institute

Denver, Colorado
October 2001

Project Report

DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE PRO SE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Introduction

This report provides information about an education and technical assistance project conducted by The Justice Management Institute (JMI) that has been aimed at helping courts develop effective pro se assistance programs. The principal component of the project was a prototype workshop conducted in Minneapolis in May 2000 for teams from ten jurisdictions—four states, five local jurisdictions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The project was planned as a complement and follow-up to the National Conference on Pro Se Litigation conducted by the American Judicature Society (AJS) in November 1999. Like the National Conference, the JMI prototype workshop and technical assistance work was supported by grants from the State Justice Institute (SJI) and the Open Society Institute (OSI). This report is intended to provide interested court system leaders and judicial branch educators and managers with basic information about the planning, presentation, and impact of the workshop.

The report is organized in five main sections, plus a set of appendices. Section I provides basic background information about the project, beginning with work done jointly by AJS and JMI during the 1996-98 period to develop baseline information about self-represented litigation and about court and bar efforts to address the growth in the number of cases in which litigants represent themselves. Section II provides an overview of the workshop planning process, including the basic design of the workshop. Section III describes the workshop itself, with particular attention to the topics covered in the plenary sessions and to the team and other small group sessions that constituted the core of the workshop. Section IV discusses follow-up activities, notably including a November 2000 conference focused on opportunities for collaboration in the development of pro se assistance programs. Section V provides information on the progress of the jurisdictional teams in implementing plans developed at the workshop. Section VI discusses future education and training focused on development of pro se assistance programs, building on what has been learned through this project.

One of the objectives of the project was to develop curriculum materials that could be used by national organizations and by state judicial branch educators in presenting similar programs for jurisdictional teams. The appendices contain materials drawn from the prototype workshop: the agenda for the 2 ½ day Minneapolis Workshop (Appendix A.1) plus an agenda for a two-day workshop that could be conducted in a single state or on a regional basis (Appendix A.2); guidelines for faculty facilitators to use in conducting team and peer group sessions at a workshop (Appendix B); a list of articles, monographs, and other materials (including web site addresses) that can be used as resource materials for future workshops and seminars (Appendix C); a workshop evaluation form (Appendix D); and materials on faculty for the workshop (Appendix E).

I. Background

During the decade of the 1990s, judges and court administrators across the United States were becoming increasingly aware of an upsurge in the number of self-represented litigants involved in court proceedings. The increase appeared to be particularly concentrated in family law cases. Beginning in 1996, AJS and JMI jointly conducted a study aimed at developing a base of knowledge about the general topic of pro se litigation and—equally important—providing guidance for judges and court managers in handling cases involving persons representing themselves. The final report of the study—entitled *Meeting the Challenge of Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Guide Book for Judges and Court Managers*¹—provided information on the types of cases most likely to involve pro se litigants, the range of persons (in terms of income and education) representing themselves, the reasons for the apparent growth in the number of self-represented litigants, and the views of judges and court managers concerning issues related to pro se litigation.

The pro se guidebook included a section that described ways in which courts have begun responding to the challenges posed by pro se litigants. While some courts had made no changes, others were experimenting with a variety of approaches aimed at making the courts more truly accessible to self-represented litigants, the great majority of whom were involved in some type of family law proceedings – including divorce, custody, child support, and domestic violence. Types of assistance provided included the following:

- *Forms and instructions*—making available the basic forms that an individual needs to complete in order to initiate or participate in a legal proceeding, along with instructions about how to complete the form, when and how to file it with the court, and how to serve it on another party if service is required.
- *Explanatory materials: brochures, pamphlets, and videos*—providing information about how particular types of cases are handled, in plain English and sometimes in other languages.
- *Staff assistance*—at a minimum, responding to requests for information made over the phone or at the counter; in some cases, establishing special units of staff attorneys and others to provide assistance to unrepresented persons on available legal remedies for specific problems, proper forms to complete, filing requirements, and court procedures.

¹ Jona Goldschmidt, Barry Mahoney, Harvey Solomon, and Joan Green, *Meeting the Challenge of Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Guidebook for Judges and Court Managers* (Chicago: American Judicature Society, 1998). Copies of this report have been distributed to all state law libraries and to all persons who attended the November 1999 National Conference on Pro Se Litigation. Additional copies can be obtained from the American Judicature Society.

- *Legal clinics*—conducting special workshops or seminars to educate pro se litigants about the court process and facilitate their access to forms and to pro bono or low cost legal services.
- *Pro bono and reduced cost legal services*—collaborative programs organized by courts and bar associations to provide individual guidance to pro se litigants, typically staffed by volunteers from the local bar.
- *Self-help centers*—comprehensive collections of forms, instructions, educational materials about court processes (e.g., brochures, videos), lists of attorneys available to work with pro se litigants on a task-by-task basis, and lists of mediators who can help resolve disputes; may also involve volunteer lawyers available to provide short consultation on specific issues at a reduced fee.

The *Meeting the Challenge* report set forth fifteen policy recommendations, including several that emphasized the importance of collaborative efforts to develop programs to assist self-represented litigants. The November 1999 National Conference on Pro Se Litigation was the first major educational initiative to follow up on these recommendations, and clearly had a major impact. Teams from 49 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Australia participated in the two and a half day-day conference. The team members heard from court and bar leaders and from other practitioners who had been instrumental in starting pro se assistance programs in their own jurisdictions, and also had an opportunity to begin developing plans for improving pro se litigation in their own states. The conference helped to stimulate action in a number of states.

The JMI workshop was designed from the outset to be a follow-up to the National Conference, offering a different kind of educational experience—one focused on the nuts and bolts of planning and implementing a pro se assistance program shaped to the circumstances of specific jurisdictions. It was anticipated that at least some of the participating teams would be from local jurisdictions, and would focus on developing programs in or linked to the trial court in the jurisdiction. The first meeting of the project’s advisory committee was held on the evening of the second day of the AJS national conference, at a time when advisory committee members could gauge the enthusiasm of the conference participants and also identify educational needs that could be met by a focused workshop designed for jurisdictional teams.

