



**Judicial Council of California**  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
*Chief Justice of California*  
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

JODY PATEL  
*Interim Administrative Director of the Courts*

CURT SODERLUND  
*Interim Chief Deputy Director*

ZLATKO THEODOROVIC  
*Director, Finance Division*

February 29, 2012

Hon. Mark Leno, Chair  
Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
State Capitol, Room 5100  
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Bob Blumenfield, Chair  
Assembly Committee on Budget  
State Capitol, Room 6026  
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Bob Huff, Vice-Chair  
Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review  
State Capitol, Room 5097  
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Jim Nielsen, Vice-Chair  
Assembly Committee on Budget  
State Capitol, Room 6031  
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011 (Including Supplemental Information on Statewide Technology Infrastructure Funding and Expenditures)

Dear Senator Leno, Senator Huff, Assembly Member Blumenfield, and Assembly Member Nielsen:

Under the reporting requirements set forth in Government Code section 77209(j), regarding use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund, and with the Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act, Item 0450-101-0932—Trial Court Funding, pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, the Judicial Council respectfully submits this Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010–2011.

In addition, though not required by statute or supplemental report language, the report contains an addendum with information relating to the amount of funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund and the Trial Court Improvement Fund allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, as well as

February 29, 2012

Page 2

expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in FY 2010–2011 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs.

Funding provided by the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund represents an essential component of the judicial branch budget. These funds support statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and education and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report highlight many of the judicial branch's efforts to ensure that all Californians have access to a fair system of open and equal justice.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic at 415-865-7584.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Patel", written in a cursive style.

Jody Patel  
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts

JP/CS

February 29, 2012

Page 3

cc: Members of the Judicial Council  
Hon. Gregory P. Schmidt, Secretary of the Senate  
Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel  
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly  
Ms. Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell  
S. Steinberg  
Ms. Fredericka McGee, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez  
Ms. Jody Martin, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
Mr. Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review  
Mr. Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office  
Mr. Marvin Deon II, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee  
Mr. Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office  
Ms. Anita Lee, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office  
Mr. Michael Miyao, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance  
Mr. Curt Soderlund, Interim Chief Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts  
(AOC)  
Ms. Christine Patton, Regional Administrative Director, AOC Regional Office  
Mr. Curtis L. Child, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs  
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Finance Division  
Judicial Administration Library (2 copies)



**Judicial Council of California**  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
*Chief Justice of California*  
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

JODY PATEL  
*Interim Administrative Director of the Courts*

CURT SODERLUND  
*Interim Chief Deputy Director*

Report Title: Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011

Statutory Citation: Government Code section 77209(j) and Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act, Item 0450-101-0932—Trial Court Funding

Date of Report: February 2012

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Government Code section 77209 (j), regarding use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund, and with the Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act, Item 0450-101-0932—Trial Court Funding, pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund.

The following summary of the report is provided per the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

Funding provided by the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund represents an essential component of the judicial branch budget. These funds support statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and education and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report highlight many of the judicial branch's efforts to ensure that all Californians have access to a fair system of open and equal justice.

In addition, though not required by statute or supplemental report language, the report contains an addendum with information relating to the amount of funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund and the Trial Court Improvement Fund allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, as well as expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in FY 2010–2011 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs.

The full report is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm>.

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-7542.

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

**Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye**

*Chief Justice of California  
and Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Second Appellate District, Division Two*

**Hon. Stephen H. Baker**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Shasta*

**Hon. Marvin R. Baxter**

*Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of California*

**Ms. Angela J. Davis**

*Assistant United States Attorney for the Central  
District of California*

**Hon. Emilie H. Elias**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles*

**Hon. Noreen Evans**

*Member of the California State Senate*

**Hon. Mike Feuer**

*Member of the California State Assembly*

**Hon. James E. Herman**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Santa Barbara*

**Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Third Appellate District*

**Hon. Teri L. Jackson**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Francisco*

**Hon. Ira R. Kaufman**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Plumas*

**Ms. Miriam Aroni Krinsky**

*UCLA School of Public Affairs*

**Ms. Edith R. Matthai**

*Attorney at Law, Los Angeles*

**Hon. Douglas P. Miller**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two*

**Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Contra Costa*

**Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.**

*Attorney at Law, Newport Beach*

**Hon. Kenneth K. So**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego*

**Hon. Sharon J. Waters**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,*

*County of Riverside*

**Hon. David S. Wesley**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Los Angeles*

**Hon. Erica R. Yew**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Santa Clara*

### ADVISORY MEMBERS

**Hon. Sue Alexander**

*Commissioner of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda*

**Mr. Alan Carlson**

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

**Hon. David F. De Alba**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Sacramento*

**Hon. Terry B. Friedman (Ret.)**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles*

**Hon. Robert James Moss**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Orange*

**Mr. Frederick K. Ohlrich**

*Clerk of the Supreme Court of California*

**Hon. David Rosenberg**

*Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Yolo*

**Hon. David M. Rubin**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego*

**Ms. Kim Turner**

*Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of  
California, County of Marin*

**Mr. David H. Yamasaki**

*Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of  
California, County of Santa Clara*

### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

**Ms. Jody Patel**

*Interim Administrative Director of the Courts  
and Secretary to the Judicial Council*

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

**Hon. Tani Cantil-Sakauye**  
*Chief Justice of California and  
Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Ms. Jody Patel**  
*Interim Administrative Director of the Courts*

**Mr. Curt Soderlund**  
*Interim Chief Deputy Director*

***FINANCE DIVISION***

***Zlatko Theodorovic***  
*Director*

***Marcia Carlton***  
*Assistant Director*

**Primary Author**  
***Colin Simpson***  
*Supervising Budget Analyst*



# Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011

(Including Supplemental Information  
on Statewide Technology  
Infrastructure Funding and  
Expenditures)

---

FEBRUARY 2012



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE COURTS

## INTRODUCTION

Government Code section 77209(j)<sup>1</sup> requires the Judicial Council to annually report to the Legislature on expenditures from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF). Also, language in the Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act (Item 0450-101-0932, Trial Court Funding) requested an annual reporting to the Legislature of expenditures from the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund). In accordance with the statutory requirement and legislative intent expressed in the Supplemental Report, the council submits this report to the Legislature.

In addition, though not required by statute or supplemental report language, the report contains an addendum with information relating to the amount of funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund and the Trial Court Improvement Fund allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, as well as expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in FY 2010–2011 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs.

## RESOURCES, EXPENDITURES, AND FUND BALANCE OVERVIEW

The TCIF (see Attachment A, page 1) is supported by a variety of funding sources, including annual deposits from the 50/50 excess fees and fines split revenue pursuant to section 77205(a), the 2% automation fund pursuant to section 68090.8(b), interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF), royalties from publication of jury instructions, other miscellaneous revenues, and a transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). Section 77209(b) places specific restrictions on the use of the transferred funds from the TCTF: at least one-half of these monies must be set aside as a reserve that may not be allocated prior to March 15 of each fiscal year for purposes other than to courts for “urgent needs”. Section 77209(i) specifies that royalties from jury instruction publication can only be used for the improvement of the jury system.

The Modernization Fund (see Attachment B, page 1) receives an appropriation annually in the state Budget Act with its primary funding source being the state General Fund with additional interest revenue from the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF).

