

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force
Hon. Laurence Donald Kay (Ret.), Chair
Diane Nunn, Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Lee Morhar, Assistant Director
Bobbie Welling, Supervising Attorney and Task Force Lead Staff,
415-865-7822, bobbie.welling@jud.ca.gov

DATE: October 24, 2006

SUBJECT: Domestic Violence: Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure
Task Force Interim Report (No Action Required)

Issue Statement

This report summarizes the activities of the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force since its appointment on September 6, 2005, and its subsequent status report to the Judicial Council submitted on December 2, 2005. The report chronicles the major task force activities and accomplishments during the past year and describes the task force plan for its second and final year of operation. A final report will be submitted to the council in December 2007.

Background

On September 6, 2005, Chief Justice Ronald M. George appointed the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force to recommend changes to improve court practice and procedure in cases involving domestic violence allegations. The task force was further instructed that its recommendations should specifically address the fair, expeditious, and accessible administration of justice for litigants in domestic violence cases.

More specifically, the task force charge included the review and implementation, as appropriate, of court-related recommendations contained in the June 2005 report to the California Attorney General from the Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence, entitled *Keeping the Promise: Victim Safety and Batterer Accountability*. This report is available online at www.safestate.org/index.cfm?navid=386 and will be referred to in this report as the Attorney General's Report.

Judicial Council task force activities and projects

On December 2, 2005, the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force submitted and the Judicial Council approved its project plan and status report. Since that time, the task force has engaged in a number of activities within its project areas described in greater detail below. First, task force chair, Laurence D. Kay (Ret.), Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four, created the following two major working groups to oversee the development of a series of recommendations for improving practice and procedure in domestic violence proceedings:

- Criminal Best Practices Working Group, Associate Justice Tani Gorre Cantil-Sakauye, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, working group chair; and
- Restraining Order Working Group, Judge Mary Ann Grilli, Superior Court of Santa Clara County, working group chair.

A significant component of the task force's work involves the development of this series of recommended practices and procedures. The task force met four times since its inception to discuss the recommended practices. In crafting its recommendations, the task force has relied on the invaluable expertise and experience of its members, an extensive literature search, requests for recommendations from presiding judges and court executive officers, similar requests distributed at judicial education programs in subject areas relating to domestic violence, and review of other survey results such as those distributed by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to court staff, clerks, and family law judicial officers. At its next meeting on December 7, 2006, the task force will finalize the text of the proposed practices. The proposed practices, drafted in concept form, will then be distributed for statewide comment using an array of information-gathering methods.

New Members

Since the initial appointment of the task force, three new members have been added to its roster. To broaden the membership and enhance the work of the task force, the Chief Justice appointed the following new members:

- Judge Katherine A. Feinstein, Superior Court of San Francisco County - November 28, 2005;
- Judge Quentin L. Kopp (Ret.), Superior Court of San Mateo County - November 4, 2005; and
- Judge Susan P. Finlay (Ret.), Superior Court of San Diego County - May 17, 2006.

Liaison members from both the Judicial Council and the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) have also helped inform the task force's work. Liaison members include:

- Judge Michael Nash, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Judicial Council liaison;
- Judge Scott L. Kays, Superior Court of Solano County, newly appointed Judicial Council liaison (replacing Judge Nash); and
- Commissioner Adam Wertheimer, Superior Court of San Diego County, CJER Governing Committee liaison.

A roster of task force members and staff is attached at pages 8–10.

California Courts Protective Order Registry Pilot Project

One of the most significant issues flagged for improvement in the Attorney General’s Report was the critical need to ensure prompt and accurate entry of restraining and protective orders into the Domestic Violence Restraining Order System (DVROS), the statewide database.¹ Ensuring the entry of orders into DVROS is a court responsibility required by law² and must be accomplished so that orders are enforced. Moreover, judicial officers must be able to view existing protective orders to avoid making orders that conflict with those of other courts and to maximize the information available for decisionmaking.³

Recognizing the critical need to make immediate improvements, the task force, under the auspices of the AOC Information Services Division and the Superior Court of Orange County, will launch a pilot project to create the California Courts Protective Order Registry. The registry will be based on a system now in operation in the Superior Court of Orange County that task force members and AOC staff have reviewed. AOC and court staff will also consider features of systems used in other courts that have the capacity to enter orders directly into DVROS. The registry will contain an actual image, rather than data listed on a form, of every type of protective order required to be entered into DVROS. Major features of this innovative registry include:

- 24-hour availability;
- Data validity;
- Statewide Web-based access;
- Search capability linking to an image of the order; and
- Accessibility of actual orders to both the judiciary and law enforcement.

