



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 28, 2012

| | |
|---|--|
| Title | Agenda Item Type |
| Judicial Branch Report to the Legislature: Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011 | Action Required |
| Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected | Effective Date |
| N/A | N/A |
| Recommended by | Date of Report |
| Administrative Office of the Courts Jody Patel, Interim Administrative Director of the Courts | February 24, 2012 |
| | Contact |
| | Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397 zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov |

Executive Summary

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommends that the Judicial Council approve the attached *Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011 (Including Supplemental Information on Statewide Technology Infrastructure Funding and Expenditures)*. Government Code section 77209(j) requires the council to report annually to the Legislature on expenditures from the Trial Court Improvement Fund. In the interests of transparency, Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund expenditures are also included in the report, and an addendum to the report provides information about funding allocated to the courts from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and Trial Court Improvement Fund through the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, as well as FY 2010–2011 TCTF expenditures for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure programs and projects.

Recommendation

The Administrative Office of the Courts recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the report entitled *Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011 (Including Supplemental Information on Statewide Technology Infrastructure Funding and Expenditures)*, and
2. Direct AOC staff to submit the report to the Legislature.

Previous Council Action

AOC staff have submitted previous legislative reports to the council as information-only items. Those reports were also submitted by AOC staff, on behalf of the council, to the Legislature. Previous legislative reports can be found at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm>.

At its April 21, 2006, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services as well as the trial court supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, with authority to allocate funds delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts. As part of those processes, the council directed AOC staff to report back annually as to the amount of funding from the TCTF and the Improvement Fund allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process, as well as any amounts paid directly out of the TCTF in the previous fiscal year for statewide administrative infrastructure costs. To comply with this direction, the requested information appears in an addendum to the *Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011* to the Legislature.

Rationale for Recommendation

The annual submission of this report by the Judicial Council to the Legislature is required under Government Code section 77209(j).

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The legislative report was not circulated for comment, as it is purely informational in nature.

No alternatives were considered because statute requires the Judicial Council to submit annual status reports on these subjects to the Legislature.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

There are no costs or operational impacts to implementing the recommendations in this report.

Attachments

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



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 G. 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. Bill Emmerson, Vice-Chair
Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
State Capitol, Room 4082
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*, as required under
Government Code section 77209(j)

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

The Judicial Council respectfully submits the attached *Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010–2011* under the reporting requirements stated in Government Code section 77209(j) regarding use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund. Also, though not required by statute, expenditures pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund are included in the report, as well.

In addition, though not required by statute, the report contains an addendum identifying 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

February 29, 2012

Page 2

infrastructure services, as well as expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in fiscal year 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 are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts and court proceedings and programs.

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

Sincerely,

Jody Patel
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts

JP/CS

Enclosures

cc: Members of the Judicial Council
Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel
Hon. Gregory P. Schmidt, Secretary of the Senate
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
Peter Allen, Manager, AOC Office of Communications
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 G. 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

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.

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 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 are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts and court proceedings and programs.

In fiscal year 2010–2011, \$47,649,745 was expended or encumbered from the Trial Court Improvement Fund. Of that amount, \$46,467,807 went toward “Ongoing Statewide Programs,” including statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts, and \$1,181,938 to “Trial Court Projects and Model Programs.” From the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, \$36,802,396 was expended or encumbered. Of that amount, \$28,258,659 went toward “Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts,” \$2,170,339 to “Education and Developmental Programs,” and \$6,373,397 to “Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs.”

The full report is available at 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

*University of California, Los Angeles, 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 G. 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

Colin Simpson
Supervising Budget Analyst / Primary Author

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)¹ requires the Judicial Council to annually report to the Legislature on expenditures from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF). In accordance with the statutory requirement, the council submits this report to the Legislature. Though not required by statute, expenditures pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund are included in the report.

In addition, though not required by statute, the report contains an addendum identifying funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and the TCIF allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure services, as well as expenditures from the TCTF in fiscal year 2010–2011 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs.

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all citations are to the California Government Code.

