

NATIONAL JUDICIAL COLLEGE OF AUSTRALIA

ANNUAL REPORT 2003 - 2004

Introduction

This is the second Annual Report by the Council of the Judicial College of Australia. It relates to the year 1 July 2003 – 30 June 2004.

The College is supported financially by the Attorneys-General for the Commonwealth, for New South Wales, for Tasmania, for South Australia and for the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. The Council acknowledges the contribution that they are making to the standard of Australia's judiciary, through the work of the College. The Attorney-General for the Commonwealth in particular has been generous in his support for the College.

As will appear from this Report, a lot has been achieved by the College. At the date of this Report it is barely two years since the College appointed its first staff member, took occupation of its premises and began to operate. Bearing in mind the time and effort spent in establishing the College as an operating entity, and deciding on the approach to be taken to the provision of professional development for the Australian judiciary, we are pleased with the progress that has been made.

As will appear, we have developed two different professional development programs that lend themselves to ongoing change and improvement. We have presented each of them more than once. They have been well received. We have developed good working relationships with other bodies involved in the provision of professional development for the judiciary. We are developing a pilot program for the provision of professional development programs by distance education. If the pilot is successful, we will be able to reach many judicial officers at their place of work. We are developing a website through which we aim to provide useful material to judicial officers and to other bodies involved in the provision of professional development. We continue to give a good deal of attention to the best means of

providing professional development for the judiciary, and to identifying the real needs of the Australian judiciary in this respect.

During 2004 – 2005 we aim to increase the number of programs that we deliver, and we expect that other projects outlined below will come to fruition. This will require considerable work from all involved, but the strong support that we have received so far from the Australian judiciary and from others makes us think that we will achieve our aims.

In our Report we outline the constraints imposed on us by our limited funding. If our funding is increased, we will be able to achieve a good deal more. One of our tasks is to persuade Australia's governments of the value to the Australian community in investing in the professional development of its judiciary.

The College

Attachment A to this Report provides information relating to the Council, the Regional Convenors, the Consultative Committee and the College Secretariat.

Attachment B repeats two portions of the first Annual Report. First, a second summarising the origin of the College. This is provided because not all readers of this report will be familiar with the origin of the College. The other portion contains a summary of the policies the Council has adopted in relation to the provision of professional development. This material is repeated because it reflects the basis upon which the Council continues to operate.

The College is based in premises provided by the Faculty of Law at the Australian National University. During the year the College moved into a refurbished suite of rooms. They provide suitable accommodation for the College. The Council has developed a good

working relationship with the Dean of Law, Professor Coper, and with other members of the Faculty. We are pleased with the relationship that has developed, and are grateful to the Dean and to the faculty for their support.

Funding

During the year the College operated within its recurrent income of \$325,600. As the Council has said on other occasions, the funds available to the College are very limited. During the establishment phase of the College the limited funding has imposed some constraints on the Council.

However, these constraints were not severe. Initially the Council had to decide what kind of programs it would provide to Australia's judiciary, and how it would provide them. It also had to find premises and employ staff. Having decided on its preferred approach, it then had to develop its first programs. Now that stage has passed. The College is in a position to provide programs, and is being asked to provide them. Limitations attributable to our limited funding are assuming greater significance. The financial constraints under which we operate limit our ability to provide programs to Australia's judiciary.

Of necessity the College presents professional development programs on the basis that it will recover its costs, and make a modest profit, by charging a fee to participants in the programs.

A number of courts have informed the College that they lack the funds to meet the costs of more than a few participants in our programs. This is a significant problem. If the College proposes to present a program for a particular court, it would usually aim to have a little more than half of the participants in the program from the court in question. The balance of the participants would come from other courts and usually from other States. Getting this

mix is important. If the court in question cannot meet the cost of the number of participants required for a successful program, we cannot proceed with the program.

A constraint of lesser significance is the difficulty that most courts have in releasing judicial officers from their judicial duties so that they can attend programs. This has two aspects. First, there are heavy demands on the time of most judicial officers. Courts have difficulty finding replacements for the judicial officers so that they can attend College programs. Second, we have become increasingly aware of the need for the College to set dates for its programs well in advance (ideally, at least six months in advance) to give Courts as much time as possible to make arrangements to release judicial officers. In our first two years it has been difficult to give that much advance notice. In part this has been because Courts have had difficulty committing themselves to provide the required number of participants for a program to be presented for their judicial officers.