¹ Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence, *Keeping the Promise: Victim Safety and Batterer Accountability* (June 2005), pp. 21–26, 35.

² Fam. Code, § 6380.

³ See California Rules of Court, rule 5.500 requiring local courts to set up procedures to ensure that courts can communicate about these potentially conflicting orders. (Note that after January 1, 2007, rule 5.500 will be renumbered 5.450.)

Most importantly, plans call for the protective order registry to connect with both the California Case Management System (CCMS) and the Department of Justice's DVROS system. On September 5, 2006, the Superior Court of Orange County's model was presented to Attorney General Bill Lockyer and his staff and received an enthusiastic response. AOC staff and staff from the Superior Court of Orange County have begun the initial requirements phase of this innovative pilot project.

Additional Project Updates

1. Restraining orders/Domestic Violence Restraining Order System (DVROS)

Project. In addition to participating in the development of the California Courts Protective Order Registry pilot project, the Restraining Order Working Group conducted two invitational forums on key issues. The working group also developed a series of proposed practices and procedures relating to restraining orders, based in part on the information gathered at the forums.

The first forum, the Firearms Relinquishment Colloquium, was conducted on April 23, 2006, in collaboration with the Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP) Planning Committee, to develop ideas for enhancing court procedures for ensuring the relinquishment of registered firearms. Firearms pose a significant risk of harm to victims of domestic violence. Most courts do not have procedures in place to discover whether or not restrained persons have indeed relinquished their firearms as required by the terms of applicable protective orders. The colloquium provided an opportunity to discover and develop practices for California's courts to ensure that firearm prohibition orders are being followed and thereby to increase public safety. Colloquium participants examined existing state and national procedures for relinquishing registered firearms, including legal and practical issues and barriers, and developed suggestions for task force consideration.

The second of the invitational forums, the Access to CLETS (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System) Forum, held on June 21, 2006, was designed to assist the task force with developing recommendations for short- and long-term goals for improving entry of restraining orders into the Domestic Violence Restraining Order System (DVROS), a database contained in CLETS. This invitation-only CLETS Forum brought together six courts that are currently entering restraining orders in the DVROS database and select courts that had either expressed an interest in entering restraining orders or had established best practices for ensuring the entry of restraining orders. The registry system in place in the Superior Court of Orange County was presented to participants at the forum.

Based on these two invitational forums and additional information-gathering mechanisms, the task force developed a series of recommended practices relating to restraining orders. A detailed list of topic areas related to restraining orders, firearms relinquishment and entry into CLETS is attached at pages 11–15.

2. Domestic Violence Criminal Best Practices Project. Similarly, the Criminal Best Practices Working Group developed a series of recommended practices relating to procedure in domestic violence criminal matters. This area of primary focus was also an issue of emphasis in the Attorney General's Report.⁴ Many of the practices under consideration address these already-articulated concerns. The working group used a similar methodology to develop its recommendations. A list of the topic areas for the working group is attached at pages 16–18.

3. Forms revisions. Legislative changes required certain forms revisions, and recommendations contained in the Attorney General's Report urged changes in forms or the creation of new forms. Forms changes have been handled according to the regular Judicial Council process for revising and creating forms. The task force had an opportunity to comment on the proposed forms changes during the regular period for statewide comment. Forms changes relating to the work of the task force approved since December 2005 are listed at pages 19–20.

4. Enhancing Community Collaboration Project. Historically, the AOC has supported the development of court/community collaborative councils to act as a feedback and monitoring mechanism for improving practice and procedure in domestic violence cases. A number of statewide conferences have focused on this important topic. The Attorney General's Report recognized the significance of these important justice system partnerships and the need for judicial leadership in maintaining this public focus.⁵ As a result, the task force is considering a recommended practice describing the parameters of judicial leadership needed to promote the fair administration of justice in domestic violence cases. In conjunction with the AOC's VAWEP and staff of the Center for Children, Families, & the Courts (CFCC), the task force also acknowledges and supports a technical assistance and local education project that funds local court efforts to establish or revitalize court/community domestic violence councils. This project, known as the Domestic Violence Safety Partnership Project, also funds local courts' domestic violence summits and provides technical assistance to courts seeking to evaluate practices and implement improvements. A list of the project staff and the technical assistance and local training projects initiated since the appointment of the task force is attached at pages 21–23.

