



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: December 14, 2012

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Branch Report to the Legislature: Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected N/A	Effective Date December 14, 2012
Recommended by Administrative Office of the Courts Steven Jahr Administrative Director of the Courts	Date of Report December 7, 2012
	Contact Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397 zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Administrative Office of the Courts recommends that the Judicial Council approve the *Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*, as required by Government Code section 77209(j)¹, to be sent to the chair of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, vice-chair of the Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, and the chair and vice-chair of the Assembly Committee on Budget.

Recommendation

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the *Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*,
and

¹ Government Code section 77209 has been amended by SB 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) reflecting the creation of a successor fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Future fiscal year reports of expenditures will be required by Government Code section 77209(i).

2. Direct the AOC to submit the report to the Legislature.

Previous Council Action

The report on trial court special funds expenditures has been required and submitted pursuant to Government Code section 77209(j) since 2002–2003.

Rationale for Recommendation

Government Code section 77209(j) requires that the Judicial Council annually report to the Legislature regarding use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund. For the purposes of transparency and consistent with the reporting requirements for the successor fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, pursuant to Government Code section 77209(i), expenditures pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund as well as expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in fiscal year 2011–2012 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs are also included in the report.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Since this report is required by the above referenced section of the Government Code, no alternatives were considered. This report is not required to circulate for public comment.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Submission of this mandated report to the Legislature does not involve any implementation requirements, costs, or operational impacts for the trial courts.

Attachments

1. *Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION
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

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

CURT SODERLUND
Chief Administrative Officer

ZLATKO THEODOROVIC
Director, Fiscal Services Office

December 15, 2012

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

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

Hon. Bill Emmerson, Vice-Chair
Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 4082
Sacramento, California 95814

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

Re: Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012, as required under
Government Code section 77209(j)¹

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 2011–2012* under the reporting requirements stated in Government Code section 77209(j) regarding the use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund. Also, though not

¹ Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41), which established a successor fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Future fiscal year reports of expenditures will be required by Government Code section 77209(i).

December 15, 2012

Page 2

required by statute, expenditures pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) 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 infrastructure services, as well as expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund in fiscal year 2011–2012 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 important component of the judicial branch budget. These funds support statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational 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.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Fiscal Services Office, at 916-263-1397.

Very truly yours,

Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

SJ/CS
Enclosures

December 15, 2012

Page 3

cc: Members of the Judicial Council
Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel
Gregory P. Schmidt, Secretary of the Senate
E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg
Fredericka McGee, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez
Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Marvin Deon II, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office
Mike Petersen, Consultant, Senate Republican Office of Policy
Mark Redmond, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy
Anita Lee, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Jay Sturges, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Jody Patel, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Chief of Staff
Curt Soderlund, AOC Chief Administrative Officer
Curtis L. Child, AOC Chief Operating Officer
Cory Jasperson, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office
Peter Allen, Senior Manager, AOC Office of Communications
Steven Chang, Manager, AOC Fiscal Services Office
Colin Simpson, Supervising Budget Analyst, AOC Fiscal Services Office
Bernadine Gonzalez, AOC Court Operations Special Services Office



Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

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

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

CURT SODERLUND
Chief Administrative Officer

ZLATKO THEODOROVIC
Director, Fiscal Services Office

Report Title: *Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*

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

Date of Report: December 2012

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Government Code section 77209(j) regarding the 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, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report highlight many judicial branch efforts to ensure that all Californians are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts.

In fiscal year 2011–2012, \$43,987,551 was expended or encumbered from the Trial Court Improvement Fund. Of that amount, \$37,815,184 went toward “Ongoing Statewide Programs”, including statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts; \$1,672,366 to “Trial Court Projects and Model Programs”; and \$4,500,000 for “Urgent Needs” of the courts. From the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, \$15,353,426 was expended or encumbered. Of that amount, \$9,662,650 went toward “Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts”; \$1,208,628 to “Educational and Development Programs”; and \$4,482,149 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 415-865-7966.

Judicial Council Members

As of December 5, 2012

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

Hon. James R. Brandlin

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

Ms. Angela J. Davis

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

Hon. David De Alba

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

Hon. Emilie H. Elias

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

Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth

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

Hon. Noreen Evans

Member of the California State Senate

Mr. James P. Fox

Attorney at Law (Retired)

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. Edith R. Matthai

Attorney at Law

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

Hon. David Rosenberg

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

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. Laurie M. Earl

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

Hon. Allan D. Hardcastle

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

Hon. Morris D. Jacobson

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

Hon. Brian L. McCabe

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

Hon. Robert James Moss

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

Hon. Kenneth K. So

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

Ms. Mary Beth Todd

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

Hon. Charles D. Wachob

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

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

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

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Hon. Steven Jahr

*Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of 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*

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

Mr. Curt Soderlund
Chief Administrative Officer

**JUDICIAL AND COURT
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION**

FISCAL SERVICES OFFICE
Zlatko Theodorovic
Director

Steven Chang
Manager

Colin Simpson
Supervising Budget Analyst / Primary Author of Report

Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011–2012

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

DECEMBER 2012



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

Introduction

Government Code section 77209(j)¹ requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature annually 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 (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 (FY) 2011–2012 for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects and programs.

¹ Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41), which established a successor fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Future fiscal year reports of expenditures will be required by Government Code section 77209(i). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations are to the California Government Code.

Resources, Expenditures, and Fund Balance Overview

In FY 2011–2012, the TCIF was supported by a variety of funding sources, including annual deposits from the 50/50 excess fees, fines, and forfeitures split revenue under Government Code (GC) section 77205(a); the 2 percent automation fund under GC 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 (see Attachment A-1). GC section 77209(b) placed specific restrictions on the use of the transferred funds from the TCTF: at least one-half of these monies had to be set aside as a reserve that could not be allocated before March 15 of each fiscal year for purposes other than for “urgent needs” of courts.² GC section 77209(i), now GC section 77209(h), specified that royalties from jury instructions publication can be used only for the improvement of the jury system.

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

For FY 2011–2012, expenditures and encumbrances from the two special funds were made in the following council-approved categories, described in greater detail below:³

TCIF

Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs	\$37,815,184
Category 2: Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	1,672,366
Category 3: Urgent Needs	4,500,000
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances:	<u>\$43,987,551</u>

Modernization Fund

Category 1: Statewide Technology Infrastructure	\$9,662,650
Category 2: Educational and Development Programs	1,208,628
Category 3: Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	4,482,149
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances:	<u>\$15,353,426</u>

The resulting year-end fund balance in FY 2011–2012 was \$40.247 million for the TCIF and \$7.881 million for the Modernization Fund (see Attachments A-2 and B-2).

² Amended section 77209 has eliminated the 1 percent transfer from the TCTF as well as the related “urgent needs” reserve requirement beginning in 2012–2013 and going forward.

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.

Trial Court Improvement Fund FY 2011–2012 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. GC section 77209(g)—changed to GC section 77209(f) for FY 2012–2013 by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41)—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 2011–2012, \$43.987 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 the funding of trial courts. Consistent with this change, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has been developing and implementing statewide administrative and technology infrastructure initiatives to provide services that previously were provided by the counties. The projects and programs funded in Categories (1) and (2) are projects of statewide importance and directly support the trial courts. Category (3) reflects allocations to courts of the funds set aside to address “urgent needs”.

Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs

(See Attachment A-3 for the amounts allocated for each of these programs.)

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

Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program

In FY 2011–2012, of the \$1,750,000 allocated to this program, \$1,730,000 was distributed directly to the courts. Court funding is used entirely for court staffing and the travel costs of interpreters where needed, to ensure access to justice in areas without substantial full time interpreter services. The remaining \$20,000 of the allocation was used to pay for the translation of domestic violence forms and instructions into Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese and to make them available to all courts. It is critical to keep these forms updated to reflect legislative changes.

Interpreter shortages adversely affect court proceedings. Attorneys report that when interpreters are unavailable, court proceedings, particularly those involving self-represented litigants, often result in continuances or very difficult, protracted hearings. Interpreter shortages also result in delays in processing restraining orders, and potentially affect the quality and enforceability of

orders, which in turn affect law enforcement, schools, and others who have to interpret orders in these cases, thus compromising public safety.

Demand for this funding is strong. Even at the current level, funding falls far short of court needs. Court requests typically total \$3.0 million to \$3.5 million in each fiscal year—about twice the amount available from this allocation.

Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers

FY 2011–2012 funds were used to provide assistance and support to approximately 1,500 judicial officers and their families dealing with a wide range of personal, family, and financial matters. These functions were outsourced to a vendor, and the vendor was tasked with providing the following services:

- Maintaining a toll-free telephone access line 24 hours per day for participant access to Judicial Officers' Assistance Program services (specialists were available through the telephone access line to assess the caller's problem and arrange for appropriate assistance);
- Linking each participant who requests in-person counseling services to a counselor;
- Monitoring the participant's compliance with a substance abuse treatment program, as needed; and
- Providing critical incident stress management services to counter emotional distress caused by catastrophic or traumatic events, and to foster appropriate coping strategies including peer and community-based solutions.

In FY 2011–2012, the AOC Human Resources Office secured a contract with Managed Health Network to provide this benefit.

Human Resources (HR) Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits

In FY 2011–2012, the AOC Human Resources Office contracted with one law firm to support all trial courts on matters pertaining to benefits questions arising in the courts.

The firm worked directly with the AOC Human Resources Office and in consultation with the AOC Legal Services Office (LSO), 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 regarding highly compensated employees; and HIPPA issues regarding propriety of business associate agreements between the courts and insurance brokers. Outside legal assistance was needed because of the specialized nature of the subject matter.