II. Planning for the Prototype Workshop

The basic plan for the prototype workshop was described in JMI’s original grant application. It provided for a workshop lasting two and a half days that would have five main types of sessions:

- *Plenary sessions*, covering basic concepts and conveying information and ideas relevant to all participants;

- *Concurrent sessions*, focusing on specific implementation issues.
- *Peer group sessions*, enabling practitioners who have similar positions in their justice systems to exchange ideas on topics that are of particular concern to them;
- *A site visit* to a court-based pro se assistance program, to enable participants to see an actual program in operation and ask questions of those involved in the program's planning and operations; and
- *Team sessions* that would take participants through a series of structured planning exercises focused on (1) problem identification and initial goal-setting; (2) identification of potential obstacles and of resources that can be used to help support the program (force field analysis); and (3) preparation of an action plan that includes clear goals, identification of tasks and timelines, and allocation of responsibilities to team members.

At the November meeting of the project's advisory committee, committee members endorsed the basic approach and also had a number of useful suggestions about composition of the teams that would participate in the workshop, criteria for selection of teams to participate, potential location and dates for the workshop, workshop faculty, and linkage of the workshop with state planning efforts and other initiatives that were underway or likely to be started as a result of the National Conference. Of particular note, advisory committee members recommended that, in selecting teams to participate, attention should be given to (a) the involvement of team members who could be instrumental in bringing about change in the jurisdiction; and (b) the team's linkages with any state plans that might be in existence or under development

In the months between November 1999 and May 2000, JMI staff implemented detailed plans for the workshop, following the general guidelines established by the advisory committee. Activities during this period included the following:

1. A decision was made to hold the workshop in Minneapolis, Minnesota, working with staff of the Hennepin County District Court. That court had already developed an active pro se assistance program and self-help center, working in collaboration with the Hennepin County Bar Association.
2. Arrangements were made to conduct the program at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Minneapolis. The hotel could provide a plenary session room and additional space for team and small group sessions, and is located near the courthouse to which the site visit would be made. The workshop dates were set for May 22-24, 2000 (a Monday to Wednesday period).
3. A program announcement and call for applications was prepared and distributed. The announcement and application forms were mailed to all persons who had

participated in the November 1999 National Conference, all state court administrators, and a number of court administrators in large urban trial courts. The announcement indicated that, in accordance with the original plans, up to eight teams would be selected to participate in the workshop. It sought applications from jurisdictions interested in working in a collaborative way to develop an operational program. Interested jurisdictions were encouraged to form teams that included a judge, court administrator, clerk, private bar member, representative of a legal services organizations, and community group representative.

4. With input from advisory committee members who reviewed the applications, teams from ten jurisdictions were selected to participate in the workshop. In expanding the number of teams from eight to ten, a deliberate decision was made to place primary emphasis on the workshop itself rather than on follow-up technical assistance. Four state teams—from the states of Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, and Minnesota—were selected. Teams from five local jurisdictions—Essex County, New Jersey; Genesee County, Michigan; Shelby County, Ohio; Waukesha County, Wisconsin; and the multi-county Tenth Judicial District of Wisconsin—were selected. The tenth jurisdiction selected to participate was a team from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
5. Faculty members for the workshop were selected, to be presenters and panelists at the plenary sessions and to serve as facilitators for the participating teams. The faculty included several persons who had also served as faculty for the National Conference plus others who had had active roles in the development of innovative pro se assistance programs in their own jurisdictions.
6. The agenda was drafted and, after successive reviews, finalized. The principal change from original plans was the addition of a concurrent session in which three or four teams would meet together on the second day of the workshop. This session would provide opportunity for teams from different jurisdictions to compare notes on their plans and progress. A copy of the agenda may be found in Appendix A of this report.
7. Resource materials for the workshop – including descriptions of operating pro se assistance programs and articles about key issues were assembled and organized in a resource notebook that would be distributed to workshop participants.
8. Special guidelines were drafted for use by facilitators and team members in conducting the team, peer group, and multi-team sessions. The guidelines are included in Appendix B of this report.
9. Arrangements were made for a faculty orientation and training session to be held at the hotel on the Sunday afternoon before the workshop was scheduled to begin. The faculty meeting was held as scheduled, and proved to be very helpful in

familiarizing all of the faculty members with the plans for the workshop and with the special skills and knowledge of their faculty colleagues.

III. Workshop Sessions

Workshop Design. As noted above, the basic plan for the workshop was to use plenary sessions to provide an overview of basic concepts and information that was thought to be relevant to all participants. In smaller sessions—the peer group session, the multi-team session, and four jurisdictional team sessions—there would be opportunity for participants to discuss the concepts and ideas with each other and with knowledgeable faculty.

JMI staff recognized that, at any educational program in a rapidly developing area, there are likely to be persons in attendance who have widely varying levels of knowledge about the subject. In the case of pro se assistance programs, some of the participants would be persons who had attended the November 1999 National Conference, and others would have had extensive familiarity with the subject through their work on program development in their own jurisdictions. Some participants would, however, be coming to the workshop with little or no current knowledge about issues related to pro se litigation or about the innovations that had been made in other jurisdictions.

The staff also recognized that the participating teams were likely to be in very different stages of their own plan development. Some of the teams had been working on plans for a pro se assistance program since the time of the National Conference, while others had barely started. It would not be possible to structure a program that met every participant's needs at every session, but the overall design sought to enable each team to make progress in developing practical plans for improving pro se litigation.

Plenary sessions would be a primary vehicle for covering the basics and also for introducing participants to ways in which some specific issues had been addressed in jurisdictions that had made significant progress in implementing effective pro se assistance programs. Topics covered at the plenary sessions included the following:

- An overview of how some jurisdictions had already re-thought and re-designed their response to unrepresented litigants.
- Ways to integrate modern computer technology into pro se assistance programs.
- Experiences of several jurisdictions in establishing community linkages and acquiring resources to help support a pro se program.
- Handling caseload management issues, by integrating pro se assistance programs into on-going operations.

In addition to the plenary sessions, information and ideas would be provided through concurrent sessions, peer group sessions, and the site visit to the Hennepin County District Court, which was scheduled for the second afternoon. At the court, workshop participants would have an opportunity to see the video used in Hennepin County to give pro se litigants a sense of how the court system works and of the resources available; pick up brochures; see how particular types of cases are handled by special units that assist pro se litigants in handling some types of family law matters; and talk directly with practitioners who had been involved in planning the program and who were dealing with these matters on a day-to-day basis.