The issue of domestic violence has long been a concern of great public importance. The fair and expeditious administration of justice in cases involving domestic violence allegations is an important factor in improving public trust and confidence in the courts. So that the public can have an opportunity to respond to specific proposals for improving practice and procedure in these critical cases, the task force will conduct two public hearings, scheduled for early spring 2007, to gather information on its proposals.

⁴ Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence, *Keeping the Promise: Victim Safety and Batterer Accountability* (June 2005), pp. 49–57.

⁵ *Id.* at p. 84.

Comment, both supportive and critical of the proposals, will be solicited and speakers will be requested to recommend practices that might not yet be included among the task force proposals.

To further enhance court/community outreach in this vital area, the task force will sponsor a series of regional meetings to provide a forum for courts to share information, assess promising practices, and engage in dialogue about enhancing their own procedures. The meetings will focus on four of the main areas of concern to the task force (1) domestic violence restraining and protective orders, (2) criminal law procedures, (3) firearms restrictions and relinquishment, and (4) entry of, and access to, restraining orders in DVROS. These meetings, scheduled for late spring and early summer, will provide a venue for the courts and community partners to delve into these selected areas of particular concern, provide feedback on the task force's proposed practices, and formulate specific action plans.

5. Education and Training Project. Since 2003, the AOC has received grant funding through the state Office of Emergency Services and the federal Violence Against Women Act to support judicial branch education and technical assistance in cases involving allegations of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. The Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP) has conducted approximately 46 statewide and local education programs during this period and has published benchguides and produced statewide broadcasts since the inception of the project. Judicial branch education plays a vital role in ensuring compliance with mandates and the development of best practices in the domestic violence arena. With the support of the task force, education and training on domestic violence have been enhanced and improved during the last calendar year. A list of the relevant domestic violence judicial education programs conducted since 2003 is attached at pages 24–28. Under consideration as well are proposals relating to minimum education and training requirements and expectations for judicial officers who routinely hear matters containing domestic violence allegations. At the request of the Chief Justice, the task force will also consider the use, qualification, and training of temporary judges who may be designated to hear domestic violence matters.

At the suggestion of the task force and the CJER Governing Committee, during the next year of its funding, the VAWEP staff plan to develop an online Domestic Violence Resource Center for judges. The resource center will be housed on the judicial branch's password-protected Web site, Serranus. The center will link to helpful publications relating to domestic violence, a judicial newsletter will be launched, and a community of practice listserv is under consideration. Task force best practice materials would be available through the resource center.

Next Steps

The next year of task force activities will involve obtaining diverse and thoughtful comments from the judicial branch, justice system partners, and the public through the following mechanisms:

- Distribution of proposed practices and procedures for public comment;
- Public hearings;
- Regional domestic violence meetings;
- Focus groups for specific stakeholders; and
- Discussions with Judicial Council advisory committees.

The task force will review and revise its proposals based on the suggestions received and report to the Judicial Council in December of 2007. A timeline delineating future task force activities is attached at pages 29–30.

Attachments

Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force

As of 10/24/06

Hon. Laurence Donald Kay (Ret.), Chair
Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Hon. Mary Ann Grilli
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Deborah B. Andrews
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Tressa S. Kentner
Executive Officer of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Hon. Quentin L. Kopp (Ret.)
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Mateo

Hon. Jeffrey S. Bostwick
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. Jean Pfeiffer Leonard
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Tani Gorre Cantil-Sakauye
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. William A. MacLaughlin
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Sharon A. Chatman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. George A. Miram
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Mateo

Hon. Katherine A. Feinstein
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Mr. James B. Perry
Executive Officer of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo

Hon. Susan P. Finlay (Ret.)
Judge of the Superior Court of California
County of San Diego

Hon. Rebecca S. Riley
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Ventura

Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force

As of 10/24/06

Mr. Alan Slater

Chief Executive Officer of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Dean Stout

Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Inyo

JUDICIAL COUNCIL LIAISON

Hon. Scott L. Kays

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Solano

GOVERNING COMMITTEE OF THE CJER LIAISON

Hon. Adam Wertheimer

Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force

As of 10/24/06

AOC STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Bobbie Welling

Supervising Attorney

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102

415-865-7822

Fax 415 865-7217

bobbie.welling@jud.ca.gov

Ms. Tamara Abrams

Senior Attorney

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Ms. Penny Davis

Senior Court Services Analyst

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Ms. Jenny Lee

Administrative Coordinator

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Ms. Julia Weber

Supervising Attorney

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Mr. Joshua Weinstein

Senior Attorney

Office of the General Counsel

Restraining Order Proposal Topics

Assistance for parties (general)

1. Removal of barriers for the parties
2. Access to rulings on restraining order applications
3. Information/resources for the parties
4. Legal services
5. Family law facilitator/self-help center/other assistance
6. Computer assistance
7. Appropriateness of counseling orders
8. Confidentiality

Obtaining and perfecting orders

9. Emergency protective orders
10. Reasonable and timely review of applications for restraining orders
11. Notice
12. Background checks
13. Service of process
14. Preparation of restraining order
15. Determination of past acts
16. Child and spousal support orders available
17. Additional protected persons
18. Supervised visitation
19. Right to hearing
20. Orders accessible to court and law enforcement

21. Sufficiency of evidence
22. Residence-exclusion orders
23. CLETS/DVROS entry
24. Withdrawal or dismissal of applications for restraining orders

Hearings and services

25. Courtroom security
26. Staffing
27. Provision of court interpreters
28. Training for court interpreters
29. Services in the courtroom
30. Self-represented litigants
31. Scheduling hearings

Court and case management

32. Local procedures
33. Calendar management
34. Court coordination
35. Court communication
36. Domestic violence coordinating councils
37. Training (judicial officers and staff)
38. Statistics
39. Facility security
40. Orders not intended for DVROS/CLETS entry
41. Eliminating barriers to service of process

Improving access to and entry into CLETS

1. Court access to DVROS/CLETS
2. Courts to conduct needs assessments
3. Enhancement of communication: court and justice partners
4. Enhancement of communication: AOC and DOJ
5. Implementation standards
6. Audit standards
7. Training standards
8. Data collection
9. Restraining order registry
10. Computer generated orders
11. Service of orders

Firearms Relinquishment Proposal Topics

Communication and education

1. Communicate with justice system partners to enhance firearms relinquishment procedures.
2. Identify sale and storage policies of local gun dealers and law enforcement agencies.
3. Educate law enforcement about mandatory firearms relinquishment statutes.
4. Consider legislation requiring the prosecutor to conduct a firearms search in firearms registry (Automated Firearms System).

Emergency protective order (EPO)

5. Court to ask law enforcement officer about existence of firearms prior to issuance of an EPO.
6. Law enforcement officer to ask about firearms pursuant to Penal Code Section 13730.

Criminal court protective orders

7. Prosecutor to conduct database search for registered firearms.
8. Court to advise the defendant about firearms restrictions.
9. Court to distribute information sheet.
10. Court to set review hearing.
11. At hearing, court makes appropriate orders, including issuance of bench warrant for nonappearance and notification for follow-up.

Civil court restraining orders

12. Court to conduct database search for registered firearms.
13. Court to note reported firearms (whether reported pursuant to database search or notification by protected person) on restraining order.
14. Court to orally advise parties about firearms restrictions.

15. Court to set review hearing.
16. At hearing, court to make appropriate orders and notify law enforcement and prosecutor's office if firearms are reported and restrained person does not file relinquishment/sale form.

Suggested forms revisions to implement practices

1. Modify existing firearm relinquishment information sheet to allow for more locally specific instructions.
2. Develop "Failure to relinquish or sell firearms" notification form outlining penalties for failure to comply with relinquishment order.
3. Revise restraining and protective order forms to add check box for protected person to report the existence of firearms.
4. Revise EPO form to indicate reported existence of firearms.

