



for the

Third Quarter 2012

RECORD

NEWS FOR THE OHIO COURTS

DIRECTIONS

RETIRED JUDGE MARK R. SCHWEIKERT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

WHAT WE DO AND WHY WE DO IT!

Over the summer when we could generally expect a calm legislative period, we found ourselves focused on OPERS reform activities. We gathered a group of judges who had particular interests to help analyze the impact of the changes. It quickly became clear that although we were intent on preserving the state pension system for our members and their employees, we needed to be attentive to the impact of legislation on those who were currently or soon to be eligible to retire; those who had directed their careers based on expectations based in statute and tradition. We were engaged with the legislature and the OPERS leadership on behalf of judges, court employees, and our retirees. Because of our participation in the Ohio Council of County Officials we were also engaged on their behalf.

Our intervention was influential regarding the transition rules, the effective date, the contribution based benefit cap and the purchase of elected time. We continue to be concerned about the expansion of the authority of the OPERS board to make independent determinations on COLA, the contribution based benefit cap, and employee/employer contribution rates that will impact our members in the future. Our perspective is that if the board is going to have this expanded authority the board needs to be more representative and responsive to the diversity of the membership. Specifically, there needs to be a judicial branch representative.

Judges come from a more complex background than most career state or county employees. The ability of the judicial branch to attract mature capable experienced attorneys to the judiciary, to abandon their practice and seek election, requires a meaningful pension factor. Similarly, elected public service and court employee service deserves respect and encouragement through sensible benefits and retirement security. Our dedicated officials and employees deliver competent, responsive, and accessible courts and The Ohio judicial Conference will continue to pursue these perspectives and advocate for our members and their employees because that's what we do and why we do it.

In This Issue...

<i>Judge in the News.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Ohio Judicial Conference News.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Recent Enactments.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2012 Annual Meeting Review.....</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>State of the Judiciary Address.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>The ABC's of Transitional Control.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Summary of Provisions of S.B. 337.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Judicial College Course Schedule.....</i>	<i>22</i>

JUDGE IN THE NEWS

JUDGE JIM D. JAMES *STARK COUNTY FAMILY COURT*

Judge Jim D. James was elected Chair of the Ohio Judicial Conference during the 2012 Annual Meeting. He is the Administrative Judge of the Juvenile Division of the Stark County Family Court. He has served as a judge of the Stark County Common Pleas Court since 1999 and previously presided over cases at the Court as its Chief Magistrate for ten years. Prior to joining the court in 1986, Judge James served as an Assistant Prosecuting Attorney for Stark County as well as Washington County.



Judge Jim D. James

Judge James serves as a co-chair of the Judicial Conference's Juvenile Law and Procedure Committee and is a member of the Judicial Conference's Domestic Relations Law & Procedure Committee. He also serves on the Supreme Court of Ohio Advisory Committee on Court Security, is a trustee of the Supreme Court of Ohio Judicial College Board of Trustees and has served on the Ohio Child Support Guidelines Council.

Judge James is a past-president of the 700-member Stark County Bar Association and past-president of the Ohio Association of Domestic Relations Judges. He also serves on the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy Court and presides over Stark County Family Court's Drug Court.

Judge James was named "Judge of the Year" by the Ohio CSEA Director's Association at its 2009 Partner's Conference. The Judge is a graduate of Capital University and obtained his J.D. degree from Capital University Law School. He is a Boy Scout troop committee member and past volunteer fire chief, firefighter and EMT. Judge James and his wife are parents of two sons.

OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE NEWS

WELCOME MICHELE WOROBIEC, ESQ.



Michele Worobiec, Esq.

Michele Worobiec, Esq. Michele joined the staff in September as the new Judicial Services Coordinator. Michele is a 1996 graduate of The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law. Prior to joining the Judicial Conference, Michele served as Magistrate for the Marion County Municipal Court since 2004 and was an associate in the Marion Office of Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter. She served as the Municipal Court Practice Area Chief for the Ohio Association of Magistrates and was the President of Marion Matters, Inc, a local Bridges Out of Poverty initiative. Michele now resides in Dublin, Ohio.

RECENT ENACTMENTS

**EFFECTIVE IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER
OPERS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 7, 2013**

By now, you should have received a special mailing on Senate Bill 343, the OPERS reform legislation that was signed by the governor on September 26, 2012 and is scheduled to go into effect on January 7, 2013. The reforms change the laws governing retirement benefits for Ohio public employees. This mailing, along with all new enactments and much more legislative information, is available on the OJC website: www.ohiojudges.org.

HB 99: Texting While Driving prohibits driving a vehicle while writing, sending, or reading a text-based communication on a handheld electronic wireless communications device and establishes the violation as a secondary traffic offense; prohibits a person who is less than 18 years of age from using, in any manner, an electronic wireless communications device while driving; and requires driver education courses to include instruction in the dangers of texting while driving. **EFFECTIVE August 31, 2012**

HB 326: PUBLIC FUNDS prohibits any person from knowingly conducting any transaction of public funds to the benefit of any campaign committee, political action committee, legislative campaign fund, political party, campaign fund, political committee, separate segregated fund, or candidate. **EFFECTIVE September 5, 2012**

HB 487: COURT REPORTING PLUS makes operating and other appropriations, makes changes to adult criminal and civil sections, makes changes to juvenile law, and requires court reporters to provide free copies of transcripts to county prosecutors and public defenders. (Enactment News available at ohiojudges.org) **EFFECTIVE September 10, 2012**

HB 509: LOCAL GOVERNMENT, among other things, abolishes the Sandusky County Court and creates the Sandusky County Municipal Court (effective January 1, 2013). **EFFECTIVE June, 26, 2012, September 28, 2012, and other statutorily established dates within the bill.**

SB 19: JUVENILE DRIVING SUSPENSION permits a judge to elect to order the Registrar of Motor Vehicles not to suspend the probationary driver's license, restricted license, or temporary instruction permit of certain juvenile repeat traffic violators, requires the Director of Public Safety to establish standards for advanced juvenile driver improvement programs, and transfers authority to establish standards for juvenile driver improvement programs from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to the Director of Public Safety. **EFFECTIVE September 28, 2012**

SB 202: TRESPASS specifies the responsibility of a possessor of real property to a trespasser and the circumstances in which the possessor may be liable in a tort action for the death or injury of a trespasser, and specifies that it is the intent of the General Assembly to declare that the American Law Institute's finalized "Restatement Third of Torts: Liability for Physical and Emotional Harm" does not constitute the public policy of the state of Ohio, and codifies the current law of Ohio regarding the duties owed to trespassers by those who own, occupy, or control premises. **EFFECTIVE September 6, 2012**

SB 224: WRITTEN FRAUD CONTRACTS shortens, from 15 years to 8 years, the period of limitations for actions upon a contract in writing. **EFFECTIVE September 28, 2012**

Continued on next page...