The core of the workshop would be the team sessions—four in all—at which each of the participating teams would work through a series of exercises aimed at helping them develop an action plan for implementing a pro se assistance program in their own jurisdictions. The guidelines developed for use of facilitators and team members (see Appendix B) were intended to be exactly that—general guides that could help structure discussions, but not straight-jackets that would inhibit progress. The team sessions were designed to engage all of the team members, raise awareness of other potential resources, and lead to a clear plan that could guide post-workshop activities

The design of the workshop appears to have worked well. By the end of the workshop, all of the participating teams had developed an action plan. The evaluation results indicate that participants found the workshop very valuable in helping them make progress toward having effective pro se assistance programs. The site visit to the court proved to be a particular highlight. Taking place on the second afternoon, it seems to have provided an opportunity for participants to see in action many of the ideas they had heard discussed in the preceding day and a half. It clearly helped catalyze development of the action plans that were put together on the third morning of the workshop.

Evaluation. The overall evaluation of the workshop was very positive. Of the 37 respondents who completed the JMI evaluation form (See Appendix D), 27 rated the program as “Excellent” and the other 10 rated it as “Good.” Using a five-point scale (5=excellent; 1=poor), the tour of the pro se assistance program at the Hennepin County District Court received a rating of 4.6 and the team session involving development of an action plan was rated at 4.7. In open-ended comments, a number of the participants noted that the configuration of the plenary session room was a problem and that the workshop days were long. (The faculty and JMI staff shared these views. For future workshops, JMI would seek to get a better plenary session room and would shorten the agenda.) Most of the open-ended comments were highly complimentary about the workshop. For example:

- “I don’t believe we would have known where to start without this program.”
- “The speakers were all very knowledgeable and articulate.”
- “Our facilitator was very helpful; offered valuable suggestions.”

- “Excellent facilitation in all sessions.”
- “The entire program was an invaluable experience.”
- “It was well thought out as well as organized. A lot of information to digest in a short time.”

A separate evaluation conducted by an independent evaluator (Richelle Uecker) produced evaluation ratings that are consistent with the JMI evaluation, with especially high ratings for the court tour, the materials provided to participants, the presenters and facilitators, and the workshop format and time schedule. Follow-up telephone interviews conducted by Ms. Uecker with representatives of five of the teams that participated in the workshop found that all five felt that the workshop had “kick-started” their programs, and that the action plans developed at the workshop provided an invaluable tool once they returned to their home jurisdictions.

IV. Follow-up Activities

In July 2000, representatives of six organizations involved in the development of pro se assistance programs—SJI, OSI, JMI, AJS, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC)—met to discuss possible next steps in further development of pro se assistance initiatives. A decision was made at this time to conduct a conference in October 2000, for persons from states in which there appeared to be significant progress made already. The conference would focus on ways to increase collaboration between and among the courts, the bar, legal services organizations, and community groups interested in pro se assistance programs, with particular attention to linking court-based pro se initiatives with initiatives being undertaken by LSC-funded legal services programs.

JMI participated actively in the planning and presentation of the October 2000 conference, which was held in New Orleans. For practical purposes, participation in the conference planning and in the conference itself—plus support for travel to the conference by judges and court staff members who attended the conference--constituted JMI’s principal technical assistance activity following the May 2000 workshop. Key members of several of the teams that had participated in the May 2000 workshop were invited to attend the New Orleans conference.

The New Orleans conference emphasized the benefits of collaboration, focusing on strategies for forging effective collaboration to address the legal and social problems that impede access to justice. As key elements of program development – including planning processes, utilization of technology, funding, and evaluation – were discussed, the concepts of partnership and collaboration were recurring themes.

V. Implementing the Action Plans

In the period since the May 2000 workshop, considerable progress has been made by most of the teams that participated in the workshop. The action plans served as a starting point, but in some jurisdictions the actual accomplishments have already outstripped what was hoped for in May 1999. The following is a brief summary of accomplishments as of September 2001:

In Hawaii, the Ho'okele Court Navigation Project has opened in two Honolulu courthouses and is moving from "pilot project" status to being an integral component of ongoing operations. Both the Family Court Service Center and the Civil Division Service Center provide brochures, self-help packets that contain forms and instructions, use of computers to learn about the status of the individual's case, and typewriters for completing forms. Service Center staff members provide explanation of the forms and procedures when necessary. Additionally, Court Concierge Desks have been established in both courthouses, staffed by volunteers who will help the litigant identify the specific program that can provide needed assistance and refer him or her to the appropriate program or agency. Internet users can obtain information, forms, and instructions from a web site.

In Delaware, two Resource Centers have been opened to assist litigants in Family Court cases. The Resource Centers each have a Triage Unit that assesses the level of assistance needed by litigants, and an Intake Unit that provides assistance for domestic violence cases and for litigants in other cases who need extensive assistance. Additionally, the Resource Centers provide court forms and instructions, brochures and pamphlets that describe court processes and provide information about social services agencies and community-based services, and a family court attorney roster. The Delaware Family Court also has a web site that provides information about the Court and contains information about starting and participating in a Family Court case.

In Indiana, the Supreme Court has worked with the Bar to strengthen pro bono services. An Indiana Pro Bono Commission has been formed, district committees have been established, and the Legal Services Organization of Indiana is working with the Commission and the district committees to help coordinate the referral of clients in need of pro bono legal services. The Supreme Court has also laid the groundwork for a statewide pro se assistance network to provide basic resources for persons who choose to represent themselves. The Indiana Self-Service Legal Center web-site contains advice about what types of disputes individuals can resolve themselves; forms needed for some types of cases, along with instructions for completing them; listings of Indiana attorneys and mediators; links to websites of Indiana trial courts; and a list of frequently asked questions with answers.

At the local level in Indiana, pilot projects linked to the statewide initiative are underway in several counties. In Hendricks County, for example, the collaborative efforts of several judges (one of whom, Judge David Coleman, participated in both the Minneapolis workshop and the New Orleans conference), the County Clerk, and the

Prosecutor have led to establishment of the Hendricks County Court Self Help Center. The Center, located on the first floor of the county courthouse, will contain forms, instructions, information, and law books.

In Waukesha County, Wisconsin, the team that attended the workshop has expanded to become a broad-based 36-member partnership with strong community ties. With support from a foundation grant and the County, a project coordinator has been hired, a web site is being set up, and space for a pro se self help center has been obtained adjacent to the Clerk's office. Law student volunteers will be available to assist litigants in understanding court processes and providing basic information. The Center is slated to open early in 2002.