Criminal Proceeding Best Practices Proposal Topics

Pretrial

1. Bail release considerations
 - Bail schedule
 - Standardized procedure for setting bail
 - Receipt of specified information
 - Felony domestic violence arrests and “no OR” or “no cite and release” policy

2. Initial appearance hearing before setting bail
 - Hearing
 - Notice of hearing
 - Reasons for deviation from the bail schedule
 - Need for relevant information
 - Order to appear for arraignment

3. Arraignment
 - Defendant must be present
 - Issuance of criminal protective order
 - Presence of prosecutor and defense counsel
 - Calendaring probation violations
 - Contacting victim
 - Determination of gun ownership
 - Firearms relinquishment

4. Setting bail
 - Underlying policy of ensuring appearance and protection of victim
 - Notification of prosecutor if defendant released on bail
 - Reasonable efforts to notify victim
 - Additional bail conditions
 - Protection-of-public factors for consideration
 - Need to obtain all relevant information

5. Release on own recognizance (OR)
 - Violent felony or specified domestic violence offense - hearing required
 - Report if violent felony
 - Record must reflect reasons for granting or denying OR

6. Issuing stay-away orders - Penal Code section 136.2

- On court's own motion
- Determination of firearms
- Search for conflicting orders
- Serve defendant if present in court

Trial

7. Trial setting - set a hearing to

- Manage the case
- Enter into settlement discussions
- Consider issuance of stay-away order
- Change bail
- Consider any new information
- Set case for evidentiary hearing

8. Continuances

- Restrictions
- State facts constituting good cause

9. Dismissal and refiling

10. Evidentiary issues

- Confidential victim/domestic violence counselor communications
- Disclosing addresses or telephone numbers of victims or witnesses prohibited
- Special needs of victims and witnesses
- Impact of *Crawford v. Washington*

11. Discovery

- Generally
- Medical records

12. Jury selection

- Voir dire
- Larger juror panel

13. Presence of support persons

14. Victim testimony

- Reluctance to testify
- Compelling participation or testimony

15. Sentencing

- Probation and mandatory terms and conditions
- 52-week batterer programs
- Protective orders
- Communication between courts to avoid conflicting orders
- Firearms restrictions
- Entry into DVROS/CLETS
- Copies of criminal protective order
- Termination of criminal protective order
- Notice of disposition to the victim
- Fees and fines
- Consideration of family law orders

16. Postsentencing

- Generally
- Review hearings

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL FORMS CHANGES
Related to the Work of the Domestic Violence
Practice and Procedure Task Force**

FORMS CHANGES EFFECTIVE July 1, 2006

1. Domestic Violence Forms DV-100, DV-110, DV-126-INFO, DV-130, DV-170, DV-210-INFO; DV-260, DV-500-INFO, DV-510-INFO, DV-520-INFO, DV-530-INFO, DV-540-INFO, DV-550-INFO, DV-720-INFO, FL-105/GC-120, FL-310, FL-341, JV-200, JV-205, JV-245, JV-250

These forms changes implement legislative amendments that (1) extended the initial term of a domestic violence protective order from three to five years; (2) provided that an emergency protective order has enforcement precedence over any other protective order under specified circumstances; (3) required the family court, when issuing a custody or visitation order in a case where a criminal protective order is in effect, to reference and acknowledge the precedence of the criminal order in enforcement; (4) prohibited the restrained person from making any effort to determine the address or location of the protected persons; and (5) required the court to transmit data related to filed domestic violence protective orders to California's restraining order registry. The forms include additional firearms information as a response to a recommendation from the Attorney General's Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence and other technical updates and corrections.

FORMS CHANGES EFFECTIVE January 1, 2007

1. Criminal Law: Batterers Intervention Program Progress Report in Domestic Violence Cases (CR-168)

This form, approved for use in local courts, assists courts in evaluating defendants' progress in statutorily mandated domestic violence counseling programs. The form addresses concerns that courts may not be informed when defendants do not successfully complete the batterers intervention program and responds to a recommendation of the Attorney General's Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence.

2. Criminal Law: Criminal Protective Order Forms (CR 160, CR-161, and CR-162)

These forms changes comply with statutory changes and improve enforcement of the orders. The forms, current form CR-160 and proposed forms CR-161 and CR-

162, would provide separate forms for (1) domestic violence case, (2) criminal cases other than domestic violence, and (3) an order for firearms relinquishment only. These three forms were suggested by the Attorney General's Task Force on Local Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence and comply with new legislation allowing courts to issue firearms relinquishment orders without other protective order provisions.