SB 268: DNA SAMPLES provides for the taking of a DNA sample from a person who is charged with a felony but not arrested for the offense or whose DNA sample related to a felony offense was not taken when required and provides for a court order, upon the person's request, requiring the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation to seal DNA specimens, records, and profiles taken from a person when the person is found not guilty, the charges are dismissed with prejudice, or the charges are dismissed without prejudice and the statute of limitations has expired. **EFFECTIVE August 6, 2012**

SB 305: VEHICLE COMPARTMENTS prohibits designing, building, constructing, fabricating, modifying, or altering a vehicle to create or add a hidden compartment with the intent to facilitate the unlawful concealment or transportation of a controlled substance, prohibits operating, possessing, or using a vehicle with a hidden compartment with knowledge that the hidden compartment is used or intended to be used to facilitate the unlawful concealment or transportation of a controlled substance, and prohibits a person who has committed a first or second degree felony violation of aggravated trafficking in drugs from operating, possessing, or using a vehicle with a hidden compartment. **EFFECTIVE September 28, 2012**

SB 337: COLLATERAL SANCTIONS makes changes intended to reduce recidivism by removing unnecessary statutory and regulatory barriers to employment and housing for ex-offenders (CQE), and makes changes to juvenile detention procedures, sealing and expungement law, child support calculations, credit for time of confinement, background checks, bindovers, return bindovers, juvenile competency and other technical fixes to juvenile law. (Enactment News available at ohiojudges.org) **EFFECTIVE September 28, 2012**

SB 343: OPERS REFORM revises the law governing the Public Employees Retirement System. (Enactment News available at ohiojudges.org) **EFFECTIVE January 7, 2013**

2013 Ohio Judicial Conference Annual Meeting

September 12 - 13
Hilton Polaris/Columbus

Save the Date!

2012 OJC ANNUAL MEETING REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 13-14, 2012
HILTON COLUMBUS/POLARIS

The 2012 OJC Annual Meeting was held Thursday and Friday, September 13th and 14th, at the Hilton Columbus/Polaris. Approximately 354 judges registered for the two day event. Ohio Judicial Conference committees and judicial associations held meetings in conjunction with the annual meeting, including the Ohio Courts of Appeals Judges Association's fall meeting.

The theme for this year's plenary session was "Advancing the Administration of Justice." The program began with Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger's informative overview and game show quiz testing the audience's knowledge of The Supreme Court of Ohio's Writing Manual: A Guide to Citations, Style, and Judicial Opinion Writing, which took effect on January 1, 2012. Professor Jeffrey Rosen from the George Washington University Law School discussed how the law should adapt to new technologies and described recent examples of constitutional rights that are both enhanced and eroded by technological advances. OSBA President Judge Patrick F. Fisher addressed the attendees and presented its Judicial Administration and Legal Reform Committee Innovative Court Practices Award to the Stark County Family Court. Judge Rosemarie A. Hall accepted the Award on behalf of her court for its Never-Married

Parents Program that helps separating non-married parents work together to resolve important issues such as custody, visitation and child support.



After lunch, Judge Kevin Burke of the Hennepin County Family Justice Center in Minnesota shared steps toward improving public confidence in our courts, which included videos of judges that demonstrated best practices and pitfalls to avoid on the bench. Judge William A. Klatt, from the Tenth District Court of Appeals, talked about the joint OSBA/OLAF pro bono project. Richard Zorza, J.D. rounded out the day by describing a range of effective innovations utilized by his Self Represented Litigation Network that have improved access to the courts for pro se litigants.

Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor was introduced by Judge A. Thomas Swift of the Trumbull Co. Probate Court and Chair of the Ohio

Judicial Conference for the annual State of the Judiciary address. A copy of the transcript of the speech is printed on page 7. The annual business meeting followed lunch on Thursday, at which time Judge Powell was elected as a new officer of the Conference and Judge James was installed as the new Chair. Several constitutional amendments were approved, resulting in the addition of the Appellate Law & Procedure committee and the Traffic Law & Procedure committee, and deletion of the Alternative Dispute Resolution committee. A motion from the floor was entertained

Continued on next page...

and approved to retain the Magistrate's committee, which was originally proposed to be deleted. The constitution was also amended to remove an in person meeting requirement for the Executive Committee on the last Friday in February, and instead requires the Executive Committee to meet at least once per year.

A total of thirteen (13) concurrent sessions were offered on Friday morning covering the following topics: Highlights of the Past Term of the Supreme Court of Ohio, Contempt of Court, Hearsay and the Confrontation Clause in Criminal Cases, Probate/Domestic Relations/Juvenile Jurisdictional Conflicts, Court Budgets and Dealing with Funding Authorities/Steps to Court Ordered Funding, The Merger Mess, Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision, Preparing for Certification (Family Dependency Treatment Court and Juvenile Court Specialized Dockets), Preparing for Certification (Common Pleas and Municipal Court Specialized Dockets), Endless Demands with Little Relief, From Domestic Violence to Coercive Control: New Directions in Understanding, Assessing and Responding to Cases Involving Partner Abuse, A Judge's Guide to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, and Cloud Computing, Remote Appearances, and iPads in the Courtroom.

Binders containing printed materials from both days are available for purchase through the OJC. Electronic materials are available through the OJC website at no charge.

The Judicial Conference Executive Committee, officers and staff wish to thank all of the presenters, panel members and especially the attendees for their participation at this annual event.

“JUSTICE DELAYED”

PRE-PUBLICATION ANNOUNCEMENT

By Paul H. Mitrovich, author and retired judge of the Lake County Common Pleas Court, the book *JUSTICE DELAYED; The Road to Brown v. Brd. of Ed. of Topeka and the Civil Rights Movement*, explains the political, social and economic reasons why the Brown case was decided at that particular time in our National history.

The case *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* was the precursor for the civil rights movement, which followed in the 1950's through the 1960's. A civil-rights movement did not exist on the advent of Brown. Brown gave the direction for the movement because it established the fact that the black man had all the legal rights under the Constitution as any other citizen.

Judge Mitrovich's book is available from Halo Publishing International at www.halopublishing.com.



STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

CHIEF JUSTICE MAUREEN O'CONNOR

*SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
SEPTEMBER 13, 2012*

Good morning. Thank you Judge Swift for that introduction. And thank you for your leadership as chair of the Ohio Judicial Conference.

