

# **REPORT TO INNS OF COURT COLLEGE OF ADVOCACY ('ICCA') ON TRAINING PROGRAMME CONDUCTED FOR AMERICAN INNS OF COURT NATIONAL ADVOCACY TRAINING PROGRAMME ('NATP'), 14-18 SEPTEMBER 2020**

**REQUESTING ORGANISATION:** American Inns of Court ('AIC')

**FUNDING:** AIC/ICCA

**NATURE OF PROGRAMME:** Advocacy training. At the request of the AIC it is run as though a mock trial before ICC i.e. opening address followed by witness evidence and then closing address

**LENGTH:** Five sessions each lasting 2.5 hours spread over 5 days (required by time difference and availability of trainers)

**FORMAT:** Remote training via Zoom. Basic Hampel method used for reviews (but participants before undertaking witness handling were asked what they hoped to achieve, trainers played the witnesses for the performance but for the demonstration the advocate was asked to be the witness). Room review only but delayed replay sessions.

**TRAINERS:** HHJ James Burbidge QC, Mukul Chawla QC, Neil Chawla, Sarah Clarke QC, Paul Garlick QC, Mr Justice Martin Griffiths, Barnaby Hone, Tom Kark QC, HHJ Joanna Korner CMG QC (organiser), Ijeoma Omambala QC, HHJ Amanda Rippon, Andrew Smith QC, Sarah Whitehouse QC

**MATERIALS:** Training case *Prosecutor v. Rupert Hentzau* (reduced version). The NATP in advance of the course, placed on-line various papers and films e.g. 'Hampel Method', examination-in-chief aka "direct", cross-examination (American version)

**PARTICIPANTS:** 24 lawyers from various US states

## **SUMMARY OF TRAINING:**

- This is the sixth year the programme has taken place. The regard in which it is held by the AIC is demonstrated by the fact that, notwithstanding the impossibility of holding the programme in Washington, (as a result of the Covid-19 restrictions), they were keen for it to go ahead as remote training via Zoom.

- For the past two years two courses have been run consecutively over the week, with 18 different participants in each course, divided into two groups. After a number of discussions, in respect of the content, length and technical aspects of the programme, with Libby Bingham (Director of the AIC Education and Mentoring Programmes) and Cara Fitzgerald (Event Coordinator, ICCA), it was decided that one course for 24 participants, (in three groups), would be run, with a slightly reduced programme, (no legal submission exercise and no video-review sessions), a simpler case study than that used in previous years and with training sessions taking place over five evenings (from 4:30pm-7pm).
- In the past trainers for the programme have been selected via EOI's to the four Inns, so as to give an opportunity to those who have not taken part in earlier programmes, (although because of the importance of this programme a criterion of proven excellence is applied). This year because of the, still relatively new, method of the delivery of training, the AIC requested that trainers, whom they knew from previous years, take part. Accordingly, those trainers were contacted. Whilst in the past only five trainers have been needed as all were physically present in the USA, on this occasion, owing to professional commitments more were needed.
- In fact, of the thirteen trainers who took part, ten were "veterans" of the programme and of the three "new" trainers, viz: Neil Chawla, Sarah Clarke and Barnaby Hone, the first two are seasoned international trainers and Barnaby, (with whom I trained), was excellent. The feedback from Libby was that all trainers were highly rated by the participants, (Mukul rated a special mention as having had to conduct a training session from his car as the court in which he was sitting had thrown him out). Where possible, in the absence of social interaction, trainers were allocated to the same groups.
- Given the limitations of the "remote" method of training, the Evaluation forms demonstrate that the programme was a success and greatly appreciated by the participants. As in past years, they were drawn from different areas of practice, with court advocacy experience varying from none to relatively extensive. Few had attended a training course and as one participant stated "*Thought it was an incredible training technique. Walked away wishing law school had more "hands on"*"

*training like this*" The difference in experience and abilities highlighted the need for trainers not just to be experienced, but have the ability to adjust the review to the level of the participant and the empathy to deal with the nervous advocate. Only one participant fell-out after the first session, owing to work commitments.

- The technical aspects of the course went virtually without a hitch so that plenary sessions and break-out groups blended seamlessly. This was entirely due to Libby Cara and the assistance of "alumni" from past NATP courses who were present in the group sessions. The alumni also conducted pre-course interviews with the trainers which were available on-line for the participants.

Joanna Korner

26 October 2020