**Domestic Violence Safety Partnership Project (DVSP)
Activities Supported by the Violence Against Women Education Project**

**Staff: Tamara Abrams, Penny Davis, Jenny Lee, Gabrielle Selden, Eryn Shomer, Julia Weber, and
Bobbie Welling**

| Projects supported during federal fiscal year 10/1/05–9/30/06 | | | Specific funding requirement |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 10/28/05 | Superior Court of Siskiyou County | Interdisciplinary regional training on family violence issues. Invitations extended to Shasta and Trinity Counties. | Faculty fees for Mark Wynn, Hon. Jane York (Ret.), Penny Blake, and Nadine Blaschak-Brown; facility rental; supplies and duplication charges |
| 12/12/05 | Statewide event | Domestic violence-focused workshop at the Beyond the Bench Conference – “The Nexus of Substance Abuse, Family Violence and Child Welfare.” | Faculty fee for Elke Rechberger and Hon. Patricia Bresee (Ret.) |
| 1/06 | Superior Court of Riverside County | Domestic Violence Court Staff Training Manual | Production costs |
| 1/27/06 | Superior Court of Los Angeles County | 2006 Domestic Violence Training for Child Custody Evaluators and Mediators | Faculty fees for Dan Saunders, Gail Pincus; facility rental |
| 4/26/06 | Statewide event | Four domestic violence-related workshops at the Family Dispute Resolution Statewide Annual Conference: 1. “Parenting when Domestic Violence Is an Issue” 2. “Spectrum of Violence” 3. “Domestic Violence in a Digital Age: From Radio Scanners to Spyware - Part 1” 4. “Domestic Violence in a Digital Age: From Radio Scanners to Spyware - Part 2” | Faculty fees for Alyce LaViolette and two presenters from the National Network to End Domestic Violence (Cindy Southworth and Sarah Tucker) |
| 8/30/06 | Superior Court of Orange County | Domestic violence training for judges and court staff | Faculty fees for Linda Chamberlain; facility rental |
| 9/06 | Superior Court of Yolo County | Computer equipment to support access to the Domestic Violence Restraining Order System via the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) | Purchased computer and printer |

| Projects supported during federal fiscal year 10/1/05 – 9/30/06 | | | Specific funding requirement |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 9/14/06 | Statewide event | Restraining order presentation during the plenary session at the Assigned Judges Program conference. (Judge Becky Dugan) | AOC staff support |
| 9/15/06 | Superior Court of Santa Clara County | Judicial officer training on domestic violence issues, including restraining orders and firearms | Travel fees for Judge Becky Dugan |
| 9/21/06 | Superior Court of Ventura County | Court training for judicial officers and staff on domestic violence issues | Travel fees for AOC attorney to present at training |
| 9/22/06 | Superior Court of Stanislaus County | Judicial officer educational training on domestic violence issues, with a focus on restraining orders | Travel fees for Judge Catherine Purcell |
| 9/22/06 | Superior Court of Alameda County | Interdisciplinary training on domestic violence issues | Faculty fees for Dr. Patricia Van Horn; facility rental and duplication costs |
| 9/22/06 & 9/25/06 | Superior Court of Contra Costa County | Mandatory four-hour training for family law mediators to include an update on new legislation and the impact of domestic violence on children (9/22). Training for court staff on basic domestic violence issues, with a focus on victim/perpetrator minimization of abuse and victim reluctance to follow through on orders (9/25). | Faculty fees for Alyce LaViolette |

| Proposed projects for federal fiscal year 10/1/06 – 9/30/07 | | | Specific funding requirement |
|--|---|--|---|
| 11/4/06 | Superior Court of San Bernardino County | Court staff training on domestic violence issues conducted by AOC attorneys | Travel fees for AOC staff |
| 11/16/06 | Superior Court of Inyo County | Interdisciplinary Domestic Violence Prevention Symposium – “Working Together to End Abuse in our Multi-Cultural Community.” Invitations extended to Mono and Alpine Counties and the Ridgecrest Division of Kern County. | Faculty fees Mark Wynn, Dr. Alex Stalcup, and Gail Pincus |
| Proposed projects for federal fiscal year 10/1/06 – 9/30/07 (continued) | | | Specific funding |