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 2011–2012, allocated funds were used to pay for the CJP defense master insurance policy, which covers portion related to the defense costs of a judge or subordinate judicial officer under investigation by the CJP.

Jury System Improvement Projects

The Jury System Improvement Projects are supported by royalty revenue from the publication of the Judicial Council’s civil (CACI) and criminal (CALCRIM) jury instructions. The Judicial Council’s Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions prepare new and revised instructions and propose their adoption to the council. On approval, the instructions are then copyrighted and licensed to commercial publishers. The publishers pay royalties to the council based on sales of the instructions. In FY 2011–2012, funds were used to (1) support the meeting expenses of the Judicial Council’s Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions, and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official CACI and CALCRIM publications.

Litigation Management Program

GC section 811.9 requires the Judicial Council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state’s trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and court employees. In FY 2011–2012, 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.

Self-Help Centers

In FY 2011–2012, \$5 million in TCIF funds were distributed directly to the courts for public self-help center programs and operations. All 58 trial courts receive funding for their self-help centers. The minimum allocation is \$34,000; the remainder is distributed according to population size in the county where the trial court is located. Ninety-two percent of the funds are used by the courts for staffing.

Reducing self-help services increases court’s other costs. When self-help staff decrease, the number of questions and issues at the public counters increase substantially, therefore increasing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and cleanup work in the clerks’ offices.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short- and long-term cost benefits to the court in addition to providing operational efficiencies by helping self-represented litigants more accurately pursue their legal issues. One study found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent.

Demand for self-help services is strong. Courts indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need for \$44 million in additional funds to fully support their self-help efforts. The judicial branch has been able to allocate only a quarter of the amount needed in 2007, \$11.2 million annually from the TCTF and TCIF combined.

Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support

In FY 2011–2012, funds supported statewide services available to court self-help centers in all of California’s 58 trial courts. These funds were used to provide translations for the self-help website, instructional materials, and forms, and to review Spanish-language translations for accuracy. They were also used to update the judicial branch self-help website with materials for self-help centers and the public.

The self-help website provides local courts with information that they would otherwise need to research, translate, and post on their own. It saves hundreds of hours of duplicative work. Many courts have requested the development of videos for self-represented litigants as a way to provide more information in a time of staff reductions. The site has more than 4,000 pages of content in English and Spanish, and links to hundreds of free, accurate legal resources. More than 4 million users view the self-help website annually.

Funds were also used to assist in providing education for self-help center staff on legal updates. They also supported the maintenance of an extensive bank of resources for self-help and legal services programs to share sample instructions, translations, and other materials.

Finally, these funds are being used to adapt websites created by the Justice Education Society in British Columbia, which provide extensive information to parents, teenagers, and children about family issues after separation. These websites will be linked closely to the self-help website and have extensive video and interactive content.

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 Defense Insurance program. In FY 2011–2012, budgeted funds were expended to cover the annual subscription cost for this publication.

Trial Court Security Grants

In FY 2011–2012, the Office of Security used existing statewide master agreements for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of duress alarms, video surveillance, and access systems in the courts. Other security enhancement projects included the reconfiguration of a clerk’s counter, tinting windows to ensure court personnel safety, and upgrading a judicial officer parking lot. Narrow-banding radios were purchased for two small courts whose security is provided by their own marshals. These radios were necessary to be compliant with federal narrow-banding frequency requirements. In addition, funds were used to provide training to trial courts on the preparation and maintenance of their continuity-of-operations plans.

The program budget was reduced this fiscal year to \$1.2 million. Based on a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Working Group, the Judicial Council approved the rollover of \$248,550 in unspent funds from FY 2010–2011, bringing the adjusted budget to \$1,448,550. The additional funds were used specifically to retrofit 63 duress alarm systems in 25 courts statewide. The total cost of the retrofit project was estimated at \$445,500, which was addressed with the combination of the rolled-over funds and funds from the current-year budget. As of June 30, 2012, all funds allocated to the retrofit project were expended, and the project was completed.

Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program

The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program in July 2001 as a means by which the Office of the General Counsel (now the Legal Services Office) could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed by the LSO. In FY 2011–2012, 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; the additional areas in which legal assistance is provided reflect council actions to expand the scope of the program.

Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts

TCIF-funded ongoing services to the trial courts consist of the following programs—including AOC staff support—which provide administrative services to the trial courts (see Attachment A-4).

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

FY 2011–2012 monies were used for staff and related expenses specific to the Information Technology Services Office Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) team, contracted services, and the purchase of hardware and system software related to the ongoing maintenance and operations of the Phoenix System. The ERP team provides technical support to the Phoenix

System, including application support for programming, troubleshooting, system enhancements, system upgrades, and deployment. These monies also funded the contract for EPI-USE America, Inc., the project's system integrator, providing statewide deployment, and system maintenance support. Also funded were the contracts for SAP software and licenses for court and AOC system users, the costs of the technology center, system maintenance agreements, and consultants.

California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to maintain staffing for the program. Seven superior courts used the AOC-sponsored CLETS access program, with two additional courts in the process for approval and deployment. CLETS access, as provided by the California Department of Justice, was enabled during FY 2006–2007 through the California Courts Technology Center with implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services.

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 assists 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 identifies statutory changes needed to improve the collection of delinquent fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments.

In addition, the ECU provides ongoing professional and technical support to justice partners to improve the effectiveness of the statewide collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. Enhancement activities include 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 unit of the AOC Fiscal Services Office primarily conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) of court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations of the trial courts. Allocated funds were expended to provide continued support for five staff positions.

Regional Office Assistance Group

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended for attorneys and staff working primarily in three AOC office locations. 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 related to the compensation and operating expenses and equipment costs for one senior accountant and one staff accountant. 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 they are 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 2011–2012, 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 Process Reengineering

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to continue the Reengineering Program. During FY 2011–2012, the Reengineering Unit, comprising a manager and a senior court services analyst, focused on reengineering the business processes and systems of trial courts to achieve improvement in business performance. Specifically, upon request from a trial court, the unit observed the court's workflow and business processes and met and collaborated with the court's judicial officers, executive management, management team, and line staff to identify and recommend efficiencies and streamlined processes. The unit has been assisting courts throughout the state, with primary emphasis on courts in the northern central region. In FY 2011–2012, reengineering efforts included analysis and recommendations for traffic and family law business process activities in the Superior Court of Merced County, and courtroom support activities in the Superior Court of Madera County.

In addition, the Reengineering Unit participated in providing subject-matter expertise and input into the development of the charge for the Trial Court Presiding Judges and the Court Executives Advisory Committees' combined Trial Court Business Process Reengineering (TCBPR) Working Group. The charge was approved by the Judicial Council in February

2012 and includes the development of TCBPR educational events and information sharing that will begin in FY 2012–2013.

Finally, during FY 2011–2012, the Reengineering Unit was actively involved in coordinating activities and developing the findings of the Court Assistance Review Team (CART) of the Superior Court of San Joaquin County. The unit helped CART in developing recommendations regarding operational and administrative activities where the court might achieve additional cost savings and increase revenues. These recommendations, and the court's responses to them, were presented to the Judicial Council in June 2012.

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs

Trial Court Improvement Fund-funded statewide technology infrastructure ongoing programs consist 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-5).

California Courts Technology Center—Operations

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to provide ongoing technology center / shared services to the courts, as well as a full disaster recovery program.

Applications include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Computer-Aided Facilities Management, Integration Services Backbone, and local court desktop/remote server support. The California Court Technology Center (CCTC) hosts the Phoenix Financial System (serving all 58 courts) and the Phoenix Human Resources System (serving seven courts). Three case management systems (CMSs) operate out of CCTC: Sustain; the criminal and traffic CMS (V2); and civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3). The CCTC program had a one-time reduction for FY 2011–2012 of 37 percent by the Judicial Council. As a result, three projects (hardware refresh, Oracle EIdM, and the Federated Security Model) were deferred. The case management systems supported by CCTC and listed here are not related to the Court Case Management system project that was halted by the Judicial Council earlier this year.

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to provide a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders to the 21 counties that are currently onboard. Access to protective orders through CCPOR will ultimately be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, in all court jurisdictions and venues. The allocated funds were expended to cover the hosting costs of the CCPOR application at the California Courts Technology Center, maintain the application code, and provide user support to the court and local law enforcement agency users of the system. Support was also provided to roll out read-only access to five tribal courts as a pilot project.

Enterprise Policy and Planning—Operation

In FY 2011–2012, 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. These initiatives include the Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy budget, which funds the Oracle Branchwide License Agreement (BWLA), Enterprise Architecture (EA) program and Enterprise Methodology and Process (EMP) program. The Oracle BWLA frees up local courts from having to manage complex software asset management and costly annual maintenance renewals. Local courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment. The EA program identifies interdependencies between branchwide data and systems to improve investments in technology. Enterprise architects provide support to guide the development and implementation of statewide applications and ensure compatibility with California Court Technology Center infrastructure, communications, and security protocols. The EMP program develops and promotes standardized, repeatable processes to reduce complexity and increase efficiencies throughout the Solution Development Lifecycle.

Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)

In FY 2011–2012, 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). The ETMS provides application enhancement for the software testing process and improves quality management of those applications. These tools help ensure that mission-critical applications are delivered with a consistently high quality, maximizing function and minimizing defects.

Interim Case Management System (ICMS)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to provide program management support to 16 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. 11 of the 16 SJE courts are hosted at and supported from the CCTC which 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 as needed. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Justice, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information System, as well as custom interfaces with Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collections program, interactive voice / interactive web response processing, issuance of warrants, traffic collections, failure-to-appear / failure-to-pay collections, and web portal interfaces.

Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to support the UCFS that automates centralized reporting and distribution of UCF cash collections. Funding supported two contractors to provide the ongoing maintenance and support of UCFS. Work in FY 2011–2012 included updates reflecting statutory changes in fees and distribution rules. Support

allowed processing of prior period reporting of collected fees in response to trial court audits. Major enhancements included developing additional utilities and reporting which were used to analyze and verify the integrity of the distribution rules.

Data Integration (DI)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to continue work with trial courts to develop a statewide approach to data exchange standards and the integrated service backbone—a leveraged, enterprise-class platform for exchanging information within the judicial branch and between the judicial branch and its integration partners. The DI program worked with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and three pilot courts on the grant-funded eCitations project to exchange data with law enforcement and trial courts. The program provided critical support for the California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 project, servicing all case types to facilitate integration between CCMS courts and justice partners. The Judicial Council cancelled deployment of CCMS V4 in March 2012.

Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to maintain staffing for the program. All other funding for projects was eliminated from the FY 2011–2012 budget. SEBS (now Justice Partner Outreach & E-Services (JPO&E)) promotes the Judicial Council’s objectives for court e-services and e-filing initiatives by supporting the planning and implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all 58 California superior courts and local and state justice/integration partners. This program also provides representation for the judicial branch at key partner justice forums.

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects

TCIF-funded statewide technology infrastructure projects consist 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 information technology (IT) infrastructure related to the trial courts, including support provided by AOC staff, temporary staff, and outside private consultants (see Attachment A-6).

California Court Case Management System Development:

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended for infrastructure hosting, hardware, software, and support; professional services for development, testing, data integration, and deployment assessment; and project governance. On March 27, 2012 the Judicial Council stopped the deployment of CCMS V4.

Category 2: Trial Court Projects and Model Programs

(Refer to Attachment A-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.

Domestic Violence—Order After Hearing

This program is designed to assist courts in preparing orders after hearings in domestic violence cases and submission of those orders to a central registry. This is an area of special concern for the Judicial Council because of significant policy concerns regarding domestic violence and the large numbers of self-represented litigants in these cases who are generally unable to prepare their own orders. The specially designed Family Court Case Tracking System (FACCTS) program allows clerks to generate minute orders and orders after hearing in domestic violence cases in a very streamlined manner.

A number of the courts that have implemented the FACCTS program also intend to participate in CCPOR. CCPOR is designed to be a repository of all domestic violence restraining orders in the state. These funds are being used to modify the software to allow the information entered by the court to generate the order after hearing and send it directly into CCPOR, rather than requiring clerks to scan the information and reenter all the data. This will be an extremely efficient solution for courts and minimizing time and reducing the potential for error that results from multiple requirements for data entry.

Human Resources—Court Investigation

The Trial Court Investigations Program provides investigative services by a contracted licensed attorney. Each request for assistance is evaluated by the AOC Human Resources Office's Labor and Employee Relations Services Unit team in cooperation with the Labor and Employment Unit of the LSO.

In FY 2011–2012, AOC HR contracted with two firms to provide investigative services for the following courts: San Mateo, Santa Clara, Amador, and El Dorado Counties.

Other Post–Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report

The allocated funds were expended for licensed actuarial services to produce OPEB valuation reports, assess existing valuation reports or testify that qualified benefits do not exist for each of the 58 trial courts. All documentation was forwarded to the State Controller's Office so that it could include the appropriate information in the State's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report as required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statements numbers 43 and 45.

Reimbursement to Trial Courts for Public Access

The allocated funds were expended to partially reimburse the superior courts for the costs of providing public access to nondeliberative or nonadjudicative court records relating to the administration of the courts. During this reporting period, the Superior Courts of Butte, Inyo, Kern, Marin, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, and Sonoma Counties received reimbursement from this funding. 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

As a result of the establishment of the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (JBWCP), this allocation was established to resolve outstanding liabilities with counties for workers' compensation claims handled by the counties from January 1, 2001, until the claims transferred to the JBWCP.

In FY 2011–2012, the AOC Human Resources Office arrived at a settlement with Orange County in the amount of \$865,379. Additional charges in the amount of \$115,905 were tied to services performed by the risk consultant, Marsh Risk & Insurance Services, in researching and facilitating payment of this settlement, and for services tied to other pending claims.

Category 3: Urgent Needs

(Refer to Attachment A-8 for this category.)

These funds were allocated to provide one-time urgent needs funding of \$1.084 million as well as a loan of \$916,000 to the Superior Court of San Joaquin County to keep a sufficient number of courtrooms open and provide other necessary services to meet the court's obligation to adjudicate all matters, both civil and criminal. Funds were also allocated to provide an urgent needs loan of \$2.5 million to the Superior Court of San Francisco County, enabling the court to keep 11 courtrooms open and better structure any necessary staff layoffs.

Modernization Fund: FY 2011–2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances

(Refer to Attachment B-2)

The Judicial Council allocated 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. GC section 77213(b) authorized expenditures from this fund to promote improved access to, and efficiency and effectiveness of, the trial courts. GC section 77209(g) authorizes the council 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 2011–2012, \$15.353 million was expended from the Modernization Fund. The Modernization Fund provides funding for 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-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, consist of programs that provide administrative services to the trial courts. Only one program was funded by the Modernization Fund in FY 2011–2012.

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

In FY 2011–2012, 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 on page 7-8.)

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs

Statewide technology infrastructure ongoing programs, funded by the Modernization Fund, consist of the following maintenance and operations activities of large, branchwide initiatives and ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance.

California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System

In FY 2011–2012, both TCIF and Modernization Fund resources supported CLETS. (For details, refer to the California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System item in the TCIF section of this report on page 8.)

Data Integration

In FY 2011–2012, both TCIF and Modernization Fund resources supported data integration. (For details, refer to the Data Integration item in the TCIF section of this report on page 12.)

Telecommunications Support

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funds were expended to provide a program for the trial courts to develop and support a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local court systems and enterprise applications such as Phoenix and hosted case management systems via shared services at the CCTC, which eases deployment, and provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources. The program took a one-time budget cut of \$6,600,000 during FY 2011–2012, eliminating funding for the network technology refresh and ad-hoc network consulting to the superior courts. Funded activities included network maintenance, which provides the trial courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure; and network security services, which maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three managed security services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention; vulnerability scanning; and web browser security and network technology training for court IT staff.

Category 2: Educational and Development Programs

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

The Judicial Council's strategic plan identifies education of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and 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 the knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable them to discharge their duties in fair, effective, and efficient ways that foster the trust and confidence of the public.

The content of educational programs and products is developed through rigorous needs analyses, prioritization, and instructional design strategies and provided using a wide variety of delivery methods, including technology-assisted distance education.

Allocated funds were expended to cover the costs of trial court judicial and non-judicial participants, for lodging and group meals, for 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, the design of courses to be delivered by the trial courts, infrastructure maintenance and improvement, and transmission of satellite broadcast programs.

The following education programs and resources were delivered in FY 2011–2012 from this funding:

Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers

New Judge Education and Judicial Primary Assignment Orientation Courses

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

- a. New Judge Orientation (NJO) Program: Two programs were provided this fiscal year to 25 participants—a small group resulting from an unusually low number of appointments by Governor Jerry Brown.
- b. B. E. Witkin Judicial College: 150 participants.
- c. Judicial Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) and Overview Courses: Five events comprising more than 20 different courses were provided to 360 participants.

2. Program Purpose

All newly elected or appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers are required by California Rules of Court, rule 10.462(c)(1) to complete new judge education offered by the AOC Office of Education/Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) by attending the New Judge Orientation within six months of taking the oath of office, attending an orientation course in their primary assignment within one year of taking the oath of office, and attending the B. E. Witkin Judicial College within two years of taking the oath of office. By rule of court, the Office of Education/CJER is the sole provider for these audiences.

These programs which provide the new judge education required under rule 10.162(c)(1), have been determined by the CJER Governing Committee to be essential for new judges and subordinate judicial officers and are specifically designed for that audience. The content of each program has been developed by the various curriculum committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee; below are brief descriptions of each:

- a. The week-long New Judge Orientation is designed to assist new judges and subordinate judicial officers in making the transition from attorney advocates to judicial officers and includes the subject areas of judicial ethics, fairness, and trial management. Program participants focus on ethics—including demeanor (demeanor issues are the number one cause of discipline, according to the Commission on Judicial Performance), fairness, and courtroom control—in this highly interactive program, as well as learning about the judicial branch, Judicial Council, and Administrative Office of the Courts. The concept at NJO is to give new judges the opportunity, as they begin their careers, to focus on the core of what it means to be a judge and to come away with a commitment to maintaining high standards in their work. There are four highly experienced faculty members that

participate for the entire week of orientation, with the number of programs required depending on the number of judicial appointments in a given year.

- b. The two-week long Judicial College offers new judges and subordinate judicial officers a broader educational experience than the orientation courses while still emphasizing their current position as new bench officers. Extensive courses in evidence and other basic civil and criminal courses are offered as well as a multitude of relevant elective courses, including mental health and the courts, self-represented litigants, and domestic violence. The class is divided into seminar groups, which meet frequently during the college to provide participants an opportunity to discuss the courses and answer questions that arise during the program. The college design is premised on the belief that working professionals learn best from each other. The small group design of the college, as well as the presence of seminar leaders, is a means to encourage this type of learning. It also allows participants to present sensitive issues that they might be reluctant to raise at their local courts. The statewide program provides an early opportunity for new judges to see a variety of approaches within different courts. Similar to the NJO, the number of participants varies based on the number of judicial appointments. In the past, participation has ranged from 55 to 140 judges and subordinate judicial officers.
- c. The Primary Assignment Orientation courses provide new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion in their primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, and traffic), with a heavy emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, and classroom exercises designed to test their skills in the assignment. These courses are also available to experienced judges who are moving into a new assignment for the very first time in their career.

