



Educating the Judiciary about the Social Determinants of Health

OCTOBER 2020

White Paper Three:
Judicial Education Programs:
Surveying the Landscape

About the Project:

Salus Populi: Educating the Judiciary about the Social Determinants of Health is a project in collaboration with the Center for Health Policy and Law at Northeastern University School of Law and the Institute for Health Equity and Social Justice Research at Northeastern University.

The Center for Health Policy and Law at Northeastern University School of Law promotes innovative solutions to public health challenges in Massachusetts and around the globe. The Center advances law and policy reforms to strengthen population health, reduce health disparities, nourish public health programs, and enhance access to affordable, high-quality healthcare. Wendy E. Parmet is the faculty director of the Center for Health Policy and Law, and Matthews Distinguished University Professor of Law and Professor of Public Policy and Urban Affairs at Northeastern University.

The Institute for Health Equity and Social Justice Research is dedicated to generating scientific knowledge to promote health equity and social justice, and reduce disparities in health, mental health and well-being. The Institute's projects focus on public mental health and substance use disorders, violence prevention and trauma studies, refugee, immigrant and global health, and health promotion and disease prevention across the life course. The director of the Institute for Health Equity and Social Justice Research is Alisa K. Lincoln, Associate Dean of Research for the College of Social Sciences and Humanities and Professor of Health Sciences and Sociology at Northeastern University.



Acknowledgements:

The Center for Health Policy and Law and the Institute for Health Equity and Social Justice Research would like to acknowledge the dedicated research assistants who provided support for this report: Emily Butcher, Gregory Paal, and Benjamin Sephton. Thank you to Faith Khalik, legal fellow for Public Health Law Watch, for her valuable work on this paper.

Support for this report was provided by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Judicial Education Programs	5
Nationwide Programs	5
State-run Programs	7
Subject Matter-Focused Programs.....	7
Ethical Considerations	9
Continuing Education Accreditation	11
Conclusion	12

Executive Summary

Over the last 60 years, judicial education programs (JEPs) have proliferated around the United States. These programs vary greatly in terms of sponsorship (public or private), funding (tuition or public or private grants), scope (national or state-specific), subject matter, and format. Although in the past, most programs offered their courses primarily through in-person workshops and seminars, in the past few years, JEP courses have increasingly been offered online. The COVID-19 pandemic appears to have accelerated this move to online judicial education programming.

Most JEPs focus their curriculum on judicial administration, court processes, leadership skills, and/or specific areas of law, such as criminal procedure. However, **several programs seek to inform judges about non-legal disciplines or subjects that are relevant to the work of the judiciary**, such as economics, environmental science, and brain science. **There does not appear to be any existing JEP focused on the social determinants of health.**

In order to be interesting and useful to judges, **JEPs usually involve judges in both curriculum development and teaching. Successful programs also qualify to provide continuing judicial education credit.** In order to do so, some smaller programs partner with large national organizations (such as the American Bar Association (ABA) or the Judicial College) that are experienced with and have the capacity to ensure that their programs qualify. Such partnering may be crucial for helping a new JEP focused on social determinants to attract judges and quality for judicial education credit.

Whatever the program's format, **a JEP must comply with applicable ethical guidelines.** Although these vary by jurisdiction, most closely track the ABA's Code of Judicial Conduct, which requires judges to avoid activities that **"would reasonably appear to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality."** Programs must also ensure that any reimbursements or honoraria comply with a jurisdiction's ethical codes and reporting requirements.

Introduction

Judicial education programs (JEPs) have proliferated widely across the United States since the 1960s, spurred in part by the increasing recognition of the complexity and diversity of the matters that come before the courts.¹ A related, but distinct incentive, is the fact that most jurisdictions require all members of the bar, including judges and judicial staff, to attain a specified number of continuing legal education credits each year. In addition, several states mandate that judges participate in judicial education. Some states specify the particular program that judges must attend. For example, Illinois requires that active judges attain 30 hours of continuing judicial education every two years by attending the biennial Education Conference.² Some jurisdictions also require that judges and court staff take courses on specified topics. For example, almost half of the states require some form of mandatory training in domestic violence.³ Some states, such as Florida, require new judges to complete an orientation course. See Appendix C for a complete list of continuing judicial education requirements.

JEPs take many forms and cover a wide range of subject matters. Traditionally, JEPs relied on relatively small in-person seminars. These can be conducted within the targeted jurisdiction, on a university campus, or even at a resort. Many national judicial and legal organizations provide judicial training in plenary or break-out sessions at large conferences for judges or members of the bar.