In the 13-county Tenth Judicial District of Wisconsin, training for Clerk's office staff – aimed at providing guidance to deputy clerks on how to respond to litigants' inquiries -- was conducted during the summer of 2000. The training, led by Court Administrator Gregg Moore, used materials developed by John Greacen and the Michigan Judicial Institute. Work has also gone forward on simplifying forms and providing clear instructions, with help provided by the legal services organization that serves rural northwest Wisconsin.

In Genesee County, Michigan, a Legal Information Center opened in the main courthouse in July 2001. It consists of a Receptionist's Desk staffed by two volunteers who will provide maps, directions, and basic information regarding court proceedings. Phase Two of the projects, now in the planning stage and scheduled to start in January 2002, will involve an office and seating area for pro se litigants, and staffing by paralegals. The office will provide information about the legal process, including preprinted forms and instructions for use in proceedings where individuals commonly represent themselves (e.g., motions to modify child support or custody). Pamphlets and instructions will be provided to deal with the most frequently asked questions, and instructional videos will be prepared to help guide unrepresented litigants. The staff person will assist in providing information about specific cases. Individual litigants will be encouraged to seek legal assistance from the Genesee County Bar Association and/or the Legal Services of Eastern Michigan.

In Shelby County, Ohio, a pro bono legal services program has been set up, focusing on pro se litigants in divorce proceedings where children are involved. Referrals to the program are made through Western Ohio Legal Services, the legal services organization that serves a 17-county region. The Greater Dayton Volunteer Legal Services Program provides a paralegal who helps litigants complete the necessary forms. A Shelby County attorney then meets with the litigants and handles the filing of papers and in-court proceedings.

In Newark, New Jersey, the Family Division of the Essex County Superior Court has established a Family Information and Community Relations Center, staffed by a receptionist and (on a part time basis) a law student intern who can help litigants understand court forms and filing procedures. The Center has a collection of brochures

and other informational materials on domestic violence, parent education, drug abuse prevention, community resources, health services, bar association services, and other topics. Outreach efforts have been made to let community groups know about the Center and invite them to refer people to it.

In Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth's first pro se center is scheduled to open in October 2001 in the Carolina Region near San Juan. It will focus on family law issues providing forms, instructions and an informational video for litigants. A project director has been designated, and arrangements have been made for law student interns to assist pro se litigants in understanding forms and procedures.

VI. Future Education and Training

The prototype JMI workshop was clearly successful in helping to catalyze action on the development of pro se assistance (and, in some cases, pro bono representation) programs in the participating jurisdictions. As a prototype, it provides a model for similar programs – designed for teams involving key representation of different stakeholder groups – that can be conducted at the national, regional, or single state level.

Depending on the stage of development of pro se assistance efforts in the jurisdictions that would participate in such a workshop, it may be desirable for workshop planners to place greater emphasis on some of the “nuts and bolts” of implementing a pro se assistance program. The prototype workshop covered some of these topics, but others are suggested in the report of the project evaluator, Chelle Uecker. Ms. Uecker identified seven issues that were encountered by the participating teams as they went through the planning and initial implementation stages, all of which could usefully be addressed at future workshops or through technical assistance. They are:

- Operational planning of resource centers, including approaches to funding, design of facilities, staffing, and equipment
- Design and implementation of web access to forms for self-represented litigants
- Training of program staff
- Guidelines for dealing with the politics of developing programs – i.e., how to deals with judges, the bar, legislators, and the press
- Evaluation/performance measurement
- Educating the public about the availability of pro se resource programs
- How to promote judicial leadership of pro se assistance programs

All or some of these topics can be incorporated into the design of a workshop similar to the Minneapolis prototype. For some topics, however, direct on-site technical assistance (perhaps including a seminar or workshop for practitioners in the jurisdiction) may be more valuable than a workshop designed for teams from different jurisdictions.

The curriculum materials in the appendices can be adapted for use by state judicial branch educators, national organizations that provide judicial branch education and training, and bar and legal services groups. The basic framework of the programs – built around a sequence of team sessions – is sound, and can be used effectively even as issues change and new resources become available. However, because of the rapid pace at which this field is developing, the content of sessions involving the presentation of information (for example, about services provided or the utilization of computer technology) will have to be updated regularly.

The prototype workshop was “resource-intensive”, involving ten faculty members. Most of the faculty members served in multiple roles including making plenary session presentations, leading peer group sessions, and facilitating team sessions. Having a faculty of this size also gave participants an opportunity to learn how different types of pro se assistance programs had been developed in different states, tailored to the needs of specific jurisdictions. Optimally, the workshop design would (like the prototype) provide for a faculty that could describe different approaches and would enable each participating team to have a facilitator. In our experience, good facilitation of team sessions can be very valuable in focusing team members on key (and sometimes difficult) issues and in helping to forge consensus on meaningful goals and a viable action plan. It would, however, be feasible to conduct a similar workshop with a smaller faculty, thus saving some of the costs incurred in conducting the prototype workshop.

For funding agencies and others interested in encouraging system changes that will increase access to justice, education should be a continuing priority. Programs such as the prototype workshop provide opportunity for state and local-level practitioners to focus on key policy issues, initiate new collaborative projects, and develop mutual support networks. This workshop – together with the November 1999 National Conference and the October 2000 New Orleans Conference – clearly helped foster such collaboration and networking. The results can already be seen in the projects developed and the increased access to justice now available to persons who represent themselves or receive pro bono legal assistance.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP AGENDAS

This appendix contains two model agendas that can be used to plan and conduct a workshop on *Developing Effective Pro Se Assistance Programs* for jurisdictional teams: (1) the agenda used for the prototype workshop conducted by JMI in Minneapolis in May 2000; and (2) an agenda for a two-day workshop that could be presented on a single-state or regional basis. The May 2000 agenda was clearly effective in catalyzing action on the part of participating teams. The shorter (two-day) agenda has not yet been used for an actual workshop, but reflects our best judgment as to how to condense the original program into a two-day period. In many states, it is more feasible to conduct a two-day program than a longer one.