In addition to the Primary Assignment Orientation programs, the Office of Education/CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments that are substantively more complex than those covered by the PAOs above (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, and capital cases). These programs are designed for experienced judges who are expected by the education rule to take a course in their new primary assignment or to fulfill other statutory or case-law-based education requirements.

All of the orientation courses are taught by judicial faculty who have been specifically trained for this education program and who are acknowledged experts in these assignments. Because these programs focus deeply on all of the major bench assignments, the Assigned Judges Program relies heavily on the PAOs to provide its judges with the education and training they need to be able to take on assignments that these retired judges may never have had during their active careers.

These are statewide programs and provide judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state with the opportunity to network with their colleagues and learn the different ways various courts do the work of judging. This interaction ensures cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide. Educating judges to understand the rules and issues of ethics and fairness enhances public confidence in the judiciary and ensures access to justice.

The structure of NJO and the College provides two opportunities for new judges to develop relationships that last throughout a judicial officer's career. Many of the NJO exercises encourage new judges to open up in a very personal way. Bringing the newly assigned judges together also allows them to ask the faculty questions and discuss issues with them and their colleagues. Uniformity in judicial practice and procedure is promoted by the sharing of ideas and best practices. The benefits to the individual judge, who is able to feel confident in his or her practice on the bench, and to courts, most of whom are unable to provide a systematic training program for judges, are great. Moreover, providing a well-educated judiciary enhances the administration of justice, increases the public's confidence in the judicial branch, and promotes support for the branch.

All judges, justices and court leadership (presiding judges [PJs], assistant presiding judges [APJs], court executive officers [CEOs], and clerk administrators) were surveyed at the end of the first education cycle regarding the effectiveness of judicial education in California. Four hundred and fifteen responses (24.2 percent response rate) were received. Question 1 of the survey asked whether requiring specific education for new justices or judges is reasonable and appropriate: 80 percent of justices agreed, 86 percent of judges agreed, and 96 percent of trial court leadership agreed. Question 2 asked whether requiring/expecting specific education programs for judges beginning a new role or assignment is reasonable and appropriate. 88 percent of justices agreed, 77 percent of judges agreed, and 85 percent of trial court leadership agreed. Based on this feedback, the CJER Governing Committee concluded that these programs are highly valued by the courts.

Continuing Judicial Education – Statewide Judicial Institutes

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Because of special fund budget reductions, judicial institutes are not offered annually; therefore, the number and size of institutes offered in a given year varies. As a result, the specific funding requirements differ from year to year. In FY 2011–2012, special funds supported delivery of the following judicial institutes:

- a. Criminal Law Institute: 77 participants
- b. Domestic Violence Institute: 48 participants

- c. Cow County Institute: 58 participants

2. Program Purpose

The Office of Education/CJER offers educational programs and institutes in all of the major trial court bench assignments (civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate) as well as specific programs for appellate justices, rural court (aka “cow county”) judges, appellate court attorneys (not funded with special funds), and trial court attorneys. The bench assignment institutes are designed primarily for experienced judicial officers, but judges new to the assignment also benefit from attending. The specialized institutes target those audiences. These two-day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 separate courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and so forth. Participants frequently comment that their learning is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues because they can learn about different strategies for dealing with the many challenges faced by judges in the same assignment or by the specific audiences attending the institute. By attending these programs, judges and subordinate judicial officers achieve education hours toward the continuing education expectations and requirements of the California Rules of Court. These programs have had attendance ranging from 70 to 140.

Essential content is identified by curriculum committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee and developed by workgroups. This content can include in-depth coverage of common, yet complex, issues that are not covered in sufficient detail at the Primary Assignment Orientations. In addition, there are many course offerings on advanced topics as well as courses on recent developments in the law. The primary benefit to the courts, and the branch as a whole, is that statewide programming for experienced judges provides uniformity in the administration of justice, substantive judicial education, and the opportunity for judges to network with other experienced judges. Additionally, as appropriate, sessions at institutes are videotaped by staff and posted online, where they are available to all judges.

a. The Criminal Law Institute

The Criminal Law Institute was formerly an annual program attended by approximately 100 to 120 judicial officers with criminal assignments. Previous cuts reduced the frequency of the offering of this institute from every year to every other year. By attending this program, judges and subordinate judicial officers acquire education hours toward the continuing education expectations and requirements of rules 10.462(d), 10.463, and 10.464 of the California Rules of Court.

This institute is CJER’s primary forum for advanced education in criminal law. Program content focuses on issues that are particularly challenging, including essential issues identified by the Criminal Law Curriculum Committee requiring in-depth coverage that, because of their complexity, cannot be covered in sufficient detail at the Criminal Law

Primary Assignment Orientation. The institute courses include new developments in the law and content identified as critical by various statutory provisions and Rules of Court including sentencing, domestic violence, voir dire, and the treatment of jurors. (Pen. Code § 1170.5; Gov. Code §§ 68551, 68555; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.469). The primary benefit to the courts, and the branch as a whole, is that statewide programming for experienced judges promotes uniformity in the administration of justice by providing the opportunity for judges to share innovative practices across county lines. (Gov. Code, § 68551)

b. The Domestic Violence Institute

The Domestic Violence Institute was formerly an annual program attended by approximately 50 family law judges and subordinate judicial officers. Previous cuts reduced the frequency of the offering of this institute from every year to every other year. By attending this program, judges and subordinate judicial officers achieve education hours toward the continuing education expectations and requirements of rules 10.462(d) and 10.463 of the California Rules of Court, as well as meeting the provisions of rule 10.464(a), which states the education requirements and expectations for judges and subordinate judicial officers on domestic violence issues.

c. The Cow County Institute

The Cow County Institute, as with all other CJER institutes, has received previous funding cuts. Before the first Modernization Fund cut, the Cow County Institute, a two and a half day program designed to cover a broad range of education that meets the unique needs of judges in rural counties, was provided every year to rural court judges and was considered the major educational program provided to this group of judges. It is a critical educational opportunity for Cow County judges with their unique education needs. Roughly 50 percent of California's superior courts have 10 or fewer authorized judgeships serving counties with smaller populations. This institute is designed specifically for these courts and the CJER Governing Committee now recommends offering it each year.

The challenges faced by judges and commissioners in small counties—challenges that are not commonly found in larger courts—include multidisciplinary assignments and the sudden need to cover a colleague's calendar in an unfamiliar area of law; frequent service in court administrative roles; disqualification issues and other ethical quandaries due to living in small communities; and resource limitations such as lack of access to drug treatment facilities, mental health facilities, psychiatrists and other experts, other community-based services, public information officers, judicial colleagues with expertise in a specific legal area, and research attorneys. A workgroup of judges from small counties determines the course topics and works with CJER staff and faculty to create

court lesson plans that not only address each area of substantive law and court administration, but are also tailored to address issues unique to rural courts.

Content covered in other courses and institutes often focus on the large courts, as most of the judges attending these programs come from medium to large courts. Therefore, the specific specialized needs of judges in rural courts are not always addressed well in other CJER programs.

Courses in all disciplines are offered, thereby providing an efficient method for judges to become versed or updated in all areas of the law in a single forum, reducing the need to travel to multiple institutes in different substantive areas. Courses range from nuts-and-bolts overviews to legal updates to in-depth treatment of complex areas of law. A recent example of a specially designed substantive law course is the Domestic Violence and Rural Courts: Selected Issues course. This course provided a multidisciplinary criminal, juvenile, and family law nuts-and-bolts look at how a rural location may present unique issues in domestic violence cases such as transportation during winter months for alleged victims and perpetrators, lack of available interpreters, conflicting tribal court orders, firearms restrictions in hunting communities, and innovative approaches some rural courts have used to deal with these issues.

The opportunity to meet with other similarly situated judges and commissioners is also invaluable. To strengthen collegiality and build mentoring relationships that extend beyond the institute, most courses are often taught in roundtable discussion formats. This approach fosters the sharing of ideas for handling problematic areas in the law and for sharing calendar management strategies. Faculty often field phone calls in their areas of expertise years after teaching at the institute, enhancing the benefit to participants, who are often isolated in small courthouses, often in remote locations.

Continuing Judicial Education—Advanced Education for Experienced Judges

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

The expenditures under this category were combined in FY 2011–2012 with Primary Assignment Orientation Overview Course activities and are reflected in the Primary Assignment Orientation Program information stated above. These courses are now being categorized separately to better reflect the difference between these types of education program.

2. Program Purpose

In addition to Primary Assignment Orientation Courses, the Education Division/CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges—continuing education courses designed to address

issues of advanced judging. They include such subject areas as capital cases, complex civil litigation, and domestic violence.

As with the New Judge Education programs and Primary Assignment Orientation programs these programs are statewide programs and provide judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state the opportunity to network with their colleagues and learn the different ways various courts do the work of judging. This experience ensures cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide. Planned courses can typically accommodate up to 210 participants per year.

Continuing Judicial Education—Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures
 - a. Regional Judicial Education: 248 participants. 36 courses
 - b. Local Judicial Education: 789 participants, 22 courses

2. Program Purpose

Regional and Local Judicial Education courses allow the Office of Education/CJER to provide high-quality judicial education to the trial courts. Statewide budget reductions over the past few years have necessitated that the Office of Education/CJER develop and expand both of these programs because they offer a much less expensive alternative to statewide programming while preserving the quality of education. The courses and programs included in both the regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees and are taught by experienced CJER faculty. Regional and local programs provide invaluable educational experiences and opportunities for interaction and discussions with judges and court staff across California.