For fiscal year (FY) 2010–2011, expenditures and encumbrances from the two special funds were made in the following council-approved categories, described in greater detail below:

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all citations are to the California Government Code.

***TCIF***

Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs	\$46,467,807
Category 2: Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	1,181,938
Category 3: Urgent Needs	0
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances:	<u>\$47,649,745</u>

***Modernization Fund***

Category 1: Statewide Technology Infrastructure	\$28,258,659
Category 2: Education and Developmental Programs	2,170,339
Category 3: Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	6,373,397
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances:	<u>\$36,802,396</u>

The resulting year-end fund balance in FY 2010–2011 was \$38.534 million for the TCIF and \$2.764 million for the Modernization Fund (See Attachments A and B, page 2).

TRIAL COURT IMPROVEMENT FUND  
FY 2010–2011 EXPENDITURES AND ENCUMBRANCES

The Judicial Council allocates funds from the TCIF to assist courts in improving court management and efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. Section 77209(g) authorizes the council to administer monies deposited in the TCIF and allows the council, with appropriate guidelines, to delegate administration of the fund to the Administrative Director of the Courts.

In FY 2010–2011, \$47.650 million was expended from the TCIF. Most of the expenditures from the TCIF were for ongoing statewide programs for the benefit of the trial courts. Since the passage of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997, the state has been responsible for funding of the trial courts. Consistent with this change, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has been charged with developing and implementing statewide administrative and technology infrastructure to provide services that were previously provided by the counties. The projects and programs funded in Categories 1 and 2 represent critical efforts of statewide importance as well as direct support of the trial courts.

## **Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs**

(Refer to Attachment A, page 3 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs)

To improve trial court administration, increase meaningful access to justice, and enhance the provision of justice throughout the state, the council continued support for the various ongoing statewide programs and multi-year initiatives.

### **Domestic Violence – Family Law Interpreter Program**

In 2002, the council established the Domestic Violence – Family Law Interpreter Program to provide assistance to trial courts to increase interpreter services for litigants with limited English proficiency in cases where domestic violence or elder abuse protective orders have been issued or are being sought and in general family law cases. In FY 2010–2011, 45 courts received funding through this program to provide services in court hearings, family court services mediation proceedings, family law facilitator sessions, and court-sponsored self-help settings. Participating courts used the funds to cover the costs of providing certified or registered interpreters (which includes per diem or salary, benefits, and mileage), Language Line services, and interpreter coordinator services. The project also translated updated domestic violence-related court forms and information sheets into Spanish, Korean, Chinese, and Vietnamese.

Feedback from participating courts indicates that the program has been extremely helpful in improving access to California's justice system, enhancing safety for domestic violence victims and children, and improving court efficiency by reducing the need for continuances of court hearings due to lack of interpreters. The AOC Center for Families, Children, and the Courts (CFCC) has been operating this program for a number of years and generally receives requests for funding that are at least twice as much as the funding available.

### **Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for Bench Officers**

The allocated funds were expended to secure a contract with Managed Health Network (MHN) for providing various types of assistance to the program members, including judges, commissioners, referees, and assigned judges in the trial courts, and their families, in dealing with a wide range of emotional, family, health, and other personal matters.

### **Human Resources Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits**

The allocated funds were expended to maintain contracts with two law firms to support the trial courts on matters pertaining to employee benefits. The firms worked directly with the AOC Human Resources division and the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) in providing legal advice and information to the trial courts on various benefits issues, including, but not limited to: health plan reform legislation and its legal application in the trial courts such as the dependent coverage imputed taxation differences between state and federal law; COBRA temporary premium supplement payments and appropriate application to the employees of the trial courts; deferred compensation plan legal requirements and issues that have arisen regarding tax law

requirements; cafeteria plan applications including discrimination testing as to highly compensated employees; and HIPPA issues as to propriety of business associate agreements between the courts and insurance brokers.

### **Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) Defense Insurance Program**

The Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) Defense Insurance program was approved by the council as a comprehensive loss prevention program in 1999. The program: 1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints; 2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties; and 3) lowers the risk of conduct that could develop into increased complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers. In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were used to pay the premium for the CJP defense master insurance policy, which covers the defense costs of a justice, judge, or subordinate judicial officer under investigation by the CJP.

### **Jury System Improvement Projects**

The allocated funds were expended to educate the public, jurors, and potential jurors about the importance of jury service and the work of the superior courts through production of an educational outreach pamphlet, *Court and Community*. This pamphlet provides information about jury service and was distributed directly to courts statewide, as well as being sent by 15 trial courts with their jury summons.

### **Litigation Management Program**

Section 811.9 requires the council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state's trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and court employees. In FY 2010–2011, the allocated funds were expended to pay the costs of defense, including fees for attorneys from the Attorney General's Office and private counsel, and to pay settlements of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals.

### **Quality of Justice and Service to the Public (formerly titled California Courts – Connecting With Constituencies)**

The allocated funds were expended to help trial courts implement new web templates that support the efficient delivery of information and services via the internet. Under the guidance of the Trial Court Web Template Working Group, the new templates helped institute industry-standard usability best practices across trial court websites. In addition, the allocated funds were used to translate hundreds of pages of trial court web content from English to Spanish.

### **Self-Help Centers**

Funds were expended to maintain self-help assistance programs in all 58 superior courts, with the funding amount apportioned according to a population-based formula. Eighty percent or more of the funding was used for staffing to increase the amount of services available in self-help centers, and the remaining funds used for supplies, travel, and related operational expenses.

All trial courts have now implemented self-help assistance programs and serve over 480,000 litigants each year in a wide variety of case types, including conservatorship, consumer, domestic violence, family law, guardianship, housing, and other civil matters. Program funding provided additional assistance through workshops, one-on-one sessions, phone appointments, e-mail information, mediation, and a variety of other methods to help litigants navigate the court system. Resources developed by local programs are shared with other self-help programs throughout the state.

### **Self-Represented Litigants**

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were used to provide a statewide conference and other training sessions for self-help centers to assist them in providing more efficient and effective services for litigants.

In February 2011, a family law conference was held to focus on the needs of low and moderate income family law litigants and to develop strategies for assisting the large numbers of self-represented litigants in family law. Over 175 attorneys and court staff received this two-day intensive training. In June 2011, a statewide conference provided educational information in other areas of law such as small claims, landlord/tenant, and guardianships, as well as sharing many best practices for service delivery being developed throughout the state including the use of technology. Forty-two workshops were offered in addition to plenary sessions and break-out discussion groups. Over 400 self-help and legal services attorneys, court staff, librarians, interpreters and others involved in providing court-based self-help attended the 3-day conference.

In addition, the California Courts self-help website added over a thousand pages of information on step-by-step procedures for common legal issues with translations made into Spanish. An information-sharing website for self-help and legal services staff was expanded to include information from the conferences as well as brochures, videos, and other informational materials for self-represented litigants. These materials are available online to be shared or adapted by all courts. Additional resources for the website were developed, including on-line tools for domestic violence and child custody actions.

Self-help center attorneys, judges, clerks, administrators and other subject matter experts convened to develop methods of simplifying divorce forms and procedures, as well as to review AOC guidelines for self-help centers to ensure that they are still appropriate for use by trial courts.