The officers and members of the Judicial Conference Executive Committee, the staff of the Ohio Judicial Conference and the Supreme Court Judicial College should also be commended for offering yet another interesting and educational program this year.

My colleagues from the Supreme Court are all here as well. Paul Pfeifer, Evelyn Lundberg Stratton, Terry O'Donnell, Judy Lanzinger, Bob Cupp and Yvette McGee Brown. We don't always agree on everything, but we are unanimous that the Ohio Judicial Conference Annual Meeting cannot be missed. We have to get CLE credits too.

Much has occurred since my first State of the Judiciary Address, and there is plenty to talk about today. I always look forward to this annual conference because it is an opportunity for us to reflect on the administration of justice. The daily demands of the courthouse, the crush of our caseloads, the magnitude of our work, offer us precious little time to step back and reflect. Events like this annual gathering are the opportunities we have to take stock of what we do and consider how we might improve. So let's seize this opportunity and spend our time together today and tomorrow reflecting on what we can do better. How can we be more efficient? What could we be doing differently? These are questions we should always be asking as public servants. But, the difficult times we live in make it an absolute imperative.

Last year when we gathered for this conference, I spoke to you of how the Great Recession has caused courts everywhere to face challenges not seen in a generation. Today I want to take stock of some of the things we are doing to make the courts more efficient, encourage you to continue in your efforts at the local level, and make the case that our argument for adequate court funding – including adequate judicial compensation – is directly tied to our success in building more efficient courts. It is inspiring to see courts in every corner of this state working to continue the professional administration of justice in the face of sometimes austere fiscal conditions.

It's often said that necessity is the mother of invention, and these indeed are inventive times in Ohio's courts. Let's start with a court that makes vital decisions everyday in the Moyer Ohio Judicial Center but often gets overlooked in the shadow of the Ohio Supreme Court. That is the Court of Claims. The Court of Claims has significantly reduced personnel costs through attrition. Nine staff positions have been eliminated since January 2011. The court also reduced and will continue to reduce discretionary spending on supplies and maintenance by eliminating the purchase of unnecessary books and redundant software packages, and moving toward a paperless system. Going forward, the court will realize savings by using a shared-services approach with the Supreme Court for support services such as Information Technology and printing, much like the executive branch does. These changes have resulted in savings of almost three quarters of a million dollars annually.

All the while, the Court of Claims has been able to reduce the time it takes to decide cases. Many of these changes have occurred under the leadership of the court's new administrator, Mark Reed, who has been willing to come in and make tough choices and never be afraid to ask how things can be done more efficiently.

Continued on next page...

Outside of the capital city, courts across Ohio are engaged in efforts to improve efficiency. As just one of many examples, there is a program taking hold in several courts that offers an innovative approach to one of the most persistently contentious issues we see in litigation: child custody in divorces. A program called Early Neutral Evaluation is helping families going through divorce or a legal separation to resolve conflicts while saving the courts' time and money. It has been successful in Marion County, and officials in Hamilton County Domestic Relations Court recently held a training seminar to learn about adopting the innovative practice. As a type of alternative dispute resolution, the program allows parents and their attorneys to meet to discuss possible financial and custody solutions without having to go before a judge and without involving their children. Hamilton County expects to be able to resolve cases more effectively for the families, just as Marion County has experienced a 70 to 80 percent success rate in resolving divorce cases before they would have gone to trial.

Another area where we are making progress is in local court consolidation. Local government officials in several areas around the state have approached the Supreme Court for statistical evidence to support proposals for consolidating judgeships because they, too, are searching for increased efficiencies. In recent months, Supreme Court staff members have participated in discussions with officials from Mahoning County, Sandusky County, Seneca County and Trumbull County on the feasibility of proposals to consolidate judgeships in their court systems. We have to find new ways to operate that demonstrate we are running efficient organizations. That's the selling point funding authorities want to and need to hear.

While we can make the case for more funding we have the reciprocal responsibility of better management and use of those dollars ... we have to be more efficient. Former Governor George Voinovich made it his mantra, and it is as true today as it was when he led us through our last big fiscal crisis in the 1990s: We must work harder and smarter and do more with less. So I urge all judges to examine what you do, how you do it and identify efficiencies, eliminate inefficiencies and adopt an attitude that rejects the justification for mediocrity ... "That's the way we've always done it."

Moving on... Last year I announced the formation of the Task Force on the Funding of Ohio Courts, which is doing a top-to-bottom assessment of court funding and how we can improve efficiencies. Their work has proven difficult, as we have found that it is no easy task to identify the total amount Ohio spends on the judicial system from all the various sources of funding nor to identify how much money is generated by the courts through costs and fines. And that's just the starting point. Unless we know where we are, we are at a disadvantage when trying to identify where we want to be and how to get there. The work is difficult, but it will continue throughout the next year, and I am indebted to all the judges who are working on that body, including several with us here today.

But you know what? Our efforts to improve the justice system are not just about dollars and cents. It also means looking at public policy and the law. For example, capital punishment. Last year, we spoke of the creation of a Joint Task Force to Review the Administration of Ohio's Death Penalty. After five meetings, the group is hard at work discussing and debating topics that cover a lot of ground on this important and complex issue. A sampling of some of the issues raised includes:

- Looking at the accreditation of crime labs and coroners to ensure that DNA evidence used in death penalty cases is processed correctly.

Continued on next page...

CONTRIBUTE TO *FOR THE RECORD*!!!

We are always looking for interesting articles to print in *For the Record*. If you know of a good topic, are willing to write an article, or if you participate in an association, committee, commission or other group covering important information regarding the Ohio or national judicial system, please email Jennie Long at: Jennie.Long@sc.ohio.gov or Jeff Jablonka at: Jeff.Jablonka@sc.ohio.gov to let us know. We will contact you for more information.

- The task force is also looking at the training for both defense counsel and prosecutors who handle capital cases and the training for judges who have these cases before them. The group is examining increased record keeping and reporting to the Supreme Court in an effort to maintain better data on death cases, and additional guidance on when judicial intervention is appropriate in cases of ineffective counsel.
- Discussions that encompass the very core of the death penalty process are taking place. For example is uniformity in its use better achieved through a state review process rather than a local prosecutor making the decision to indict?
- The task force is looking, too, at race and ethnicity in capital cases, proportionality issues and whether or not any recommendations are needed regarding “making the punishment fit the crime.”
- Judge Brogan is doing a magnificent job as chair and the judges who are participants are dedicated and insightful and a wonderful asset. I’m looking forward to the final report from the group on ensuring that Ohio’s death penalty is administered in the most fair, and judicious manner possible.