It is important to emphasize that both agendas are designed for *teams* from state and/or local jurisdictions. For a pro se assistance program to succeed, it will be important to have the active involvement of a range of collaborating institutions and organizations involved in the team planning process. Categories of persons who are logical team members include, at a minimum, judges, clerk's office staff, and representatives of the organized bar. Legal services organizations may be part of the organized bar, and in any event should certainly be included in any invitation process, especially in light of the publicly expressed commitment of the Legal Services Corporation to development of effective pro se assistance programs. Representatives of community groups whose interests are affected by court operations are also logical planning team members.

The two-day agenda included in this appendix (Appendix A.2) differs from the May 2000 workshop agenda in four main ways: (1) building on experience gained at the October 2000 New Orleans Conference on *Opportunities for Collaboration*, it places greater stress on the importance of collaboration and how to make collaboration work effectively in this area; (2) it shortens the time allowed for some sessions, especially the opening introductions and expectations session; (3) it eliminates a plenary session on caseload management; and (4) it drops the site visit to an operating program.

The decision to drop the site visit is a difficult one. That module was clearly a highlight of the May 2000 workshop, but much of what was gained through the site visit (including the opportunity to speak with those involved in the planning and operation of a pro se assistance program) can be achieved by (a) including program practitioners in the workshop faculty; and (b) obtaining, and making available for viewing, some examples of videos that describe the program and provide instructions to litigants on how to deal with particular legal issues.

In considering possible adoption of either of the model agendas, persons planning a workshop in this area should regard them simply as *models*. Each outlines a logical and coherent workshop program, but the specific modules and time sequences can be re-arranged to meet the needs of participants and the resources available. The most critical ingredient for workshop success will be knowledgeable and experienced faculty.

Appendix A.1

**DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE PRO SE LITIGATION
PROGRAMS**

**A Workshop Presented by The Justice Management Institute
with Funding from The State Justice Institute and The Open**

Society Institute

May 22 - 24, 2000

**Hyatt Regency Hotel
Minneapolis, Minnesota**

AGENDA

MONDAY, 22 MAY 00

7:30 - 8:30 am	Registration (<i>Greenway Balcony</i>)
8:00 - 8:30 am	Continental Breakfast (<i>Greenway Balcony</i>)
8:30 - 8:50 am	Welcome and Introductions (<i>Mirage</i>) Overview of the Purposes and Format of the Workshop
	Barry Mahoney, The Justice Management Institute Cheryl Reynolds, The State Justice Institute
8:50 - 9:45 am	Introduction of Participant Teams and Identification of Workshop Expectations
9:45 - 10:30 am	Plenary Panel: Rethinking and Redesigning the Court's Response to Unrepresented Litigants Moderator: Barry Mahoney Panelists: Judge Rebecca Albrecht, Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County Carmen Ramirez, Ventura County Superior Court Kate Sampson, American Judicature Society Richard Zorza
10:30 - 10:45 am	BREAK

10:45 - 11:45 am	<p>Team Session #1: Reaching Consensus on the Team's Priority Areas for the Workshop Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Michigan (<i>Mirage</i>) Minnesota (<i>Lake Harriet, 5th Floor</i>) Eau Claire and Waukesha, WI (<i>Lake Calhoun, 5th Floor</i>) Ohio and Puerto Rico (<i>Prior Lake, 5th Floor</i>) New Jersey (<i>Cedar Lake, 5th Floor</i>)</p>
11:45 - 1:15 pm	LUNCH (on your own)
1:15 - 2:15 pm	<p>Concurrent Sessions on Building Support for Programs among:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Judges Judge Rebecca Albrecht and Kate Sampson (<i>Mirage</i>) 2) Court Staff Linda Ridge and Susan Ledray (<i>Cedar Lake</i>) 3) The Bar Barry Mahoney and Harvey Solomon (<i>Lake Harriet</i>) 4) Other Stakeholder Groups Richard Zorza and Carmen Ramirez (<i>Lake Calhoun</i>)
2:15 - 3:15 pm	Team Session #2: Identifying Key Players/ Advocates and Building Support
3:15 - 3:30 pm	BREAK
3:30 - 4:15 pm	<p>Plenary: Integrating Technology into Assistance Programs Richard Zorza</p>
4:15 - 5:00 pm	<p>Peer Group Sessions Judges: Judge Rebecca Albrecht (<i>Mirage</i>) Court Administrators: Mary Durkin and Susan Ledray (<i>Mirage</i>) Clerk's Office Staff: Linda Ridge (<i>Cedar Lake</i>) Pro Se Assistance Program Staff: Carmen Ramirez (<i>Lake Harriet</i>) Private Bar: Harvey Solomon and Kate Sampson (<i>Lake Calhoun</i>) Legal Services: Richard Zorza (<i>Prior Lake</i>) Community Representatives: Julie Hodges and Barry Mahoney (<i>Mirage</i>)</p>
5:00 - 5:30 pm	Wrap-Up and Overview of Tuesday Agenda
5:30 - 6:00 pm	Faculty Meeting

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 00

8:00 - 8:30 am	Continental Breakfast
8:30 - 9:30 am	Plenary Panel: Establishing Community Linkages and Acquiring Resources and Funding Judge Rebecca Albrecht Carmen Ramirez Linda Ridge
9:30 - 10:15 am	Multi-Team Session: Progress Report and Opportunity for Feedback from Other Teams and Faculty <i>Delaware, New Jersey, Puerto Rico (Cedar Lake)</i> <i>Eau Claire, WI, Hawaii, Indiana, Minnesota (Mirage)</i> <i>Michigan, Ohio, Waukesha, WI (Lake Harriet)</i>
10:15 - 10:30 am	BREAK
10:30 - 11:15 am	Caseflow Management Issues: Making Programs Blend with Ongoing Operations Barry Mahoney
11:15 - 12:15 pm	Team Session #3: Analysis of Factors Affecting Change
12:15 - 1:30 pm	LUNCH (on your own)
1:30 - 2:00 pm	Walk/Ride to Hennepin County Court
2:00 - 3:45 pm	Tour of Pro Se Assistance Programs
3:45 - 4:30 pm	Debrief Tour: Q&A w/Hennepin County Court Personnel
4:30 - 5:00 pm	Return to Hotel
5:00 - 5:30 pm	Faculty Meeting