- a. Regional Judicial Education

Providing regional courses enables judges and commissioners to attend education events that are closer to their courts. They are also still able to connect with their colleagues from surrounding courts. Delivery of these courses is inexpensive relative to traditional multiday statewide events such as institutes. Faculty members are recruited regionally whenever possible so their expenses and time away from court can be reduced. Regional courses address substantive law areas such as civil, criminal, family, juvenile, domestic violence, and probate/mental health. The half-day courses are held at AOC regional offices and at court locations that serve multiple courts. Regional programs provide additional opportunities to learn from outstanding CJER faculty and to interact with colleagues—but closer to home, thereby reducing the time and cost of travel. Once a regional course has been offered and has been evaluated as successful and well received, it is added to the local court catalog, and presiding judges may request that that course be delivered in their courts at their convenience. For domestic violence education courses, some funding is provided for participant costs not covered by Center for Children,

Families & the Courts (CFCC) grant funding. Typically between 15 and 30 people attend each course.

b. Local Court Judicial Education

Local education is provided only to judges. Courts are able to request and host judicial education classes at their court by selecting course(s) from the Judicial Education Course Catalog and contacting the Office of Education/CJER with a proposed date. The Office of Education/CJER recruits the faculty and works with the court to provide written materials for the course. Local courts will typically arrange for an appropriate classroom for the course and handle the participant attendance and registration aspects for the course, unless otherwise requested. As funds allow, faculty travel expenses and course materials costs are covered and AOC staff provide audiovisual support as requested. In addition, many of the classes offered locally come from classes offered in our statewide programs as well as from some trial court programs, and are appropriate for local delivery.

The courses offer effective judicial education in substantive areas of law, as well as access to justice, collaborative courts, computer training, court security, domestic violence, fairness, judicial ethics, and issues pertaining to self-represented litigants. The faculty members who teach the courses are very experienced in the areas they teach and trained in adult learning principles.

Courses are designed for approximately 20 participants. The number of local courses offered, and the resulting number of participants, depends on how many courts request these courses in any given year.

Continuing Judicial Education—Leadership Training (Reflected in the “Leadership Training Non-Judicial” line-item of Attachment B-4)

Approximately \$28,500 in expenditures under this category was combined in FY 2011–2012 with activities for CEOs, managers, and supervisors. These expenditures are reflected in the “Leadership Training Non-Judicial” line-item of Attachment B-4. These courses are now being categorized under this new Judicial Education category.

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

- a. PJ/CEO Court Management Program: 73 participants
- b. Supervising Judges Program: 40 participants

2. Program Purpose

Two programs offer educational opportunities for trial court judicial leadership. Each of these programs offers participants a chance to learn management techniques, strategies, and best practices that are designed specifically for the unique environment of the courts. In each case, the participants have the responsibility to support and manage people, calendars, and

projects. The ability to bring court leaders together to focus on the specific and special nature of their responsibilities is essential to the smooth, efficient, and fair operations of the court. These programs enable judges to fulfill continuing education hours and expectations under rules 10.462(c)(2) and 10.462(c)(2)(a–c) of the California Rules of Court.

- a. The PJ/CEO Court Management Program brings together the top leadership in the trial courts for a multiday education event that focuses on the challenges of managing trial courts including changing budgets and pressures on operations as well as focusing on the benefits of creating and building an effective partnership between the presiding judge and the court executive officer. This program is especially beneficial to new presiding judges to begin building that partnership with their CEOs. The program contains segments that break out the trial courts by size, appreciating that courts of different sizes have unique issues and challenges. Finally, this program is intended to instill a sense of community among trial court leadership throughout the state that allows them to learn from one another and share best practices. Courses on finance, human resources, and strategic planning are frequently offered.
- b. The Supervising Judges Program is the one education program that focuses on this very challenging and politically sensitive leadership position. Supervising judges are charged with managing peer judges and calendar assignments. In the larger courts, supervising judges may also have responsibilities for an entire court facility. Smaller courts also benefit because they are less likely to be able to provide this type of training locally and rely on this program to develop their supervising judges. Courses can include basic management, how to lead teams, and effective communication skills.

Essential & Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisor

Leadership Training - Non Judicial

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Nine regional manager/supervisor courses and courses for HR professionals were provided for approximately 183 participants.

2. Program Purpose

Regional education for court managers/supervisors and human resources personnel allows the Office of Education/CJER to provide high-quality education to court management and human resources personnel at a greatly reduced cost and in a manner that minimizes the impact on the work of the courts, in both reduced travel expenses and limited court management time away from the courts. Regional education generally consists of single, full-day classes offered in several locations around the state. Courses are structured and located to enable court management to travel to and from the class location on a single day. This

arrangement allows these crucial court employees to receive a full day of education without missing additional work time to travel. It also allows participants to learn alongside other court managers from nearby courts.

Manager and Supervisor Training

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures
 - a. Institute for Court Management (ICM) Courses: Ten courses were provided for 171 participants
 - b. Core 40 Courses: Three courses were provided for approximately 66 participants.

2. Program Purpose
 - a. ICM courses offer a national curriculum that leads to certification by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The courses serve a dual purpose: (1) to provide relevant education for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Management, and (2) to provide this education locally at a cost to courts and participants significantly lower than that of the national programs. The series of courses—the primary education offered by CJER—address essential functions of court managers. This program grew out of a multistate consortium formed in 2008 between the AOC, ICM, and six other states to enhance the existing ICM certification program and provide court leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to effectively manage courts in the future. This effort has resulted in affordable delivery of management education and certification for court managers and supervisors. In the past, the courts had to pay ICM to bring these courses to their location or send their staff to NCSC headquarters in Williamsburg, Virginia, and the cost was prohibitive for most courts. CJER’s ability to offer these courses at the regional offices using California faculty has allowed all courts—small, medium, and large—to reap the benefits of this program.

Twelve courses constitute the certification program: “Fundamental Issues of Caseflow Management,” “Court Performance Standards: CourTools,” “Managing Court Financial Resources,” “Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts,” “Managing Human Resources,” “Managing Technology Projects and Technology Resources,” “Essential Components,” “Visioning and Strategic Planning,” “Court Community Communication,” “Education, Training, and Development,” “Leadership,” and “High-Performance Court Framework: Concluding Seminar.”

The initial capital investment has yielded extremely positive results in advancing judicial branch education for court leaders. Since June 2009, more than 90 court leaders have achieved Certified Court Manager or Certified Court Executive certification from ICM, and 846 course participants have taken one or more courses. The ICM courses are taught and held within California, making attendance affordable and convenient. It is evident

from the hundreds of participants taking these courses that the program is effective and promotes professional development for court leaders.

- b. The CORE 40 is an intensive one-week program for new trial court supervisors, as well as managers, both new and experienced. It contains valuable and practical information that can be used to improve leadership skills as well as enhance the overall performance of staff. Classes are limited to 28 participants, who are selected from applications received online. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management.

Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel

Court Personnel Institutes

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures
 - a. Court Clerk Training Institute: 171 participants in one two-week program with multiple courses
 - b. Trial Judicial Attorney Institute: 172 participants
2. Program Purpose
 - a. Court Clerk Training Institute

This program, offered over two weeks, provides courtroom- and legal process-counter clerks' education in each area of the court (civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile). Each separate course is five days long, and participants typically attend only one of the two weeks. Courts must have personnel who are well trained and who are prepared to provide excellent customer service along with accurate information. They must also be knowledgeable, familiar with the Rules of Court, and familiar with changes to the laws that affect their responsibilities and their customers' access to justice. Classes taught by experienced court personnel include "Criminal Procedures," "Civil Procedures," "Traffic Procedures," "Probate Procedures," "Juvenile Procedures," and "Family Procedures." CCTI was started by the Superior Court of Orange County and was subsequently transferred to the AOC as a statewide program.

Although courts from all 58 counties have accessed this education for their employees, many courts do not have training departments and rely on CJER to provide a statewide perspective on the duties and responsibilities of courtroom and counter staff. CCTI has been an essential education program for courts for more than 25 years and continues to prepare court personnel for the essential functions of their jobs consistent with the law and statewide practices. Although allowing personnel to attend a week of education can be a staffing challenge for the courts, there is tremendous value in the training,

compounded by the benefit that courts do not incur the cost of hotel lodging. In addition to legal process and procedure, classes stress statewide consistency, ethical performance, and efficient use of public funds. Many of today's court managers and supervisors are graduates of CCTI and continue to send their staff for this opportunity to learn with clerks from all 58 counties.

b. Trial Judicial Attorney Institute

The Trial Judicial Attorney Institute was formerly an annual program attended by approximately 180 trial court judicial attorneys. Previous cuts reduced the frequency of the offering of this institute from every year to every other year. By attending this program, trial judicial attorneys acquire education hours toward the continuing education expectations and requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 10.474.

Participants frequently comment that their learning is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues because they can learn about different strategies for dealing with the daily work of trial judicial attorneys.

The Trial Judicial Attorney Institute offers content identified by the Trial Judicial Attorney Institute Workgroup and includes courses on advanced topics and courses on recent developments in the law.