Another area identified for change relates to both lawyers and judges. What about efficiencies on how we as the Supreme Court regulate the practice of law? One area that for years I have heard lawyers and judges complain could be made better is Continuing Legal Education requirements. CLE reform could be on its way to some major changes. I hope each of you submitted feedback during the comment period that ended in early July. From increasing the number of self-study hours, to earning credit for pro bono work, the proposed changes are intended to update some rules to match today’s world. The Supreme Court will receive the results of the public comments as well as recommendations for our review and approval in October of this year. I’m hopeful we will have improvements to announce at the end of the year.

Courts are also working hard to do more in the area of access to justice. I was recently on a panel discussion with ABA President Bill Robinson where we discussed how the funding problems facing courts around the country underscore the necessity of continuing to make justice accessible to all. We cannot let funding problems close the courthouse doors.

But Funding challenges are but one facet of the access to justice focus. In Ohio, we are discussing creating an Access to Justice Commission to focus on access to civil justice for the underserved and marginalized of our communities. The Commission would be staffed by an Access and Fairness attorney specifically hired to spearhead these efforts. The model for the commission would be found by studying the twenty-seven other states which already have such commissions. I learned how other chief justices structured their programs by attending a national meeting of State Access to Justice Chairs in Jacksonville, Florida in May. Because of their established programs, we know what works and will apply that in Ohio.

The Access and Fairness counsel will work in several areas related to access such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, assisting Bruno Romeo and our Interpreter Services staff in increasing access to justice for those with limited English proficiency, developing a diversity curriculum for judges, and strengthening diversity on the bench and bar. The Access and Fairness attorney would focus on continuing legal education requirements in this area, working with the affinity bar associations, and combating the existence of biases.

Improving efficiency also requires that we collaborate in the administration of justice at the leadership level. Last year I announced that we would be forming a working group to explore a process for building a more collaborative model among the Supreme Court, the Judicial Conference and the various judges associations. There has been true movement toward this end through the creation of the Judicial Leadership Council. Members of the council will include the seven Justices on the Supreme Court, the five members of the Judicial Conference executive team and a representative from each of the judicial associations. On a quarterly basis, this group will sit down and discuss matters of interest to the judiciary. An ongoing practice implemented since I became chief is frequent meetings with Mark

Continued on next page...

Schweikert to discuss anything from legislation, to policy to better communication. These meetings involve me, Mark and Steve Hollon. I find them very helpful, and I hope Mark does as well. We are committed at the Supreme Court to having the best judiciary possible, and that can only be done through open and continual communication.

We already have one of the most unique judicial structures in the world. This came into sharp focus for me as a result of attending the International Academy for Judges at the University of Haifa Israel for almost three weeks this summer. Twenty judges from around the world gathered to compare constitutional law, bio ethics and cyber law ... Lest you think it was a vacation there were classes five and a half days a week from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. ... The Constitutional portion was so enlightening. We judges in the United States and in Ohio are entrusted with an awesome responsibility to interpret our Constitutions. Other countries' systems of justice don't require their judges to take this broad interpretive view. It's a great tribute that this authority is placed on our shoulders and underscores our nation's belief in the judiciary the public's confidence in us. It's much different in Romania, Albania, Uganda, Philippines, Rwanda and the other countries that were represented at the academy. Internationally, courts serve a ministerial function – even in democracies. Only constitutional courts have the authority to interpret the law. While here in Ohio, all judges from the Supreme Court to the common pleas court have that authority. I point this out to remind us all of the awesome responsibility we have. Our efforts to improve our system may at times seem daunting, but I am always encouraged in knowing that what we strive to improve is something that is already the envy of the world.

I want to close by addressing a couple of items that are of particular interest to judges as professionals. First are the changes to our pension system that were passed yesterday in the Legislature. I've met with PERS leaders to obtain a better understanding of the impact of the legislation on Ohio's judges. It's important to remember that the cost of living adjustment for retirees will not disappear. It's true that a 3 percent increase will no longer be automatic. But going forward – if the legislation remains as is – the COLA will either match the consumer price index if it's lower than 3 percent or be capped at 3 percent if the consumer price index is higher. Although the changes to the pension system will be dramatic, it is important to remember that these changes are necessary in order to ensure a solvent system into the future. Before considering retirement, I encourage you take the time to understand exactly what the PERS changes would mean to you and meet with a PERS representative.

While we're talking about retirement I would like to speak briefly about the topic of visiting judges. If some of you do decide to retire, you may also be considering continuing to serve on the bench in a limited capacity as a retired assigned judge. Please keep in mind however, that the Supreme Court has de-emphasized the use of retired assigned judges over the last few years in favor of using sitting judges under reciprocity arrangements. The retired assigned judge expenditures for courts of appeals, which totaled \$179,062 in Fiscal Year 2008 has declined every year since. The amount was \$132,132 in FY 2009; \$34,848 in FY 2010; \$23,166 in FY 2011; and only \$660 in FY 2012.

We have many sitting appellate court judges to thank for making this drastic decrease possible. Their willingness to accept assignments outside of their home court and serve as visiting judges in other appellate courts has been invaluable in reducing costs in this area. Because of this reduction, the retired assigned judge compensation overall – including that directed to common pleas courts – is 25 percent less in FY 2012 compared to five years ago.

As you can see, there have been savings realized in this area of the judicial branch. Of course, we will continue to use any of the 159 retired assigned judges already on the eligible to serve list in emergencies or when it makes financial sense. But we will continue to focus on maximizing the efficient use of our resources in general and in this area in particular. In addition, please know that it's OK for sitting judges who need a visiting judge for reasons other than a conflict to recommend a visiting judge. But don't ask for a specific judge in a conflict case. A conflict case takes you out of the decision-making process altogether.

Since we last spoke, we have partnered with the Association of Municipal and County Judges to form a working group to examine reactivating the acting judge reimbursement formerly part of the court's budget. I thank Judge Reddin and the other judges and staff who came together to examine the issue and make a proposal of what should be included in the legislation that would have to be enacted to restore the reimbursement. The proposal was submitted to the court in August and will receive priority as we begin our budget process this fall. Funding will have to be scrutinized and legislation enacted but I said we would revisit with an aim to restoring reimbursement and I will keep my promise.

I recognize that being a judge is not an easy job... There's a lot on your plate. There are decisions you've made during the day that keep you awake at night wondering if you made the right call. But you are not alone. I want to remind you of the network of support that is available to you every day.

First, please remember that the Supreme Court is a resource you can turn to. We are here to help. You can talk in confidence if a situation arises that's troublesome. The Supreme Court staff can provide guidance and advice on many topics such as case management, specialized dockets, and mediation. As many of you know, technical assistance is also available.