WEDNESDAY, 24 MAY 00

8:00 - 8:30 am	Continental Breakfast
8:30 – 9:30 am	Open Forum with Faculty: Outstanding Issues and Obstacles
9:30 – 10:30 am	Team Session #4: Action Plan Development
10:30 - 10:45 am	BREAK
10:45 - 11:45 am	Plenary: Presentation of Action Plans
11:45 – 12:15 pm	Leadership and Teamwork in the Process of Change Barry Mahoney
12:15 - 12:30 pm	Concluding Session: Evaluation and Closing Remarks

Appendix A.2

Agenda for a 2-Day Single State or Regional Workshop for Jurisdictional Teams on *Developing Effective Pro Se Assistance Programs*

Day 1

- 8:30 – 8:45 Welcome; Overview of the Workshop
- 8:45 – 9:15 Introduction of Participating Teams and Faculty; Expectations
- 9:15 – 10:00 Plenary: Re-thinking and Re-designing Court and Bar Responses to Unrepresented Litigants
- 10:00 – 10:15 BREAK
- 10:15 – 11:15 Team Session #1: Reaching Consensus on the Team’s Priority Areas
- 11:15 – 12:15 Concurrent Sessions: Building Support Among:
- Judges
 - Court Staff
 - The Bar (including Legal Services organizations)
 - Other stakeholder groups
- 12:15 – 1:15 LUNCH
- 1:15 – 2:00 Plenary: Collaboration in Pro Se Program Development—Opportunities and Issues
- 2:00 – 3:00 Team Session #2: Identifying Key Players, Advocates and Community Partners
- 3:00 – 3:15 BREAK
- 3:15 – 4:00 Plenary: Integrating Technology into Pro Se Assistance Programs
- 4:00 – 5:00 Peer Group Sessions

Day 2

- 8:30 – 9:15 Plenary: Community Linkages and Funding Opportunities
- 9:15 – 10:15 Team Session #3: Analysis of Factors Affecting Change
- 10:15 – 10:30 BREAK
- 10:30 – 11:45 Multi-Team Session
- 11:45 – 1:00 LUNCH, with opportunity to view videos from operating pro se programs
- 1:00 – 1:45 Plenary [or concurrent sessions]: Open Forum with Faculty to Discuss Outstanding Issues, Implementation Obstacles, and Potential Strategies
- 1:45 – 3:00 Team Session #4: Action Plan Development
- 3:00 – 3:15 BREAK
- 3:15 – 4:00 Plenary: Presentation of Action Plans
- 4:00 – 4:15 Concluding Session; Workshop Evaluation

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES FOR TEAM AND SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

This appendix contains copies of the guidelines used to conduct team and small group sessions at JMI's May 2000 workshop on *Developing Effective Pro Se Assistance Programs*. The guidelines for the four jurisdictional team sessions are presented as a group, followed by guidelines for (a) a peer group session; and (b) a multi-team session. Note that this order is not the same as the order in which the sessions were conducted at the workshop.

In conducting these sessions, it is very helpful to have a faculty facilitator. Faculty members assigned to facilitate these sessions should (a) be knowledgeable about the issues involved in developing pro se assistance programs; and (b) have basic training in facilitation skills. The guidelines are meant to guide, not to force participants to address every question or point in a guideline (Often, there simply will not be enough time to cover every point.) Experience facilitators may occasionally depart from the guidelines, but should generally seek to help the team produce the main product(s) called for by the guideline.

Team Session #1: Reaching Consensus on the Team's Priority Areas

TIME: Monday, 22 May 2000, 10:45 – 11:30 AM

PURPOSE: To provide an opportunity for teams to identify and begin work on the top priority areas they wish to concentrate on during this workshop and in post-workshop implementation efforts. Your efforts on this assignment should serve as a point of departure for the work of your team during the remainder of this workshop and once you return home.

PROCESS:

1. Identify the top priority programmatic area(s) that you wish to concentrate on during this workshop. Consider what specific goals and objectives you would like to see adopted in order to improve/enhance the quality and delivery of pro se assistance.
2. In order to meet these goals and objectives and make a pro se assistance program work, what changes would have to be made to the current practices and procedures in your court?
3. What policies, traditions, ways of doing business would need to be implemented to accommodate the new or enhanced program?
- 4.. What should be done first?

PRODUCTS: A designation of top priority area(s) for attention, a list of the court's goals and objectives, and a preliminary outline for change.

Team Session #2: Identifying Key Players, Advocates and Community Partners

TIME: Monday, 22 May 2000, 2:15 – 3:15 PM

PURPOSE: To begin the process of identifying the financial, political, material and informational resources needed for your program and ways of accessing and acquiring them.

PROCESS AND PRODUCT: The team should consider and list answers to the following questions:

- (1) What additional team members and stakeholders are critical to the successful planning and implementation of your program?
- (2) What role can legal services play in the planning and implementation of your program?
- (3) What role might the community play in the planning, operation or evaluation of your program. Why might you want to engage the community?
- (4) Think broadly about the organizations, institutions, businesses, and other entities in your community. Inventory what each might contribute toward your program.
- (5) What are some methods for connecting with legal services and the community and recruiting partners?
- (6) How do you nurture and maintain partnerships over time?
- (7) What individuals and organizations can serve as the most effective advocates for the program?

Team Session #3: Analysis of Factors Affecting Change

TIME: Tuesday, 23 May 2000, 11:15 AM – 12:15 PM

PURPOSE: Successful change requires both the effective leadership of the court and the early and continuing involvement of representatives of the Bar and of all the agencies that affect and are affected by the existing system. It is anticipated that, as part of the follow-up to this workshop, judges, clerks' office staff, Bar, legal services and other agency representatives in each jurisdiction will continue to work as a team, perhaps forming a standing committee or work group. One of the first responsibilities of such a group is analysis of the forces operating in the environment which can either help or hinder change efforts. The purpose of this assignment is to begin the process of analyzing those forces and taking initial steps toward organization of the team.

PROCESS:

1. Use the form on the following page to identify factors such as rules, facilities, people, traditions, attitudes, events, etc. that may help or hinder your efforts to undertake change and achieve the goal(s) you have identified for your system. Estimate the relative strength of each factor using the scale at the bottom of the form.

2. Examine the analysis of facilitating and hindering factors. Does it suggest any specific agencies or individuals who should be included on the team? If so, identify them. Develop a preliminary list of members.

PRODUCT: A list of (a) your team's three to five strongest facilitating and hindering factors; and (b) plans for composition of the team upon returning to your jurisdiction.