In short, the issue of funding is emerging as a significant one. Either the College needs to be sufficiently funded to provide programs at no cost to participating judicial officers (other than their own travel and accommodation) or the courts need to be provided with the funding to enable them to pay for their judicial officers to participate in the College programs.

A benchmark for professional development

In the light of this, the College has invited the Judicial Conference of Australia (JCA) and the Australian Institute of Administration (AIJA) to develop a written statement of the amount of time that judicial officers should commit to their professional development and the time that should be made available each year to a member of the judiciary for professional development. That means time free from ordinary judicial duties. The statement is also intended to indicate the amount of funding that should be provided on an

annual basis for professional development for judicial officers. “Benchmark statements” along these lines have been prepared in other countries.

The statement will be developed in consultation with heads of jurisdiction, members of the judiciary, and other bodies involved in providing professional development for the judiciary.

The College aims to use the statement as a benchmark to encourage Australian governments to make an appropriate commitment to professional development for Australia’s judiciary. The College will also use the statement to encourage heads of jurisdiction to make arrangements to enable each judicial officer to be released from ordinary duties for the required amount of time each year. As well, the College will encourage individual judicial officers to recognise their own obligation to commit time to professional development, including some of their own time.

The Council regards the issue of adequate funding for professional development, and the commitment of courts and judicial officers to professional development, as a major issue.

We need to convince Australia’s governments that investing in the professional development of the judiciary is a sound investment. As the Chair of the Council said in the 2004 Sir Richard Blackburn Lecture, (2004) 14 JJA page 5 at page 8:

“The importance of the administration of justice, and the substantial investment that society makes in the system for the administration of justice, and in judicial officers, leads to the conclusion that it is in our national interest to ensure that judicial officers perform as well as they can.

That means, I suggest, ensuring that they maintain their skills at a high level, and that during the course of their judicial career they improve those skills with practice and with the benefit of experience, and that they adapt their skills and method of performing their duties to the changing expectations of society and to changed circumstances. As well, and the importance of this should not be overlooked, it means ensuring that they maintain their commitment to and enthusiasm for the administration of justice.

College programs and projects

During the year the College presented programs that were very well received by participants. The Council is satisfied, on the basis of its own observations and on the basis of the responses of participants, that the policies underlying these programs are sound. Those policies are to be found in Attachment B.

In brief, our emphasis is on sharing and building on the experience of judicial officers participating in programs. The emphasis is on groups of judicial officers working together, and on discussion and the sharing of experience and knowledge, rather than on lectures and formal presentations. Our emphasis is on practical skills. In the nature of things, most of our programs are suitable for groups of no more than about 25 or 30 judicial officers. As far as possible we aim to present programs throughout Australia rather than bring participants to Canberra, although some of our programs have been and will be presented in Canberra. As a national organisation, our aim is to mix judicial officers from different courts and from different places, to ensure the widest exchange of experience and knowledge.

The Travelling Judicial Education Program (TJEP) is a program presented over one and a half days. It comprises three modules, each half a day in length. The first TJEP was presented in Adelaide in August 2003. Another was presented in Hobart in February 2004. These were well attended and enthusiastically received.

The Phoenix Program is a five day program. The concept is anew one. It is based on a group of about 30 judicial officers, about half of them being recently appointed and half being experienced. The Phoenix Program has two aims. The first is for experienced judicial officers to transfer the benefit of their hard won experience to recently appointed judicial officers. The second aim is to do this through a program that also helps the experienced judicial officers improve the manner in which they perform their work. A substantial part of

the program is based on group discussion led by members of the group, both newly appointed and experienced. As well we bring in a number of appropriately skilled presenters. The first Phoenix was presented in Canberra in August 2003. The second Phoenix was presented on the Gold Coast in May 2004. Each of these programs was for magistrates. These also were enthusiastically received by the participants.

The Council intends to continue with these programs. The content of each program can and will be varied, and, obviously enough, will be adjusted according to the work of the court for which the program is presented. However, a good deal of the material is generic in nature, and is applicable to all courts and to all judicial officers.

We have no doubt about the value of these programs. However, they require quite intensive preparation to ensure a high quality result. The fact that they require a relatively small group of participants limits the number of judicial officers who can benefit from each program. The Council looks forward to the stage when its funding will permit it to present TJEPs and Phoenix programs several times a year at different places around Australia.

