



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 April 24, 2014

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Courts: Allocations From the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	April 24, 2014
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	April 18, 2014
Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Cochair	Contact
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Cochair	Frank Tang, 415-865-7955 frank.tang@jud.ca.gov
	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195 steven.chang@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

For fiscal year 2014–2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocating \$78.372 million in funding from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various trial court–related projects and programs.

Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its meetings on January 16, 2014, March 25, 2014, and April 17, 2014, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously recommends that the Judicial Council, effective April 24, 2014:

1. Beginning with fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015, no longer transfer \$20 million revenue from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).

2. Allocate \$78.372 million from the IMF in FY 2014–2015, as follows:
 - Maintain funding for 23 projects and programs at their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels.
 - Transfer ongoing costs from and to the TCTF for three programs:
 - Transfer \$647,500 in ongoing cost from the TCTF to the IMF for V2 Case Management System (CMS).
 - Transfer \$5.658 million in ongoing cost from the TCTF to the IMF for V3 CMS.
 - Transfer the \$625,000 in ongoing cost from the IMF to the TCTF for Enhanced Collection Support.
 - Eliminate the \$34,000 in ongoing cost for the Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers.
 - Increase and decrease funding for 34 projects and programs from their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels, for a net overall decrease of \$1.891 million.
3. Direct the Judicial Council Technology Committee to develop a technology plan that would result in the future elimination of subsidies from the IMF and the TCTF to courts for CCMS V3 and Sustain Justice Edition costs.

A summary of the recommended IMF allocations by project and program is displayed in Attachment A, and a comparison of the IMF FY 2013–2014 and FY 2014–2015 allocations by project and program is displayed in Attachment B.

Previous Council Action

At its August 23, 2013, business meeting, the council exercised its authority provided by statute and delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts the limited authority to transfer allocations between projects and programs that are funded from the IMF, subject to the following criteria:

1. The sum of allocation transfers cannot exceed 20 percent of the allocation to be reduced or 20 percent of the allocation to be augmented.
2. The Administrative Director must notify the chair of the council’s Executive and Planning Committee and the cochairs of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) in advance of any transfer.
3. The Administrative Director must report back to the council on the rationale for and amounts of any approved adjustments after the end of the fiscal year.

Recommendation 1: Retain \$20 Million Revenue in the IMF

Beginning with FY 2014–2015, no longer transfer \$20 million revenue from the IMF to the TCTF.

Rationale for recommendation 1

The IMF revenues are intended to be used for statewide projects and programs and should be used for those purposes. Unlike the \$13.397 million transfer, which is required by statute (Gov.

Code, § 77209(k)), the \$20 million transfer to offset trial court funding reductions is not required by statute. The fiscal impact of this recommendation is to resolve the negative IMF fund balance in FY 2014–2015. If the \$20 million revenue were to continue to transfer to the TCTF and with the TCBAC recommended allocation of \$78.372 million in FY 2014–2015, the projected IMF fund balance would be at negative \$14.596 million; if the \$20 million revenue were to be retained in the IMF, the projected fund balance would be at positive \$5.404 million (see column c, row 25 of Attachment C, IMF—Fund Condition Statement) and the structural deficit would be down to \$13.067 million from \$33.067 million (see column c, row 26 of Attachment C). This recommendation would also create a shortfall of \$10 million in the TCTF, which would require an ongoing reduction to the trial courts’ base allocation for operations if revenues or an increased state General Fund transfer is not forthcoming. The TCBAC is recommending separately (item 4 of the council agenda) that the council submit an FY 2014–2015 Budget Change Proposal that requests a state General Fund augmentation to the TCTF.

Recommendation 2: Make IMF Allocations for FY 2014–2015

Allocate \$78.372 million from the IMF in FY 2014–2015, as follows:

- Maintain funding for 23 projects and programs at their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels.
- Transfer ongoing costs from and to the TCTF for three programs:
 - Transfer \$647,500 in ongoing cost from the TCTF to the IMF for V2 CMS.
 - Transfer \$5.658 million in ongoing cost from the TCTF to the IMF for V3 CMS.
 - Transfer the \$625,000 in ongoing cost from the IMF to the TCTF for Enhanced Collection Support.
- Eliminate the \$34,000 in ongoing cost for the Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers.
- Increase and decrease funding for 34 projects and programs from their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels, for a net overall decrease of \$1.891 million.

Rationale for recommendation 2

The TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee reviewed IMF allocation proposals for 2014–2015 from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) on October 31 and November 1, 2013 (see Attachment D, Description/Purpose of Projects/Programs from IMF for FY 2014–2015), and made recommendations to the TCBAC. On January 16, 2014, the TCBAC deliberated on the subcommittee’s recommendations. On April 17, 2014, the TCBAC reviewed and recommended an adjusted technology allocation with a net decrease of \$4.5 million. The recommended allocations would fund projects and programs that are intended to improve the administration of and access to justice in the trial courts. The recommendations are consistent with judicial branch goals and the statutory purposes of the funds.

Expenditure authority. Of the \$78.372 million in recommended allocations, the TCBAC is recommending \$63.844 million in local assistance allocations and \$14.528 million in support

allocations.¹ The AOC has been working with the Department of Finance (DOF) to obtain an additional \$9.8 million in expenditure authority for local assistance to cover the recommended allocation amount in FY 2014–2015.

Resources. Including an estimated FY 2013–2014 ending fund balance of \$18.47 million, the total estimated resources for the IMF in FY 2014–2015 are \$83.939 million, which would be sufficient to fund the \$78.372 million in allocations being recommended by the TCBAC (see Attachment C, column c, rows 20 and 22).

The IMF receives funding from a number of sources: an annual appropriation of state General Fund monies, which is expected to be \$38.709 million in FY 2014–2015; 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue (Gov. Code., § 77205) representing the state’s 50 percent share of the fee, fine, and forfeiture revenue that exceeds each county’s base revenue maintenance of effort level from 1998–1999; interest earned on retained funds through the Surplus Money Investment Fund; 2 Percent Automation Fund (Gov. Code, § 68090.8(b)) revenues representing 2 percent of the fine, penalty, and forfeiture collections in criminal cases; and revenues from the sale of documents and royalties from publication of uniform jury instructions.

FY 2013–2014 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue distributions. Based on the current estimated 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue, the revenue from FY 2013–2014 is unlikely to exceed the total amount from FY 2002–2003 base level. If the actual revenue amount from FY 2013–2014, which will be available by the end of August 2014, is higher than the FY 2002–2003 base level, the TCBAC will report back to the council with recommendations.

Recommended FY 2014–2015 allocations for projects and programs. Table 1 displays the recommended total allocations from the IMF by the AOC offices that manage the various projects and programs.

¹ *Local assistance allocations* refers to the expenditure authority that would be used to disburse funding to courts and vendors; *support allocations* refers to the expenditure authority used to fund AOC staff costs.

Table 1. Recommended FY 2014–2015 IMF One-Time Allocations by TCBAC

AOC Office	FY 2013–2014 Allocation	Proposed Adjustment	Recommended Allocation
Office of Security	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 0	\$ 1,200,000
Center for Families, Children & the Courts	5,290,000	0	5,290,000
Center for Judiciary Education and Research	1,263,000*	151,000	1,414,000
Court Operations Special Services Office	863,000	(334,400)	528,600
Legal Services Office	11,441,200	48,500	11,489,700
Internal Audit Services	810,000	0	810,000
Fiscal Services Office	1,757,000	(1,225,000)	532,000
Human Resources Services Office	883,800	476,400	1,360,200
Information Technology Services Office	46,650,080	(4,812,680)	41,837,400
Trial Court Administrative Services Office	11,959,300	1,951,000	13,910,300
Total	\$82,117,380**	(\$3,745,180)	\$78,372,200

* If approved by the council, the recently developed biannual Education Plan of the CJER Governing Committee will result in changes to the needed allocation levels for certain programs. Requests for revisions will be made to the Administrative Director within the authority delegated by the council; requests for revisions that cannot be made within the Administrative Director's authority will be made directly to the council.

** The total allocation includes \$7,435,900 V2 and V3 CMS costs that are currently paid from the TCTF. Without this amount, the IMF allocation is \$74,681,480.

Maintain funding for 23 projects and programs at their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels.

Although, the funding for 23 projects and programs will be maintained at their FY 2013–2014 allocation levels, the TCBAC recommended making allocation adjustments to 38 projects and programs, with a net increase of \$3.745 million from FY 2013–2014 allocation levels.

Attachment D provides the description and purpose of these projects and programs.

Project and program allocations transferred from/to the TCTF in FY 2014–2015. The TCBAC recommends transferring three programs between the IMF and the TCTF:

1. V2 (Criminal and Traffic) CMS costs transferring from TCTF

Reduction: \$1,999,200

Recommended Allocation: \$647,500

Description and Impact: The decrease is due to reductions in infrastructure costs and the Superior Court of Fresno County's project to convert its criminal and traffic case types to Tyler Odyssey. The conversion project began in January 2014 and is targeted for completion

in April 2015, with CMS V2 decommissioned by August 2015. Therefore, the budget accounts for the program's ramping down in FY 2014–2015.

2. V3 (Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health) CMS costs transferring from TCTF
Increase: \$868,900
Recommended Allocation: \$5,658,100
Description and Impact: The increase is due to an increase in infrastructure and California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) costs to replace aging equipment.
3. Enhanced Collection Support
Transfer to the TCTF: \$625,000
Description and Impact: The TCBAC conducted a line-item review of allocations from the TCTF and the IMF to evaluate the level of funding for each project and program as well as the appropriateness of the funding source. Given that the enhanced collection support program provides direct services to the trial courts, the TCBAC recommends that the funding source be changed to the TCTF.

Project and program allocations funded in FY 2013–2014 that will be permanently eliminated.

The TCBAC recommends eliminating one program starting from FY 2014–2015:

1. Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers
Eliminate: \$34,000 (total allocation amount)
Recommended Allocation: \$0
Description and Impact: Due to low program use, the proposed reduction will result in the elimination of the Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers. Some courts may already provide EAP to their employees, either through county-sponsored programs or their own program. To minimize the impact to judicial officers, courts may want to extend existing EAP benefits to cover their respective populations.