More recently, many JEPs have begun to offer courses online, utilizing a variety of formats. Reviewing JEPs in 2015, Richard Reaves lamented the quality of many remote learning programs, noting a “common misconception that resort to such educational methods is more economical.”⁴ However, these programs have become more popular in recent years, and will likely become the dominant format, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In addition to live and remote formats, many JEPs offer an array of self-study and reference materials, including bench books, model orders, and standard practice forms. These are often accessible via electronic publications, hardcopy books, or dedicated websites.⁵

The curriculum of JEPs varies widely. Orientation courses seek to introduce new judges or court personnel to their positions. Other courses provide updates on developments in procedural rules or specific areas of law within a jurisdiction. Courses on sentencing and domestic relations are especially common. Many courses cover judicial administration, ethics, or ancillary court services, such as probation or family support services. Some courses focus on leadership skills and professional development. Still others introduce judges to non-legal disciplines that may be relevant to their work, such as the assessment of scientific evidence, or economics.⁶ Although

some existing courses touch on issues relevant to the SDOH, we have not found a JEP program that focuses on the SDOH.⁷

Funding for JEPs remains a serious concern. Many programs charge tuition, though in some cases scholarships are available. Other programs (such as those offered by the Federal Judicial Center or some state courts) receive government appropriations or rely on public or private grants.

Despite the proliferation of JEPs, research regarding their efficacy and impact appears to be limited. White Paper IV discusses some research relating to best practices. For present purposes, it is worth noting that the continued support of these programs by the courts, as well as private foundations, provides at least some reason to believe they can be an effective way to inform judges and improve the administration of justice.

Judicial Education Programs

Nationwide Programs

In 1961, the American Bar Association (ABA), the American Judicature Society (AJS), and several other organizations formed the Committee for Effective Administration of Justice.⁸ According to Robert G. Bone, the committee “from its inception, focused on judicial education as a way to effect court reform.”⁹ Consistent with that approach, the committee held numerous seminars for state judges across the country. These seminars proved to be popular and led in 1964 establishment of the National College of State Trial Judges. The **National Judicial College (NJC)**, as it is now known, held its first session – a four-week intensive course covering procedure and court administration – at the University of Colorado Law School that same year.¹⁰

Today, the NJC is located on the campus of the University of Nevada, Reno. A non-profit corporation governed by a Board of Trustees, it differs from many JEPs by employing full-time faculty. It also offers a wide array of courses, many of which focus on trial processes and management. There are also courses in substantive areas of the law, as well as in management and leadership skills. In addition to the Reno Campus classes, courses are offered at various remote sites around the country, as well as online. The National Tribal Judicial Center, which serves several hundred tribal jurists, is also housed on the NJC’s campus.

The **National Center for State Courts (NCSC)** also offers a broad menu of courses for state judges. Established in 1971 after Chief Justice Warren Burger called for a “national center for state courts,”¹¹ the NCSC is an independent non-profit organization focused on “improving

judicial administration through leadership and service to state courts.”¹² Located in Williamsburg, Virginia, it conducts research and disseminates knowledge about state courts. Through its **Institute for Court Management (ICM)**, it offers a broad roster of online and in-person courses around the country on court administration, management skills, and specific topics, such as domestic violence.¹³ The ICM also offers a certificate program on court management. While some of the online courses are free of charge, tuition for most live courses is currently set at \$745.¹⁴ The programs include learning objectives and descriptions for students. Many of the live courses are intended to meet over a period of time (sometimes several days or weeks) for multiple days during the week.¹⁵

Located within the NCSC, the **American Judges Association (AJA)** is a non-profit membership organization that “works to promote and improve the effective administration of justice and maintain the status and independence of the judiciary.” It offers free webinar series for judges on topics such as “Procedural Fairness: What Every Judge & Court Leader Needs to Know” and “Developing Issues with Standard Field Sobriety Tests in Impaired Driving Cases.” These webinars are not registered for state CLE credit, but certificates of completion are issued. The webinars are posted online for asynchronous viewing.

At the federal level, Congress established the **Federal Judicial Center (FJC)** in 1967 to serve as an independent research agency within the federal judiciary. The FJC seeks to “provide accurate, objective information and education, and to encourage thorough and candid analysis of policies, practices, and procedures.” The Chief Justice of the United States serves as chair of the Center’s Board, which also includes seven federal judges and the director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Court. The FJC is funded by annual appropriations from Congress; as well as support from the independent Federal Judicial Center Foundation.