### **Subscription Costs – *Judicial Conduct Reporter***

The *Judicial Conduct Reporter* is a quarterly newsletter published by the American Judicature Society that reports on recent opinions and other issues involving judicial ethics and discipline. It is provided to all judicial officers as a part of the AOC ethics education program, which was

implemented as a means of risk management when the council initiated the Commission on Judicial Performance insurance program. In FY 2010–2011, budgeted funds were expended to cover the annual subscription cost for this publication.

### **Trial Court Security Grants**

Allocated funds were expended to maintain existing statewide master agreements for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of security-related equipment in trial courts, which included: (a) duress alarm, video surveillance, and access systems installed and maintained in 43 courts; (b) entrance screening equipment purchased and installed in one court; (c) security enhancements made in one court; (d) emergency and continuity-of-operations plan training provided; and (e) completion of a pilot project initiated in FY 2009–2010 to create a more cost-effective system for linking the trial courts' duress, video surveillance, and access systems.

### **Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program (TCTAP)**

The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program (TCTAP) in July 2001 as a means by which the OGC could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed by the OGC. In FY 2010–2011, the allocated funds were expended to pay attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas including business transactions, labor and employment, finance and taxation, and real estate.

### **Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts funded by the TCIF consists of the following programs, including AOC staff support, that provide administrative services to the trial courts (see Attachment A, page 4).

***California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)*** – The allocated funds were expended to maintain staffing for the program. Seven courts are currently supported for CLETS access. CLETS access, as provided by California's Department of Justice (DOJ), was enabled during FY 2006–2007 through the California Courts Technology Center with implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services. These courts utilize the DOJ-managed statewide CLETS network to inquire into and update various California and national databases, including the California Restraining and Protective Order System. CLETS also supports direct reporting of restraining and protective orders from the California Courts Protective Order Registry that is utilized by many courts and county organizations.

***Enhanced Collections*** – The AOC Enhanced Collections Unit (ECU) provided professional support and assistance to court and county collection programs to improve collections statewide. The ECU assisted programs with the development and modification of operations to help meet the performance measures, benchmarks, and best practices established and adopted by the Judicial Council. In collaboration with the California State Association of

Counties and court and county subject matter experts, the ECU identified statutory changes needed to improve the collection of delinquent fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments.

In addition, the ECU provided ongoing professional and technical support to justice partners in order to improve the effectiveness of the statewide collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. Enhancements activities included participation in the Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt program; implementation of memoranda of understanding between the collaborative court and county collection programs; and statewide master agreements with collections vendors.

**Internal Audits** – The allocated funds were expended to supplement an internal audit program that was established by the council in FY 2001–2002. The Internal Audit Services (IAS) unit within the AOC Finance Division conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts once every 3 to 4 years, including the areas of court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations. Allocated funds were expended to provide continued support for six staff positions.

**Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services** – The Phoenix Financial System is a statewide system that enables courts to maintain control over expenditures, providing timely information about fiscal needs while complying with policies, procedures, regulations, and standardized processes. The current configuration includes general ledger, cost accounting, materials management, accounts payable, accounts receivable, project accounting, and trust accounting. As of July 2009, all 58 courts were on the Phoenix Financial System. In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended to support the planning and implementation efforts associated with the deployment of the Phoenix Human Resources System to the San Bernardino Superior Court and a statewide upgrade of the Phoenix Financial System. Monies were used to cover project expenses that included support staff, contractors, software licenses, hardware maintenance, and training.

The Phoenix Human Resources System is a human resources management system that will leverage technology for human resources administration and in-house payroll processing, develop a customer service call center, standardize processes and procedures, collect data at the source, provide central administrative processing, and provide manager self-service and employee self-service functions to the employees of the courts. Seven superior courts (Lake, Riverside, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, and San Bernardino) are currently on the system.

The Phoenix program has successfully built a hardware environment enabling and supporting future growth and functionality; thus it serves as the foundation for full system software upgrades of all Phoenix system environments in the future. These improvements and design

enhancements—including data exchange interfaces to banks, benefits providers, and the courts—were completed successfully, resulting in increased user-friendly functionality and support for additional trial court business processing and capacity.

The program also completed safeguard and quality control projects such as the SECUDE technical implementation, which increases the security of court data as it travels from the courts to the CCTC, and the Disaster Recovery Exercise, which executes a recovery plan should a program disaster occur in the production systems. Finally, the program established a methodology for system configuration and deployment that includes in-depth testing, detailed planning of complex technical milestones, and online transactions/processing assistance for court users through the use of a tool called RWD-Productivity Pak.

***Regional Office Assistance Group*** – In FY 2010–2011, all allocated funds were expended for attorneys and staff working primarily in the three AOC regional offices, whose mission is to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial courts and serve as liaisons, clearinghouses, advocates, consultants, and direct legal services providers to the trial courts in the areas of transactions, legal opinions, and labor and employment.

***Treasury Cash Management*** – Allocated funds were expended on one senior accountant and one staff accountant, including travel and rent costs. Staff are engaged in the accounting and distribution of the uniform civil fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts. Responsibilities include receiving monthly UCF collection reporting from all 58 trial courts, entering this reporting into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, and executing the monthly cash distributions when due to state and local agency recipients. Staff performed other cash management and treasury duties as needed for the trial courts.

***Trial Court Procurement*** – In FY 2010–2011, allocated funding supported two positions, a senior procurement specialist and contract specialist, whom performed solicitations and entered into master agreements on behalf of the trial courts. By providing these services at a statewide level, trial courts save resources by not having to perform these solicitations themselves with the majority benefiting from the discounted prices that result from consolidating purchases.

***Trial Court Reengineering*** – In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended to continue the AOC’s Northern/Central Regional Office (NCRO) Reengineering Unit. The unit, consisting of a manager and senior court services analyst, focuses on reengineering the business processes and systems of trial courts to achieve improvement in business performance. Upon request from a trial court, the unit observes the court’s workflow and business processes as well as meets and collaborates with the court’s judicial officers, executive management, management team, and line staff to identify and recommend efficient and streamlined

processes. The unit has been actively assisting courts throughout the state with primary emphasis on courts served by the NCRO. In FY 2010–2011, reengineering efforts included analysis and recommendations for traffic business process activities in San Joaquin and Stanislaus Superior Courts, civil business processes for El Dorado Superior Court, finance business operations for San Mateo Superior Court, and review of specific civil processes for Placer Superior Court.

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs funded by the TCIF consists of the following maintenance and operations activities of large, branchwide initiatives, ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance, and AOC staff support for statewide technology infrastructure (see Attachment A, page 5).

***California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations*** – The allocated funds were expended to provide ongoing technology center/shared services to the courts. Applications include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Computer-Aided Facilities Management (CAFM), Integration Services Backbone (ISB), and local court desktop/remote server support. CCTC hosts the Phoenix Financial System (58 courts) and the Phoenix Human Resources System (7 courts). Three case management systems operate out of CCTC: Sustain; the criminal and traffic CMS (V2); and civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3).

***Data Integration (DI)*** – In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended to continue work with trial courts to develop a statewide approach to data exchange standards and the Integration Services Backbone (ISB), a leveraged, enterprise-class platform for exchanging information within the Judicial Branch, and between the Judicial Branch and its integration partners. The program provided critical support for the CCMS project, including development of 121 data exchanges, servicing all case types to facilitate integration between CCMS courts and justice partners. The program conducted detailed review of the technical specifications for exchanges and direction on coding and data architecture standards, and played a key role in testing all exchanges.