Adjustments to FY 2013–2014 allocation levels. The TCBAC recommends adjustments to FY 2013–2014 allocation levels for 34 projects and programs—with a net overall decrease of \$1.891 million—as follows:

Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER)

1. Orientation for New Trial Court Judges
Augmentation: \$26,000
Recommended Allocation: \$121,000
Description and Impact: Ten New Judge Orientation (NJO) programs are planned for this fiscal year, with the expectation of a more typical rate of judicial appointments than has occurred in the past two years. This increase in judicial appointments requires more NJO programs to satisfy the education requirements for new judges.

2. B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California
Augmentation: \$20,000
Recommended Allocation: \$180,000
Description and Impact: Because of the increase in judicial appointments from last year (noted in last year's budget request), the Judicial College will be larger in 2014, thereby requiring an augmentation of funding.
3. Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews
Augmentation: \$24,000
Recommended Allocation: \$263,000
Description and Impact: NJO, the Judicial College, and the PAOs are the three programs that all new judges must complete, and an increase in judicial appointments affects these three programs similarly. The number of participants and related costs for these three programs will increase.
4. Leadership Training—Judicial
Augmentation: \$5,000
Recommended Allocation: \$55,000
Description and Impact: This augmentation request is due to the increase in lodging costs associated with these programs. The participant levels remain as in prior years.
5. Judicial Institutes
Augmentation: \$40,000
Recommended Allocation: \$150,000
Description and Impact: Because Judicial Institutes are not offered every year, a different number of institutes of varying sizes are offered in a given year. Hence, the specific funding requirements differ from year to year. This fiscal year will offer four institutes, an increase over last year, and therefore an augmentation in funding is being requested.
6. Advanced Education for Experienced Judges
Augmentation: \$3,000
Recommended Allocation: \$34,000
Description and Impact: Expenditure levels directed toward developing education for experienced judges have remained the same for several budget cycles. This year a policy directive has been initiated to modestly expand education for this crucial audience, which in turn has prompted this augmentation request. This augmentation will also help ensure the cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide.
7. Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses
Augmentation: \$1,000
Recommended Allocation: \$9,000
Description and Impact: Ongoing budget reductions in the trial courts continue, requiring CJER to continue to offer regional and local judicial education courses that provide high-

quality judicial education to the trial courts at a significantly lower cost. This modest augmentation request will ensure that CJER's existing programming levels in this area continue.

8. Manager and Supervisor Training

Augmentation: \$3,000

Recommended Allocation: \$34,000

Description and Impact: This modest increase is primarily due to an increase in lodging costs for the Core 40 and Core 24 courses, but not for the (ICM) courses. Courts or participants fund lodging for ICM participants.

9. Court Personnel Institutes

Augmentation: \$12,000

Recommended Allocation: \$132,000

Description and Impact: The augmentation request is primarily due to the increased costs of participant lodging for the Court Clerk Training (approximately 140 participants) and the Trial Court Attorney Institute (approximately 175 participants).

10. Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses

Augmentation: \$1,000

Recommended Allocation: \$11,000

Description and Impact: As with other allocation augmentation requests, this increase is due to increases in lodging costs.

11. Trial Court Faculty—Statewide Education Program

Augmentation: \$13,000

Recommended Allocation: \$249,000

Description and Impact: The increased cost of lodging is the primary driver for requesting an augmentation for faculty expenditures. CJER pays for faculty travel, meals, and lodging.

12. Faculty Development

Augmentation: \$3,000

Recommended Allocation: \$28,000

Description and Impact: Expenditure levels directed toward faculty development training has remained the same for several budget cycles but because of the increase in lodging costs, we need to request this augmentation.

Court Operations Special Services Office

13. Court Access and Education

Augmentation: \$16,600

Recommended Allocation: \$347,600

Description and Impact:

- a. Federal budget cuts and sequestration have reduced AmeriCorps funding nationwide. The JusticeCorps grant for the three-year funding cycle that began with the FY 2013–2014 program year was reduced by \$150,000.
- b. Given reduced grant funding, the courts are now responsible for additional key program costs. All IMF funding is distributed proportionately to directly benefit the six partnering courts in the JusticeCorps program. An augmentation of \$16,600 will allow a minimum 5 percent increase per funded court, which will help with increased costs in staffing and other operational expenses.
- c. In addition to the overall reduction in the AmeriCorps grant, a number of member training and meeting costs are no longer covered by the AmeriCorps grant and must be covered by other sources. The courts value thorough and complete member training, and the additional IMF resources will support the costs required to fulfill that training.
- d. Reduced fund balances for courts will affect their ability to front program costs before execution of a contract with the AOC for their AmeriCorps subgrant. Additional IMF funding of \$16,600 will benefit them, especially at the beginning of their program year.

14. Court Interpreter Program

Augmentation: \$28,000

Recommended Allocation: \$168,000

Description and Impact: The moderate increase in this funding source reflects (1) increasing recruitment and outreach efforts for both spoken language and American Sign Language interpreters for the coming year, a critical component to ensure a qualified pool of interpreter candidates; (2) planned regional workshops to assist trial court interpreter services staff with court interpreter issues, applying regional memoranda of understanding, programmatic issues and/or discussing protocols and procedures in procuring qualified court interpreter services; and (3) one in-person meeting of the Joint Working Group for California’s Language Access Plan in fall 2014 to continue efforts to achieve its recommended comprehensive Language Access Plan for the California courts.

15. 2015 Language Needs Study

Reduction: \$314,000 (funded every five years)

Recommended Allocation: \$0

Description and Impact: Every five years the Judicial Council is mandated under Government Code section 68563 to conduct a study of language need and interpreter use in the trial courts. Under Government Code section 68563, the Judicial Council is responsible for designating languages to include in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program. To fulfill this mandate and report the findings and recommendations in 2015, this study commenced during the FY 2013–2014 fiscal year.

Legal Services Office

16. Judicial Performance Defense Insurance

Augmentation: \$46,000

Recommended Allocation: \$966,600

Description and Impact: The increased premium is based on an increase in the number and cost of claims in the past four years.

17. Subscription Costs—*Judicial Conduct Reporter*

Augmentation: \$1,500

Recommended Allocation: \$17,100

Description and Impact: Two years ago, after the Judicial Council approved an allocation of \$17,000 from the IMF, the publisher agreed to a one-time-only discount of 10 percent, which brought the total subscription cost down to \$16,380. Of that amount, \$15,535 was charged to the IMF. Last year, the publisher agreed to offer the same discount on a one-time-only basis. For the upcoming fiscal year, the cost of the publication will revert to the undiscounted price of \$18,200, with \$17,080 of that amount charged to the IMF.

18. Jury System Improvement Projects

Augmentation: \$1,000

Recommended Allocation: \$19,000

Description and Purpose: The \$1,000 augmentation will cover the increased cost of meeting expenses for the Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions.

Fiscal Services Office

19. Contract for Other Post-Employment Benefit (OPEB) Valuation Report

Reduction: \$600,000 (every-two-year funding)

Recommended Allocation: \$0

Description and Purpose: The AOC Fiscal Services Office contracts with an actuarial firm to assist trial courts in meeting the requirements established in Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statements 43 and 45, which require government entities to disclose their accrued liability for OPEB liabilities and related information at least once every other year. Therefore, the funding is not needed in FY 2014–2015.

Human Resources Services Office (HRSO)

20. Workers' Compensation Program Reserve

Augmentation: \$511,200

Recommended Allocation: \$1,231,000

Description and Impact: This allocation is for the purpose of paying workers' compensation tail claims costs associated with trial courts leaving a county-administered workers' compensation program. To date, the program has resolved disputes with eight counties for approximately \$6.35 million. This allocation will provide funds for two as yet unresolved matters with counties.

21. Human Resources—Court Investigation

Reduction: \$5,500

Recommended Allocation: \$94,500

Description and Impact: HRSO projects that investigations will continue well into FY 2014–2015. Based on prior-year usage, HRSO has assumed that an average of nine investigative matters will be conducted in FY 2014–2015, at approximately 50 hours per matter. Attorney rates are also estimated to be \$200 per hour. The need to provide these critical services to the trial courts must take priority, especially as courts face tight budgets and reduced allocations.

22. Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums

Augmentation: \$4,700

Recommended Allocation: \$34,700

Description and Impact: In FY 2014–2015, HRSO will be offering four-day academies in Southern California and Northern California. Funding in FY 2014–2015 is based on an average annual attendance of 81 forum participants and 97 academy participants and does not account for any increases in lodging or conference rooms. The courts have continued to request these academies and, to be consistent with program efforts in FY 2012–2013, additional funds are needed to fund a similar level of course offerings in FY 2013–2014.

Information Technology Services Office (ITSO)

23. Telecommunications Support

Reduction: \$3,903,480

Recommended Allocation: \$11,705,000

Description and Impact: The recommended allocation level is based on a technology refresh cycle whose scope includes only 55 of the 58 trial courts. In February 2014, the Judicial Council approved an FY 2013–2014 budget augmentation for this program and changed the scope of the program to include all 58 courts. Based on this change in scope and the office's recently completed annual budget drill, ITSO believes \$12.6 million is needed in 2014–2015 for this program. This estimated need will be presented to the TCBAC for consideration at its planned May meeting. Any change to the current recommended allocation level and/or scope of the program will be brought before the Judicial Council in June.

24. Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy

Augmentation: \$145,700

Recommended Allocation: \$5,268,500

Description and Impact: The increase in program funding is due to the projected cost increase in the program software.

25. Interim Case Management System

Reduction: \$403,800

Recommended Allocation: \$1,246,800

Description and Impact: The cost reductions are related to continued deferment of various Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) projects, such as capital refresh projects. The allocation

primarily focuses on funding mandatory maintenance and operations projects, along with incorporating minimal enhancements, while the SJE Court Consortium evaluates alternatives to replacing the SJE application. As such, the monthly SJE hosting cost at the CCTC has decreased from the amount projected last year. Additionally, one-time savings in FY 2014–2015 from deferred expenditures are available for use with ICMS costs that will be unavailable in subsequent fiscal years.