This institute is CJER's only forum designed exclusively for trial court judicial attorneys, and program content focuses on issues that are particular to that audience. Trial judicial attorneys have a very specialized role, different from that of both judicial officers and attorneys who are in private or government practice. The primary benefit to the courts, and the branch as a whole, is that statewide programming for trial judicial attorneys provides relevant, specialized education for this court audience that cannot be found anywhere else, and ensures uniformity in the administration of justice and the opportunity for trial judicial attorneys to share best practices with other trial judicial attorneys.

Regional and Local Court Staff Courses (Reflected in the "Court Personnel Institutes" line-item of Attachment B-4)

These expenditures are reflected in the "Court Personnel Institutes" line-item of Attachment B-4.

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

- a. Court Staff Regional and Local Training: 21 courses, 474 participants
- b. Core Leadership and Training Skills: 2 courses, 40 participants

2. Program Purpose

- a. **Court Staff Regional and Local Training:** As with Regional and Local Court Judicial Education, Regional and Local Court Staff education allows the Office of Education/CJER to provide high-quality education to trial court personnel at a greatly reduced cost and with enhanced convenience to the courts. In fact, the regional and local education model originated in the area of court staff education primarily because of the challenges involved in enabling court staff to take time out from their critical duties to attend statewide, multiday education events. In addition, with severe statewide budget reductions over the past few years, this model of delivering education has become even more critical for court staff. The courses and programs are identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees, which are devoted to court staff education and are taught by experienced faculty. Courses cover a wide array of topics, including case processing in the major court assignments of civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, and traffic, as well as broad topics relevant to all court personnel, such as preventing sexual harassment.
- b. **"Core Leadership and Training Skills":** This course is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this three-day course teaches participants skills that contribute to effective leadership, discusses challenges to leading friends and former peers and identifies strategies to meet those challenges, and identifies approaches to building successful and effective work relationships at all levels of the organization.

Faculty and Curriculum Development

Statewide Education Programs—Trial Court Faculty

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Approximately 417 pro-bono faculty supported CJER programs in FY 2011–2012.

2. Program Purpose

Faculty who are asked to serve as volunteers are unlikely to be able to offer their services if their expenses are not paid for by the Office of Education/CJER. The funding covers lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty teaching trial court programs. The amount needed directly correlates with the amount of statewide, regional and local trial court programs and products developed and taught by faculty. Local courts would be hard-pressed to support a judge's or court staff's desire to serve as faculty if the cost of that service is passed to the local court.

Faculty Development

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Thirteen faculty development courses were provided to a total of 192 faculty members.

2. Program Purpose

Faculty development is a critical component of the effectiveness of the judicial branch education system, which is almost completely dependent on volunteer judges and court staff to teach their peers. Serving as faculty is a leadership function that requires subject-matter expertise, knowledge, experience, and confidence in one's education plan design and delivery skills. By developing and supporting a wide and diverse faculty base, CJER has assured the branch that continuing education needs will be met by a collaborative, talented group of well-trained faculty. These same faculty members often serve as local faculty, bringing the education we provide home to their courts in the form of local court education.

Without support from CJER, it is doubtful that these faculty positions could be filled. Competent subject-matter experts must also possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities to design and deliver education effectively. With training and education, many subject-matter experts have developed the requisite skills to pass on their knowledge and experience as judicial branch faculty. This year, programming in this area is reduced because of budget reductions and prioritization of programming.

Current CJER faculty development programs include (1) critical course- and/or program-specific faculty development (e.g., NJO, the College, ICM); (2) design workshops for new or updated courses in development (e.g., regional one-day and orientation/institute courses); (3) advanced faculty development courses (offered this year as webinars), which allow faculty to work on more complex faculty skills; and (4) short lunchtime webinars for experienced faculty on discrete faculty development topics. As a result of the "Faculty Development Fundamentals" course, many new courses have been developed by the participants, and those courses are now offered statewide under the local court training initiative.

Distance Education

Distance Education—Satellite Broadcast

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Funds were used to pay for transmission of statewide educational satellite broadcasts for trial court audiences, new satellite downlink site installation work in trial court facilities, and maintenance and repair work and fees associated with existing trial court satellite downlink sites. They were also used to pay for lodging, business meals and travel costs associated with faculty who teach at trial court satellite broadcast education programs.

- a) Two hundred thirty-seven satellite downlink sites exist and must be maintained.
- b) Four new sites were provided last year.
- c) Twenty staff broadcasts were provided.
- d) Twenty-three manager/supervisor broadcasts were provided.
- e) Nine judicial education broadcasts were provided.
- f) Two leadership broadcasts were provided for presiding judges and court executive officers.
- g) Eight *Continuing the Dialogue* broadcasts were provided, appropriate for all audiences.
- h) Satellite programming is available in all 58 trial court and 8 appellate court facilities statewide. Satellite is installed in various spaces in courthouses, including conference rooms, training rooms, jury assembly rooms, and some courtrooms, depending on the available space within the courthouse. After satellite broadcasts are aired, recordings of the broadcasts are placed on the Serranus website for individual viewing. DVDs of the broadcasts are also added to the court training libraries, where they are accessed for use in group trainings in the courts.

2. Program Purpose

The development of alternative methods for delivery of education was established by the CJER Governing Committee as a strategic goal in the mid-1990s. The intent of the Governing Committee was to meet an increasing need of judges, managers, and staff for education by establishing cost-effective delivery mechanisms that were an alternative to traditional statewide programs and written publications. Staff was directed to leverage new technologies to increase education for judges, enable new educational services for court staff and manager audiences, and provide mechanisms for continuing delivery of education even during tight budgetary times.

The Office of Education/CJER has met the goal of providing distance education to all judicial branch audiences, and much of it is delivered via the educational satellite broadcast network. The satellite network serves as the core delivery method for staff and manager/supervisor education, providing a comprehensive and timely statewide approach to high-quality staff education that is for many courts the only source of staff education. Many of the broadcasts are also recorded and provided online or as DVDs to serve as resources for local training throughout the year and posted online. Training required statewide, including sexual harassment prevention training, is delivered regularly by satellite broadcast, and time-sensitive training has been provided for judges on a number of occasions in response to new legislation, such as Senate Bill 1407 and rule 10.500 of the California Rules of Court. Broadcast education is also provided specifically for judges, presiding judges, and CEOs.

Education delivered via satellite includes the following such topics:

To court staff:

- Updates to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- The jury process
- Felony and misdemeanor appeals
- Certifying copies
- Customer service

To court managers and supervisors:

- Handling disasters
- Coaching and communication
- Technology management
- Change management
- Stress management
- Preventing and Responding to Sexual and other Workplace Harassment

To PJs and CEOs:

- ADA issues for court leaders
- Court security
- Ethical excellence

To justices and judges:

- Assembly Bill 939 overview
- Judicial canons updates
- How a child enters the juvenile dependency system

Distance Education—Online Video, Webinars, & Videoconferences (Reflected in the “Distance Education – Satellite Broadcast” line-item of Attachment B-4)

These expenditures, approximately \$7,000, are reflected in the “Distance Education—Satellite Broadcast” line-item of Attachment B-4. They are now being categorized under this new category to better distinguish between costs for different distance education delivery methods.

1. Description of Program Activities/Expenditures

Funds were used to pay for storage, encoding, and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products delivered online. Products delivered include 53 online courses devoted to judicial and court staff, 261 videos, and 51 interactive articles.

2. Program Purpose

A natural evolution of the Satellite Broadcast initiative has been the development of online instructional videos, videoconferences, and webinars. These three lines of educational products further leverage the distance education technologies that the AOC has acquired over the past 10 years and enable the Office of Education/CJER to develop multiple product lines

to meet the educational needs of virtually every judicial branch audience it serves. The broadcast video production studio, which was originally created solely to develop and transmit broadcasts, is now used frequently to create instructional videos, which are immediately uploaded to either the Serranus (judicial) or the COMET (administrative) website. Further, many online courses for trial court education include video segments, which are produced cost-efficiently in-house, to illustrate issues and support the educational objectives of the online courses.

Other Educational and Development Programs

Budget Focused Training and Meetings

The allocated funds were expended to support meetings of the Trial Court Budget Working Group and its associated subcommittees—such as the Expenditure Subcommittee—which deal with trial court funding issues.

CFCC Educational Programs

In FY 2011–2012, these funds supported local and statewide educational programs for professionals in court-based Family Dispute Resolution offices, Fostering Connections training and assistance for local courts, and the Youth Court Summit.

Funds supplied technical support to court-based family court services programs, as well as education to fulfill mandates for mediators, child custody recommending counselors, evaluators, and management staff to fulfill Family Code 1850 and California Rules of Court mandates. Funds were also used to produce an orientation video designed for local court use to meet rule 5.210 mandates. The video provides an orientation to court-based mediation for parents with child custody disputes.

These funds were also used to create curricula and webinars on the Fostering Connections Act (Assem. Bill 12 and Assem. Bill 212) to educate judges and attorneys on the complexities of the new legal framework for supporting older youth in foster care. This curricula and materials were made available through the California Dependency Online Guide.

The Youth Court Summit provided a statewide training program for approximately 150 youth court participants, judges, and staff at Sonoma State University. Funds were used for youth scholarships, lodging and meal costs, and speakers. This event was also partially funded by other outside sources and was a collaborative effort between the California Association of Youth Courts and the Judicial Council’s Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, in partial fulfillment of its charge by the Judicial Council.

CFCC Publications

In FY 2011–2012, these funds supported the California Dependency Online Guide. The website currently has 3,096 subscribers, an increase of almost 200 people compared to the number of subscribers this time last year. Subscribers encompass most of the judicial branch dependency stakeholders, including 208 judges and other judicial officers, 1,769 attorneys, 532 child welfare agency social workers, and 659 other child welfare professionals, including educators, probation officers, tribal representatives, psychologists, and others. Resources on the website include a comprehensive case law page with summaries and case text for California dependency and related state and federal cases; distance-learning courses, including for-credit online courses that meet the eight-hour training requirement for new dependency attorneys; educational content, such as the curriculum and materials for AB 12/212 training; handouts from the Beyond the Bench conference and other conferences; and articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, and publications.