The FJC offers a wide range of educational programs for federal judges and other court professionals including federal defenders, probation officers, and clerks. Subjects include “law, case management, the judicial role, leadership, ethics, and court management.” Programs are offered in a variety of formats, including in-person classes, instructional videos, podcasts, and video conferences. The FJC also hosts national and regional workshops for specific types of justices, as well as shorter seminars on distinct topics, such as pretrial decision making. The FJC purports to have “identified the specific competencies that inform a standard curriculum for each of our judicial and courts staff populations.”

Many FJC programs target specific populations. For example, the FJC offers orientation seminars for different categories of judges (district, magistrate, court of appeals, bankruptcy). Phase One of the orientation program for new district court judges consists of a one-week program led by two experienced judges. New judges receive materials and engage in an interactive, skills-based learning approach. In Phase Two, several classes are brought together to

discuss a set of topics including case management, sentencing, media relations and ethics, among others.¹⁶ Orientation programs for other types of judges appear to follow a relatively similar approach.

Many national membership organizations also offer JEPs. For example, the **Judicial Division of the ABA** hosts live webinars and on-demand courses for CLE credits on a wide range of topics, from “Staying Healthy on the Bench” to “Neuroscience and the Law.” Notably, some of the “on-demand” courses seem geared to both judges and practicing attorneys. Tuition is charged for many of the courses, but is free or discounted for ABA members.

The **National Association of Women Judges (NAWJ)**, established in 1979, offers a range of live and online educational programs. Its website explains it is “engaged in projects and judicial education that address human trafficking/modern day slavery; voter education in states with judicial elections; conditions for women in prisons; problems facing immigrants in our court system: bioethics; outreach to students about legal and judicial careers, among others.”

State-run Programs

Almost all states have JEPs specifically designed for the judges and judicial branch employees in that state. [See Appendix A] Some state JEPs also serve attorneys and others who work in or with the courts (e.g. clerks, probation officers, public defenders). Many state programs are run by agencies that are housed within and receive funding from the judiciary. Others are run by private, non-profit organizations. Some are run by one of the public universities in the state.

Although many state JEPs do not charge state judges tuition, others do. Like the larger nationwide programs, state programs utilize a variety of formats including conferences, seminars and online programs. State JEPs also produce manuals and bench books and share updates.

Subject Matter-Focused Programs

Privately-sponsored JEPs that focus on non-legal disciplines may provide especially relevant models to our efforts to create a JEP on SDOH. Some of these programs receive grants from federal agencies, including the Department of Justice (DOJ) and/or the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Other programs are funded by private foundations, including industry-associated groups (such as the tobacco companies or energy companies), a practice that has raised ethical issues, discussed below. A fuller list of private and/or issue-focused programs is set forth in Appendix B to this report.

The Mason Judicial Program

One of the best known programs is the **Mason Judicial Program** (formerly known as the Manne Program in Economics for Federal Judges) offered by the **Law & Economics Center at George Mason University**. The program, which was established by Henry Manne at the University of Miami in 1974, has trained over 5,000 federal and state judges from across the country. It seeks to provide judges with “basic knowledge of economic principles” so that they can “better understand the long-term implications of their decisions, thereby improving the development of the law and benefiting America’s free enterprise system.”¹⁷ It offers small workshops limited to 20 judges that incorporate classroom presentations and discussions, symposia on specific current legal and policy issues, case analysis seminars, and an introductory courses on economics.¹⁸ Programs are offered on the George Mason University’s campus and around the country.

Funding for the Mason Judicial Program has been confidential. A 2013 report (updated in 2014) from the Center for Public Integrity found that most of the Program’s conferences were supported by the Koch Foundation and the Searle Freedom Trust.¹⁹ The Program has also received money from corporations including ExxonMobil. In a recently published empirical study, Elliott Ash and colleagues found that judges who attended the program were more likely to use economic language and rule against regulatory agencies.²⁰

The Environmental Law Institute Judicial Education Program

One JEP that seems especially relevant to a program on the SDOH is the **Judicial Education Program of the Environmental Law Institute (ELI)**. Founded in 1990, and supported by individual donors, corporations and foundations, ELI has presented and participated in educational workshops for more than 2,500 judges from 28 countries on topics relating to environmental law. The program purports to “incorporate the latest advances in legal, scientific, public health and economic thought and allow interactive analysis by participants and faculty.”²¹