26. Data Integration

Reduction: \$3,300

Recommended Allocation: \$3,903,600

Description and Impact: The slight decrease is due to a minor cost adjustment in the program.

27. California Courts Technology Center

Augmentation: \$1,022,100

Recommended Allocation: \$10,487,200

Description and Impact: This augmentation is needed to maintain baseline services for the program, including upgrade of the end-user application access and security system, and to pay monthly invoices as obligated by the existing CCTC vendor contract. The existing end-user application access and security system is no longer supported by the vendor, and any outage may cause significant impacts to courts' access to applications hosted at the CCTC.

28. California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services/Integration

Reduction: \$81,800

Recommended Allocation: \$433,400

Description and Impact: The FY 2014–2015 request for CLETS includes funding for one full-time ITSO staff position and ongoing local assistance, which includes data center service charges and needed contract services. The program reduction is the result of the purchase and refresh of server equipment, which occurred in FY 2013–2014 but is not needed for this fiscal year.

29. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

Reduction: \$90,200

Recommended Allocation: \$585,600

Description and Impact: The program funds ongoing maintenance and support for the CCPOR application. The reduction for the program from the previous fiscal year is the result of hiring one full-time ITSO staff rather than using more expensive consulting services.

30. Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite

Augmentation: \$41,800

Recommended Allocation: \$624,300

Description and Impact: The ETMS program provides a suite of software quality assurance tools, staff, and testing expertise. Funding in FY 2014–2015 will continue to be used to

operate, maintain, and support the program. The increase in funding for FY 2014–2015 is due to projected annual increases in software maintenance costs.

31. Uniform Civil Fees

Reduction: \$42,000

Recommended Allocation: \$343,000

Description and Impact: The reduction is due to cost savings associated with the conversion of two Uniform Civil Fees support contractors to full-time ITSO staff positions during FY 2013–2014.

32. Justice Partner Outreach and E-Services

Reduction: \$371,300

Recommended Allocation: \$200,700

Description and Impact: The TCBAC recommended that the local assistance funding for this program be eliminated for FY 2014–2015. The remaining allocation funds two full-time ITSO staff to support the analysis, assessment, and implementation of e-services statewide.

33. Adobe LiveCycle Service Extension

Augmentation: \$3,900

Recommended Allocation: \$133,700

Description and Impact: The minor increase in this project is due to projected increases in the branchwide license maintenance fees per the existing contract with the vendor.

Trial Court Administrative Services Office (TCASO)

34. Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Augmentation: \$1,951,000

Recommended Allocation: \$13,885,300

Description and Impact: In FY 2013–2014, the portion of the allocation managed by TCASO and ITSO was reduced due to one-time salary and cost savings. Therefore, the augmentation amount is necessary to restore funding to adequate levels.

Recommendation 3: Develop a Plan to Eliminate Subsidies From the IMF and the TCTF to Trial Courts for V3 CMS and Sustain Justice Edition Costs

Direct the Judicial Council Technology Committee to develop a technology plan that would result in the future elimination of subsidies from the IMF and the TCTF to courts for CCMS V3 and Sustain Justice Edition costs.

Rationale for recommendation 3

Currently, except for those costs reimbursed by the courts, the TCTF funds the V3 case management system program, which supports 5 trial courts. Also, excluding reimbursed costs, the IMF funds the Interim Case Management System program, which supports 16 trial courts using the Sustain Justice Edition case management system. Funding these programs was

considered a temporary solution pending the statewide deployment of CCMS. With the cancelled deployment of CCMS, equity is an issue regarding continuing to subsidize those courts for their CMS costs while other courts are required to pay for their own costs. Regarding the V2 (criminal and traffic) CMS, the only court deployed on the CMS, the Superior Court of Fresno County, has already begun transitioning to a new CMS and plans to be fully deployed to the new system by the end of FY 2014–2015, resulting in a savings of \$3.3 million to the IMF. The fiscal impact of this recommendation would be to decrease the estimated IMF structural deficit by roughly \$7 million if and when the subsidies for the V3 and Sustain Justice Edition systems are eliminated.

Comments From Interested Parties

When developing its plan for the next two fiscal years (2014–2015 to 2015–2016), the CJER Governing Committee assumed that the \$1.414 million allocation level being recommended by the TCBAC for CJER education programs in FY 2014–2015 would be approved by the council.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: TCBAC-Recommended FY 2014–2015 IMF Allocations
2. Attachment B: FY 2013–2014 and FY 2014–2015 IMF Allocation Comparison
3. Attachment C: IMF—Fund Condition Statement
4. Attachment D: Description/Purpose of Projects/Programs from IMF for FY 2014–2015

TCBAC - Recommended FY 2014-2015 IMF Allocations

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2013-14	FY 2013-14	Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommendations for FY 2014-15		
		JC Approved Allocation ¹	Year-to-date Exp & Encum ²	Total	AOC Support	Local Assistance
		a	b	c = d + e	d	e
1	Judicial and Court Operations Services Division	8,616,000	8,055,744	8,432,600	-	8,432,600
2	Trial Court Security Grants	1,200,000	918,740	1,200,000	-	1,200,000
3	Total, Office of Security	1,200,000	918,740	1,200,000	-	1,200,000
4	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	100,000	85,259	100,000	-	100,000
5	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,000	15,900	20,000	-	20,000
6	Self-Help Center	5,000,000	4,999,834	5,000,000	-	5,000,000
7	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	60,000	38,520	60,000	-	60,000
8	CFCC Educational Programs	90,000	72,406	90,000	-	90,000
9	CFCC Publications	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	20,000
10	Total, Center for Families, Children and Courts	5,290,000	5,231,919	5,290,000	-	5,290,000
11	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	95,000	80,605	121,000	-	121,000
12	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	160,000	139,473	180,000	-	180,000
13	Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	239,000	240,109	263,000	-	263,000
14	Leadership Training - Judicial	50,000	31,456	55,000	-	55,000
15	Judicial Institutes	110,000	91,592	150,000	-	150,000
16	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	31,000	28,743	34,000	-	34,000
17	Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	8,000	2,595	9,000	-	9,000
18	<i>Subtotal, Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	<i>693,000</i>	<i>614,573</i>	<i>812,000</i>	-	<i>812,000</i>
19	Manager and Supervisor Training	31,000	21,676	34,000	-	34,000
20	<i>Subtotal, Essential/Other Education for CEOs, Managers and Supervisors</i>	<i>31,000</i>	<i>21,676</i>	<i>34,000</i>	-	<i>34,000</i>
21	Court Personnel Institutes	120,000	118,993	132,000	-	132,000
22	Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	10,000	1,921	11,000	-	11,000
23	<i>Subtotal, Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel</i>	<i>130,000</i>	<i>120,914</i>	<i>143,000</i>	-	<i>143,000</i>
24	Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	236,000	175,049	249,000	-	249,000
25	Faculty Development	25,000	33,986	28,000	-	28,000
26	Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	1,000	435	1,000	-	1,000
27	<i>Subtotal, Faculty and Curriculum Development</i>	<i>262,000</i>	<i>209,469</i>	<i>278,000</i>	-	<i>278,000</i>
28	Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	137,000	138,672	137,000	-	137,000
29	Distance Education - Online Video, Resources, Webinar	10,000	6,248	10,000	-	10,000
30	<i>Subtotal, Distance Learning</i>	<i>147,000</i>	<i>144,920</i>	<i>147,000</i>	-	<i>147,000</i>
31	Total, Office of Education / CJER	1,263,000	1,111,553	1,414,000	-	1,414,000
32	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	13,000	5,289	13,000	-	13,000
33	Court Access and Education	331,000	331,000	347,600	-	347,600
34	Court Interpreter Program	140,000	115,146	168,000	-	168,000
35	2015 Language Needs Study (every 5-year)	314,000	293,347	-	-	-
36	California Language Access Plan (one-time funding in FY 2013-14)	65,000	48,750	-	-	-
37	Total, Court Operations Special Services Office	863,000	793,532	528,600	-	528,600
38	Judicial Council and Court Leadership Services Division	12,251,200	9,305,762	12,299,700	2,120,000	10,179,700
39	Litigation Management Program	4,500,000	2,577,693	4,500,000	-	4,500,000
40	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	920,600	920,539	966,600	-	966,600
41	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	15,600	15,535	17,100	-	17,100
42	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000	425,720	451,000	-	451,000
43	Jury System Improvement Projects	18,000	8,570	19,000	-	19,000
44	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	75,000	218	75,000	-	75,000
45	Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,000	4,001,074	4,001,000	-	4,001,000
46	Regional Office Assistance Group (Support)	1,460,000	837,126	1,460,000	1,460,000	-
47	Total, Legal Services Office	11,441,200	8,786,474	11,489,700	1,460,000	10,029,700
48	Audit Contract	150,000	-	150,000	-	150,000
49	Internal Audit Services (Support)	660,000	519,287	660,000	660,000	-
50	Total, Internal Audit Services	810,000	519,287	810,000	660,000	150,000
51	Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division	61,250,180	31,892,117	57,639,900	12,407,800	45,232,100
52	Contract for OPEB Valuation Report (every 2 years)	600,000	600,079	-	-	-
53	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	50,000	32,170	50,000	-	50,000
54	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	238,000	119,401	238,000	238,000	-
55	Trial Court Procurement (Support)	244,000	19,458	244,000	244,000	-
56	Enhanced Collections (Support)	625,000	464,454	-	-	-
57	Total, Fiscal Services Office	1,757,000	1,235,561	532,000	482,000	50,000