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, fines, and forfeitures split revenue pursuant to section 77205(a); the 2 percent automation fund pursuant to section 68090.8(b); interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund; royalties from publication of jury instructions; other miscellaneous revenues; and a transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund. 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 before March 15 of each fiscal year for purposes other than for “urgent needs” of courts. Section 77209(i) specifies that royalties from jury instructions publication can be used only for the improvement of the jury system.

The Modernization Fund (see Attachment B, page 1) receives an appropriation annually in the state Budget Act. Additional interest revenue is received from the Surplus Money Investment Fund.

For FY 2010–2011, expenditures and encumbrances from the two special funds were made in the following council-approved categories, described in greater detail below: ²

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: | \$47,649,745 |

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: | \$36,802,396 |

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).

² Amounts displayed are rounded to nearest dollar. Subtotals and totals reflect the sum of amounts itemized to the penny and then rounded to the nearest dollar.

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, mostly 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 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 are critical projects of statewide importance and direct support of the trial courts.

Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs

(See 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 multiyear 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 salary or per diem, benefits, and mileage), Language Line services, and interpreter coordinator services. The project also used the allocated funding to translate 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 & the Courts has been operating this program for a number of years and typically receives requests for funding that are at least twice as much as the funding available.

Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers

The allocated funds were expended to secure a contract with Managed Health Network 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) to provide 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 HIPAA issues as to propriety of business associate agreements between the courts and insurance brokers.

Commission on Judicial Performance 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 lead to 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. Fifteen trial courts sent the pamphlet 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 Office of the Attorney General 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 for all 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 of the self-help centers, and the remaining funds for supplies, travel, and related operational expenses. All trial courts have now implemented self-help assistance programs and serve more than 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 support 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. More than 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—and shared 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 breakout discussion groups. More than 400 self-help and legal services attorneys, court staff, law

librarians, interpreters, and others involved in providing court-based self-help attended the three-day conference.

In addition, the California Courts self-help website added more than a thousand pages of information on step-by-step procedures for common legal issues, with translations in 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 and 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. It reports on recent opinions and other issues involving judicial ethics and discipline. It is provided to all judicial officers as 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

The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program 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—which 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 (CCTC) with implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services. These courts use 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 (CCPOR), which is in use by many courts and county organizations.

Enhanced Collections: The AOC Enhanced Collections Unit (ECU) provides professional support and assistance to court and county collections programs to improve collections of court-ordered debt 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 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 of the AOC Finance Division conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) of areas including court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations at each of the 58 trial courts every three to four years. Allocated funds were expended to provide continued support for six staff positions.

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services: The Phoenix services include support and deployment of an Enterprise Resource Planning system on an SAP technical platform, as well as professional financial and human resources services for the 58 trial courts in the state. The Phoenix Financial System and the Phoenix Human Resources System replace systems and support previously provided to the courts by counties and private entities. This coordinated system provides end users with seamless interaction between the input and retrieval of financial information and support for human resources. The AOC successfully deployed the financial system component of this new technology platform to all 58 courts between 2002 and 2009. In addition, 7 of the 58 courts have implemented the fully integrated system by deploying the human resources system as well. 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 program has successfully built a hardware environment enabling and supporting future growth and functionality; allowing for full system software upgrades of all Phoenix system environments in the future within the existing architecture. 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 the SAP Productivity Pak by RWD.

Regional Office Assistance Group: In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended for attorneys and staff working primarily in the three AOC regional offices. Their 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 a contract specialist, who 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 a senior court services analyst, focuses on reengineering the business processes and systems of trial courts to achieve improvement in business performance. On request from a trial court, the unit observes the court’s workflow and business processes and 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 the Superior Courts of San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, civil business processes for the Superior Court of El Dorado County, and finance business operations for the Superior Court of San Mateo County and review of specific civil processes for the Superior Court of Placer County.

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 —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, 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 case management system (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 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 California Court Case Management System (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 reviews of the technical specifications for exchanges and direction on coding and data architecture standards and played a key role in testing all exchanges.

The DI program made significant progress on the eCitations project. The DI program initiated end-to-end testing between the California Highway Patrol and courts and worked to resolve technical and business process issues. The DI program 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, the Judicial Branch Statistical Information Systems (JBSIS), and Sustain Justice Edition (SJE).