Team Session #4: Developing an Action Plan

TIME: Wednesday, 24 May 2000, 9:30 - 10:30 AM

PURPOSE: This assignment is intended to give your team an initial start on the planning process that will continue after you return home.

PROCESS: The key to this assignment is completion of the Project Planning Document. This document is an important tool for assuring a successful project. When completed in detail, it will provide a comprehensive guide for the planning and implementation activities necessary to implement change. The goals and plans you developed earlier in the workshop, the list of helping and hindering factors you completed yesterday and this document will serve as the basis for discussion when you return home.

In addition to forcing you to think through all the necessary steps for planning and implementing, the process of completing the document should also stimulate identification of the key agencies and individuals who should be involved in these activities. Further, it requires you to make a realistic assessment of the time required to complete each task and the overall project. While this Project Planning Document may change as a result of further deliberations when you return home, your work on it today will be critical to your success.

Working as a court team, fill out the form as described below. Be sure one of the tasks listed in this Planning Document is the first meeting of the team, with a tentative date and the names of any additional team members that need to be contacted.

1. **Major Tasks and Subtasks:** In this box, list each action step associated with planning and implementation. Ignore Task Number for the moment. Fill it in last; that will allow you to change the order of the tasks if necessary. In order to get to the necessary level of detail, list subtasks under each major task heading as necessary. For example, the major task may be “Convene first team meeting” and subtasks under that might be “Set up meeting with the Presiding Judge”, “Meet with the Presiding Judge to select additional team members”, “Contact potential members re: willingness”, “Select meeting date”, “Copy materials from workshop”, etc.
2. **Responsible Party:** Limit each task to one and only one responsible party, the person who either will personally complete the task or be responsible for seeing that it is done within the specified time.

3. **Need to Involve:** Enter here the names or position titles of those who must be (a) consulted or (b) advised and (c) those who have information you need in order to complete the task or subtask.
4. **Time to Complete:** Realistically assess the number of *working days* needed to complete each task or subtask. Build in time for unexpected delays!
5. **Start Date:** Enter the date you plan to start each task or subtask here.
6. **End Date:** Based on your proposed start date and the estimated time to complete the task or subtask, enter the date you plan to complete the task or subtask here.

PRODUCTS: The main product will be your team's own completed Project Planning Document. Once you have completed it, you should also prepare a 1-2 page summary - using a flip chart or overhead transparencies - of the following:

- Main Goal(s)
- Principal Tasks
- First 5 Steps (to be completed in the next 3-6 weeks)

Designate a spokesperson to present the summary at the plenary session following the break.

Project Planning Document

Main Goal(s): _____

TASK NO.	MAJOR TASKS AND SUBTASKS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	NEED TO INVOLVE	TIME TO COMPLETE	START DATE	END DATE

APPENDIX C
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WEB SITES
Articles and Monographs

GOLDSCHMIDT, Jona, *How Are Courts Handling Pro Se Litigants?* 82 JUDICATURE, No. 1 (July-August 1998) 13.

GOLDSCHMIDT, Jona, Barry Mahoney, Harvey Solomon, and Joan Green, *Meeting the Challenge of Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Guidebook for Judges and Court Managers* (Chicago: American Judicature Society, 1998).

GREACEN, John M., *Legal Information v. Legal Advice: Developments During the Last Five Years*, 84 JUDICATURE No. 1 (January-February 2001) 198.

GREACEN, John M. *No Legal Advice From Court Personnel: What Does That Mean?* 34 THE JUDGES' JOURNAL, No. 1 (Winter, 1995) 10.

KIM, Helen B., *Legal Education for the Pro Se Litigant: A Step Toward a Meaningful Right to Be Heard*, 96 YALE L.J. 1641 (1987).

MICHIGAN JUDICIAL INSTITUTE, *Legal Advice v. Access to the Courts: Do You Know the Difference* (Lansing: MICHIGAN JUDICIAL INSTITUTE, 1997) [Materials Used in Training Program for Court Clerks].

MINNESOTA CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUDGES, *Report on the Treatment of Litigants and Pro Se Litigation* (April 1996).

MOSTEN, Forrest, *Coaching the Pro Se Litigant: Unbundling Services of the Family Lawyer*, COMPLEAT LAWYER, Winter, 1996.

RIDGE, Linda K., *The Courthouse Facilitation Program: King County's Experience*, 10 THE COURT MANAGER No. 3 (Summer 1995).

SAMPSON, Kathleen, et al., *A National Conference on Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Update* (Chicago: American Judicatures Society, April 2001).

ZORZA, Richard., *Designing, from the Ground Up, A Self-Help Centered Court, One in Which the Litigant Without a Lawyer is the Norm* (Zorza Associates, 2001 [forthcoming]).

Web Sites

<http://www.co.hennepin.mn.us/courts/selfhelp>

<http://www.courts.state.de.us/family>

<http://www.state.hi.us/jud/HomeNav.html>

<http://www.state.in.us/judiciary/selfservice>

<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/self-help>

<http://www.ajs.org> - link to pro se

<http://www.ncsc.dni.us/KMO/Topics/ProSe/Resources>

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

[NOTE: This form is based on the workshop evaluation form used for JMI's May 2000 workshop on *Developing Effective Pro Se Litigation Programs*.]

Your feedback is extremely important in planning future workshops. Please use the *comments* line at the end of each section to make suggestions about specific components of the workshop. We appreciate your input.

PART I – PLENARY SESSIONS AND TEAM/GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Using a scale of 1 = "POOR" to 5 = "EXCELLENT," please rate the effectiveness of each presentation or facilitated discussion. Circle ONE rating for each statement.