TCBAC - Recommended FY 2014-2015 IMF Allocations

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2013-14 JC Approved Allocation ¹	FY 2013-14 Year-to-date Exp & Encum ²	Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommendations for FY 2014-15		
		a	b	Total	AOC Support	Local Assistance
				c = d + e	d	e
58	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	34,000	32,000	-	-	-
59	Workers Compensation Program Reserve ¹	719,800	719,749	1,231,000	-	1,231,000
60	Human Resources - Court Investigation	100,000	100,000	94,500	-	94,500
61	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	30,000	25,211	34,700	-	34,700
62	Total, Human Resources Services Office	883,800	876,960	1,360,200	-	1,360,200
63	Telecommunications Support ¹	15,608,480	221,144	11,705,000	-	11,705,000
64	Judicial Branch Enterprise License and Policy	5,122,800	4,276,960	5,268,500	-	5,268,500
65	Interim Case Management Systems	1,650,600	887,577	1,246,800	-	1,246,800
66	Data Integration	3,906,900	1,992,772	3,903,600	577,100	3,326,500
67	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9,465,100	7,689,081	10,487,200	1,892,200	8,595,000
68	Jury Management System	600,000	-	600,000	-	600,000
69	CLETS Services/Integration	515,200	360,102	433,400	114,000	319,400
70	CCPOR (ROM)	675,800	377,059	585,600	116,300	469,300
71	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	582,500	320,015	624,300	-	624,300
72	Uniform Civil Fees	385,000	275,571	343,000	343,000	-
73	Justice Partner Outreach / E-Services	572,000	386,606	200,700	200,700	-
74	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Starting from FY 2013-14)	129,800	129,780	133,700	-	133,700
75	V2 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF starting from FY 2014-15)	2,646,700	1,524,527	647,500	96,500	551,000
76	V3 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF starting from FY 2014-15)	4,789,200	3,448,729	5,658,100	1,276,000	4,382,100
77	Total, Information Technology Services Office	46,650,080	21,889,923	41,837,400	4,615,800	37,221,600
78	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services (Including Support)	11,934,300	7,889,234	13,885,300	7,310,000	6,575,300
79	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force - New	25,000	438	25,000	-	25,000
80	Total, Trial Court Administrative Services Office	11,959,300	7,889,673	13,910,300	7,310,000	6,600,300
81	Total Expenditure or Allocation	82,117,380	49,253,622	78,372,200	14,527,800	63,844,400

Note:

1. A) The allocation amount includes two items that were approved by the JC after its initial approved allocations on 8/23/2013: a) new allocation of \$719,749 for Workers' Compensation Program Reserve; b) increase allocation of \$6,868,480 for Telecommunication Support. B) The total allocation (line #81) includes \$7,435,900 V2 and V3 CMS costs that are currently paid from TCTF. Without this amount, the IMF allocation is \$74,681,400.
2. The amount displayed in this column is based on the report from Oracle Financial that includes the expenditures, encumbrances, and purchase orders as of 3/31/2014.

FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015 IMF Allocation Comparison

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2013-14 JC Approved Allocation ¹	FY 2014-15 TCBAC Recommended	FY 2014-15 Recommended vs. FY 2013-14 Approved
		a	b	c = b - a
1	Judicial and Court Operations Services Division	8,616,000	8,432,600	(183,400)
2	Trial Court Security Grants	1,200,000	1,200,000	-
3	Total, Office of Security	1,200,000	1,200,000	-
4	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	100,000	100,000	-
5	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,000	20,000	-
6	Self-Help Center	5,000,000	5,000,000	-
7	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	60,000	60,000	-
8	CFCC Educational Programs	90,000	90,000	-
9	CFCC Publications	20,000	20,000	-
10	Total, Center for Families, Children and Courts	5,290,000	5,290,000	-
11	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	95,000	121,000	26,000
12	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	160,000	180,000	20,000
13	Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	239,000	263,000	24,000
14	Leadership Training - Judicial	50,000	55,000	5,000
15	Judicial Institutes	110,000	150,000	40,000
16	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	31,000	34,000	3,000
17	Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	8,000	9,000	1,000
18	<i>Subtotal, Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	<i>693,000</i>	<i>812,000</i>	<i>119,000</i>
19	Manager and Supervisor Training	31,000	34,000	3,000
20	<i>Subtotal, Essential/Other Education for CEOs, Managers and Supervisors</i>	<i>31,000</i>	<i>34,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
21	Court Personnel Institutes	120,000	132,000	12,000
22	Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	10,000	11,000	1,000
23	<i>Subtotal, Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel</i>	<i>130,000</i>	<i>143,000</i>	<i>13,000</i>
24	Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	236,000	249,000	13,000
25	Faculty Development	25,000	28,000	3,000
26	Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	1,000	1,000	-
27	<i>Subtotal, Faculty and Curriculum Development</i>	<i>262,000</i>	<i>278,000</i>	<i>16,000</i>
28	Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	137,000	137,000	-
29	Distance Education - Online Video, Resources, Webinar	10,000	10,000	-
30	<i>Subtotal, Distance Learning</i>	<i>147,000</i>	<i>147,000</i>	<i>-</i>
31	Total, Office of Education / CJER	1,263,000	1,414,000	151,000
32	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	13,000	13,000	-
33	Court Access and Education	331,000	347,600	16,600
34	Court Interpreter Program	140,000	168,000	28,000
35	2015 Language Needs Study (every 5-year)	314,000	-	(314,000)
36	California Language Access Plan (one-time funding in FY 2013-14)	65,000	-	(65,000)
37	Total, Court Operations Special Services Office	863,000	528,600	(334,400)
38	Judicial Council and Court Leadership Services Division	12,251,200	12,299,700	48,500
39	Litigation Management Program	4,500,000	4,500,000	-
40	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	920,600	966,600	46,000
41	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	15,600	17,100	1,500
42	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000	451,000	-
43	Jury System Improvement Projects	18,000	19,000	1,000
44	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	75,000	75,000	-
45	Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,000	4,001,000	-
46	Regional Office Assistance Group (Support)	1,460,000	1,460,000	-
47	Total, Legal Services Office	11,441,200	11,489,700	48,500

FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015 IMF Allocation Comparison

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2013-14 JC Approved Allocation ¹	FY 2014-15 TCBAC Recommended	FY 2014-15 Recommended vs. FY 2013-14 Approved
		a	b	c = b - a
48	Audit Contract	150,000	150,000	-
49	Internal Audit Services (Support)	660,000	660,000	-
50	Total, Internal Audit Services	810,000	810,000	-
51	Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division	61,250,180	57,639,900	(3,610,280)
52	Contract for OPEB Valuation Report (every 2 years)	600,000	-	(600,000)
53	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	50,000	50,000	-
54	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	238,000	238,000	-
55	Trial Court Procurement (Support)	244,000	244,000	-
56	Enhanced Collections (Support)	625,000	-	(625,000)
57	Total, Fiscal Services Office	1,757,000	532,000	(1,225,000)
58	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	34,000	-	(34,000)
59	Workers Compensation Program Reserve	719,800	1,231,000	511,200
60	Human Resources - Court Investigation	100,000	94,500	(5,500)
61	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	30,000	34,700	4,700
62	Total, Human Resources Services Office	883,800	1,360,200	476,400
63	Telecommunications Support ¹	15,608,480	11,705,000	(3,903,480)
64	Judicial Branch Enterprise License and Policy	5,122,800	5,268,500	145,700
65	Interim Case Management Systems	1,650,600	1,246,800	(403,800)
66	Data Integration	3,906,900	3,903,600	(3,300)
67	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9,465,100	10,487,200	1,022,100
68	Jury Management System	600,000	600,000	-
69	CLETS Services/Integration	515,200	433,400	(81,800)
70	CCPOR (ROM)	675,800	585,600	(90,200)
71	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	582,500	624,300	41,800
72	Uniform Civil Fees	385,000	343,000	(42,000)
73	Justice Partner Outreach / E-Services	572,000	200,700	(371,300)
74	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Starting from FY 2013-14)	129,800	133,700	3,900
75	V2 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF starting from FY 2014-15)	2,646,700	647,500	(1,999,200)
76	V3 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF starting from FY 2014-15)	4,789,200	5,658,100	868,900
77	Total, Information Technology Services Office	46,650,080	41,837,400	(4,812,680)
78	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services (Including Support)	11,934,300	13,885,300	1,951,000
79	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force - New	25,000	25,000	-
80	Total, Trial Court Administrative Services Office	11,959,300	13,910,300	1,951,000
81	Total Allocation	82,117,380	78,372,200	(3,745,180)

Note:

1. A) The allocation amount includes two items that were approved by the JC after its initial approved allocations on 8/23/2013: a) new allocation of \$719,749 for Workers' Compensation Program Reserve; b) increase allocation of \$6,868,480 for Telecommunication Support. B) The total allocation (line #81) includes \$7,435,900 V2 and V3 CMS costs that are currently paid from TCTF. Without this amount, the IMF allocation is \$74,681,400.

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund - Fund Condition Statement

Line No.		FY 2012-13 Year-end Financial Statement ¹	FY 2013-14 Judicial Council Approved ²	FY 2014-15 TCBAC Recommended ³
		a	b	c
1	Beginning Balance	48,128,575	44,827,741	18,470,467
2	Prior-Year Adjustments			
3	Liquidation of Prior-Year Encumbrances and Adjustment for Revenue and Expenditure Accruals	11,911,866	-	-
4	Refund from Deloitte Consulting LLP related to prior-year contracts	776,472	-	-
5	Repayment of loan	2,500,000	-	-
6	Adjusted Beginning Balance	63,316,913	44,827,741	18,470,467
7	Revenues			
8	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	31,920,133	27,946,000	25,324,600
9	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,753,200	15,242,700	14,845,200
10	Jury Instructions Royalties	518,617	445,400	445,400
11	Interest from SMIF	201,201	135,000	135,000
12	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	(8,495)	-	-
13	Transfers			
14	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000
15	To Trial Court Trust Fund	(23,000,000)	(20,000,000)	-
16	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
17	To TCTF (Improvement Fund AOC staff savings)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)
18	To TCTF (Improvement Fund portion of Deloitte refund)	(3,629,000)	-	-
19	Net Revenue/Transfers	46,473,656	48,487,100	65,468,200
20	Total Resources	109,790,569	93,314,841	83,938,667
21	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocation			
22	Program and Project Expenditure/Encumbrance/Allocation	64,799,934	74,681,480	78,372,200
23	Less: Pro Rata	162,894	162,894	162,894
24	Total Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocation	64,962,828	74,844,374	78,535,094
25	Fund Balance⁴	44,827,741	18,470,467	5,403,573
26	Net Revenue/Transfers Over or (Under) Expenditure	(18,489,172)	(26,357,274)	(13,066,894)

Note:

1. Amount displayed in this column is from the FY 2012-2013 year-end financial statements that includes the estimated revenues, expenditures and encumbrances for the fiscal year. The differences in amount between the year-end and actual will be recorded as prior years' adjustments on the FY 2013-2014 year-end financial statements.
2. The allocation amount includes two items that were approved by the JC after its initial approved allocations on 8/23/2013: a) new allocation of \$719,749 for Workers' Compensation Program Reserve; b) increase allocation of \$6,868,480 for Telecommunication Support.
3. Based on the latest revenue estimate provided to the DOF on 4/17/2014, the 2% automation fund will be \$14K higher, and the 50/50 excess fines split revenue will be \$2.621 million lower than what are currently in the Governor's Budget.
4. The unrestricted FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 fund balance would be \$1.464 million less due to unspent jury instructions royalty revenue from FY 2003-04 through FY 2012-13 as this revenue can solely be used for improvement of the jury system.