Labor Relations Academy

The AOC held labor relations forums in Burbank and Sacramento in December 2011, with 22 participants representing 9 courts in attendance at the Burbank event, and 45 participants representing 25 courts in attendance at the Sacramento event.

The AOC Human Resources Office’s Labor and Employee Relations Unit hosted “Introduction to Labor Relations Academy” in Sacramento and “Advanced Labor Relations Academy” in both Sacramento and Burbank in March 2012. Attending these three sessions were 122 participants representing 34 of the 58 trial courts.

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

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

In FY 2011–2012, 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 promote the availability, use, and quality of mediation and settlement programs for civil cases in the trial courts. This project helps courts meet the goal of standard 10.70(a) of the California 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 insufficient, develop plans for obtaining the necessary resources. During this reporting period, the funds were

used to contract for the development of three products suitable for statewide use by courts: (1) updates to an existing video, to reflect the increased jurisdiction of the small claims court; (2) a new video to promote and facilitate the use of court-connected mediation programs for debt collection cases; and (3) an electronic-learning course about the rules of conduct that mediators in court-connected mediation programs for civil cases are required to observe (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.850 et seq.).

Complex Civil Litigation Program

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 Civil Litigation Pilot Program: Final Report* (June 30, 2003). 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

At the current level of funding, the Court Interpreters Program was able to continue to grow the court interpreter pool and ensure quality interpretation in mandated cases by providing for the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters and interpreter candidates, as well as providing and monitoring necessary continuing education activities for the over 1,800 certified and registered California court interpreters in use throughout the courts statewide.

Expenditures of Funds:

- Contractual administration of court interpreter certification and registration exams (written and oral exams administered to approximately 2,100 candidates per year). Expenditures included the contractual cost for test administration provided by Prometric (educational test administrator).
- Outreach and recruitment of potential qualified candidates, both in spoken languages and American Sign Language (ASL) (to assist interpreter growth). Expenditures included registration cost and sponsorship fees associated with the conferences of the following organizations: Interpreter America, Monterey Institute for International Studies, California Healthcare Interpreters Association, National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators, and American Translators Association.
- Seven ethics and orientation-to-the-profession workshops, under GC sections 68561 and 68562, for all newly certified and registered interpreters to meet their educational

requirements established by council. Expenditures included the contractual cost of the educators/trainers.

- Expansion of the use of video remote technology resources to leverage interpreter resources throughout the state. Expenditures included the cost of purchasing video remote equipment and service/maintenance support for direct use by nine courts.
- Membership with the NCSC Consortium for Language Access in the Courts, which provides access to certification exams, rater training, test development, and test maintenance. Expenditures included the cost of annual dues.
- One test preparation workshop (delivery to approximately 50 interpreters). Expenditures included the contractual cost of the educators/trainers.
- Production of court interpreter badges (for approximately 250 interpreters per year). Expenditures included the contractual production cost for the badges.

Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms

In FY 2011–2012, funds had been allocated to contract with ICAN!—a document assembly software program developed by the Legal Aid Society of Orange County, which was a free resource used by many courts. Document assembly programs prepare Judicial Council forms and other pleadings by asking litigants questions whose answers then populate the forms. We anticipated that we would be able to replace the discontinued EZLegalFile with ICAN! Funds were to be used to update ICAN! and integrate it more effectively with the self-help website to enable more litigants to prepare sufficiently informed, understandable, and legible pleadings.

Unfortunately, the Legal Aid Society of Orange County has determined that, due to its budget constraints, it will no longer be able to offer ICAN! at no charge to anyone other than its clients. Although the fee structure has not been determined, the society was unable to sign an agreement allowing court customers to use the programs at no charge. We were informed of this change in direction in the last two weeks of the fiscal year, so we could not go back to the Judicial Council for authority to reallocate the funds. The minimal funds that were used supported a software program and videos for the self-help website.

Public Outreach and Education (formerly Developing Promising Practices)

The allocated funds were expended to support the California JusticeCorps program, an AmeriCorps program, which operated during FY 2011–2012 in nine superior courts throughout the state. JusticeCorps is funded with a \$1 million AmeriCorps grant, with matching funds provided by the participating courts and the AOC.

The JusticeCorps program trains and places college students in service at court-based self-help centers to assist self-represented litigants. Working under the supervision of attorneys or other court staff, JusticeCorps members help litigants by identifying appropriate forms, helping litigants complete and file the forms properly, and providing information and referrals to related services. In 2011–2012 the program recruited, trained, and placed 277 undergraduate university

students in court-based legal access self-help centers, with the majority completing 300 hours of service during an academic year.

Funding for FY 2011–2012 supported the eighth year of JusticeCorps program operations at a total of nine partnering courts (Alameda, Los Angeles, Placer, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Yolo Counties). Funding was distributed directly via intrabranch agreements to the designated lead courts—Los Angeles, Alameda, San Diego, and Sacramento Counties—to continue their efforts, as follows:

- Los Angeles Superior Court: \$140,000
- Alameda Superior Court: \$110,000
- San Diego Superior Court: \$18,000
- Sacramento Superior Court: \$9,000

The funds were largely used by these courts to support program expenses—including staff salaries, training expenses, and other member support costs—all of which count toward the grant “match” required to fully leverage the \$1 million AmeriCorps grant.

The JusticeCorps program presents an innovative, cost-effective approach to increasing access to justice for self-represented litigants. The program has shown measureable results since it began in 2004. In the 2011–2012 program year, JusticeCorps’ 277 members provided assistance to more than 90,000 litigants.

Ralph N. Kleps Award Program

Allocated funds were expended to support the work of the Kleps Awards Committee, which met once in FY 2011–2012. 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, honoring innovative contributions to the administration of justice by individual courts in California. The committee met in February 2012 to plan for the award criteria for the 2012–2013 awards cycle, before the program’s suspension later in the fiscal year. Allocated funds were also used to support committee travel and attendance at local court award ceremonies in summer 2011 for the seven programs honored in the previous award cycle. In addition, allocated funds were also used for the reproduction 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. Although primarily an online publication, print versions were produced in-house to disseminate information on innovative court programs to state and national court leaders. Finally, funds were used to produce materials in-house to promote collaboration with public libraries and law libraries to recognize Law Day in May 2012 with a series of court and justice-based programs at the libraries. This was a continuation of an event

based on a previous Kleps Award recipient program. After the suspension of the Kleps Award Program in May 2012, the balance of the allocated funds was unexpended.

Trial Court Performance and Accountability

Allocated funds were expended to reimburse trial court administrators' and judges' travel to the AOC offices in San Francisco to participate in meetings on September 8 and 9, 2011, and on May 1, 2012. Court administrators and judges who traveled to the meetings are members of the SB 56 Working Group or belong to courts that participated in the time studies of staff and judicial officers. At the September 2011 meetings, representatives of the SB 56 Working Group and time-study courts met to review data from the time study and provide input on the workload estimates for judicial officers. At the May 1, 2012 meeting, representatives of the SB 56 Working Group and the time study courts met to review staff workload estimates and the caseweights derived from a time study and Delphi adjustments. In addition, Judge Nancy Wieben Stock, Superior Court of Orange County, was flown to the AOC offices in San Francisco to present the final report on the judicial workload assessment to the Judicial Council in December 2011.

Addendum: Supplemental Information on FY 2011–2012 Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Court Funding and Expenditures

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

A total of \$37.116 million from the TCTF was expended or encumbered in support of statewide administrative and technology initiatives that support the objectives stated 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 2011–2012 for statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts by program or project and by local assistance or support.

Description	Amount ⁴
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Deployment	\$ 2,357,507
CCMS V4 Development	1,160,634
CCMS Maintenance and Operations	10,980,401
Interim Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Case Management System (V3)	7,913,888
Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2)	4,256,739
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)—Operations	1,689,325
Interim Case Management System (Sustain)	1,270,596
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	7,446,660
Trial Court Procurement	39,846
Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Local Assistance	23,373,944
Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts—Support	13,741,651
Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	\$ 37,115,595

⁴ 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, funded by the TCTF, consists of the following programs that provide administrative services to the trial courts, including AOC staff support.

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services: In FY 2011–2012, 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 on pages 7-8.)

Trial Court Procurement: In FY 2011–2012, 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 on page 9.)

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.

CCMS Maintenance and Operations: During FY 2011–2012, funding supported staffing and consultant costs, infrastructure support and hosting services at the vendor’s data center, and hosting of support and production environments at the CCTC.

Interim Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Case Management System (V3): In FY 2011–2012, funding supported the maintenance and operations support provided by the AOC for the civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3), currently deployed in five superior courts: Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties. The civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS was deployed in six superior courts (Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties). Five of the six courts rely on this production application for daily case management processing, with a total of 2,705 users statewide. Los Angeles Superior Court of Los Angeles previously used the civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS for processing a limited number of small claims, but as of June 2012 the court no longer processes small claims using the civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS, using it only for inquiries. All V3 courts are now using the latest version of the V3 application.

V3 processes 25 percent of all civil cases statewide, and the system’s functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queue, payment and financial processing. This model allows for a single deployment and common version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate installations. E-filing has been successfully deployed at the Orange Superior Court, saving time and resources. Sacramento Superior

Court has also deployed e-filing for their Employment Development Department cases. San Diego Superior Court is targeting deployment of e-filing in 2012–13. Sacramento and Ventura Superior Courts integrate V3 with public kiosks. E-filing and public kiosks are recognized as providing public and justice partners with increased ease of use and efficiencies.