The team made significant progress on the eCitations project. The team initiated end-to-end testing between the CHP and courts and worked to resolve technical and business process issues. The team managed the software, hardware, and support of the core ISB infrastructure and continued to provide steady state and project support for all ISB-based interfaces, including those supporting CCMS, Phoenix, CCPOR, JBSIS, and Sustain Justice Edition.

***Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)*** – The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) provides application enhancement for the software testing process and improves applications quality management. The allocated funds were expended to support deployment of ETMS to additional applications; including maintenance for the civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3) previously managed by Deloitte. These tools help ensure that mission-

critical applications are delivered with a consistent high quality, maximizing function and minimizing defects. Other teams have adopted elements of ETMS to update key clients and promote transparency, including the Web Development team.

***Interim Case Management System (ICMS)*** – The allocated funds were expended to provide program management support to 15 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Support to 10 CCTC-hosted courts, includes maintenance and operations, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management. Five locally hosted SJE courts utilize ICMS program resources for legislative updates and SJE support. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), DOJ, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information Systems (JBSIS), as well as custom interfaces with Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt collections, Interactive Voice/Interactive Web Response processing, Issuance of Warrants, Traffic Collections, Failure-To-Appear/Failure-To-Pay collections, and Web Portal interfaces.

***Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2)*** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF was the primary source of funding for the CCMS program. (For details, refer to the Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2) item in the addendum of this report.)

***Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)*** – In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended on technical consulting services and travel related to joint application design sessions related to e-filing and e-service functional requirements. The ongoing support of e-filing/data exchange initiatives and steady-state support for local trial courts aids in standardizing filing procedures, procurement through Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs), development and testing of data exchanges, and writing of scripts for e-filing and justice partners. The program supported the transition of maintenance and support for the civil, small claims, probate, and mental health CMS (V3) to the CCTC. The team provided test support services by developing test scenarios and scripts for CCMS V4, supporting court users during testing, performing stress and functional testing, and triaging e-filing defects. E-filing and data integration teams worked with an EFSP to test scripts, schemas and data exchanges for product acceptance testing of the CCMS V4 product.

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects funded by the TCIF consists of the following development and deployment of technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure that benefits trial courts, including support provided by AOC staff, temporary staff, and outside private consultants (see Attachment A, page 6).

**California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Development** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF was the primary source of funding for the CCMS program. (For details, refer to the CCMS Development item in the addendum of this report.)

**CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF was the primary source of funding for the CCMS program. (For details, refer to the CCMS DMS Development and Deployment item in the addendum of this report.)

**Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy** – In FY 2010–2011, the Modernization Fund was the primary source of funding for the Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy program. (For details, refer to the Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy item in the Modernization Fund section of this report.)

## **Category 2: Trial Court Projects and Model Programs**

(Refer to Attachment A, page 7 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs.)

Funding was provided for various ongoing programs and limited-term projects that support trial court operations as well as improve court management and efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials.

### **Audit Contract**

The allocated funds were expended to supplement an internal audit program that was established by the council in FY 2001–2002. The Internal Audit Services (IAS) unit contracted with outside consulting and auditing firms to supplement the IAS staff in conducting comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) of the trial courts, including areas, such as court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations.

### **Human Resources – Court Investigation**

Allocated funds were used to supplement the work of AOC staff by contracting with a licensed attorney providing investigative services to the trial courts. Each request from the court for assistance is evaluated by the AOC HR division’s Labor and Employee Relations Unit (LERU) team in cooperation with the Labor and Employment Unit (LEU) in the OGC. Generally, investigative services are provided by staff in the LERU. However, in some situations LEU and LERU have determined that completion of the investigation would be best served by a third party investigator. This generally occurs when AOC staff are fully committed to other assignments or a particular situation requires objective review by an outside third party investigator.

### **Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report**

The allocated funds were expended for consultant services to produce the necessary information to complete the OPEB report. The purpose of this report is to provide the State Controller’s Office with the OPEB liability for each trial court based on the requirements of Governmental

Accounting Standards Board Statements Nos. 43 and 45. Information from this report is also included into the state's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

### **Reimbursement to Trial Courts for Public Access**

The allocated funds were expended to partially reimburse superior courts for the costs of providing public access to nondeliberative or nonadjudicative court records relating to the administration of the courts. The council approved a one-time allocation to reimburse trial courts for specified expenses incurred between January 1, 2010, and December 31, 2011, in response to requests for public access to judicial administrative records under rule 10.500 of the California Rules of Court.

### **Workers' Compensation Program Reserve**

Funds in FY 2010–2011 were utilized for the services of a consultant for tail claim data validation and liability calculations and a settlement paid out to Fresno County. The AOC has been resolving outstanding liabilities with counties for workers' compensation tail claims handled by the counties from January 1, 2001 until the claims transferred to the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program. Settlements, in the total amount of \$5,605,249, have been reached with seven counties.

### **Category 3: Urgent Needs**

(Refer to Attachment A, page 8 for this category.)

No urgent needs funding was requested by nor distributed to the trial courts in FY 2010–2011.

### **MODERNIZATION FUND**

#### **FY 2010–2011 EXPENDITURES AND ENCUMBRANCES**

(Refer to Attachment B, page 2)

The Judicial Council allocates funds from the Modernization Fund in support of statewide projects and programs to ensure the highest quality of justice in all of California's trial courts. Section 77213(b) authorizes expenditures from this fund to promote improved access to, and efficiency and effectiveness of, the trial courts. In addition, the council is designated to administer monies deposited in the Modernization Fund and allows the council, with appropriate guidelines, to delegate administration of the fund to the Administrative Director of the Courts.

In FY 2010–2011, \$36.802 million was expended from the Modernization Fund. The Modernization Fund provides funding for critical technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts, mandated and non-mandated education for judicial officers, education for court administration and staff, and key local assistance initiatives.

## **Category 1: Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

(Refer to Attachment B, page 3 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs.)

### **Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts funded by the Modernization Fund consists of the following programs that provide administrative services to the trial courts.

***Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services*** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF, TCIF, and Modernization Fund resources supported Phoenix Financial and Human Resources services. (For details, refer to the Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services item in the TCIF section of this report.)

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs funded by the Modernization Fund consists of the following maintenance and operations activities of large, branchwide initiatives, and ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance.

***California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)*** – The allocated funds were expended to complete development of the core CCPOR application, train users, and deploy to 20 courts. CCPOR is a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders. Access to protective orders through CCPOR will ultimately be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week in all court jurisdictions and venues. In addition, a deployment grant from the California Emergency Management Agency augmented the Modernization Fund allocation for CCPOR.

***Courts Linked by Information and Knowledge (CLIK) System*** – The allocated funds were expended to replace the current Themis System, first developed in 2001 on a platform no longer supported by the software vendor. Funding supported requirements development and functional specifications for several CLIK modules, and a business case analysis. CAPS provides data for key personnel both within and external to the judicial branch. The Assigned Judges Tracking System facilitates the matching and assignment of active and retired judges when the court has a critical need for assistance.