In order to develop its programs, ELI conducts “extensive consultation with practitioners and organizations on all sides of the political spectrum.” It also relies heavily on an advisory board, in which judges played a major role.²² ELI also collaborates with nonpartisan entities, including the FJC and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

In developing a JEP program focused on climate science, ELI proceeded “incrementally,” beginning with a pilot series of seminars for judges at Columbia University and George Washington University in 2019.²³ These seminars included presentations by leading climate scientists, a keynote speaker, and a discussion with attendees.²⁴ Between 15-50 judges participate in each seminar, though ELI considers 20-25 judges per seminar to be ideal. Many of

the programs are offered in collaboration with pre-existing state or federal judicial conferences, the FJC or the NJC. These collaborations facilitate broad attendance and ensure that the state-focused programs qualify for continuing education credit. Moreover, ELI does not have to pay travel costs for attendees when its programs are offered as part of a professional association sponsored conference. In addition, ELI has found it must provide honoraria to scientists on the faculty.²⁵

Ethical Considerations

All JEPs must comply with relevant state and federal guidelines. This section provides a brief overview of key principles of those guidelines that may be applicable to the program we aim to build.

Federal and state judges are obligated to comply with the code of ethics for their respective jurisdiction. A majority of these codes closely track the **ABA's Model Code of Judicial Conduct**.²⁶ The relevant section of the Model Code appears in Appendix D to this report. **Canon 3**, which requires judges to conduct their personal and extrajudicial activities to minimize the risk of conflict with their judicial obligations, is the most relevant to JEPs.²⁷ This does not preclude attending JEPs. To the contrary, some codes explicitly permit participation in JEPs.²⁸

Judges, however, must avoid extrajudicial activities that “would reasonably appear to undermine the judge’s independence, integrity, or impartiality.”²⁹ As applied to JEPs, a critical factor is the nature of the sponsoring organization. For example, in an advisory opinion, the **federal Committee on Codes of Conduct** listed twelve factors that judges should consider in determining whether to participate in an educational seminar. The first nine factors relate to the nature of the sponsoring organization:

- (1) its identity;
- (2) its stated mission, including any political or ideological point of view;
- (3) whether it engages in education, lobbying, or outreach to members of Congress, key congressional staffers, or policymakers in the executive branch;
- (4) whether it conducts outreach or educational programs for the media, academia, or policy communities;
- (5) whether it is actively involved in litigation in the state or federal courts, including the filing of amicus briefs, participating in moot courts or boards to prepare candidates or advocates;
- (6) whether it holds rallies, meetings, or appearances in conjunction with hearings or trials with a view towards influencing public opinion;

- (7) whether it advocates for specific outcomes on legal or political issues;
- (8) its sources of funding; and
- (9) whether it is generally viewed by the public as having adopted a consistent political or ideological point of view equivalent to the type of partisanship often found in political organizations.³⁰³¹

These factors should be viewed holistically as opposed to independently. It is also important that JEPs focus on improving the law and legal system rather than promoting a particular ideological stance. As one **Advisory Opinion from the Federal Committee on Codes of Conduct** explained, programs should focus on “improving the law, qua law, or improving the legal system or administration of justice, and not merely utilizing the law ... as a means to achieve an underlying social, political or civic objective.”³²

JEPs must also avoid ethical problems related to the reimbursement of travel expenses. The general rule is that judges “may accept reimbursement of necessary and reasonable expenses for travel, food, lodging or other incidental expenses, or a waiver ... of fees or charges for registration ... if the expenses or charges are associated with the judge’s participation in extrajudicial activities” permitted by the relevant code.³³ Some state codes provide further guidance. For example, many states, including Minnesota, follow Comment 3 to Section 3.14 of the ABA Model Code by requiring consideration of “whether the sponsor is an accredited educational institution . . . whether the funding comes from many contributors [or] a single entity . . . whether the activity is primarily educational rather than recreational,” and how the costs compare to similar events; “whether information concerning the activity and its funding sources is available upon inquiry; “whether sponsor” is “associated with particular parties or interests . . . likely to appear in the judge’s court . . . whether differing viewpoints are presented; and . . . whether the program is designed specifically for judges.”³⁴

It is also important to avoid any perception that judges are being compensated for participation in the program by ensuring that reimbursements do not exceed reasonable costs. New York, for example, limits permissible reimbursement to actual, reasonably incurred costs, defines any amount of reimbursement over the actual cost as compensation, and imposes a reporting requirement on judges who receive compensation “in excess of \$150.”³⁵ Pennsylvania requires reporting on reimbursements unless the total received in a calendar year “does not exceed \$650.”³⁶ See Appendix E for a further listing of reimbursement requirements.