Enterprise Test Management Suite: 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 groups have adopted elements of ETMS 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 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 use ICMS program resources for legislative updates and SJE support. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, DOJ, and 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: In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended on technical consulting services and travel related to joint application design sessions for 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 of filing procedures, procurement of Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs), development and testing of data exchanges, and writing of scripts for e-filing for 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 program 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 development and deployment of specified technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to specific trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure related to the 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 and 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 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 an 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 No. 43 and No. 45. Information from this report is also included in 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 used 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.)

Urgent needs funding was neither 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. The council is the designated entity for administration of monies deposited in the Modernization Fund but may 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 nonmandated 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 programs that provide administrative services to the trial courts. Only one program was funded by the Modernization Fund in FY 2010–2011

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 development of requirements and functional specifications for several CLIK modules and a business case analysis. CAPS provides data for key personnel within and outside 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: 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 efficiently. Major activities in FY 2010–2011 included:

- Providing software support for Oracle database and application server products included in the branchwide license agreement;
- Researching, developing, and reviewing software architecture plans for branchwide applications and infrastructure;
- Overseeing 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 enterprise architecture governance and decision-review process for the branch; and
- Providing support to the local courts with enterprise architecture-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 in 55 courts to replace network equipment that could no longer be maintained. Funding was also used to maintain a high level of network reliability, acknowledging the increased reliance on internal and external connectivity with the CCTC, state and local justice partners, and court locations. Program funds provide the foundation for other forms of communication that the courts require, such as Voice over Internet Protocol, 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 UCFS that supports centralized reporting and distribution of UCF cash collections. In 2005, the Legislature, through Section 68085.1(b), required that the 58 trial courts submit to the AOC a schedule of collected civil fees by code section at the end of each month. Under section 68085.1, the AOC is responsible for reporting and remitting 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 statutory changes in fees and distribution rules in November 2010 and April 2011. Major enhancements included an automated interface from Phoenix to the UCFS that, 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 accurate historical reporting.

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects, funded by the Modernization Fund, consists of development and deployment of technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to specific trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure related to the trial courts. Only one project was funded by the Modernization Fund in FY 2010–2011.

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 to this report.)

Category 2: Educational and Developmental Programs

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

The Judicial Council’s strategic plan identifies education of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and nonjudicial 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),
- Nonmandated education programs for judges (e.g., advanced education for experienced judges, probate and mental health institute, overview courses),
- Education, training, and 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., midlevel management conference, Court Clerk Training Institute, distance learning), and
- Other educational and developmental programs (e.g., teen courts, Beyond the Bench, budget-focused training and meetings, Labor Relations Academy).

The curriculum of education and other related courses are developed through rigorous needs analysis, prioritization, and instructional design and delivered using a wide variety of delivery methods, including technology-assisted distance learning education.

Allocated funds were expended to cover the costs of lodging and group meals for trial court judicial and nonjudicial 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, designing courses to be delivered by the trial courts, 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 Judicial 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

The Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) project is designed to expand mediation and settlement programs for civil cases in the trial courts. This 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. The ADR

project 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: 5 planning grants to conduct a needs assessment or plan a mediation or settlement program and 15 implementation grants to initiate a new mediation or settlement program or improve or expand an existing one. A portion of the Modernization Fund budget for 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 to allow 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, a companion to the *Pocket Directory of the California Legislature* (and other directories produced by Capitol Enquiry) It gives a public face to branch policymakers. Each year's publication is updated to reflect the current leadership of the appellate and trial courts as well as membership of the Judicial Council, its committees, advisory committees, and task forces.

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 exclusively handling 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 written and oral court interpreting exams and supported the transition to 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 and 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 new English base content to be used for future exam developmental activities;
- Ensured standardized administration practices for the national 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;
- Conducted a full-day orientation session for new members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel, including 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 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;
- 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 the translation of commonly used forms. Additionally, funds were used to support a national document assembly server that will enable litigants to complete their forms online at no charge. Developed in collaboration with legal services programs, these interactive programs can be used in every county to help litigants in workshop settings to complete pleadings more quickly and accurately.