Second, there are others you can turn to as well: the Ohio Legal Assistance Program or the Judicial Assistance Group or your colleagues. A judge is not immune to substance abuse, mental health issues stress and anxiety. Personality conflicts arise among multi-judge courts. Some judges can be bullies. In other words, judges have problems at the office just like other professions. The difference is the public arena in which judges find themselves. A problem, whether personal or professional can swell out of proportion when it is unaddressed. Please for your sake, for the sake of the court as an institution and for the community you serve, get help at the first signs of trouble.

It's not easy pointing out to a colleague a mistake in judgment, but sometimes those difficult conversations are necessary even if they are unwelcome. It's not easy to intervene when there is a problem among colleagues, but if you don't who will? The Supreme Court will help you if you need our assistance, and the JAG is always available. I encourage you to be proactive with any concerns.

As I close I think that you should be aware that I continue to actively discuss judicial compensation with the General Assembly. I have met with all four leaders in the Legislature and a majority of the members who are also lawyers to talk with them about compensation and other improvements to the judiciary. And you should know that these discussions have not fallen on deaf ears – we do have advocates in the General Assembly who agree that judges are underpaid in Ohio. I have advocated for the creation of an ongoing elected official compensation commission which would make recommendations to the General Assembly on a regular basis regarding compensation for all elected officials in Ohio, from county commissioners to the Governor. Judges cannot isolate themselves when it comes to increased compensation. We have to be willing to be part of a comprehensive compensation review for elected officials. Since 2008, no judge in Ohio has received a raise. And according to the records we maintain, this has been the longest stretch of stagnation in judicial salaries since the 1950s. A national survey released in July noted that Ohio ranked in the bottom half of all 50 states for judicial pay. I can make no promises, just as those who would support us can make no promises, but I am hopeful this issue will be addressed very soon. I promise to keep you up to date on any developments.

Keeping you up to date is a great segue into the topic of Court News Ohio. It is a way that the Supreme Court is available as a resource to you as a clearinghouse of information. We recently launched a new program that is a first in the country and that I want to encourage you to utilize. Court News Ohio is a dynamic multiplatform news and information program that offers you the latest developments in case law, rule changes, and administrative matters in

Continued on next page...

the Ohio judicial branch. The program includes a website with daily news, a monthly news magazine that you can get in print or online, and even a TV program on the Ohio Channel. If you haven't checked it out yet, I encourage you to visit courtnewsohio.gov. Contribute news, read about topics specifically related to the judiciary and showcase positive things happening in your court. CNO has just launched, and the reaction has been very favorable. Check it out.

As one last final piece of business, we will say goodbye to one of our colleagues at the end of this year. It's no secret that Justice Evelyn Lundberg Stratton has been torn between doing her elected job and focusing on ways to improve the lives of veterans and those with mental illness. She will soon leave the court to devote herself full-time to those causes, serving those who served their country and those of our citizens who suffer from mental illness. Thank you Eve for your distinguished service on our court and to the judiciary as a whole over these many years. You will be missed.

Thank you for your time and attention today. Thank you for all you do every day to serve the cause of justice. And God bless you.

THE ABC'S OF TRANSITIONAL CONTROL

ALICIA HANDWERK

**CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF COMMUNITY SANCTIONS
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION**

Working with the Transitional Control (TC) population on a daily basis, corrections professionals don't realize that courts and court personnel who are outside the process aren't really aware of all of the special care taken with the screening and monitoring of these offenders in the community, so we forget to take the time to educate others in our processes. This became especially clear to us at a recent meeting between ODRC, the Ohio Community Correction Association (OCCA) and several judges. The following is an overview of the screening, supervision and return and release processes in place to specifically address the transitional control offender---or the ABCs of transitional control

- (A) Screening and Placement
- (B) Supervision and Assessment
- (C) Return to Prison or Moving on to the Community

A. Screening and Placement

- a. An automated screening of the criminal history contained in the prison database lets Unit Management (UM) know that the offender has met the first tier of eligibility for participation in the TC program. This automated screening looks for statutory exclusions such as having a detainer in place for an active felony warrant.
 - i. UM notifies the offender she is eligible and allows her to opt in or out of program.

Continued on next page...

- b. When offender has indicated willingness to participate in program, the Parole Board Parole Officer (PBPO) reviews the “paper “ file of information not included in the prison database, looking for any out of state convictions or juvenile adjudications that might preclude that person from participating in the program. The PBPO also reviews the offender’s institutional records to see if there are any sufficiently serious violations within recent history that would make the offender ineligible. This process weeds out a significant number of offenders.
- c. The letter announcing the offender’s eligibility to participate in the TC program no sooner than 180 days before the end of the sentence goes out to the court. Note: the letter may come out a few months before the offender is eligible, but the offender will not be released before that 180 day cap. In the meantime, Bureau of Community Sanctions (BCS) staff also requests placement at a halfway house as near to the offender’s identified county of residence as possible. In addition, BCS does a final review of the offender, looking at the medical and mental health status to insure ability to fully participate in the program; to make sure that no detainers have been placed or time has been added to the offender’s sentence since the screening process began; and that the offender hasn’t committed any serious violations since the initial screening. Prison staff will also alert BCS staff immediately if any disqualifications crop up.

B. Supervision and Assessment

- a. Halfway house staff travels to the prison to pick up the offender.
- b. For the first two weeks, the offender is in orientation and confined to the halfway house. The offender is assessed with the ORAS tool and any other specialized assessment tool the halfway house may deem appropriate.
- c. Once risk and need is determined, case planning is done to determine the appropriate programming for each offender. Ability to begin job searching and take home passes is determined by risk level and program progress, so it will be much longer before a high risk offender can go into the community unsupervised, even for pro-social activities such as employment.
- d. All offenders, regardless of risk, must create weekly itineraries with their case managers and must abide by them strictly, or risk discipline or even removal from the program. When offenders are in the community at jobs or on home passes, they are checked regularly with phone calls to the employer or home.
- e. Offenders must fully participate in assessed programming or risk removal from the program and return to prison.

C. Return to Prison or Moving on to the Community

- a. Return to prison
 - i. While over 70% of the offenders participating in the TC program complete it successfully, a number are returned to prison.
 - ii. Several are returned administratively because they choose to quit the program; others may be returned to prison because they receive additional sentence time from a previous offense, or a detainer is lodged against them; or their medical or mental health issues may preclude them from participation in the program.