During FY 2011–2012, funding supported:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for all environments: development, test, training, staging and production;
- Software product support including ongoing technical support to the CCTC and locally hosted courts;
- User support; and
- Product releases including court enhancement requests, judicial branch requirements, and bi-annual legislative changes.

Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2): In FY 2011–2012, funding supported the maintenance and operations support provided by the AOC for the interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2) deployed in the Superior Court of Fresno County in 2006. The criminal and traffic case management system (V2) currently operates in Fresno Superior Court, and supports 650 court users and 2,800 justice partner users.

V2 enables the Fresno Superior Court to process and administer its criminal and traffic caseload, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, payment, and financial processing. The daily fund distribution report generated by V2 calculates distributions for monies collected from fees and fines, an operation that was previously done manually. Fresno Superior Court has caught up on a backlog of case data entry, while reducing traffic counter queues from 30 or 40 customers to three or four. With the courtroom functionality, a defendant is able to walk out of a hearing and immediately receive a transcript of the hearing, including any actions or instructions delivered at the hearing. Justice Partners such as the District Attorney’s office have inquiry access from their offices to authorized case information. Automated interfaces to justice partner systems include: 1) Department of Motor Vehicles for updates and inquiries on traffic violations; 2) Web Pay for online payment of bail, fines, and fees; and 3) the Fresno County Sheriff’s Office for warrants issued or revoked. Collection of information for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System is automated. The public is able to view authorized case information on V2 at kiosks. For example, a case participant is able to view the location and time of their hearing using a kiosk.

During FY 2011–2012, funding supported:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the CCTC;
- Help desk support for end users;
- Day to day operational application support and service requests; and
- Ongoing product releases to address court requests and judicial branch requirements, including bi-annual legislative changes.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) Operations: In FY 2011–2012, TCTF and TCIF resources supported CCTC. (For details, refer to the California Courts Technology Center item in the TCIF section of this report on page 10.)

Interim Case Management System (ICMS): In FY 2011–2012, TCTF and TCIF resources supported ICMS. (For details, refer to the Interim Case Management System item in the TCIF section of this report on page 11.)

Statewide Technology Infrastructure Projects

Statewide technology infrastructure projects, funded by the TCTF, have resulted in the development and deployment of the technology projects listed 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 2011–2012, allocated funding supported AOC staffing and consultant costs as well as reimbursement of trial court costs related to subject matter expert resources for the completion of the development of CCMS-V4, which began in June 2007. Funds were encumbered to complete the development vendor contract in previous fiscal years.

CCMS Deployment: In FY 2011–2012, the CCMS team began focusing on the development of configurations for early adopter courts. At their March 27, 2012 business meeting, the Judicial Council voted to stop the deployment of CCMS V4 while continuing the maintenance and support for the V2 and V3 interim case management systems.

In FY 2011–2012, allocated funding supported:

- AOC staffing and contracted services related to pre-deployment activities; and
- Hosting of deployment specific environments at the CCTC.

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. Beginning in FY 2006–2007, courts have received supplemental funding allocations related to statewide administrative and technology infrastructure needs. In FY 2011–2012, an additional \$76 in ongoing funding was allocated to one court and a total of \$3.548 million was distributed. The entire \$3.548 million distributed to courts is ongoing and is part of courts’ base allocations for trial court operations. The table below shows the distribution of these allocated funds to courts in FY 2011–2012.

Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure Program	Funding Distributed
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	\$ 1,475,868
Interim Case Management System (Sustain)	1,003,027
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	776,626
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V2 and V3	292,380
Total, Supplemental Funding Distributed	\$ 3,547,901

**Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012
Resources**

Description

Beginning Fund Balance

Prior Year Adjustments

Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance

Revenues and Transfers

50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Split

2% Automation Fund

Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund

Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions

Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments¹

One Percent (1%) Transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund

Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (Gov. Code, § 77209 (k))

Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers

Total Resources

¹ Items include a \$2.167 million wire transfer from Bank of America due to the closure of the Trial Court Medical Insurance and Flexible Spending Accounts, and \$14,929 from escheat and other general

**Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012
Fund Balance Summary**

Description

Total Resources

Expenditures and Encumbrances

Ongoing Statewide Programs

Trial Court Projects and Model Programs

Urgent Needs

Subtotal, Expenditures and Encumbrances

Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services

Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata

Total Fund Balance

**Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Category 1 - Ongoing Statewide Programs**

Description	Amount
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	\$ 1,750,000
Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	85,000
Human Resources Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits	40,000
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	794,247
Jury System Improvement Projects	14,614
Litigation Management Program	3,974,030
Self-Help Centers	4,999,992
Self-Represented Litigants - Statewide Support	169,519
Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	17,080
Trial Court Security Grants	1,445,438
Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program	603,239
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Local Assistance and Support ¹	9,429,117
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs - Local Assistance and Support ²	14,491,472
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects - Local Assistance and Support ³	1,437
Total, Ongoing Statewide Programs	\$ 37,815,184

¹ See Attachment A, page 4, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts".

² See Attachment A, page 5, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs".

³ See Attachment A, page 6, for the listing of project and program expenditures for "Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects".

**Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**

Description

Local Assistance

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Subtotal, Local Assistance

Support

California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System

Enhanced Collections

Internal Audits

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Regional Office Assistance Group

Treasury Cash Management

Trial Court Procurement

Trial Court Process Reengineering

Subtotal, Support¹

Total, Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts

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 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs

Description

Local Assistance

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Operations
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)
Data Integration
Enterprise Policy and Planning - Operation
Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)
Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)
Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)
Uniform Civil Fees

Subtotal, Local Assistance

Support

Case Management System – Criminal and Traffic (V2)
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Operations
Data Integration
Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)

Subtotal, Support¹

Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Ongoing Programs

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 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects**

Description

Local Assistance

California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Development
Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy

Subtotal, Local Assistance

Support

CCMS V4 Development
CCMS DMS Development and Deployment

Subtotal, Support¹

Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects

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 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Category 2 - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs

Description	Amount
Audit Contract	\$ -
Domestic Violence - Order After Hearing	81,420
GC 77205(a) 20% for Administrative Cost (SB 940)	-
Human Resources - Court Investigation	50,000
Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report	554,362
Reimbursement to Trial Courts for Public Access	5,300
Workers' Compensation Program Reserve	981,284
Total, Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	\$ 1,672,366

¹ As of 6/30/2011, \$19,875.99 was reimbursed to 19 trial courts (Butte, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Madera, Marin, Merced, Monterey, Nevada, Placer, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, Shasta, Solano, Tulare, Tuolumne, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba); and four trial courts (Butte, Imperial, Kern, and Monterey) submitted requests in July 2011 and were reimbursed total of \$2,897.14 in early September 2011.

Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Category 3 - Urgent Needs

Description	Amount
Superior Court of California, San Francisco County	\$ 2,500,000
Superior Court of California, San Joaquin County	2,000,000
Total, Urgent Needs	\$ 4,500,000

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012
Resources

Description	Amount
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 2,763,902
Prior Year Adjustments	1,612,049
Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	4,375,951
Revenues and Transfers	
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	141,602
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	8,074
State General Fund Transfer	38,709,000
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (Per Item 0250-111-0556, Budget Act 2011)	(20,000,000)
Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers	18,858,676
Total Resources	\$ 23,234,627

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012
Fund Balance Summary**

Description	Amount
Total Resources	\$ 23,234,627
Expenditures and Encumbrances	
Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	9,662,650
Education and Developmental Programs	1,208,628
Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	4,482,149
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	15,353,426
Total Fund Balance	\$ 7,881,201

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Category 1 - Statewide Technology Infrastructure and
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts

Description	Amount
Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	\$ 755,540
Statewide Technology Infrastructure Ongoing Programs	
California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System	147,389
Data Integration	2,647,111
Telecommunications Support	6,112,610
Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	\$ 9,662,650

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund

FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances

Category 2 - Educational and Development Programs

Description	Amount
New Judge Education and Judicial Primary Assignment Orientation Courses	\$ 411,769
Continuing Judicial Education - Statewide Judicial Institutes	91,365
Continuing Judicial Education - Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	1,602
Continuing Judicial Education - Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	8,970
<i>Subtotal, Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	<i>513,705.72</i>
Leadership Training - Non-Judicial / Leadership Training - Judicial	10,959
Manager and Supervisor Training	40,049
<i>Subtotal, Essential and Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors</i>	<i>51,007.46</i>
Court Personnel Institutes / Regional and Local Court Staff Courses	111,574
<i>Subtotal, Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel</i>	<i>111,574</i>
Statewide Education Programs - Trial Court Faculty	191,203
Faculty Development	26,669
<i>Subtotal, Faculty and Curriculum Development</i>	<i>217,872</i>
Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast / Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars, & Videoconferences	166,854
<i>Subtotal, Distance Education</i>	<i>166,854</i>
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	13,938
CFCC Educational Programs	90,400
CFCC Publications	20,013
Labor Relations Academy	23,265
<i>Subtotal, Other Educational and Development Programs</i>	<i>147,615</i>
Total, Educational and Development Programs	\$ 1,208,628

Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012 Expenditures and Encumbrances
Category 3 - Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs

Description	Amount
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$ 60,765
Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,010
Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment and Education	124,973
Interactive Software - Self-represented Litigant Electronic Forms	700
Public Outreach and Education	277,000
Ralph N. Kleps Award Program	4,671
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	13,029
Total, Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects	\$ 4,482,149