Attachment D

Description/Purpose of Projects/Programs Recommended by the
TCBAC to be funded from the IMF in FY 2014–2015

Table of Contents

<i>Office of Security</i>	4
<i>Trial Court Security Grants</i>	4
<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	5
<i>Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support</i>	5
<i>Domestic Violence – Family Law Interpreter Program</i>	6
<i>Self-Help Centers</i>	6
<i>Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms</i>	7
<i>CFCC Educational Program</i>	8
<i>CFCC Publications</i>	9
<i>Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER)</i>	10
<i>CJER Summary and Explanation of Proposed Total Allocation</i>	10
<i>A. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	11
<i>New Judge Education and Judicial Assignment Orientation Courses (Mandated)</i>	11
<i>Leadership Training - Judicial (Mandated)</i>	13
<i>Judicial Institutes (Essential)</i>	14
<i>Advanced Education for Experienced Judges</i>	15
<i>Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses</i>	15
<i>Manager and Supervisor Training</i>	16
<i>Court Personnel Institutes</i>	18
<i>Regional and Local Court Staff Courses</i>	19
<i>Statewide Education Programs - Trial Court Faculty</i>	20
<i>Faculty Development</i>	20
<i>Curriculum Committees and Education Plan Development</i>	20
<i>E. Distance Learning</i>	21
<i>Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast</i>	21

<i>Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars, & Videoconferences</i>	22
<i>Court Operations Special Services Office</i>	22
<i>Trial Court Performance (Measures Study) and Accountability</i>	22
<i>JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)</i>	23
<i>Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment and Education</i>	24
<i>Legal Services Office</i>	26
<i>Litigation Management Program</i>	26
<i>Judicial Performance Defense Insurance</i>	27
<i>Subscription Costs – Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	27
<i>Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program</i>	28
<i>Jury System Improvement Projects</i>	28
<i>Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers</i>	29
<i>Complex Civil Litigation Program</i>	30
<i>Regional Office Assistance Group</i>	31
<i>Internal Audit Services</i>	32
<i>Audit Contract</i>	32
<i>Internal Audits</i>	33
<i>Fiscal Services Office</i>	33
<i>Budget Focused Training and Meetings</i>	33
<i>Treasury Services</i>	33
<i>Trial Court Procurement</i>	34
<i>Enhanced Collections</i>	34
<i>Human Resources Services Office</i>	34
<i>Judicial Officer Assistance Program</i>	34
<i>Workers’ Compensation Program Reserve</i>	35
<i>HR – Trial Court Investigation</i>	35
<i>Labor Relations Academy</i>	36
<i>Information Technology Services Office</i>	37
<i>Telecommunications Support</i>	37
<i>Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy</i>	39
<i>Interim Case Management System</i>	40
<i>Data Integration</i>	41

<i>California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations</i>	43
<i>Jury Grant Program Support</i>	44
<i>California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)</i>	45
<i>California Courts Protective Order Registry</i>	46
<i>Enterprise Test Management Suite</i>	47
<i>Uniform Civil Fees</i>	48
<i>Justice Partner Outreach/E-Services (JPO&E)</i>	49
<i>Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension</i>	50
<i>V2 (Criminal and Traffic) Case Management System</i>	51
<i>V3 (Civial, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health) Case Management System</i>	52
<i>Trial Court Administrative Services Office</i>	53
<i>Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services</i>	53
<i>Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services</i>	54
<i>Judicial Council’s Court-Ordered Debt Task Force</i>	55

JUDICIAL AND COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

Office of Security

Trial Court Security Grants

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,200,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

In FY 2014–2015 the Office of Security will utilize existing statewide master agreements for the purchase, installation and maintenance of duress alarm, video surveillance, and access systems, as well as other security enhancement projects at Trial Court Facilities.

Trial Court Security Grants are determined in part as the result of security assessments conducted by Office of Security staff. A number of courts are currently scheduled for security enhancement as a result of assessments conducted in FY 2013–2014, but deferred to FY 2014–2015 due to a lack of funds in the current year’s budget.

The list below does not represent all projects to be completed in FY 2014–2015. The unallocated amounts listed on the last two lines of the chart are for projects pending cost estimates and an amount held in reserve to address emergencies.

COUNTY	FACILITY	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST
AOC	CCTV/Access (Siemens)	Time & materials service calls	150,000.00
AOC	Duress alarm systems (StopTech)	Service agreements	42,000.00
AOC	COOP, Emergency Training (Bold Planning)	Maintenance and training	78,000.00
Unallocated	System upgrades and replacements	Projects pending cost estimates	680,000.00
Unallocated		emergency reserve	250,000.00
		Total	1,200,000.00

Purpose

Video Surveillance (CCTV) and Access Systems – A one year warranty is included in the cost of installation of new CCTV and access systems. In prior years, extended service agreements averaging between \$300,000 and \$400,000 annually were purchased. As a cost saving measure, service agreements are no longer purchased, and service calls have been addressed on a time and materials basis. This practice will continue in FY 2014–2015 and \$150,000 has been estimated based on expenditures in FY 2013–2014.

Duress Alarm Systems – A two year warranty is included in the cost of installation for new duress alarm systems. Over 130 systems have been installed with Trial Court Security Grant funds. Approximately \$42,000 has been estimated for the renewal of extended service

agreements in FY 2014–2015.

Emergency Plans – The contract with Bold Planning Solutions includes an annual system maintenance fee of \$78,000 to maintain the web based tool used by the courts for their various emergency plans..

Deferred Projects – A number of projects were deferred from FY 2013–2014 due to lack of funds. These projects will add necessary elements to existing video surveillance and duress alarm systems and will be a priority in the current year funding.

System Upgrades and Replacement – Security equipment, like all electronics, has a finite lifespan. The systems in place in court facilities need to be upgraded and in some cases, replaced. Properly functioning equipment is a critical element in ensuring the safety and security of judicial officers, court personnel and the public. This year emphasis will be placed on updating systems previously installed by the Office of Security. Thirteen sites will be evaluated to determine if technical upgrades are required on systems that were installed in FY 2008–2009.

Emergency Reserve – This amount will be held in reserve to address unforeseen emergencies and will be allocated to system upgrade and replacement projects near the end of the fiscal year. The amount held in reserve for FY 2013–2014 was \$250,000. That amount was used to address urgent court requests and it is anticipated that the entire 2013-2014 budget of \$1.2 million will be used.

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$100,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

This allocation is the only source of statewide operational support for court self-help services in all of California’s 58 trial courts. The allocation amount has been cut 2/3 from \$300,000 to \$100,000 since 2011. Due to workforce reductions in courts and the AOC, FY 2014–2015 funding will be used to add new content, tools, and resources that can be accessed directly by users of the statewide self-help website. These tools will allow litigants to get information and assistance with their legal issues at home or other locations so that they can either avoid the need to come to a self-help center or require less time at the center. The self-help website also provides links to local court self-help services. There are links to the “Ask a Librarian” website that enables users to get information from a law librarian. Additional links are provided to many legal resources, such as local lawyer referral services, domestic violence hotlines, and the State Bar website. The judicial branch website design includes many additional features, such as video clips developed by the local courts and the AOC. Additional content will be translated into Spanish and reviewed by a bilingual attorney to ensure legal accuracy.

The self-help section of the judicial branch website at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp.htm>, includes instructional videos and materials from local self-help programs that have been adapted for statewide use. Many courts have requested the development of additional videos and other multi-media products for self-represented litigants as an alternative source of information in a time of staff reductions. Funds are also used for translation of forms and instructional

materials as requested by trial courts.

In FY 2014–2015, funding will support workshops for self-help court staff including court partners in legal aid, law librarians, mediators, and small claims advisors. The workshops will provide MCLE and other professional credit on topics of significance to this audience (e.g., changes in family law, consumer debt, international service requirements) as well as strategies for effectively serving the greatest possible number of people (e.g., leveraging technology and forming collaborative partnerships).

Purpose

In February 2004, the Judicial Council adopted a Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants that called upon the AOC to develop resources that can be used by programs statewide (e.g, distributing information and local court innovations for use by all other courts). Demand for these services is high. The website provides local courts with information that they would otherwise need to research, translate, and post on their own. Providing this service statewide prevents hundreds of hours of duplicative work for local courts. Over 4 million users view the self-help website annually. The self-help website usage has increased by 135% over the last eight years.

Domestic Violence – Family Law Interpreter Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$20,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will be used to pay for the translation of domestic violence forms and instructions and to make them available to all courts. There is a critical need to keep these forms updated to reflect legislative changes.

Purpose

The purpose of translating these critical forms is to aid litigants in completing required Judicial Council forms in these critical cases where there are few attorneys. It also helps in ensuring that litigants understand the terms of the orders that are made. These forms are made available to all the courts as well as the public and legal services providers.

Self-Help Centers

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$5,000,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

None of these funds are used for AOC administrative costs. Funds are distributed directly to support self-help center programs and operations in all 58 trial courts. An additional \$6.2 million in funds are distributed from the TCTF. The combined minimum allocation to each court is \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population size in the county where the trial court is located. Courts use these funds for services for self-represented litigants. Ninety-two percent of the funds are used by the courts for staffing.