- iii. Halfway houses are responsible for disciplinary actions taken against offenders in the program. A sanction grid outlines the potential violations and the point range available to each type of violation, depending on its severity. An offender may be returned to prison based upon one violation if it is sufficiently severe, i.e. assault on another offender; or based upon an accumulation of smaller violations. The halfway house holds an administrative hearing and provides a report of the results to BCS which processes the appropriate paperwork for return to prison.
- iv. About 4.6% of TC offenders abscond from the halfway house. There is a policy in place that outlines the halfway houses' responsibility to try to locate the offender and persuade that person to return and for notification of the APA and BCS night or day so that the appropriate searches can be made for the offender and a warrant issued for that person's arrest.
- b. Moving on to the community
 - i. Offenders successfully completing the program leave the halfway house with an aftercare plan that describes their course of action for the immediate future, and may also include linkages to appropriate community resources for follow up.
 - ii. About half of the offenders that participate in transitional control have fulfilled their obligations as to their sentence and are free to go on with their lives, but the other half must serve a period of post release control with the Adult Parole Authority.

This is just a brief overview of the TC process. For more information please feel free to contact: Alicia Handwerk, Chief of the Bureau of Community Sanctions at 614-752-0605; Lusanne Green, Executive Director of

OJC CITIZENS GUIDE BROCHURES

How to Order

The Judicial Conference has created a series of brochures to help judges inform the public about Ohio's judicial system. We have seven tri-fold brochures with general information about aspects of the judicial system and one 25-page guide to small claims court. The back panel of each brochure has space for a standard size mailing label with contact information for a local court or judge.

Tri-Fold Series

The Citizens Guide tri-fold series consists of the following brochures:

- Jury Service
- Grand Jury Service
- Legal Terminology
- Electing Judges
- Representing Yourself
- Ohio Courts
- Mediation
- Why Can't I Talk to the Judge?

The brochures can be ordered in bulk at a low cost of 15 or 20 cents per copy, depending on the number ordered.

Small Claims Court Guide

The Small Claims Court guide was previously published by the Ohio State Bar Foundation.

This guide can be ordered for 58 cents per copy.

Ordering Information

Individual brochures are available for download at www.ohiojudges.org on the "Publications" webpage. You may also place your orders for large quantities of the Citizens Guide Brochures on this same page or retrieve a downloadable order form on this page that can be faxed.

You may also contact Trina Bennington at Trina.Bennington@sc.ohio.gov or 614-387-9750 to obtain ordering information or for general questions regarding the brochures.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF S.B. 337 RELEVANT TO COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES

Margaret Love, Esq.
Law Office of Margaret Love
Washington, D.C.

I. Certificate of qualification for employment

S.B. 337, signed into law on June 26, 2012, creates a mechanism by which an individual who has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to an offense, who for a specified period of time has been released from incarceration and all supervision imposed after release or has received a final release from all other sanctions imposed, and who is subject to a "collateral sanction"¹ may obtain from the court of common pleas of the county in which the individual resides a "certificate of qualification for employment" (CQE) that will provide relief from certain bars on employment or occupational licensing. See Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2953.25.²

- **Effect:** A CQE has the effect of lifting most collateral sanctions imposed under Ohio law. *Id.* § 2953.25(B)(1)-(2). See also *id.* § 2953.25(D):

[A CQE] lifts the automatic bar of a collateral sanction, and a decision-maker may consider on a case-by-case basis whether to grant or deny the issuance or restoration of an occupational license or an employment opportunity, notwithstanding the individual's possession of the certificate.

- **Sanctions excepted:** Certain collateral consequences are not affected, such as restrictions on employment as a prosecutor or law enforcement officer, restrictions on driver's licenses and on licensing in the health care field, and loss of licenses resulting from failure to pay child support. *Id.* § 2953.25(C)(5). Nor does a CQE relieve restrictions contained in Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2961.01(A)(1) regarding service on a jury, and § 2961.02(B) regarding public office or employment, including as a volunteer, if the volunteer activity involves substantial management or control over the property of a state agency, political subdivision, or private entity. *Id.* § 2953.25(E).
- **Limitation on employer liability:** In a judicial or administrative proceeding alleging negligence or other fault, a certificate of qualification for employment issued under the mechanism may be introduced as evidence of a person's due care in hiring, retaining, licensing, leasing to, admitting to a school or program, or otherwise transacting business or engaging in activity with the individual to whom the certificate was issued if the person knew of the certificate at the time of the alleged negligence or other fault. In any proceeding on a claim against an employer for negligent hiring, a certificate of qualification for employment issued under the mechanism provides immunity for the employer as to the claim if the employer knew of the certificate at the time of the alleged negligence. § 2953.25(G).

¹ A collateral sanction is defined as "a penalty, disability, or disadvantage that is related to employment or occupational licensing, however denominated, as a result of the individual's conviction of or plea of guilty to an offense and that applies by operation of law in this state whether or not the penalty, disability, or disadvantage is included in the sentence or judgment imposed." Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2953.25(A)(1).

² The new bill has no effect on the mechanism, enacted in 2011, authorizing "certificates of achievement and employability."

- **Procedure:**

- *Eligibility waiting period:* If the offense was a felony, the petition may be filed one year after sentencing, or one year after release from prison if later; or after six months for a misdemeanor. *Id.* § 2953.25(B)(4). If the offender is subject to a period of post-incarceration supervision, the eligibility waiting period runs from the conclusion of that period of supervision. *Id.*
- Petitions for a CQE may be filed with a court, unless the person has served a term in a state correctional institution or spent time in a department-funded program for any offense, in which case the petition is initially filed with the designee of the deputy director of the division of parole and community services, who then forwards it to court. *Id.* § 2953.25(B)(1)-(2), (5). The required contents of a petition are specified, and include a statement of the reasons the certificate is sought and references.
- Upon receiving a petition, the court shall review the petition, the individual's criminal history, all filings submitted by the prosecutor or the victim, and all other relevant evidence. *Id.* § 2953.25(C).
- The court in which a petition is filed or forwarded is required to attempt to determine all other Ohio courts in which the individual was found guilty of an offense other than the offense from which relief is sought and notify those courts of the filing, notify the prosecuting attorney of the county in which the individual resides that the individual has filed the petition, and review the petition, the individual's criminal history, all filings submitted by the prosecutor or the victim, and all other relevant evidence.
- The court that receives or is forwarded a petition under the bill must decide whether to issue the certificate within 60 days after the court receives or is forwarded the completed petition and all information requested by the court. This time limit may be extended upon request of the individual who filed the application.
- A court that denies a petition may place conditions on the individual regarding the filing of any subsequent petition for a certificate. An individual may to appeal a denial decision of a court of common pleas to the court of appeals only if the individual alleges that the denial was an abuse of discretion by the court of common pleas.
- The certificate is "presumptively revoked" if the individual is convicted of or pleads guilty to a felony offense committed after issuance of the certificate. *Id.* § 2953.25(H).