***Data Integration*** – In FY 2010–2011, both TCIF and Modernization Fund resources supported data integration. (For details, refer to the Data Integration item in the TCIF section of this report.)

***Interim Case Management System (ICMS)*** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF, TCIF, and Modernization Fund resources supported ICMS. (For details, refer to the Interim Case Management System item in the TCIF section of this report.)

**Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy** – The allocated funds were expended to support AOC delivery of a number of technology initiatives. The program ensures that the comprehensive technological needs of the branch will be met in an efficient manner. Work continued to develop and maintain branchwide technology and planning commitments through Enterprise Architecture (EA). This program provides a roadmap on how technology initiatives fit together from a business and technology perspective, and implements standards to maximize resources. Major activities in FY 2010–2011 included:

- Software support for Oracle database and application server products included in the branchwide license agreement;
- Actively researching, developing, and reviewing software architecture plans for branchwide applications and infrastructure;
- Oversight of CCMS application architecture and design and review of technical deliverables to ensure their quality, completeness, and accuracy;
- Interfacing between application development teams and branch-level software partners including Oracle and Adobe;
- Formalizing the Solution Development Lifecycle for development and ongoing support of Branch applications;
- Implementing the EA governance and decision review process for the branch; and
- Providing support to the local courts with EA-related issues and solution design.

**Telecommunications Support** – The allocated funds were expended to support the ongoing goal of the court telecommunications program to develop and maintain a network infrastructure aligned with emerging needs of enterprise applications such as Phoenix, ICMS and CCMS. Funds were expended to replace network equipment in 55 courts that could no longer be maintained. Funding was also used to maintain a high level of network reliability in acknowledgement of the increased reliance on internal and external connectivity with CCTC, state and local justice partners, and among court locations. Program funds provide the foundation for other forms of communication that the courts require, such as Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), building automation systems, security cameras, electronic signage, and energy management systems, which can provide cost savings to courts as these systems are implemented. Funding supported the critical focus on information security by providing 24/7 system monitoring for electronic intrusions and data corruption.

**Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)** – The allocated funds were expended to support the UCF system that supports centralized reporting and distribution of uniform civil fees cash collections. In 2005, the Legislature, through Section 68085.1(b), required that the 58 trial courts submit a schedule of collected civil fees by code section at the end of each month to the AOC. Under section 68085.1, the AOC is responsible for reporting and remittance of UCF cash collections. The UCFS is used to calculate correct distribution of 192 categories

of fees collected by the superior courts. The fees are distributed to up to 22 different funds or entities. Work in FY 2010–2011 included updates reflecting changes in fee schedules and distribution rules as legislated by the state in November 2010 and April 2011. Major enhancements included an automated interface from Phoenix to the UCFS which, in conjunction with data from Bank of America, allows the UCFS to provide consolidated and accurate reporting of current and available trial court balances. New mechanisms were created to allow recording of retroactive adjustments, dating of distribution rule changes, and provide accurate historical reporting.

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects funded by the Modernization Fund consists of the following development and deployment of technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure that benefits trial courts.

**CCMS Development** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF was the primary source of funding for the CCMS program. (For details, refer to the CCMS Development item in the addendum of this report.)

### **Category 2: Educational and Developmental Programs**

(Refer to Attachment B, page 4 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs.)

The council’s strategic plan identifies education of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and non-judicial court staff as a significant means to advance the mission and goals of the judicial branch in the areas of access, fairness, diversity, ethics, and general excellence in judging and court administration. With the increasing complexity of the law, court procedures, and court administration, the provision and administration of justice for the people of California requires judges and court personnel to be equipped with knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable them to discharge duties in fair, effective, and efficient ways that foster the trust and confidence of the public. The allocations for education programs fall into five general categories: mandated education programs for judges (e.g., orientation for new judges, B.E Witkin Judicial College of California, family law assignment education), non-mandated education programs for judges (e.g., advance education for experienced judges, probate and mental health institute, overview courses), education/training/programs related to court administration (e.g., court management courses, technical assistance to local courts, trial court faculty education program), education programs for court staff (e.g., mid-level management conference, Court Clerk Training Institute, distance learning, ), and other educational and developmental programs (e.g., teen courts and Beyond the Bench, budget-focused training and meetings, Labor Relations Academy). The curriculum of education and other related courses are either developed through rigorous needs analysis, prioritization, and instructional design and delivered using a wide variety of delivery methods, including technology-assisted distance learning education.

The allocated funds were expended to cover the costs of lodging and group meals for trial court judicial and non-judicial participants attending mandated and other essential education programs. The allocated funds were also expended to cover lodging, meal, travel and other incidental costs related to faculty development, local courses designing, and infrastructure improvement, and transmission of satellite broadcast programs.

### **Category 3: Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs**

(Refer to Attachment B, page 5 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs.)

In FY 2010–2011, the council allocated funding from the Modernization Fund to support various projects and programs with the objective of enhancing the delivery of justice.

#### **Alternative Dispute Resolution**

This project is designed to expand the mediation and settlement programs for civil cases in the trial courts. The project helps courts meet the goal of section 10.70(a) of the Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations. It also implements the council's February 2004 directive that AOC staff work with the trial courts to: 1) assess their needs and available resources for developing, implementing, maintaining, and improving mediation and other settlement programs for civil cases; and 2) where existing resources are not sufficient, develop plans for obtaining the necessary resources. During this reporting period, two types of grants were awarded to trial courts: 1) five planning grants to conduct a needs assessment or plan a mediation or settlement program, and 2) fifteen implementation grants to implement a new mediation or settlement program or improve or expand an existing one. A portion of the Modernization Fund budget for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) projects was also used to contract for the development of a video, suitable for statewide use by courts, to promote and facilitate the use of court-connected mediation programs for civil harassment cases and for court staff to travel to conferences regarding statewide ADR projects.

#### **Branchwide Communications**

The allocated funds were expended to produce the *2011 Pocket Directory of California Judicial Leaders*. This booklet is a small directory of the leadership of the judicial branch and is a companion to the *Pocket Directory of the California Legislature* (and other directories produced by Capitol Enquiry) and demonstrates that the judicial branch is co-equal with the legislative and executive branches while providing transparency and accountability by giving a public face to branch policymakers. Each year's publication is updated to reflect the current membership of the Judicial Council, its committees, advisory committees, and task forces as well as the leadership of the appellate and trial courts.

### **Complex Civil Litigation Program**

The allocated funds were expended to provide support for the Complex Civil Litigation Program, which began as a pilot program in January 2000 to improve the management of complex civil cases. In August 2003, the council made the program permanent. The National Center for State Courts reported on the program in its *Evaluation of the Centers for Complex Litigation Pilot Program*. The lengthy report included information on the number of complex cases filed; the impact of the complex litigation departments on case and calendar management; the impacts on trial courts, attorneys, and parties; and recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor concerning complex litigation departments. During this reporting period, all funds went directly to courts to support the operation of 17 courtrooms/departments handling exclusively complex cases in the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties.