Self-help centers provide assistance to self-represented litigants in a wide array of civil law matters to save the courts significant time and expense in the clerk’s office and in the courtroom. Self-help centers serve over 450,000 persons per year with the STCIMF and TCTF funds.

Purpose

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, calls for self-help centers in all counties. California Rule of Court 10.960 provides that self-help services are a core function of courts and should be budgeted accordingly. The California Budget Act provides that “up to \$5,000,000 [from the Trial Court Improvement Fund] shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants.” Based upon recommendations by the Trial Court Budget Working Group, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6,200,000 for self-help services from the TCTF since 2007.

Reducing self-help services would increase court’s other costs. When self-help staff are decreased, the number of questions and issues at the public counter increases substantially, therefore increasing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerk’s office. Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and results in measurable short and long-term savings to the court. One study found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$.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 \$.36 to \$.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 \$.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 of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help. The judicial branch has been able to allocate a quarter of the amount needed in 2007, \$11.2 million annually.

Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$60,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will provide all 58 courts access to the National Legal Document Assembly Server, operated by ProBonoNet. This server makes it possible for courts to develop software programs that assist self-help centers to complete forms quickly, as well as to provide programs on the California Court’s On-Line Self-Help Center. The cost of the server and technical support for this project is \$60,000 per year. This allocation is used to extend the ProBonoNet contract. None of these funds are used for AOC administrative costs.

The courts have a pressing need to transition to ProBonoNet as an alternative to EZLegalFile and ICAN!, both of which will now be charging for usage. Programs designed by the AOC using the National Legal Document Assembly Server in self-help centers are now being adapted so that the public can access free tools to complete their forms online and, whenever possible, avoid the need to use in-person services at self-help centers.

Currently more than 60,000 litigants complete forms using interactive forms in self-help centers. With wider access to web-based programs, the number of litigants able to access interactive forms is expected to rise significantly.

Purpose

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, called on the AOC to develop interactive forms to create case-specific documents as well as to continue to develop resources for local court self-help programs.

In the current economy, demand for self-help services is increasing just as courts' resources are dramatically reduced. By populating Judicial Council forms with information gathered from litigants using a "Turbo-Tax" approach, interactive forms enable litigants to complete many required documents with no assistance or with the use of Justice Corps or other volunteers. As many litigants are now used to shopping on-line, this style of answering questions is much easier for them than trying to complete a Judicial Council form in a standard PDF. Branching logic in the program skips over questions that are not necessary to answer, based on prior responses. For example, if a litigant answers that there are no children of the marriage, the program does not ask further questions about child custody or support. The process produces typewritten documents with more complete information. It provides more instructions and can ask questions in a way that more self-represented litigants can understand and answer appropriately. Litigants can then complete the remainder of the pleadings in a workshop setting, saving significant time for self-help center staff. Persons preparing the pleadings can also find more information on the self-help web site.

Automated document assembly programs facilitate a more efficient use of self-help center resources, supporting litigants to avoid unnecessary use of court self-help center resources. One court reports that the method saves at least one hour per litigant preparing restraining order forms. Another indicates that they will save their self-help center 3 hours per litigant in preparing conservatorship pleadings.

Since Judicial Council forms are used statewide, it is much more cost-effective to develop document assembly programs on a statewide basis and to make any adjustments required by a local court to accommodate its practice and procedure. A number of courts have developed self-help center services based on the programs developed by AOC staff and using the existing ProBonoNet license. Courts can use the server and license paid for with this allocation to host their own HotDocs forms. The branching logic requires legal understanding of the court processes, as well as technical ability with the program. While the forms creation program is designed to be used by attorneys and paralegals who do not have a technology background, experience has shown that it takes a significant investment of time to become proficient, and few courts can dedicate staff time to creating these programs.

CFCC Educational Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$90,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

CFCC Educational Programs provide multidisciplinary and specialized education and mandatory trainings for court professionals. Due to budget reductions, statewide programs such as Beyond the Bench and Family Law Education Programs are now offered every other fiscal year. CFCC and CJER work closely to coordinate offerings to make all required training available to judges and court staff every calendar year.

The FY 2014–2015 allocation will be used to assist judicial officers and court employees in

attending the 2015 Family Law Education Programs conference and the 2014 Fall Regional Family Dispute Resolution training series. Attendance at these programs is open to all 58 court systems. The FY 2014–2015 allocation will also provide assistance for California’s annual statewide Youth Court Summit.

Purpose

Family Law Education Programs is a week-long multidisciplinary conference that brings together judicial officers through the Family Law Institute, that is held concurrently, Family Court Services staff, supervisors, managers, and directors, Access to Visitation programs, and child support commissioners and family law facilitators to address issues such as domestic violence, family court case processing, and mandatory programs such as child custody mediation and child support programs. A statewide conference also provides the opportunity for face-to-face collaboration with colleagues across the state and a forum to exchange effective approaches to meeting the challenges of the current economic and court funding context. The conference provides a cost efficient venue for judicial officers and court staff to meet mandatory training requirements in family law and child custody. The 2014 Fall regional training series in Family Dispute Resolution provides additional options for Family Court Services staff and managers to obtain mandatory education unit required for 2014 in a localized venue that reduces time away from court. The cost of the training is far below the rate of outside vendors.

IMF funding also provides partial support for California’s annual statewide Youth Court Summit, a collaborative effort among local youth, or peer courts, the California Association of Youth Courts, Inc., and the Judicial Branch. The Summit will bring together youth and peer court staff, juvenile bench officers, education experts, judges, and youth-focused associations to share ideas and best practices about youth courts.

CFCC Publications

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$20,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

In FY 2014–2015, the allocation will be used to support maintenance of the *California Dependency Online Guide*. This resource is available statewide. *The California Dependency Online Guide* is a chief training and information resource used by 2,000 court-appointed attorneys in dependency proceedings across the state and a source of relevant, up-to-date information for judicial officers, attorneys, and all professionals working in California’s child welfare system. CalDOG continued to grow in FY 2013-2014, increasing subscribers by 7 percent and seeing a comparable increase in daily page views.

Purpose

The *California Dependency Online Guide* saves costs of print publications, in-person training, and attorney time by providing easy access to practice resources. The online guide is an important resource supporting the quality of practice in dependency cases as well as efficient and effective use of valuable court time. The guide is not a public resource, but children and families benefit from the quality of practice it supports.

Over 4,800 individual entries are available on the *California Dependency Online Guide*, including a comprehensive case law page with summaries and case text for California dependency and related state and federal cases; links to legal resources, including California Rules of Court, Judicial Council forms, California statutes, and state and federal regulations;

sample briefs, motions, and writs; a calendar of upcoming conferences and trainings; distance-learning courses, including for-credit online courses that meet the eight-hour training requirement for new dependency attorneys; educational content, such as handouts from the Beyond the Bench conference and other conferences, articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, publications; expert witness listings, including links to other databases of experts; information about county-specific reunification and family maintenance service providers, in areas such as substance abuse treatment and therapy and domestic violence counseling, including links to county or regional databases of service providers serving most California counties; juvenile court–related links to resource libraries, directories, service and training organizations, courts, and government agencies; and child welfare news, including timely updates about new and pending statutes, cases, California Rules of Court, and Judicial Council forms.

Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER)

CJER Summary and Explanation of Proposed Total Allocation

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,414,000, \$151,000 increase from FY 2013–14

The budget requirements for CJER typically change from year to year for only two primary reasons. First, the number of judicial appointments varies each year and consequently, the new judge education funding requirements (NJO, the College, and PAOs) differ from year to year. Second, because the CJER Governing Committee develops education plans on a two-year cycle, different programs are offered in different years. Judicial Institutes, for example, are typically offered every other year; some years, four Institutes are offered and in others, five Institutes are offered. In 2014, an increase in the state rate for lodging is a third reason and is responsible for an increase in the cost of live programs that require participant and faculty lodging.

CJER proposes that funding be allocated at the five subcategory levels to allow CJER to meet changing needs during the year while maintaining the Council’s intent of funding at different levels for different audiences. This would enable more timely flexibility to respond to changing needs and efficient use of the approved funds as final costs of individual programs often change due to varying attendance levels, faculty availability, and venue-related contract terms. Also, because CJER’s Curriculum Committees and Governing Committee have recently completed their biannual assessment and prioritization of education needs in the courts and completed the proposed biannual education plan (that is being provided to the Judicial Council at its April meeting), some of the line items below will need to be adjusted during the year but will not alter the total of the proposed allocation.

CJER would submit any requests for funding changes between categories for approval to the Administrative Director of the Courts.

Subcategory	Amount
A. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers	\$812,000
B. Essential & Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors	\$34,000
C. Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	\$143,000
D. Faculty and Curriculum Development	\$278,000
E. Distance Learning	\$147,000
TOTAL	\$1,414,000

Descriptions and the estimated funding need for the individual programs within each subcategory are provided to facilitate allocation decisions at a more granular level if the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council opt to allocate funding at the program level instead.

A. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers

Proposed 2014–20145 Allocation – \$812,000, \$119,000 increase from 2013–2043. Details described in specific program areas below.

New Judge Education and Judicial Assignment Orientation Courses (Mandated)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$564,000, \$70,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the following:

- a. New Judge Orientation (NJO): *\$121,000 (an increase of \$26,000)*. Ten NJO Programs are planned for this year with the expectation of a more typical rate of judicial appointments. The typical number of NJO programs in the past has been between eight and ten.
- b. B.E Witkin Judicial College: *\$180,000 (an increase of \$20,000)*. There will be more new judge participants at this year’s Judicial College. Most of the proposed additional funding amount is already encumbered in the contract for the August 2014 College
- c. Judicial Primary Assignment Orientation and Overview Courses: *\$263,000 (an increase of \$24,000)*. The items funded from this line item are the various orientation courses for new judges, judges new to an assignment and judges returning to an assignment. There are approximately eighteen different courses, some of which are offered multiple times during the year. There will be additional new judge participants in the coming year based upon a return to a more typical number of appointments (+\$30,000).

Purpose

All newly elected or appointed judges and subordinate *judicial officers are required by Rule of Court 10.462 (c)(1)* to complete new judge education offered by CJER by attending the New Judge Orientation Program within 6 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, CJER is the sole provider for these audiences.