| | | | requirement |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 11/17/06 | Superior Court of Los Angeles County | Sexual assault workshop for 200+ criminal law judges | Faculty fees and travel fees for Hon. J. Richard Couzens (Ret.); other faculty TBD |
| 3/15/07 | Superior Court of Los Angeles County | Workshop for judicial officers on sexually violent predators | Faculty fees and travel fees for Hon. J. Richard Couzens (Ret.); other faculty TBD |
| TBD | Superior Court of Alameda County | Local training on restraining orders for juvenile law judges and assistance from DVSP review team to review self-assessment and identify training to help the court improve services to the community | TBD |
| TBD | Superior Court of Tulare County | Computer equipment to support access to the Domestic Violence Restraining Order System (DVROS) via the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) | Computer equipment |

Violence Against Women Education Project
 Judicial Education Programs
 July 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006
 (does not include broadcasts or committee meetings)

| Date(s) | Program | Number of Judicial Participants |
|-------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 2005 | | |
| 9/7/05 | 2005 Statewide Judicial Branch Conference—“Domestic Violence, Community Activities, and Ethics” | 14 |
| 9/7/05 | 2005 Statewide Judicial Branch Conference—“The Judge’s Role in Domestic Violence Cases” | 23 |
| 9/7/05 | 2005 Statewide Judicial Branch Conference—“Sex Offenders: Sentencing and Management Issues for Judges” | 14 |
| 10/25/05 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Fall 2005—“Family Law Overview: Domestic Violence and Family Law” | 18 |
| 10/26/05 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Fall 2005 – “Family Law Overview: Difficult Custody Cases: Effects of Domestic Violence on Child Development” | 18 |
| 2006 | | |
| 1/10/06 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Winter 2006—“Family Law Overview” | 25 |
| 1/11/06 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Winter 2006—“Criminal Law Overview: Protective Orders, Domestic Violence Trials, and Sentencing” | 35 |
| 3/1/06 | Criminal Law Institute—(Pre-Institute Workshop) “Stalking Cases and Courtroom Security” | 28 |
| 3/1/06 | Criminal Law Institute—(Pre-Institute Workshop) “Criminal Domestic Violence” | 30 |
| 3/12/06 | Domestic Violence Judicial Institute—(Pre-Institute Workshop) “California Law in Domestic Violence Cases (Nuts and Bolts)” | 41 |
| 3/12–15/06 | Domestic Violence Judicial Institute—“Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases” | 51 |
| 4/26/06 | Family Law Institute—“Ethics, Domestic Violence, and the Role of the Family Law Judge in the Community” | 72 |
| 4/26/06 | Family Law Institute—“Domestic Violence Cases in Your Court—Developing Best Practices” | 116 |
| 4/27/06 | Juvenile Law Institute—“The Impact of Domestic Violence on Female Juveniles” | 104 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| 5/10/06 | Cow County Judges Institute—"Criminal Domestic Violence" | 55 |
| 6/14-15/06 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—"Domestic Violence Awareness" | 116 |
| 6/23/06 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—"Criminal Sexual Assault" | 79 |
| 7/31-8/3/06 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2006—"Handling Sexual Assault Cases" | 18 |
| 8/3/06 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2006—"Immigration Issues in Domestic Violence Cases" | 13 |
| 8/2-8/4/06 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2006—"Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Faculty Development" | 12 |

Violence Against Women Education Project
 Judicial Education Programs
 July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
 (does not include broadcasts or committee meetings)