The College presented a workshop on the recently enacted *Human Rights Act* for the judiciary of the Australian Capital Territory in June 2004. This also was well received.

The Council has assumed responsibility for the National Judicial Orientation Program (NJOP) from the Judicial Commission of New South Wales (JCNSW) and from the AIJA. Those bodies continue to be involved in the presentation of the NJOP. The NJOP was presented in Sydney in October 2003. The Council intends to continue to present the NJOP in Sydney.

The Council is well advanced in planning for programs for the year 2004 – 2005. It will continue with the TJEP, the Phoenix Program and with the NJOP. We will present as many of these programs as we are able to organise, subject to limitations attributable to the issue of funding. We will also provide single modules or sessions to be included in programs being organised by individual courts for their own members. This is an important aspect of the work of the College. The College has encouraged all courts to continue with their own programs, on the basis that the College will provide them with whatever help it can in presenting those programs and in developing suitable programs.

There is considerable interest among judicial officers in a program on Judgment Writing. During the year in question the College entered into an arrangement with the Judicial College of Victoria (JCV) for the joint presentation of a program on judgment writing in Melbourne in August 2004.

The Council believes that the provision of professional development programs by way of distance education will become a significant part of the College programs. Using information technology to deliver distance education programs should enable the College to reach more judicial officers than it would otherwise be able to reach. The use of distance education is not intended to replace programs such as the TJEP, Phoenix and NJOP. It is intended as a supplement.

This is an area in which the College needs to develop skills in the preparation and presentation of programs, and in the use of the information technology. We already know that the development of high quality programs is time consuming, and fairly expensive.

The Council has entered into a contractual arrangement with the Australian National University for the development of a pilot program on judgment writing. The cost of this is

being met from the College's funds. The Council has also entered into a contractual arrangement with Monash University for the development of a pilot program on disability awareness. This has been assisted by a generous grant from the Committee that organises the annual Supreme and Federal Court Judges' Conference.

We have high hopes for these pilot programs. We hope that we will be ready to test the pilots in the first half of 2005. All being well, we should then be able to begin offering them on a regular basis. We will then develop further programs for delivery by way of distance education. However, this is another area in which our limited funding will be an issue.

Progress with the development of our website has been relatively slow, due to other commitments. With a staff of only three, there is a limit to what we can achieve, and to the number of activities that we can undertake at one time. During the year 2004 – 2005 we will have available a newly designed website for the College. Thanks to a generous grant from the Commonwealth Attorney-General, we will embark upon developing an electronic library of otherwise unpublished or hard to find material that will assist judicial officers with professional development. We have in mind in particular some of the many papers that are delivered seminars around Australia, but are rarely published beyond the immediate participants.

During the year 2004 – 2005 we also plan to develop an electronic database with information about sentencing in relation to Commonwealth offences. We hope to undertake this project jointly with the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions. In this respect also we have been assisted by another generous grant from the Commonwealth Attorney-General.

These have been the main activities in the area of professional development for the year in question.

Regional Convenors Consultative Committee

The College continues to draw on the knowledge and time of its Regional Convenors, all of whom are making a valuable contribution to the work of the College. The same applies to the Consultative Committee, which includes the Regional Convenors.

The Council and the Consultative Committee met over a weekend in Hobart in February 2004, immediately after the Hobart TJEP. The meeting was most productive. Members of the Consultative Committee made a number of suggestions that Council has adopted. One of them is the benchmark statement referred to above.

The Consultative Committee also emphasised the need for the College to promote itself, and the importance of judicial professional development for the judiciary, to the Australian community, and in particular to Attorneys-General. The Consultative Committee emphasised that the College should not focus entirely on the presentation of programs, but should promote itself as a national body and should also promote the cause of judicial education. At the suggestion of the Consultative Committee the Council is developing a Strategic Plan that will provide a concise statement of the College's objectives and activities. The Council aims to use the Strategic Plan to promote the College and the cause of professional development for Australia's judiciary.

Conclusion

The Council considers it important that it should have sound working relationships with JCNSW, JCV and the AIJA. It is anxious to avoid any waste or duplication of effort. Bearing in mind the limited funding available for judicial education, it is important that all available funds be used as efficiently as they can be. The Council is pleased to say that we have good working relationships with each of these bodies. The Council also aims to work

with the Education committees of individual courts, and hopes over time to be able to assist them with the programs that they provide.