### **Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment, and Education**

The allocated funds were expended to cover costs for the following activities:

- Administered the written and oral court interpreter exams and supported the transition to the utilization of exams developed by the National Center for the State Courts' Consortium for Language Access in the Courts. To date, a total of 836 written exams have been administered in 15 locations throughout California. Additionally, a total of 566 oral court interpreter exams in 11 certified languages, as well as English-only exams for registered status, were administered in 5 locations throughout the state;
- Developed court interpreter oral exam versions in three languages, new versions of English-only oral proficiency exams used for registered status, and created new English base content to be used for future exam developmental activities;
- Ensured standardized administration practices of Consortium oral exams so that the public and trial courts have access to certified and registered interpreters;
- Developed rater training materials for remote refresher trainings provided to raters on an as-needed basis to reduce costs associated with in-person rater trainings;
- Convened an in-person meeting. A full orientation session for new panelists was provided, including a review of Judicial Council governance, as well as a discussion of the mission, structure, and function of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel. Updates were shared by the Professional Ethics and Conduct Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on American Sign Language;
- Used video remote equipment for interpreters of American Sign Language (ASL). The input provided from the pilot has assisted the Subcommittee on ASL of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel in producing recommended guidelines for the use of video remote interpreting equipment for ASL interpretation;

- Printed badges for new interpreters, as well as replacement badges as requested;
- Purchased video and DVD copies to be provided to the court interpreters program for use in training, as well as footage that can be posted to the California courts website;
- Provided two in-language skills building workshops for currently registered interpreters of Punjabi and Khmer. In accordance with the exam grace period policy, currently registered interpreters of newly-designated languages must take and pass certification exams within 18 months. These trainings supported Punjabi and Khmer candidates in this exam grace period;
- Presented 10 institutes by the interpreter program directors, coordinators, and lead faculty to discuss the utilization of remote technology for online training programs and the creation of training programs in languages other than Spanish;
- Provided presentations at the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators and the California Healthcare Interpreters Association regarding “Orientation to the Profession”; and
- Conducted four workshops, pursuant to Sections 68561 and 68562, for all newly certified and registered interpreters to meet their education requirements established by the council.

#### **Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms**

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended to develop additional “plain language” forms and for translation of commonly used forms. Additionally, funds were used to support a national document assembly server that will enable litigants to complete their forms on-line at no charge. Developed in collaboration with legal services programs, these interactive programs can be used in every county to help litigants complete pleadings in workshop settings more quickly and accurately.

#### **Public Outreach and Education (formerly titled Developing Promising Practices)**

The allocated funds were expended to support two programs:

- California JusticeCorps Program – JusticeCorps, an AmeriCorp program, assists court-based self-help center attorneys in serving the public by helping to triage cases, providing information and referrals, identifying and completing legal forms, and assisting in court hearings. The program recruited, trained, and placed 310 undergraduate university students in court-based legal access self-help centers, with a majority of these students completing 300 hours of service during an academic year.
- California on My Honor Civics Institute for Teachers – professional development was provided to teachers through multi-day workshops held in coordination with courts in Southern and Northern California. Teachers worked collaboratively to create lesson units to improve the education of K-12 students about civics with an emphasis on the judicial branch. In addition, a two-day Leadership Institute for teachers and Local Court

Connection Workshops where teachers would meet on-site at local courts. These workshops featured guest speakers, observations of live court proceedings, and sharing of local, state, and national civic education resources to motivate teachers for offering effective civic education opportunities in their classes.

### **Ralph N. Kleps Award Program**

The allocated funds were primarily used to support the work of the Ralph N. Kleps Awards Committee, which met twice in FY 2010–2011. The Ralph N. Kleps Awards Committee—a 19-member panel comprising justices, judges, and court administrators—is charged with soliciting nominations, evaluating received nominations, and making recommendations for the Judicial Council’s biannual Ralph N. Kleps Award to recognize and honor the innovative contributions to the administration of justice made by individual courts in California. The committee carefully evaluates all applicants based on the award criteria, including improvements that reflect innovation, fulfillment of the intent of at least one goal of the judicial branch’s strategic plan, and transferability to other courts.

A total of 16 nominations were received and were reviewed by the committee to determine if they successfully met the award criteria as outlined in the nomination materials. Twelve nominations were found to be eligible. Committee members then made site visits to applicants to see the programs in action and learn more from the program staff and judicial officers involved in the programs. Immediately after each site visit, committee members scored each program and submitted a consensus score and evaluation form to staff. Seven programs were eventually recommended to the Judicial Council for awards

Allocated funds were also used for the publication, *Innovations in the California Courts*. This book profiles replicable court innovations and statewide initiatives in California, including projects that are recipients of the Ralph N. Kleps Awards and contains statewide initiatives designed to promote advances in infrastructure, management, communications and other aspects of the day-to-day business of the California courts. The publication is used to disseminate information concerning innovative court programs to California and national court leaders. Allocated funds were used to contract a writer and copyeditor to develop the content of the book. The design was performed in-house, as a cost-saving measure.

### **Self-Help Videos for the Website**

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended to pay the costs of a web server for providing videos to the public on issues such as how to prepare for court and how mediation works. Captioning was added to all videos for the public website to make them ADA compliant for the deaf or hard of hearing. Some funds were saved as the AOC was able to transition a number of videos to a free YouTube service.

**Trial Court Performance and Accountability**

The allocated funds were expended to implement the final phase of the Judicial Workload Assessment and begin work on finalizing the Resource Allocation Study (RAS) as required by statute (§ 77001.5). The SB 56 Working Group met twice to review and give input on the data and workload estimates for judgeships based on time study of judges. In addition, six days of focus groups were conducted with over 40 judges and 50 trial court staff to review the workload studies time estimates and determine whether these needed adjustment. The model will be used as the basis for the special assessment of the need for new judgeships in family and juvenile assignments as required under section 69614.

## ADDENDUM

### Supplemental Information on FY 2010–2011 Statewide Technology Infrastructure & Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts Funding and Expenditures

#### **TCTF Funding for Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

A total of \$70.036 million from the TCTF was expended and/or encumbered in support of statewide administrative and technology initiatives that support the objectives set forth by the council in its strategic and operational plans and as approved by the council’s Court Technology Advisory Committee.

The chart below displays the expenditures and encumbrances from the TCTF in FY 2010–2011 for statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts by program or project and by local assistance or support:

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount<sup>2</sup></b>
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Deployment	\$ 12,659,317
CCMS V4 Development	18,256,014
CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment	4,104
CCMS Maintenance and Operations	2,492,460
Interim Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (V3)	19,631,537
Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2)	5,973,991
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)—Operations	1,806,573
Interim Case Management System (Sustain)	1,270,596
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	7,905,526
Trial Court Procurement	36,128
<b>Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Local Assistance</b>	<b>55,972,024</b>
<b>Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Support</b>	<b>14,064,221</b>
<b>Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts</b>	<b>\$ 70,036,246</b>

<sup>2</sup> Amounts displayed rounded to nearest dollar. Subtotals and totals reflect the sum of itemized amounts to the penny, then rounded to the nearest dollar.

### **Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts funded by the TCTF consists of the following programs, including AOC staff support, that provide administrative services to the trial courts.

***Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services*** – In FY 2010–2011, TCTF, TCIF, and Modernization Fund resources supported Phoenix Financial and Human Resources services. (For details, refer to the Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services item in the TCIF section of this report.)

***Trial Court Procurement*** – In FY 2010–2011, both TCTF and TCIF resources supported Trial Court Procurement. (For details, refer to the Trial Court Procurement item in the TCIF section of this report.)