Public Outreach and Education (formerly 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 serve 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 the majority completing 300 hours of service during an academic year.
- California on My Honor Civics Institute for Teachers: Professional development was provided to teachers through multiday 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 brought teachers to meet onsite 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 for Improvement in the Administration of the Courts

The allocated funds were expended primarily to support the work of the Kleps Awards Committee, which met twice in FY 2010–2011. The 19-member panel of justices, judges, and court administrators is charged with soliciting and evaluating nominations and recommending honorees to receive the Judicial Council’s biennial Kleps Award. To recognize and honor innovative contributions to the administration of justice 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 strategic plan, and transferability to other courts.

The committee received and reviewed 16 nominations this cycle, with 12 nominations found to be eligible. Committee members then made site visits to applicants to see the programs in action and learn more from staff and judicial officers involved in each program. Immediately after each site visit, committee members scored the 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 of *Innovations in the California Courts*, a book that profiles replicable court innovations in California—including Kleps Award recipients’ programs—with an emphasis on 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 serves to disseminate information on innovative court programs to state and national court leaders. Allocated funds were used to contract a writer and copy editor to develop the content, while the book's design was performed inhouse as a cost-saving measure.

Self-Help Videos for the Website

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funds were expended for the costs of a web server to stream online educational videos to the public, on topics such as how to prepare for court and how mediation works. Captioning was added to all the web videos to make them American with Disabilities Act-compliant for the deaf or hard-of-hearing. Some funds were saved by the AOC's transitioning a number of videos to storage and distribution through the 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 (Gov. Code, § 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 more than 40 judges and 50 trial court staff to review the workload studies' time estimates and determine whether these needed adjustment. The model was 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 and 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 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:

| Description | Amount ³ |
|--|----------------------|
| 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 |
| Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Local Assistance | 55,972,024 |
| Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Support | 14,064,221 |
| Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts | \$ 70,036,246 |

³ Amounts displayed are rounded to nearest dollar. Subtotals and totals reflect the sum of amounts itemized to the penny and then rounded to the nearest dollar.

Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts

The Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts project 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 connecting all the superior courts. The project is managed by the AOC CCMS Program Management Office with support from the AOC Information Services Division. More than 200 court representatives from more than 29 counties participated in the application’s design and testing.

CCMS applies 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 comprises four distinct components: a core product, an Internet portal, a statewide data warehouse, and data exchanges with justice partners.

CCMS Maintenance and Operations: During FY 2010–2011, funding supported infrastructure support and hosting services at the vendor’s data center, along with 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;
- Completing 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, with monthly savings of approximately \$300,000 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 provided changes to the Emergency Medical Air Transportation Penalty;
- A 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
- A modified interface for automated warrants provided real-time information to Fresno Sheriff’s Office and upgrading the Official Payments interface improved 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 have resulted in the development and deployment of technology projects below, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to specific trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure related to the trial courts, with 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.

In order to mitigate the immediate impact of several years of ongoing funding reductions to the judicial branch, the council has redirected significant funds to offset reductions to trial court operational funding. In FY 2011–2012, \$66.4 million in funding planned for the CCMS program was redirected by the Judicial Council for trial court purposes, with available funding in future years uncertain. The program continues, as directed and authorized by the council, to modify its strategy in light of current and foreseeable future economic realities as well as the needs of courts whose current systems are at imminent risk of failing.

In FY 2010–2011, allocated funding supported:

- Vendor support and contracted services to develop standardized configuration and tools;

- Intrabranh agreement with Superior Court of San Diego County to implement document management and electronic filing in preparation for deployment; and
- Intrabranh agreements with the Superior Courts of San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties to support early adopter deployment activities.

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

Funding in FY 2010–2011 supported the following activities:

- A request for proposals to solicit vendor bids for a DMS solution for the trial courts;
- Selection and procurement of a DMS product piloted at the Superior Court of Santa Clara County; and
- Starting 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 monies from unallocated funds of the TCTF and TCIF to the trial courts in accordance with the supplemental funding request process. The table below shows the distribution of these allocated funds to courts in FY 2010–2011.