- **Standard:** The standard for issuing a certificate is whether the individual has established by a preponderance of the evidence that (a) granting the petition will materially assist in obtaining employment or occupational licensing, (b) the individual has a substantial need for the relief in order to live a law-abiding life, and (c) granting the petition would not pose an unreasonable risk to the safety of the public or any individual. Ohio Rev. Code § 2953.25(C)(3).

- **Report to Legislature:** Requires DRC: (1) to conduct a study to determine the manner for transferring the bill's mechanism for the issuance of a CQE to an electronic database established and maintained by DRC, specifies certain provisions that must be included in the database to which the mechanism is to be transferred, and requires DRC by one year after the bill's effective date to submit to the General Assembly and the Governor a report containing the results of the study and recommendations for transferring the mechanism;³ and (2) in

³ The DRC database "shall include granted certificates and revoked certificates and shall be designed to track the number of certificates granted and revoked, the industries, occupations, and professions with respect to which the certificates have been most

conjunction with the Ohio Judicial Conference, to conduct a study to determine whether the application process for certificates of qualification for employment created by the bill is feasible based upon DRC's caseload capacity and the courts of common pleas and, not later than one year after the bill's effective date of this section, to submit to the General Assembly a report that contains the results of the study and any recommendations for improvement of the application process. Ohio Rev. Code § 2953.25(K).

II. Sealing of criminal records - Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 2953.31 et seq.

- *Expansion of Eligibility:* Before the passage of S.B. 337, the only conviction records eligible for sealing under Ohio law were certain minor non-violent convictions where the court determined that the applicant had no other criminal record and no charges pending.⁴ The “first offender” requirement was jurisdictional, and included both felonies and misdemeanors. *State v. Coleman*, 691 N.E.2d 369 (Ohio Ct. App. 1997). A new law passed by the legislature and signed by the governor on June 26, 2012, replaces the term “first offender” with “eligible offender” throughout the chapter, and authorizes sealing for anyone with a single felony conviction, two misdemeanor convictions if the convictions are not of the same offense, and one felony conviction and one misdemeanor conviction from Ohio or any other jurisdiction. S.B. 337 (amending Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 2953.31(A)(1) (defining eligible offender) and 2953.32(A)(1) (permitting eligible offenders to petition for the sealing of a conviction record)).
- *Procedures Unchanged:* Existing law, unchanged by the bill, provides for a hearing upon the filing of an application to have a conviction sealed, and the prosecutor for the case must be notified of the hearing on the application. The prosecutor may object to the granting of the application by filing an objection with the court prior to the date set for the hearing that specifies the reasons for believing a denial of the application is justified. The court must direct its regular probation officer, a state probation officer, or the department of probation of the county in which the applicant resides to make inquiries and written reports as the court requires concerning the applicant.
- *Child support provisions -* Additional provisions of S.B. 337 require the probation officer or county department of probation that the court directs to make the required inquiries concerning an applicant for the sealing of a criminal record to contact the child support enforcement agency enforcing the applicant's obligations under a child support order to inquire about the offender's compliance with the child support order if the applicant was convicted of or pleaded guilty to a violation of nonsupport of dependents. It also provides an exception to the current prohibition against sealing the records of an offender's conviction in cases in which the victim of the offense was under 18 years.

III. Ex-offender Reentry Coalition

Adds a member to the Ex-offender Reentry Coalition who must be an ex-offender appointed by the Director of Rehabilitation and Correction.

applicable, the types of employers that have accepted the certificates, and the recidivism rates of individuals who have been issued the certificates.” § 2953.25(K).

⁴ The term “first offender” was previously defined in Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2953.31(A) as: [A]nyone who has been convicted of an offense in this state or any other jurisdiction and who previously or subsequently has not been convicted of the same or a different offense in this state or any other jurisdiction.”

IV. Juvenile records

A. Sealing - Ohio Rev. Code. § 2151.356

- *Sexual battery and gross sexual imposition* - Removes sexual battery and gross sexual imposition from the list of offenses for which juvenile records may not be sealed.
- *Application process* – Reduces the eligibility waiting period for applying for sealing of juvenile records from two years to six months after any of certain specified events occurs, including the date the court enters an order after a hearing or a petition upon the classification of a child as a juvenile offender registrant under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law that contains a determination that the child is no longer a juvenile offender registrant. Prohibits the court from charging a fee for the filing of an application for the sealing of juvenile records.
- *Determination procedures* - Adds an additional factor to the factors that the court must consider in determining whether the person has been rehabilitated to a satisfactory degree for the purposes of sealing juvenile records: the granting of a new tier classification or declassification from the Juvenile Offender Registry under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law, except for public registry-qualified juvenile offender registrants.

B. Confidentiality of juvenile records – criminal records checks – (Ohio Rev. Code § 109.572 and 109.578)

- Limits disclosure of records of individual under 18 convicted in adult court and transferred back to juvenile court *unless* conviction for aggravated murder or murder violation or the adjudication, or conviction was for a sexually oriented offense, as defined in Ohio Rev. Code § 2950.01, the juvenile court was required to classify the child a juvenile offender registrant for that offense under §§ 2152.82, 2152.83, or 2152.86, and that classification has not been removed.

V. Limits on Licensing Exclusions

- Prohibits **Ohio Optical Dispensers Board, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles** (with regard to motor vehicle salvage dealers, motor vehicle auctions, and salvage motor vehicle pools), **the Construction Industry Licensing Board, the Hearing Aid Dealers and Fitters Licensing Board, and the Director of Public Safety** (with regard to private investigators and security guards) from precluding individuals from obtaining or renewing licenses, certifications, or permits the entity issues due to any past criminal history of the individual unless the individual has committed a crime of moral turpitude or a disqualifying offense.⁵ Provides a new definition of “crime of moral turpitude” to include only a number of specified serious crimes of violence.⁶

Specifies that: (1) if an individual applying for a license, certification, or permit has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor that is not a crime of moral turpitude or a

⁵ Ohio Rev. Code §§ 3772.07, 4501.02, 4725.44, 4725.48, 4725.52, 4725.53, 4738.04, 4738.07, 4740.06, 4740.10, 4747.05, 4747.10, 4747.12, 4749.03, 4749.04, 4749.06, and 5502.011.

⁶ Ohio Rev. Code § 4776.10(A).