These three programs which comprise 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 Program 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 by 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 the new judge 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. The number of programs required depends on the number of judicial appointments in a given year. The programs are taught by four highly experienced faculty members for the entire week.

- b. The two week 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 college 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. This also allows participants to bring sensitive issues with them which 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. As with NJO, the number of participants varies based on the number of judicial appointments. In the past, participation has ranged from approximately fifty-five to one hundred and forty judges and subordinate judicial officers.
- c. The Primary Assignment Orientation courses (PAOs) provide new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion in their primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, traffic, probate) with a heavy emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, as well as 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, CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments which are substantively more complex than those covered by the PAOs above (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, 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 which these retired judges may never have had during their active careers.

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 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.

All judges, justices and court leadership (PJs, APJs, CEOs and Clerk Administrators) were surveyed in 2010 regarding the effectiveness of judicial education in California. 415 responses (24.2% response rate) were received. Question 1 of the survey asked whether requiring specific education for new justices or judges is reasonable and appropriate: 80% of justices agreed, 86% of judges agreed, and 96% 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% of justices agreed, 77% of judges agreed, and 85% of trial court leadership agreed. Based upon this feedback, the CJER Governing Committee concluded that these programs are highly valued by the courts.

As part of its 2012 Annual Agenda, the CJER Governing Committee appointed a workgroup to evaluate all new judge education programming offered by CJER to assess whether it was being provided in the most effective and efficient way. The workgroup concluded that, by and large, new judge education was provided appropriately and the Council approved their report and recommendation in June 2013.

Leadership Training - Judicial (Mandated)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$55,000, \$5,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the following:

- a. PJ/CEO Court Management Program: \$38,500 (*an increase of \$3,500*)
- b. Supervising Judges Institute: \$16,500 (*an increase of \$1,500*)
The items funded in this line item include the PJ/CEO Court Management Program and the Supervising Judges Institute. The increase is due primarily to additional lodging cost.

Purpose

Two programs offer educational opportunities for trial court judicial leadership. Each of these programs provides participants a chance to learn management techniques, strategies, and best practices that are designed for the unique environment that is 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).

- a. The PJ/CEO Court Management Program brings together the top leadership in the trial courts for a multi-day education event which focuses on the challenges of managing trial courts (especially in the current financial environment) as well as focusing on the rewards of creating and building an effective partnership between the Presiding Judge and Court Executive Officer. This program is especially critical opportunity for new Presiding Judges to begin building a partnership with their CEOs. The program contains segments which break out the trial courts by size, appreciating that different size courts have unique issues

and challenges. Finally, this program is intended to instill a sense of community and bonding among trial court leadership throughout the state. Courses on finance, human resources, strategic planning are frequently offered.

- b. The Supervising Judges Institute is the one education program that focuses on this very challenging and politically difficult 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. Course can include basic management, how to lead teams, and effective communication skills.

Judicial Institutes (Essential)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$150,000, \$40,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

The increased cost is due primarily to the biannual nature of Judicial Institutes. A different number of institutes of different sizes are offered in a given year. Because of this, the specific funding requirements differ from year to year. Also, hotel lodging costs are expected to increase as a result of the new state lodging rate.

In FY 2013–2014, the Education Plan developed by the CJER Governing Committee includes the following institutes:

- a. Family Law Institute
- b. Juvenile Law Institute
- c. Cow County Institute
- d. Civil Law Institute

Purpose

CJER offers an Institute in all of the major trial court bench assignments (civil, criminal, family, juvenile, probate) as well as specific programs for appellate justices, rural court judges (aka “cow county”), appellate court attorneys, 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 are keyed for those audiences. All of these two day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and so forth. Participants frequently comment that the learning environment is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues, because it provides an opportunity to 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 towards the continuing education expectations and requirements of California Rules of Court. These programs have had attendances ranging from 70 to 140.

Essential content is identified by Curriculum Committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee and subsequently developed by workgroups. This content can include in-depth coverage of common, yet complex, issues which 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 and the opportunity for them to network with other advanced judges. Additionally, when the content and program design is appropriate, sessions at institutes are videotaped by staff and posted online to Serranus, where they are available to all judges.

Advanced Education for Experienced Judges

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$34,000; \$3,000 increase from FY 2013–2014.

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs. Costs in this line item can also change based upon changing needs assessment by the CJER Curriculum Committees and the reprioritization of resources by the CJER Governing Committee.

Purpose

In addition to Primary Assignment Orientation Courses, CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges. These are continuing education courses designed to address issues of advanced judging,

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 ensures cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide.

Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$9,000; \$1,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs.

Purpose

Regional and Local Judicial Education courses allow CJER to provide high-quality judicial education to the trial courts at lower cost. Statewide budget reductions over the past few years have necessitated that CJER develop and expand both of these programs because they offer a much less expensive alternative to statewide programming while preserving the quality of our 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 judicial faculty. Regional and local programs provide invaluable educational experiences and opportunities for interaction and discussions with colleagues across California.

Regional Judicial Education

Providing regional courses enables judges and commissioners to attend education events which are closer to their courts. They are also still able to connect with their colleagues from surrounding courts. These courses are able to be delivered inexpensively when compared to the traditional multi-day statewide events, such as institutes. Faculty is 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. These half-day or one-day courses are held in AOC facilities 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 course be delivered in their courts at their convenience. For domestic violence education courses, some funding is provided for participant costs not covered by CFCC grant funding. Typically between fifteen and thirty people attend each course.

Local Court Judicial Education

With the local education effort, 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 CJER with a proposed date. 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, the AOC pays for faculty travel expenses and course materials and will provide audiovisual support as requested. In addition, many of the classes offered locally were taken from classes offered in our statewide programs as well as from some trial court programs and they are uniquely appropriate for local delivery. The courses offer effective judicial education in substantive areas of law, as well as access, collaborative courts, computer training, court security, domestic violence, fairness, judicial ethics, and self represented litigants. The faculty members who teach the courses are very experienced in the areas they teach and they are trained in adult learning principles.

Courses are designed for approximately twenty participants. The number of local courses offered, and the resulting number of participants, is dependent upon how many courts request these courses in any given year.

B. Essential & Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$34,000, \$3,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Manager and Supervisor Training

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$34,000 (increase of \$3,000)

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging for Core 40 and Core 24 Courses, but not for the ICM courses. Courts or participants fund lodging for ICM participants. Funds are also used to pay for business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for all of the courses. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs.

The estimated funding needs for each program are:

- a. Institute for Court Management (ICM) Courses: \$15,000
- b. Core 40 Courses: 10,000Core 24, Parts 1 and 2Courses: \$9,000

Purpose

- a. *The Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses comprise a series which lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts. The courses serve a dual purpose: (a) to provide relevant education courses for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Managers, and (b) to provide this education locally at a significantly reduced cost to courts and participants as compared to the national programs. The series of courses are the primary education offered by CJER which addresses essential functions of court managers. This program grew out of a multi-state consortium formed in 2008 between the California Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), ICM, and six other states to enhance the existing ICM certification program and prepare court leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to effectively manage courts in the future. This effort has resulted in the AOC being certified to provide affordable delivery of management education 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 have been developed which comprise the certification program: Fundamental Issues of Caseflow Management; Court Performance Standards (CPS): 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. 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 remains a viable educational opportunity, promoting professional and personal development for court leaders. Funding will enable CJER to offer the twelve courses on the Education Plan for this year for up to three hundred and sixty participants.

- b. The week-long 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 their leadership skills as well as enhance the overall performance of their staff. Classes are limited to 28 participants who are selected from applications received online. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management.
- c. The three-day CORE 24 program is designed for experienced managers and takes them through more advanced topics and areas, including topics such as leadership skills, fiscal/budget management and planning, presentation skills, business reengineering, communication, technology, and conflict management. This course is also intended to begin

preparing experienced management for possible development for the next phase of their careers in the courts.

C. Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$143,000, \$13,000 increase from FY 2013–2014: Details described in specific program areas below.

Court Personnel Institutes

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$132,000 (increase of \$12,000)

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Court Clerk Training Institute. Lodging costs have increased across all live program budgets and so are the primary driver for these augmentation requests.

In FY 2013–2014, the Education Plan developed by the CJER Governing Committee includes the following institutes:

- a. Court Clerks Training Institute– \$70,000
Funding covers lodging and group meals for at total of 140 participants at two one-week programs. Additional costs covered include participant materials production, meeting room rental and AV equipment rental.
- b. Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute – \$50,000
This program will not be offered in 2014-15. Funding in this line items will be required to offset increased costs of an additional Judicial Education Institute in this fiscal year. A request to reallocate will be made after approval of the CJER Education Plan.

Purpose

- a. Court Clerk Training Institute
This week-long program offers courtroom and court legal process clerks education in each area of the court (civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, juvenile). Courts must have staff who are well trained and who are prepared to provide excellent customer service along with accurate legal information. They must also be knowledgeable, familiar with the Rules of Court, and changes to the laws that affect their responsibilities and their customers' access to justice. Classes taught by experienced court staff include Criminal Misdemeanors, Criminal Felony, Civil Procedures, Traffic, Probate, Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency, and Family. CCTI was started by Orange Court in 1998 and was subsequently transferred to the AOC in early 1990s as a statewide program.

CCTI has a special relationship with the smaller courts, although all 58 courts have accessed this education for their staff. Smaller courts do not often have training departments and rely on CJER to provide a statewide perspective on the duties and responsibilities of courtroom and counter staff. It is the larger courts who often provide faculty for this program. CCTI has been an essential education program for courts for more than 25 years and continues to prepare court staff for the essential functions of their jobs consistent with the law and statewide practices. Letting staff go for a week of education is a burden to the courts, but one

they are willing to bear as we have not added the cost of hotel rooms to their share of the costs. 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.