| Date(s) | Program | Number of Judicial Participants |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2004 | | |
| 8/4/04 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2004— “Selected Issues in Sexual Assault Cases” | 33 |
| 8/5/04 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2004— “Immigration Issues in Domestic Violence Cases” | 20 |
| 9/9–10/04 | Family Violence and the Courts Conference | 102 |
| 2005 | | |
| 1/26/05 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Winter 2005— “Judicial Decision Making in Sexual Assault Cases” | 14 |
| 1/24–28/05 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Winter 2005— “Family Law Overview” | 38 |
| 3/13–16/05 | Domestic Violence Judicial Institute: “Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases” | 40 |
| 4/13/05 | Family Law Institute—“Domestic Violence Protective Orders: Issuance, Effects, and Enforcement” | 19 |
| 4/13/05 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Spring 2005— “Selected Issues in Sexual Assault Cases” | 21 |
| 4/15/05 | Juvenile Law Institute—“Domestic Violence, Child Sexual Abuse, and Addiction: Is There A Continuum?” | 57 |
| 5/12/05 | Cow County Judges Institute—“Judicial Decision Making in Sexual Assault Cases” | 11 |
| 5/12/05 | Cow County Judges Institute—“An Overview of Domestic Violence Cases and Protective Orders” | 22 |
| 5/13/05 | Cow County Judges Institute—“Protective Orders” | 28 |
| 6/10/05 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Domestic Violence Awareness” | 63 |
| 6/16/05 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Criminal Sexual Assault” | 7 |
| 6/16/05 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Criminal Domestic Violence” | 20 |

Violence Against Women Education Project
 Judicial Education Programs
 July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004
 (does not include broadcasts or committee meetings)

| Date(s) | Program | Number of Judicial Participants |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2003 | | |
| 8/6/03 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Summer 2003— “Judicial Decision Making in Sexual Assault Cases” | 49 |
| 2004 | | |
| 1/28/04 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Winter 2004— “Judicial Decision Making in Sexual Assault Cases” | 23 |
| 4/21–22/04 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Spring 2004— “Advanced Custody and Domestic Violence Issues” | 40 |
| 4/22–23/04 | Continuing Judicial Studies Program, Spring 2004— “Beyond the Basics: Special Issues in Restraining Orders and Risk Assessment” | 36 |
| 5/5/04 | Cow County Judges Institute (Pre-Institute Workshop)— “Judicial Decision Making in Sexual Assault Cases” | 19 |
| 6/6–8/04 | Domestic Violence Judicial Institute—“Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases” | 33 |
| 6/20/04 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Domestic Violence Awareness” | 112 |
| 6/26/04 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Criminal Sexual Assault” | 51 |

Violence Against Women Education Project
 Judicial Education Programs
 July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003
 (does not include broadcasts or committee meetings)

| Date(s) | Program | Number of Judicial Participants |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2003 | | |
| 5/18–21/03 | Domestic Violence Judicial Institute—“Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases” | 45 |
| 6/20/03 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Domestic Violence Awareness” (two sessions) | 131 |
| 6/26/03 | B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California—“Criminal Sexual Assault” | 23 |

**Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force
Timeline for Completion of Charge
December 2006–December 2007**

| DEADLINE | TASK | NOTES |
|-------------------|--|---|
| December 1, 2006 | Interim report to the Judicial Council | |
| December 7, 2006 | Task force meeting | Review full edited packet of best practices with explanatory information and concise justification for proposals. Determine proposals that require legislation, rules, standards, or integration into judicial education materials or publications. Discuss format of report. |
| January 2007 | Distribute draft proposals to courts and justice system entities | |
| January–July 2007 | Request for written comments Focus groups Presentations to advisory committees | |
| February 7, 2007 | Public Hearings Southern California—Ronald Reagan Building, Auditorium, Los Angeles | All task force members requested to attend both hearings |
| March 21, 2007 | Public Hearings Northern California—Milton Marks Conference Center, Auditorium, San Francisco | All task force members requested to attend both hearings |
| April 2007 | Task force meeting | Review testimony gathered at public hearings |

| DEADLINE | TASK | NOTES |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| May 14–15, 2007 | Regional meeting for rural courts | Hilton Sonoma Wine Country, Santa Rosa; in conjunction with Cow County Judges Institute |
| May 21–22, 2007 | Regional meeting for Bay Area courts | Crowne Plaza Hotel, Burlingame |
| June 6–7, 2007 | Regional meeting for Southern California courts | Marriott Hotel, Torrance |
| July 2007 | Task force meeting | Review information gathered at regional meetings and revise proposals as appropriate Review draft report |
| September 7, 2007 | Task force sunsets | |
| September 26, 2007 | Presentation of proposals at Statewide Judicial Conference | Task force members to attend |
| November 30, 2007 | Final report presented to Judicial Council | |
| January 1, 2008–July 1, 2008 | Implementation Phase: Proposed rules, forms, and legislation to be implemented by relevant advisory committees and in the regular RUPRO and legislative cycle for projected effective date of July 1, 2008. | |