Overall, the year has been a busy one. The work of the College makes considerable demands on the time of members of Council. However, we are conscious of the importance of the work and remain committed to the College. Provided the College can secure the necessary support, we believe that it will make a real contribution to the Australian judiciary.

**NJCA Council members, Council alternates, Regional Convenors,
Consultative committee members and Secretariat members
as at 30 June 2004**

THE COUNCIL

In the course of the development of proposals for the College it was generally agreed that the independence of the judicial arm of government required that a body devoted to judicial education be under the control of the judiciary. That is reflected in the constitution of the College which provides for control by the judiciary with outside representation. The Council is comprised of four judicial members, a member nominated by the Commonwealth Attorney General, and a member nominated by participating State and Territory Attorneys General. The Council members as at 30 June 2004 are:

Chief Justice John Doyle AC Supreme Court of South Australia	Nominee of the Chief Justices of the State or Territory Supreme Courts and chair appointed by the Chief Justice of the High Court
Justice John Dowsett Federal Court of Australia	Nominee of the Chief Justice of the Federal Court and the Family Court
Judge Jack Goldring* District Court of New South Wales	Nominee of the Chief Judges of the District or County Courts
Chief Magistrate Hugh Bradley Magistrates Court of the Northern Territory	Nominee of the Chief Magistrates of the Federal Magistrates' Court and Magistrates' or Local Courts
Mr Robert Cornall Secretary, Commonwealth Attorney General's Department	Nominee of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth
Mr Laurie Glanfield AM Director-General, New South Wales Attorney General's Department	Nominee of the Attorneys General of the participating States and Territories

*Judge Tony Skoien(District Court QLD) replaces Judge Goldring as from 1 July 2004.

COUNCIL ALTERNATES

The Constitution of the College provides for each member of the Council to appoint an alternate to exercise some or all of the powers of that Council Member as required from time to time. The alternate members of the Council as 30 June 2004 are:

Justice Geoffrey Miller Supreme Court of Western Australia	Nominee of the Chief Justices of the State or Territory Supreme Courts
Justice Sally Brown Family Court of Australia	Nominee of the Chief Justices of the Federal and Family Court

Judge Peter Martino District Court of Western Australia	Nominee of the Chief Judges of the District or County Courts
Chief Magistrate Ronald Cahill Magistrates Court of the Australian Capital Territory	Nominee of the Chief Magistrates of the Federal Magistrates' Court and Magistrates' or Local Courts
Ms Kathy Leigh Commonwealth Attorney General's Department	Nominee of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth
Mr Timothy Keady Secretary of the Department of Justice and Community Safety, Australian Capital Territory	Nominee of the Attorneys General of the participating States and Territories

REGIONAL CONVENORS

The College's Constitution provides for the Council to appoint, after consultation with the relevant Chief Justice or Chief Justices, a Regional Convenor for each State and Territory:

- (a) to provide liaison between the College and his/her region;
- (b) to advise as to appropriate subject matter for the College's programmes and methods of delivery;
- (c) to provide feedback concerning the College's programmes previously conducted;
- (d) to assist in the organisation of the College's programmes to be conducted within his/her region, including arrangement of appropriate facilities;
- (e) to stimulate interest amongst judicial officers in his/her region concerning the College's programmes and attendance thereat;
- (f) to recruit judicial officers to assist in the preparation and conduct of the College's programmes;
- (g) where appropriate, to co-ordinate the activities of all members of the Consultative Committee based within his/her region;
- (h) if practicable, in consultation with the Council, to organise a local chapter of the College in his/her region.

The following are regional convenors as at 30 June 2004:

Australian Capital Territory	Justice Terry Connolly Supreme Court of the ACT
New South Wales	Magistrate George Zdenkowski Magistrates' Court New South Wales
Northern Territory	Justice Sally Thomas Supreme Court of the Northern Territory
Queensland	Judge John Robertson District Court of Queensland
South Australia	Judge Brian Gilchrist Industrial Relations Court of South Australia

Tasmania	Magistrate Peter Dixon Magistrates' Court Tasmania
Victoria	Judge Wendy Wilmoth County Court of Victoria
Western Australia	Justice Geoffrey Miller Supreme Court of Western Australia

THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The College's Constitution provides for a Consultative Committee to:

- a) advise the Council as to how the College should meet the professional development needs of judicial officers;
- b) advise the Council as to the perceived quality and value of the College's programmes previously conducted; and
- c) facilitate good communications between the College and judicial officers.