“disqualifying offense” (defined below) less than one year prior to making the application, any licensing entity listed in the preceding paragraph may use its discretion in granting or denying the individual a license, certification, or permit, (2) if an individual applying for a license, certification, or permit has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to a felony that is not a crime of moral turpitude or a disqualifying offense less than three years prior to making the application, any licensing entity listed in the preceding dot point may use its discretion in granting or denying the individual a license or registration, or renewing the license. A “disqualifying offense” is defined to mean an offense that is a felony and that has a “direct nexus” to an individual's proposed or current field of licensure, certification, or employment. "Direct nexus" means that the nature of the offense for which the individual was convicted or to which the individual pleaded guilty has a direct bearing on the fitness or ability of the individual to perform one or more of the duties or responsibilities necessarily related to a particular occupation, profession, or trade.⁷ The provisions described in clauses (1) and (2) do not apply with respect to any offense unless the licensing entity, prior to the bill's effective date, was required or authorized to deny the application based on that offense.

- **Casino Control Commission** - Must provide a written statement to each applicant denied a license under this chapter describing the reason or reasons for which the applicant was denied the license. Requires an annual report to the legislature specifying number of applications denied in the preceding calendar year for each type of such license, and the reasons for those denials.
- **Background checks for trainees for certain professions or occupations** – requires a long list of licensing agencies to obtain criminal records checks for applicants for trainee positions: the Accountancy Board, the Board of Embalmers and Funeral Directors; the State Board of Optometry; the Ohio Optical Dispensers Board; the State Board of Pharmacy; the State Medical Board; the State Board of Psychology; the State Chiropractic Board; the Ohio Construction Industry Licensing Board; the State Veterinary Medical Licensing Board; the Occupational Therapy Section, Physical Therapy Section, and Athletic Trainers Section of the Ohio Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Athletic Trainers Board; the Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board; the Ohio Board of Dietetics; the Ohio Respiratory Care Board; the State Board of Orthotics, Prosthetics, and Pedorthics; the Casino Control Commission; the Registrar of Motor Vehicles regarding certain motor vehicle salvage licenses; Hearing Aid Dealers and Fitters Licensing Board; or Director of Public Safety regarding private investigators and security guard providers.
 - These requirements requiring a criminal records check of applicants for trainee licenses do not apply with respect to any person who is participating in an apprenticeship or training program operated by or under contract with DRC.
 - None of these agencies may issue a trainee license to an applicant if the agency determines that the applicant would not be eligible for issuance of a license, certificate, or other authority to engage in the profession or occupation, or operate certain equipment or machinery, or enter certain premises.

⁷ Id. at § 4776.10(B), (C).

- An agency that uses criminal records in determining whether an applicant should be granted a trainee license under that chapter and that division must make the results available to the applicant who is the subject of the criminal records check.
- **Child support determinations** -- Prohibits a court or child support enforcement agency (CSEA) from determining that an incarcerated or institutionalized parent is voluntarily unemployed or underemployed for the purposes of imputing income when calculating child support. Revises the law with respect to determinations of imputed income, with respect to a parent who has a prior felony conviction and a parent who is receiving means-tested public benefits, including benefits under the Ohio Works First Program, Disability Financial Assistance Program, Supplemental Security Income, or veterans' benefits. Permits a court or CSEA to disregard a parent's additional income from overtime or additional employment in limited circumstances such as when the income was generated primarily to support a new or additional family member. Requires a court or CSEA to collect information about preexisting child support orders for other children of the same parents when calculating a child support order to ensure that the total of all orders for the children of both parents does not exceed the amount that would have been ordered in a single order.

Ohio Judicial Conference Staff

Executive Director

Hon. Mark R. Schweikert, Retired 614-387-9750
Mark.Schweikert@sc.ohio.gov

Project Specialist

Jeff Jablonka 614-387-9753
Jeff.Jablonka@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Activities Coordinator

Donna Childers, Ph.D. 614-387-9763
Donna.Childers@sc.ohio.gov

Program Specialist

Jennie Long 614-387-9766
Jennie.Long@sc.ohio.gov

Judicial Services Coordinator

Michele Worobiec, Esq. 614-387-9767
Michele.Worobiec@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Liaison

Christina Madriguera, Esq. 614-387-9764
Christina.Madriguera@sc.ohio.gov

Administrative Assistant

Trina Bennington 614-387-9761
Trina.Bennington@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Liaison

Louis Tobin, Esq. 614-387-9765
Louis.Tobin@sc.ohio.gov

Legislative Secretary

Alyssa Guthrie 614-387-9756
Alyssa.Guthrie@sc.ohio.gov

Fiscal Specialist/Office Manager

Jayma Umbstaetter 614-387-9757
Jayma.Umbstaetter@sc.ohio.gov

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO - JUDICIAL COLLEGE

2012 Course Schedule

<u>DATE</u>		<u>COURSE</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
NOVEMBER 2012				
14	Wed	Guardian Ad Litem 6 Hr Pre-Service Course (11 of 12)	Attorneys	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
14	Wed	Probate Seminar	Magistrates & Judges	Video Teleconference
15	Thu	New Americans	Court Personnel, Judges & Magistrates	Doubletree Worthington - Columbus
16	Fri	Evidence	Judges	Embassy Suites Airport - Columbus
16	Fri	Judicial Transitions	Probation Officers	Webinar
30	Fri	Magistrate Ethics	Magistrates	Video Teleconference
DECEMBER 2012				
4	Tue	Ohio Association of Domestic Relations Judges (OADRJ) Winter Conference	Judges*	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
5 - 7	Wed - Fri	Defensive Tactics Faculty	Probation Officers	OPOTA - London
5 - 7	Wed - Fri	Ohio Common Pleas Judges Association (OCPJA) Winter Conference	Judges*	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
6	Thu	Acting Judge Course (4 of 4): Avoiding Potential Minefields	Magistrates, Judges & Acting Judges	Crowne Plaza Dublin - Columbus
6 - 7	Thu - Fri	Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges (OAJCJ) Winter Meeting	Judges*	Hilton Polaris - Columbus
10 - 14	Mon - Fri	New Judge Orientation Part I	New Judges	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
11	Tue	Guardian Ad Litem 3 Hr Course (23 of 24) (1:00 - 4:30 p.m.)	Attorneys	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
12	Wed	Guardian Ad Litem 3 Hr Course (24 of 24). (8:30 a.m. - noon)	Attorneys	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
14	Fri	Ethics	Judges	Video Teleconference
18	Tue	Guardian Ad Litem 6 Hr Pre-Service Course (12 of 12)	Attorneys	Quest Conference Center - Columbus

TO VIEW THE MOST UPDATED VERSION OF THE COURSE CALENDAR VISIT THE JUDICIAL COLLEGE WEBSITE: www.supremecourt.ohio.gov