Federal reporting requirements go further. In 2007, in response to concerns about sponsorship of JEPs by entities with interests before the courts, the **Federal Judicial Conference** issued a policy requiring nongovernmental sources that wish to reimburse

federal judges to disclose details regarding the program.³⁷ The policy is triggered by a reimbursement that exceeds the “threshold at which judges must report reimbursements on their annual financial disclosure reports,” which is currently set at \$390.³⁸ If a judge accepts such a reimbursement, the proposed program must disclose this information to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.³⁹

Continuing Education Accreditation

As noted above, many jurisdictions have continuing education requirements for judges. Obtaining approval to award continuing education credit will be an important step to attracting participation by judges.

Although the specific requirements for program accreditation vary by jurisdiction, the broad strokes are similar. California’s requirements provide an instructive example. Programs must (1) be “relevant to the work of the courts”; (2) “at least an hour in length”; and (3) identify “anticipated learning outcomes . . . prior to the education work.”⁴⁰ Programs must also meet two of the five following criteria: (1) “[t]he learning environment is educationally sound”; (2) “participant receives or has access to all . . . materials and resources that are required for learning and applying the content”; (3) “participant has an opportunity to practice using or applying the new information or skill”; (4) “participant has the opportunity to interact with knowledgeable faculty or other experts in the topical area”; and (5) participant can use an “assessment tool or activity” to “determine whether the skills, abilities, or knowledge gained through the education can be used in the future in his or her work.”⁴¹ Some states also require that programs not be restricted to judges with any particular background or approach to the law.⁴² [See Appendix C]

As we go forward, if we want our program to qualify for continuing education credits, we will need to ensure that we follow all of the particular steps for accreditation in the jurisdictions from which we enroll judges. One way to ease this financial and logistical burden is to present our programs in collaboration with established JEPs that are accredited for judicial education. For example, as noted above, ELI offers programs at state judicial conferences, and is planning to offer programs through the NJC. By doing so, it can provide credits without having to seek accreditation from individual jurisdictions.

Conclusion

JEPs can be an effective means of informing the judiciary about issues that related to the administration of justice. JEPs can take many different forms. Whatever the format, several key points should be kept in mind as we develop our JEP:

- Although there are numerous JEPs that aim to introduce to judges to non-legal disciplines, there do not appear to be any focusing on SDOH.
- Although JEPs have traditionally relied on in-person seminars and workshops, online courses have become more common even before the pandemic.
- JEPs receive funding from a variety of public and private sources, including federal grants.
- We should seek to partner with associations and organizations that already provide judicial education. This can add credibility to our program, help attract judges to our program, and help ensure that attendees receive continuing legal education credits.
- Programs must be non-partisan, and non-ideological, and focus on improving the administration of justice.
- We must pay careful attention to relevant jurisdictional guidelines related to travel expenses and honoraria for judges.

¹ For a history of the rise of JEPs, see Robert G. Bone, *Judging as judgement: Tying Judicial Education to Adjudication Theory*, 2015 J. DISP. RESOL. 129, 130-131, (2015) (“it was not until 1961 that the judicial education movement caught fire”).

² *Judicial Education in Illinois: Judicial Education Programs*, ILLINOIS COURTS, <http://www.illinoiscourts.gov/Education/default.asp?tab=0> (last visited May 25, 2020).

³ Nat’l. Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Mandatory Domestic Violence Training for Judges*, RESOURCE CENTER ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: CHILD PROTECTION AND CUSTODY (2013), <https://rcdvcpc.org/resources/resource-library/resource/mandatory-dv-training-for-cps.html>.

⁴ Richard Reaves, *Continuing education for judges*, 5 JUD. EDUC. AND TRAINING 29, 32 (2016) (discussing efficacy of remote learning resources for judicial education).

⁵ *Id.* at 33.

⁶ It is worth noting that The Declaration of Judicial Training Principles adopted by the International Organization for Judicial Training states that “judicial training should be multidisciplinary and include training in law, non-legal knowledge, skills, social context and values and ethics.” *Declaration of Judicial Training Principles*, INT’L. ORG. FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING, at 2 (2017).