The members of the Consultative Committee are the eight regional convenors and the following additional members:

Magistrate Robert Lawrence Magistrates Court of Western Australia	Nominee of the Australian Association of Magistrates
Justice John Byrne RFD Supreme Court of Queensland	Nominee of the Australian Institute of Judicial Administration
Mr Tony Abbott Piper Alderman Solicitors, Adelaide	Nominee of the Law Council of Australia
Justice David Lloyd Land and Environment Court NSW	Nominee of the Judicial Conference of Australia
Professor Eugene Clark University of Canberra	Nominee of the Council of Law Deans
Professor Larissa Behrendt University of Technology Sydney Ms Karen Curtis Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr Phillip French Disability Studies and Research Institute	Nominees of the Attorneys General of the Commonwealth and participating States and Territories

THE COLLEGE SECRETARIAT

The administrative staff of the College as at 30 June 2004 are:

Mr John Mc Ginness	Director
Ms Wendy Forster	Conference Co-ordinator
Ms Jane Avent	Executive Assistant

THE ORIGIN OF THE NATIONAL JUDICIAL COLLEGE OF AUSTRALIA

In the early 1990s calls were made for the establishment of a body dedicated to providing judicial education for the whole Australian judiciary. In 2000 the Australian Law Reform Commission's Report number 89 'Managing Justice' canvassed the issues and recommended the establishment of an Australian Judicial College. It proposed that the College be under the governance of judges and have responsibility for orientation training of new judicial appointees and continuing professional development of existing judicial officers.

In March 2000 the Standing Committee of Attorneys General (SCAG) formed a working group to consider the establishment of a National Judicial College. The working group found that there was a high level of support from the judiciary and other interested persons for the establishment of a national college. The working group report in May 2001 stated the case for a National Judicial College as follows:

“Currently judicial officers in Australia attend a diverse range of judicial education programmes but the availability varies greatly between jurisdictions. A national approach to judicial education would address the needs of judicial officers throughout Australia. A national college would ensure that education for judicial officers was planned and coordinated at a national level, both increasing quality and avoiding duplication. Judicial officers from across jurisdictions and from different geographical regions would have the opportunity to exchange information and experiences. This would maximize the benefit derived by judicial officers and the community from professional development programmes. The establishment of a national judicial college would bring Australia into line with developments in other common law jurisdictions in relation to the provision of judicial education.”

The working group's report was accepted in principle by SCAG in July 2001 and the working group was asked to implement the proposals in its report.

The National Judicial College of Australia was established in May 2002 as an independent entity, incorporated as a company limited by guarantee. It is funded by contributions from the Commonwealth and some State and Territory governments. The College will report annually to the Council of Chief Justices and to the Standing Committee of Attorneys General. The College will provide professional development programs to judicial officers in Australia and, on occasion, will conduct courses for non-judicial officers, such as senior court administrators and tribunal members.

At the official launch of the College in August 2002, the first chair of the Council of the College, Chief Justice John Doyle of South Australia, said the following about the need for judicial education in Australia:

“ I believe that the case for a National Judicial College for judicial education is self-evident. However, it is worth restating it very briefly. The work of the judiciary is demanding. Judges and Magistrates are expected to have professional legal skills of a high order. They should also have a wide range of practical judicial skills to enable them to carry out judicial work properly. Some of these practical skills are peculiar to the judicial role, some are skills that are also required in other professions.

The administration of justice involves much more than professional and practical competence. There is a qualitative aspect to the administration of justice which calls for judicial officers to have a real enthusiasm for their work, a strong belief in the importance of justice, and a commitment to the administration of justice in the fullest sense of the word. While these attitudes and beliefs are instilled in us in our professional life, experience tells us that over time judicial officers can become cynical and can suffer what is generally called "burn out". Experience tells us that most judicial officers can benefit from programmes of professional development that help them avoid this phenomenon.

Finally, judicial officers tend to occupy judicial office for fairly lengthy periods. This is in the public interest. It takes time to develop fully the skills required of a judicial officer, and it is in the public interest that those who have fully developed those skills put them to the public benefit for as long as possible. The fact that judicial officers hold office for substantial periods of time mean that they are likely to benefit from programmes of professional development that reinvigorate, refresh and enthuse.