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs funded by the TCTF consists of the following maintenance and operations activities of large, branchwide initiatives, ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance, and AOC staff support for statewide technology infrastructure.

***California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Program*** – CCMS is a statewide initiative to develop and deploy a unified case management system for the superior courts. The project is being managed by the AOC CCMS Program Management Office with support from the AOC Information Services Division. Over 200 court representatives from more than 29 counties have participated in the application’s design and testing.

CCMS utilizes the technology and the functionality developed for an interim civil system, incorporates the criminal and traffic functionality developed for an interim application, and has developed new functionality for family law, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile dependency. Additional areas of functionality in CCMS include court interpreter and court reporter scheduling. CCMS has four distinct components: a core product, an Internet portal, a statewide data warehouse, and data exchanges with justice partners. More information about CCMS benefits and functionality can be found at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/partners/ccms.htm>.

A new CCMS oversight and governance structure was established in late 2010 to provide overarching direction and guidance to the program and to help ensure successful implementation across the state. This new governance model gives structure and transparency to the CCMS project and consists of the CCMS Executive Committee and three advisory committees, which help manage issues and make decisions related to administration, operations, and justice partner relationships.

Core product-acceptance testing was successfully completed at the end of April 2011 with the product meeting the contract exit criteria. Seven sites with more than 70 judicial officers and staff from the courts, AOC staff, and professional testers participated. Work began on the independent evaluation of the development vendor's process for developing CCMS (Standard CCMI [Capabilities Maturities Model Institute] Appraisal Method for Process Improvement (SCAMPI)) and a code quality review (Independent Code Quality Assessment). A comprehensive report on the status of CCMS and related interim systems as well as the Phoenix program, *Status of the California Court Case Management System and the Phoenix Program 2011*, is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm>.

**CCMS Maintenance and Operations** – During FY 2010–2011, funding supported infrastructure support and hosting services at the vendor data center; and support and updates to data exchanges with justice partners.

**Interim Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (V3)** – The interim application for civil, small claims, probate, and mental health is in production in the Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties. This application supports processing of 25 percent of civil cases statewide.

During FY 2010–2011, the maintenance and support for V3 was transitioned from Deloitte Consulting to the AOC Information Services Division. The planning activities began in July 2010. Transition activities included hiring technical staff and performing knowledge transfer. The estimated cost savings is \$4.85 million to \$5.3 million over the useful life of the V3 software. Two maintenance releases, R10.01.015 and R10.03.023, were deployed during this fiscal year.

During FY 2010–2011, funding supported:

- Hiring technical staff to support the transition;
- Completed the knowledge transfer from Deloitte Consulting;
- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the vendor's data center;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for testing, training, and production environments at the CCTC;
- Vendor help desk support for end users; and
- New maintenance releases of the product to address legislative changes.

**Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2)** – The Superior Court of Fresno County implemented the interim criminal and traffic case management system in July 2006. The AOC assumed responsibility for the maintenance and support of V2 in September 2009.

The total savings from assuming internal responsibility for support of the application was estimated to be \$4.8 million over the projected useful life of the system. In June 2011 the break-even point for the transition was achieved, and monthly savings of approximately \$300,000 was recognized.

During FY 2010–2011, funding supported new releases and other efficiencies:

- Release 7.1 resolved all known JBSIS reporting issues for the criminal and traffic case management system;
- Release 8.0 Legislative Update for AB 2173, provided changes to the Emergency Medical Air Transportation Penalty;
- Project to reduce the number of servers deployed in production and staging was phased in and completed in July 2011, which will result in an annual cost savings of \$240,000; and
- Modified interface for automated warrants to provide real time information to Fresno Sheriff's Office, and upgrading the Official Payments interface for better continuity of service.

***Interim Case Management System (ICMS)***

In FY 2010–2011, TCTF, TCIF, and Modernization Fund resources also supported ICMS. (For details, refer to the Interim Case Management System item in the TCIF section of this report.)

**Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects**

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects funded by the TCTF consists of the following development and deployment of technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure that benefits trial courts, including support provided by AOC staff, temporary staff, and outside private consultants.

***CCMS Development*** – In FY 2010–2011, allocated funding supported:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Information services and vendor support for the infrastructure and hosting services for testing, training, and production environments;
- Verification of the final functional design;
- Testing of the code for the core product, e-filing, and the web portal;
- Data integration, independent project oversight, code quality review, and consulting services;
- Integration testing for the external components; and

- Support for project governance.

**CCMS Deployment** – In FY 2010–2011, the CCMS team began focusing on the development of configurations for early adopter courts. This effort includes the standardization of operational processes and configurations to the largest extent reasonably possible as well as the development of reusable tools for future deployment in courts.

Due to budget uncertainties, it became necessary to pause early adopter deployment activities in April 2011, to focus on risk mitigation and additional cost analysis. The governance committees met in June 2011 to review the revised start date for deployment options and decided to re-engage with deployment activities on July 1, 2011. Following July 1, 2011, CCMS deployment received additional cuts in funding. As a result, further modifications were made to the deployment plan in order to work under new fiscal constraints.

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funding supported:

- Vendor support and contracted services to develop standardized configuration and tools;
- Intra-branch agreement with San Diego Superior Court to implement document management and electronic filing in preparation for deployment; and
- Intra-branch agreement with San Luis Obispo and Ventura Superior Courts to support early adopter deployment activities.

**CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment**

The need for a Document Management System (DMS) has been identified by the AOC, and trial and appellate courts. Both the CCMS steering and oversight committees endorsed the need for a DMS to be integrated within CCMS. The Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC) recommended that a project to develop a DMS solution be undertaken. The AOC Information Services Division (ISD) has partnered with Santa Clara Superior Court to develop a DMS solution.

Funding in FY 2010–2011 supported the following activities:

- A Request For Proposal (RFP) to solicit vendor proposals for a DMS solution for the trial courts;
- Selection and procurement of a DMS product piloted at Santa Clara Superior Court; and
- Began the process to prepare a DMS solution for CCMS early adopter courts that do not have a DMS.

## Supplemental Funding Process Allocations

To ensure a consistent approach for considering court requests for supplemental funding related to statewide administrative and technology infrastructure, the council approved the creation of a Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Funding Committee. The role of the committee was to review staff recommendations regarding individual court requests and to forward its recommendations to the Administrative Director of the Courts for a final decision based on the availability of unallocated funds in the TCTF and TCIF.

The council delegated authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate one-time and ongoing unallocated funds from the TCTF and TCIF to the trial courts in accordance with the supplemental funding request process. The table below displays the distribution of these allocated funds to courts in FY 2010–2011.