Rethinking and Redesigning the Court's Response to Unrepresented Litigants:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1. | Usefulness of content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | 2. | Effectiveness of delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | 3. | Time allotted for subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | 4. | Comments: | _____ | | | | |

Team Session #1- Reaching Consensus on the Teams Priority Areas for the Workshop:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1. | Usefulness of content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | 2. | Effectiveness of format | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | 3. | Time allotted for subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | 4. | Comments: | _____ | | | | |

Laying the Groundwork for Change:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1. | Usefulness of content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | 2. | Effectiveness of delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | 3. | Time allotted for subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | 4. | Comments: | _____ | | | | |

Concurrent Sessions on Building Support for Programs among:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1. | Usefulness of content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | 2. | Effectiveness of delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | 3. | Time allotted for subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | 4. | Comments: | _____ | | | | |

Team Session #2-Identifying Key Players/Advocates and Building Support:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1. | Usefulness of content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | 2. | Effectiveness of format | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | 3. | Time allotted for subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | 4. | Comments: | _____ | | | | |

Integrating Technology into Assistance Programs:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Peer Group Sessions:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Establishing Community Linkages and Acquiring Resources and Funding:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Multi-Team Session:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of format	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Caseflow Management Issues: Making Programs Blend with Ongoing Operations:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Team Session #3: Analysis of Factors Affecting Change:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of format	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Tour of Pro Se Assistance Program in Hennepin County:

1.	1.	Usefulness of activity	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of presentation	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Program Evaluation:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

Team Session #4: Action Plan Development:

1.	1.	Usefulness of content	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	Effectiveness of delivery	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	Time allotted for subject	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	Comments: _____					

PART II - OVERALL WORKSHOP

The following statements refer to the workshop as a whole. Read each statement and circle the ONE response that best expresses your opinion.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1.	1.	The content was relevant to my work	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	The sophistication of the content was appropriate for me	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	The physical environment was conducive to my learning	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	The expectations were clearly described	1	2	3	4	5
5.	5.	My personal objectives were achieved	1	2	3	4	5

How would you rate this meeting overall?

Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____

PART III - FACILITIES AND LOGISTICS

The following statements refer to the facilities and logistics of the workshop as a whole. Read each statement and circle the ONE response that best expresses your opinion about that statement.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1.	1.	The on-site registration process was handled appropriately	1	2	3	4	5
2.	2.	The meeting facilities were adequate	1	2	3	4	5
3.	3.	The notebook materials were helpful	1	2	3	4	5
4.	4.	The overnight lodging accommodations were adequate	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Please answer the following questions in the space provided:

1. 1. What part of the workshop did you like best?

2. 2. What part of the workshop did you like least?

3. 3. How would you suggest we could improve future meetings?

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX E

WORKSHOP FACULTY

The quality of the workshop faculty is a critical element in the success of any educational program. For the May 2000 workshop, JMI was fortunate to have the services of practitioners and consultants who are knowledgeable about pro se litigation issues and experienced in two key aspects of adult education: plenary session presentation and small group facilitation. Several members of the faculty had been actively involved in development of pro se programs in their own jurisdictions.

If resources permit, we strongly recommend that workshop planners seek to have a faculty facilitator for each participating team. Optimally, every faculty member will have a mix of presentation and facilitation skills. Perhaps most important, however, faculty members should have an understanding of pro se litigation issues and a firm commitment to collaborative planning and program implementation. As pro se litigation programs become operational in an increasing number of jurisdictions, the goal of the pool of potential faculty members become larger.

It will be helpful if the workshop faculty consists of persons who have different institutional roles. Thus, for example, the JMI faculty for the prototype workshop included a judge, a court administrator, and a pro se assistance program director who had been a legal services attorney and was a former president of the local bar association. It also included expert consultants (one of whom, Richard Zorza, has particular expertise in the use of technology for pro se assistance) and experienced staff members of national organizations. The following bio-sketches of faculty members for the prototype workshop illustrate the range of skills and experience called upon for that workshop.

Hon. Rebecca A. Albrecht is a Judge of the Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County (greater Phoenix area). She has served in all of the Court's departments, and was the Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Department at the time the Court initiated its innovative Self-Help Program for unrepresented litigants. Judge Albrecht has also been an active member of the Maricopa County Bar Association, having served as its President in 1990-91.

Mary Durkin is currently a Senior Staff Associate with the Court Services Division of the National Center for State Courts. At the the time of the May 2000 prototype workshop, she was a member of the staff of the Justice Management Institute and was the project director for the JMI project on *Developing Effective Pro Se Assistance Programs*.

Julie Hodges is now a Program Analyst with the Colorado Judicial Department. At the time of the prototype meeting, she was a Staff Associate at JMI.

Susan Ledray is the Pro Se Coordinator for the Fourth Judicial District of Minnesota (Hennepin County). The Court hosted a site visit for its pro se assistance program for participants in the prototype workshop.

Barry Mahoney is President of the Justice Management Institute (JMI), and is responsible for overall management and program development for JMI. He is a co-author of *Meeting the Challenge of Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Guidebook for Judges and Court Managers*, has written widely on justice system issues, and has been a faculty member for many workshops and conferences. He served as project director of JMI's project on *Developing Effective Pro Se Assistance Programs* from September 2000 to its conclusion in October 2001, and is the author of this report.

Carmen Ramirez is an attorney who serves as the coordinator for the Ventura County Superior Court's Self-Help Legal Access Center located in the predominantly Spanish-speaking La Colonia area of Oxnard, California. She is also one of two attorneys who staff the Ventura Superior Court's Mobile Self-Help Unit, which travels to five communities in outlying areas of Ventura County on a regular basis. Before joining the staff of this Court, Ms. Ramirez spent 23 years working in legal services programs, sixteen of them as Executive Director of Channel Counties Legal Services Association. She has been active in numerous civic organizations and was President of the Ventura County Bar Association in 1998.

Linda K. Ridge is Director of the Regional Justice Center of the King County Superior Court in Kent, Washington. She was integrally involved in planning and implementation of the pro se assistance program developed for litigants in domestic relations cases in King County.

Kate Sampson is a Senior Program Associate with the American Judicature Society. She served as the project director for the National Conference on Pro Se Litigation that was conducted by AJS in Scottsdale, Arizona, in November 1999.

Harvey E. Solomon is a Senior Consultant and member of the Board of Directors of the Justice Management Institute (JMI). He was the Executive Director of the Institute for Court Management (ICM) from 1974 to 1992, where he had a leading role in the development of court management education across the United States. He is the author of a number of articles on court administration and court management education, and was a co-author on *Meeting the Challenges of Pro Se Litigation: A Report and Guidebook for Judges and Court Managers*.

Richard Zorza is an independent consultant who has worked for over fifteen years helping governments and nonprofit organizations develop ways to use technology to carry out their strategic and service visions. A former public defender, he writes and speaks widely on issues of technology and advocacy, legal innovation, and legal ethics. He is the author of a forthcoming monograph entitled *Designing, from the Ground Up, A Self-Help Centered Court, One in Which the Litigant Without a Lawyer is the Norm*.