Thus, the members of the Australian judiciary can benefit from programmes of professional development that focus on their legal skills, their practical judicial skills, and their approach to their work and which help them to maintain fitness and enthusiasm for the work. The scope for programmes for professional development is substantial. In the past it was assumed that, somehow or other, in the course of a judicial career, a judge or magistrate would receive the stimulus for self-improvement, and the refreshment and re-invigoration that we know we need. We now know that this assumption is too optimistic. There is a real need for organised programmes of professional development. The judiciary, as a profession, has come to understand this, as have the other professions."

THE COLLEGE'S POLICIES ON JUDICIAL EDUCATION

In considering the development of the College's programs, the Council of the College has identified some policies it intends to pursue. These policies have been formed as a result of the Working Group's consultations with judicial officers and other interested persons in 2001/2002, thorough discussions in meetings of the Council and again at the first meeting of the College's Consultative Committee in Canberra in February 2003. The policies are summarised below.

The role of the College is to assist judges in their professional development. Programmes should be developed to meet real needs. They must be delivered in ways which maximize the benefit to be derived by judicial officers and the community and take account of the particular sensitivities incidental to activities concerning judicial officers.

In developing programs the emphasis should be on matters not adequately covered by readily available sources such as text books and journals. In particular, emphasis should be on practical skills, a large aspect of judicial work. The College appreciates the importance of providing programs on social and cultural awareness issues including issues relating to disability awareness, persons from non English speaking and indigenous backgrounds and the protection of children. Other important matters include recent legal developments; legal, and programs concerning judicial physical and mental health. In general the College would not expect programs to focus upon substantive law. That area will usually be better addressed in other forums or by private study.

In Australia there are a large number of judicial officers with different responsibilities. Needs may be quite specialized. Although there are some common aspects to all judicial work, the College will not assume that one program will be suitable for all, or even most judges. This may lead to our offering specialized courses to small groups. The College must identify and try to satisfy the real needs of the judiciary and of the community.

Judicial officers are a group of people who, by reason of talent, experience, education and training, have been identified as suitable to receive the authority of the state to resolve disputes between citizens and between the state and citizens. They will be busy people who are themselves regularly asked to participate in programs as speakers and teachers. Any program developed by the College must be worthy of the time which participants will be asked to invest in it.

The College should adopt best practices for adult professional learning. The emphasis should not be on formal lectures. Rather the College will use structured discussion of practical problems and other similar forms of active learning, for example self-teaching in small discussion groups, based on well-planned, practical problems.

The focus on discussion rather than lectures means that most programs will be suitable for groups of no more than 25 to 30 participants.

The College's programs will be participant focussed rather than "teacher focussed". Judicial officers collectively will often bring more to college programs than any one presenter or group of presenters and the emphasis should be on sharing and building upon the experience of participants; presenters should guide discussion and encourage participation, but should not be seen as a faculty separate from the participants.

The College's role is not to standardize judicial approaches to problems or issues or to label any acceptable approach as "right" or "wrong", nor should there be any public comment upon the extent to which any judge, in his or her work, has complied with, or failed to comply with approaches suggested in the course of any program.

The Council believes that those who are carrying out judicial work are usually best placed to lead professional development programs, bearing in mind that almost always this involves a mix of technical and practical skills. The accumulated experience and skill of the judiciary are valuable national assets. The College should harness and enhance them in ways which are more appropriate to their true value. Thus most of the educational programs of the College will be led by experienced and respected judicial officers. However, the College will also draw on academic lawyers and members of other professions who have appropriate expertise and experience. In particular, the College hopes to build a fruitful relationship with the members of the Faculty of Law at the ANU.

As far as possible, the College will take its programs to the Australian judiciary, rather than bring them to Canberra to attend courses. There is a place for both approaches, but the emphasis should be on providing programs to the Australian judiciary in their home towns. The College's programs must be designed to be easily conducted at various places around the country and allow for different presenters to present the same program in different cities. To the extent that it is practical, we will develop "template programs" that can be readily repeated, with or without changes. Presenters should change regularly to maximize input from the whole judiciary and to avoid the institutionalization of the views of a small group.

One of the objectives of nationally organised professional development activities is that judicial officers from across jurisdictions and from different geographical regions will have the opportunity to exchange information and experiences. This would maximize the benefit

derived by judicial officers and the community from professional development programmes. The College aims as much as possible to increase opportunities for the exchange of experience between jurisdictions.