<b>Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure Program</b>	<b>Funding Distributed</b>
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	\$1,768,248
Interim Case Management System (Sustain)	1,112,791
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	776,550
<b>Total, Supplemental Funding Distributed</b>	<b>\$3,657,588</b>

Of the \$3.658 million distributed to courts, \$3.548 million is ongoing and is part of courts’ base allocations for trial court operations.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2010-2011**  
**Resources**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 20,674,512</b>
Prior Year Adjustments	6,999,429
<b>Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>27,673,942</b>
<b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	
50/50 Excess Fines and Fees Split Revenue	44,718,887
2% Automation Fund Revenue	17,746,416
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	136,199
Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	548,795
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments <sup>1</sup>	552,295
One Percent (1%) Transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund	27,232,140
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (AB 1806, Gov. Code, § 77202(a)(B)(iii))	(31,563,000)
<b>Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>59,371,733</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 87,045,674</b>

<sup>1</sup> Items include repayments of \$566,000 from two courts of FY 2008-2009 cash advances and other lesser miscellaneous adjustments.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2010-2011  
Fund Balance Summary**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 87,045,674</b>
<b>Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	
Ongoing Statewide Programs	46,467,807
Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	1,181,938
Urgent Needs	-
<b>Subtotal, Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>47,649,745</b>
Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services	861,770
<b>Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata</b>	<b>48,511,515</b>
<b>Total Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 38,534,160</b>

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances  
Category I - Ongoing Statewide Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	\$ 1,750,000
Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	100,000
Human Resources Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits	80,000
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	761,773
Jury System Improvement Projects	50,000
Litigation Management Program	4,067,810
Online Training <sup>1</sup>	344
Quality of Justice and Service to the Public	89,758
Self-Help Centers	5,194,009
Self-Represented Litigants - Statewide Support	286,065
Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	19,725
Trial Court Security Grants	1,637,066
Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program	248,250
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Local Assistance <sup>2</sup>	6,424,348
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Support <sup>2</sup>	4,683,540
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs - Local Assistance <sup>3</sup>	16,243,827
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs - Support <sup>3</sup>	2,055,688
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects - Local Assistance <sup>4</sup>	1,673,735
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects - Support <sup>4</sup>	1,101,868
<b>Total, Ongoing Statewide Programs</b>	<b>\$ 46,467,807</b>

<sup>1</sup> These expenditures were recorded to the Improvement Fund in error. In FY 2010-2011, this program was funded by the General Fund.

<sup>2</sup> See Attachment A, page 4, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts".

<sup>3</sup> See Attachment A, page 5, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs".

<sup>4</sup> See Attachment A, page 6, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects".

**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Local Assistance</b>	
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	\$ 6,424,348
<b>Subtotal, Local Assistance</b>	<b>6,424,348</b>
<b>Support</b>	
California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System	108,658
Enhanced Collections	752,073
Internal Audits	610,919
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	1,248,838
Regional Office Assistance Group	1,561,958
Treasury	240,868
Trial Court Procurement	70,054
Trial Court Reengineering	90,173
<b>Subtotal, Support<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>4,683,540</b>
<b>Total, Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts</b>	<b>\$ 11,107,889</b>

<sup>1</sup> As specified by the provisions of Government Code section 68085(a)(2)(A), the amount available from the TCIF that can be used for statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives support is 20 percent of the amounts remitted to the TCIF pursuant to Government Code section 77205(a).

**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Local Assistance</b>	
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Operations	\$ 9,645,047
Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)	788,725
Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)	5,552,482
Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	257,574
<b>Subtotal, Local Assistance</b>	<b>16,243,827</b>
<b>Support</b>	
Case Management System – Criminal and Traffic (V2)	993
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Operations	1,477,708
Data Integration	254,901
Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	322,087
<b>Subtotal, Support<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>2,055,688</b>
<b>Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs</b>	<b>\$ 18,299,515</b>

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances  
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Local Assistance</b>	
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Development	\$ 918,785
CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment	698,026
Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	56,924
<b>Subtotal, Local Assistance</b>	<b>1,673,735</b>
<b>Support</b>	
CCMS V4 Development	1,100,753
CCMS DMS Development and Deployment	1,114
<b>Subtotal, Support<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1,101,868</b>
<b>Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects</b>	<b>\$ 2,775,603</b>

<sup>1</sup> As specified by the provisions of Government Code section 68085(a)(2)(A), the amount available from the TCIF that can be used for statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives support is 20 percent of the amounts remitted to the TCIF pursuant to Government Code section 77205(a).

**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Category II - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Audit Contract	\$ 450,000
Human Resources - Court Investigation	50,000
Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report	269,954
Reimbursement to Trial Courts for Public Access	19,876
Workers' Compensation Program Reserve	392,108
<b>Total, Trial Court Projects and Model Programs</b>	<b>\$ 1,181,938</b>

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances  
Category III - Urgent Needs**

Description	Amount
Urgent Needs	\$ -
<b>Total, Urgent Needs</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2010-2011**  
**Resources**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 30,933,026</b>
Prior Year Adjustments	1,248,984
<b>Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>32,182,009</b>
<b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	274,916
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	373
State General Fund Transfer	38,709,000
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (Per Item 0250-111-0556, Budget Act 2010)	(31,600,000)
<b>Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>7,384,288</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 39,566,297</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2010-2011**

**Fund Balance Summary**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 39,566,297</b>
<b>Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	
Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	28,258,659
Education and Developmental Programs	2,170,339
Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	6,373,397
<b>Total Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>36,802,396</b>
<b>Total Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 2,763,902</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**

**Category I - Statewide Technology Infrastructure and  
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts</b>	
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	\$ 530,000
<b>Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs</b>	
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	481,000
Courts Linked by Info and Knowledge (CLIK) System	440,748
Data Integration	5,934,433
Interim Case Management System (ICMS)	125,486
Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	6,668,782
Telecommunications Support	13,811,166
Uniform Civil Fees System	266,901
<b>Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects</b>	
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Development	142
<b>Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts</b>	<b>\$ 28,258,659</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**

**Category II - Educational and Developmental Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
B.E. Witkin Judicial College of California	\$ 265,783
Family Law Assignment Education	35,674
Juvenile Law Assignment Education	16,288
Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	105,366
<b><i>Subtotal, Mandated Program for Judges</i></b>	<b><i>423,112</i></b>
Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	22,130
Civil Law and Procedure Institute	26,688
Cow County Judges Institute	24,575
Overview Courses	216,900
Probate and Mental Health Institute	40,320
Traffic Law Institute	1,110
<b><i>Subtotal, Non-Mandated Program for Judges</i></b>	<b><i>331,723</i></b>
California Judicial Administration Conference	2,329
Court Management Course	87,243
Fall Leadership Summit	12,253
Technical Assistance to Local Courts	199,483
Train the Trainers - Faculty Development	107,529
Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	274,193
<b><i>Subtotal, Program Related to Court Administration</i></b>	<b><i>683,030</i></b>
Court Clerk Training Institute	109,063
Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)	250,366
Mid-level Management Conferences	60,373
<b><i>Subtotal, Program for Trial Court Staff</i></b>	<b><i>419,802</i></b>
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	29,870
CFCC Programs (Teen Courts and Beyond the Bench)	155,860
CFCC Publications	123,251
Labor Relations Academy	3,691
<b><i>Subtotal, Other Educational and Developmental Programs</i></b>	<b><i>312,673</i></b>
<b>Total, Educational and Developmental Programs</b>	<b>\$ 2,170,339</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances**

**Category III - Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$ 1,363,953
Branchwide Communications	20,603
Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,010
Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment and Education	286,919
Interactive Software - Self-represented Litigant Electronic Forms	60,503
Public Outreach and Education	535,474
Ralph N. Kleps Award Program	41,174
Self-Help Videos for the Website	2,400
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	61,361
<b>Total, Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects</b>	<b>\$ 6,373,397</b>