⁷ We should note though that we have not been able to review the course catalogs of all programs.

⁸ Bone, *supra* note 1, at 131.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at 32.

¹¹ *Mission & History*, NAT’L. CENTER FOR STATE COURTS, <https://www.ncsc.org/About-us/Mission-and-history.aspx> (last visited May 25, 2020).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Online Courses*, NAT’L. CENTER FOR STATE COURTS, <https://courses.ncsc.org/> (last visited May 25, 2020).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Programs and Resources for Judges*, FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER <https://www.fjc.gov/education/programs-and-resources-judges#ODJ> (last visited May 25, 2020).

¹⁷ *Judicial Education Program*, MASON LAW AND ECONOMICS CENTER, <https://masonlec.org/divisions/mason-judicial-education-program/> (last visited May 26, 2020); This stance is also supported by the Federal Committee on Codes of Conduct.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ Chris Young, Reity O’Brien, & Andrea Fuller, *Pro-Business Nonprofits Foot Bill for Judicial Seminars*, THE CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY (MAY 27, 2014) <https://publicintegrity.org/politics/corporations-pro-business-nonprofits-foot-bill-for-judicial-seminars/>.

²⁰ Elliott Ash, Daniel L. Chen, & Suresh Naidu, *Ideas Have Consequences: The Impact of Law and Economics on American Justice*, (March 20, 2019).

²¹ *Judicial Education Program*, ENVIRONMENTAL LAW INSTITUTE, <https://www.eli.org/judicial-education> (last visited May 26, 2020).

²² Interview with Sandra Nichols Thiam and Jay Pendergrass, May 15, 2020.

²³ *Recent, Ongoing & Upcoming Projects*, ENVIRONMENTAL LAW INSTITUTE, <https://www.eli.org/judicial-education/recent-ongoing-upcoming-projects> (last visited May 26, 2020).

²⁴ *Educating Judges for the Climate Litigation of Today and Tomorrow*, ENVIRONMENTAL LAW INSTITUTE, <https://www.eli.org/vibrant-environment-blog/educating-judges-climate-litigation-today-and-tomorrow> (last visited May 26, 2020).

²⁵ Additional private and/or issue-focused JEPs are summarized in Appendix B.

²⁶ Andrew J. Lievens & Avcern Cohn, *The Federal Judiciary and the ABA Model Code: The Parting of the Ways*, 28 JUST. SYST. J., 270, 280 (2007); *Charts Comparing Individual Jurisdictional Judicial Conduct Rules to ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct*, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (Aug. 14, 2018), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/resources/judicial_ethics_regulation/aba_model_code_comparison/.

²⁷ MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT: Canon 3 (AM. BAR ASS’N 2010).

²⁸ CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES, Canon 4 (2019).

²⁹ *See e.g.*, PENNSYLVANIA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT, r. 3.1 (2014).

³⁰ JUD. CONF. OF THE U.S. COMM. ON CODES OF CONDUCT, ADVISORY OP. NO. 116.

³¹ Although most of these factors should raise no issue for the program we are developing, we should note that the Center for Health Policy and Law at Northeastern University School of Law, independently or with other partners and experts, has drafted and filed amicus briefs and regulatory comments on cases and issues related to health policy and law.

³² JUD. CONF. OF THE U.S. COMM. ON CODES OF CONDUCT, ADVISORY OPINION NO. 93.

³³ See e.g., MASS. CODE OF JUDICIAL ETHICS, r. 3.13 through 3.14 (2016).

³⁴ MINN. CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT, CMT. 3 TO R. 3.14 (2016); MODEL CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT § 3.14 CMT. 3 (AM. BAR ASS'N 2010).

³⁵ N.Y. RULES OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 22, §100(H) (2019).

³⁶ PA. CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT, R. 3.15 (2014).

³⁷ JUDICIARY FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REGULATIONS, GUIDE TO JUDICIARY POLICY, VOL. 2, PT. D § 330.20.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *Id.* This includes the name of the program provider and of the program; the dates and location of the program; the topics and speakers expected to address them; and the “program provider’s source(s) of support, financial or otherwise,” including “endowments or gifts not raised for the particular educational program.”

⁴⁰ CAL. RULES OF COURT, R. 10.481(B) (2020).

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² See e.g., PA. R. FOR CONTINUING JUDICIAL EDUCATION., RULE 304.