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

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

| Description | Amount |
|---|----------------------|
| Beginning Fund Balance | \$ 20,674,512 |
| Prior Year Adjustments | 6,999,429 |
| Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance | 27,673,942 |
| Revenues and Transfers | |
| 50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures 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 ¹ | 552,295 |
| One Percent (1%) Transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund | 27,232,140 |
| Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (Gov. Code, § 77202(a)(1)(B)(iii)) | (31,563,000) |
| Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers | 59,371,733 |
| Total Resources | \$ 87,045,674 |

¹ 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**

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

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

| Description | Amount |
|--|----------------------|
| 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 ¹ | 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 ² | 6,424,348 |
| Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Support ² | 4,683,540 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs - Local Assistance ³ | 16,243,827 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs - Support ³ | 2,055,688 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects - Local Assistance ⁴ | 1,673,735 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects - Support ⁴ | 1,101,868 |
| Total, Ongoing Statewide Programs | \$ 46,467,807 |

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

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

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

⁴ 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

| Description | Amount |
|--|----------------------|
| Local Assistance | |
| Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | \$ 6,424,348 |
| Subtotal, Local Assistance | 6,424,348 |
| Support | |
| 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 |
| Subtotal, Support¹ | 4,683,540 |
| Total, Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts | \$ 11,107,889 |

¹ 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

| Description | Amount |
|--|----------------------|
| Local Assistance | |
| 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 |
| Subtotal, Local Assistance | 16,243,827 |
| Support | |
| 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 |
| Subtotal, Support¹ | 2,055,688 |
| Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs | \$ 18,299,515 |

¹ 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 - Projects**

| Description | Amount |
|--|---------------------|
| Local Assistance | |
| 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 |
| Subtotal, Local Assistance | 1,673,735 |
| Support | |
| CCMS V4 Development | 1,100,753 |
| CCMS DMS Development and Deployment | 1,114 |
| Subtotal, Support¹ | 1,101,868 |
| Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects | \$ 2,775,603 |

¹ 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

| Description | Amount |
|--|---------------------|
| 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 |
| Total, Trial Court Projects and Model Programs | \$ 1,181,938 |

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

| Description | Amount |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| Urgent Needs | \$ - |
| Total, Urgent Needs | \$ - |

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund
FY 2010-2011
Resources

| Description | Amount |
|---|----------------------|
| Beginning Fund Balance | \$ 30,933,026 |
| Prior Year Adjustments | 1,248,984 |
| Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance | 32,182,009 |
| Revenues and Transfers | |
| 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) |
| Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers | 7,384,288 |
| Total Resources | \$ 39,566,297 |

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund

FY 2010-2011

Fund Balance Summary

| Description | Amount |
|---|----------------------|
| Total Resources | \$ 39,566,297 |
| Expenditures and Encumbrances | |
| 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 |
| Total Expenditures and Encumbrances | 36,802,396 |
| Total Fund Balance | \$ 2,763,902 |

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund

FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances

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

| Description | Amount |
|--|----------------------|
| Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts | |
| Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | \$ 530,000 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs | |
| 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 |
| Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects | |
| California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Development | 142 |
| Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts | \$ 28,258,659 |

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund

FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances

Category II - Educational and Developmental Programs

| Description | Amount |
|--|-----------------------|
| 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 |
| <i>Subtotal, Mandated Programs for Judges</i> | <i>423,112</i> |
| 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 |
| <i>Subtotal, Non-Mandated Programs for Judges</i> | <i>331,723</i> |
| California Judicial Administration Conference | 2,329 |
| Court Management Courses | 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 |
| <i>Subtotal, Programs Related to Court Administration</i> | <i>683,030</i> |
| Court Clerk Training Institute | 109,063 |
| Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast) | 250,366 |
| Mid-level Management Conferences | 60,373 |
| <i>Subtotal, Programs for Trial Court Staff</i> | <i>419,802</i> |
| 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 |
| <i>Subtotal, Other Educational and Developmental Programs</i> | <i>312,673</i> |
| Total, Educational and Developmental Programs | \$ 2,170,339 |

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund

FY 2010-2011 Expenditures and Encumbrances

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

| Description | Amount |
|---|---------------------|
| 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 |
| Total, Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects | \$ 6,373,397 |