Two programs are planned for this year, for a total of one hundred and forty participants.

b. Trial Judicial Attorneys Institute

The 2 1/2 day Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute (TCJAI) is offered on a biannual cycle and was last offered in 2014 for 182 participants. TCJAI is typically attended by research attorneys employed by the trial courts throughout the state and offers a wide variety of education in the major judicial assignments of criminal, family, dependency, delinquency and civil law. This program is especially needed because, unlike attorneys employed at the appellate and supreme courts, trial court research attorneys are subject to the mandatory continuing legal education (MCLE) requirements promulgated by the California State Bar. This education requirement increases the responsibility trial court research attorneys have to obtain relevant legal education and the multi-day Trial Judicial Attorneys Institute is virtually the only major educational program CJER offers to this judicial branch audience.

Regional and Local Court Staff Courses

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$11,000, \$1,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the following. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs.:

- a. Court Personnel Regional and Local Courses
- b. Core Leadership and Training Skill Course

Purpose

- a. As with Regional and Local Court Judicial Education, Regional and Local Court Staff education allows CJER to provide high-quality judicial education to the trial courts at a greatly reduced cost and with a greatly 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, multi-day education events. And now 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 included in both the regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees which are devoted to court staff education and are taught by experienced CJER faculty.

Courses cover a wide array of topics; human resources, traffic, case processing in the major court assignments of civil, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile, as well as broad topics relevant to all court staff, such as preventing sexual harassment.

- b. The Core Leadership and Training Skills course, also offered regionally and locally, is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this two-day course teaches participants behaviors 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.

D. Faculty and Curriculum Development

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$278,000, \$16,000 increase from FY 2013–2014: Details described in specific program areas below.

Statewide Education Programs - Trial Court Faculty

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$249,000, \$13,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

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 provided. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs.

Purpose

Faculty who are asked to serve as volunteers are not likely to be able to offer their services if their expenses are not covered. Local courts would be hard pressed to support a judge or court staff faculty member's desire to serve as faculty if the cost of that service is passed to the local court.

Faculty Development

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$28,000, \$3,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

The funding covers the cost of lodging, group meals, and travel for participants at train the trainer and faculty development programs, some of which are foundational for new faculty and some of which are designed to support specific courses or programs. The increased cost is due primarily to increased lodging costs.

Purpose

Faculty development is a critical component of the effectiveness of the judicial branch education system, which is almost completely dependent on judges and court staff volunteering to teach their peers. Serving as faculty is a leadership function that requires subject matter expertise, knowledge, experience, and confidence in one's design and delivery skills. Competent subject matter experts must also possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities to design and deliver education effectively. 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 CJER provides home to their courts in the form of local court education.

Curriculum Committees and Education Plan Development

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,000, no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for business meals of committee members involved in curriculum development work associated with Domestic Violence Education.

Purpose

Domestic Violence curriculum committee meetings are held in-person once a year with costs of travel and lodging covered under grant funding. This funding was established to pay for the cost of meals and breaks that cannot be covered by the grant funding.

E. Distance Learning

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$147,000, no change from FY 2013–2014: Details described in specific program areas below.

Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$137,000, no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be 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.

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 for education by judges, managers and staff 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.

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 SB1407 and CRC 10.500. Broadcast education is also provided specifically for judges, presiding judges, and CEOs.

Education delivered via satellite to court staff includes such topics as:

- Criminal Justice Realignment
- Updates to the ADA
- The jury process
- Felony and misdemeanor appeals
- Certifying copies
- Customer service

Education delivered via satellite for Managers and Supervisors includes such topics as:

- Business Process Reengineering
- Handling disasters
- Coaching and communication
- Technology management
- Change Management
- Stress management
- Preventing and Responding Sexual Harassment

Education delivered via satellite for PJs and CEOs includes such topics as:

- ADA issues for Court Leaders
- Court Security
- Ethical Excellence

Education delivered via satellite for Justices and Judges includes such topics as:

- Criminal Justice Realignment
- AB939 Overview
- Judicial Canons Updates
- How a child enters the Juvenile Dependency system

Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars, & Videoconferences

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$10,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds will be used to pay for storage, encoding and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products delivered online.

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 mediated technologies the AOC has acquired over the past ten years and enables 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 for the purpose of developing and transmitting broadcasts, is now used frequently to create instructional videos which are immediately uploaded to either the Serranus (judicial) or COMET (administrative) web sites. Funding is needed to enable streaming of judicial education videos to mobile devices like I-PADs as well as desktop computers, and to improve video quality to a standard that users have come to expect. Videoconferencing technology provides an ideal venue for the appellate courts which are small in number and which are spread across the state. Videoconferencing is an immediate, live technology which enables CJER to design classroom style programming for this critical audience. Webinars, largely due to their enormous cost savings as compared to other models, have proliferated over the past two years and have largely replaces live meetings.

Court Operations Special Services Office

Trial Court Performance (Measures Study) and Accountability

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$13,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding for FY 2014–15 would allow for two in-person meetings of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (formerly the SB 56 Working Group) – 15 member courts with approximately 20 people travelling.

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) is charged with evaluating and revising the trial court judicial and staff case weights with two goals: (1) to take into account changes in workload over time; and (2) to incorporate measures of performance into the case weights. In addition, Office of Court Research (OCR) staff to WAAC have taken on additional responsibilities related to the conversion of workload estimates into estimates of funding need. This work has involved additional coordination with members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. WAAC will focus on work identified by the Judicial Council when it approved the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model at its February, 2013 meeting including: evaluation of data quality; identification of performance standards; evaluation of the fit of the RAS model to small courts; and ongoing modifications and improvements to the RAS and judicial workload assessment models. The advisory committee will also begin designing a project plan and methodology for the next workload studies update.

Approximately \$10,000 of Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund money would be used to fund travel of between 32 and 40 people to two meetings in FY 2014–2015, with the balance used for travel to meetings of subgroup members devoted to specific issues (e.g., data quality, performance standards).

Purpose

Government Code 69614 requires biennial updates to the Judicial Workload assessment which is overseen by WAAC. Government Code 77001.5 requires an annual report to the Legislature of “judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice,” which WAAC is also charged with overseeing. At the April 2013 Judicial Council meeting, the council adopted a new funding formula for the trial courts—the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)—which is based on the RAS model, making the ongoing improvement and updating of the RAS model more important than ever.

JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$347,600, \$16,600 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

JusticeCorps is one of the judicial branch’s key access to justice initiatives. JusticeCorps is funded through an AmeriCorps grant, with matching funds provided by the participating courts and the AOC. The courts’ matching funds are made up primarily of STCIMF allocations. STCIMF funding for FY 2014–2015 will support the 11th year of JusticeCorps program operations at six partnering courts (Los Angeles, San Diego, Alameda, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Mateo). Funding will be distributed directly via Intrabranh Agreements (IBAs) to the designated lead courts—Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego—to continue their successful efforts. These funds are largely used by these courts to support program operating expenses, including staff salaries, training expenses, and other member support costs.

The following chart illustrates the proposed allocation of STCIMF funding, as well as funding and costs for each region relative to the entire statewide program:

Region	Total Combined IMF and Ameri Corps Grant funds (Proposed)	% Total Funds	IMF Fund Amount (Proposed)	%e IMF Funds	Ameri Corps Grant Amount (Proposed)	% Grant	# of Ameri Corps Members
LA	\$634,450	55%	\$ 177,600	52%	\$457,000	57%	138
Bay Area (Alameda Superior Lead Court)	\$349,000	30%	\$ 128,000	36%	\$221,000	27%	77
San Diego	\$164,000	15%	\$42,000	12%	\$122,000	16%	52
Total	\$1,146,450		\$347,600		\$800,000		267

Purpose

JusticeCorps represents a cost-saving solution to support mandated self-help centers that continue to be underresourced and are experiencing a high increase in volume and need due to the current economic crisis. 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 to complete and file the forms properly and also providing information and referrals to related services.

The JusticeCorps program presents an innovative, cost-effective approach to increasing access to justice for self-represented litigants. Supported by statewide data collection and analysis, external program evaluations, and regular monitoring by funder representatives, the program has shown measureable results since it began in 2004.

In the 2012–2013 program year, 277 students provided assistance to over 100,000 litigants in more than 20 legal self-help centers statewide. We expect to match or exceed those goals in 2013–2014, even with a somewhat reduced total member complement of 262 students.

Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment and Education

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$168,000; \$28,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

At the requested level of funding, the Court Language Access Support Program (CLASP) will be able to sustain and develop the court interpreter pool and promote quality interpretation by providing for the testing, continuing education requirements and increased recruitment efforts of new interpreters and interpreter candidates, as well as continue to provide programmatic support to the roughly 1800 certified and registered California court interpreters used throughout the courts statewide.

Specifically, at the current level of funding, the Court Language Access Support Program would be able to provide, at a minimum, all 58 courts with qualified court interpreters by continuing to provide the following:

- Statewide administration of testing by a Judicial Council-approved testing entity, which ensures consistency in the standards for test administration, test content, test scoring and reporting not only statewide, but nationally. We currently partner with 45 National Center for State Courts (NCSC) member states. Partnership provides the ability to share costs of new test development. Local administration of testing by individual courts is not a feasible option. Allocated funds subsidize a contract with an outside vendor to administer approximately 2,100 tests per year.
- Targeted outreach and recruitment activities resulting in a growing number of qualified individuals entering the court interpreter profession. Recruitment efforts are mandated under GC §68562(d). Continuing these activities will result in increasing the pool of qualified spoken language and ASL interpreters available to the courts.
- Infrastructure supporting the use of Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). A pilot program for the use of VRI in ASL cases was conducted. This equipment and the infrastructure supporting it is being used by the courts. Allocated funds subsidize service agreements to continue maintenance of the equipment.
- Sponsoring ethics workshops and retaining qualified instructors. These workshops must occur annually for interpreters to meet the requirements of rule 2.890 of the California Rules of Court and GC §68562(e). They also meet the continuing education and compliance requirements required of all new interpreters. These workshops directly benefit the courts in that new interpreters are aware of their duties to the profession and the codes of conduct expected of them while interpreting in the courtroom. These workshops are open to all interpreters, providing a review of the code of ethics to which all court interpreters must adhere and are delivered to approximately 150 – 200 interpreters per year.
- Supporting workshops for court interpreters bargaining regions to provide updated information to assist trial courts' interpreter services staff with court interpreter issues, applying MOUa, and programmatic updates that may involve court operations and/or discussing protocols and procedures in procuring qualified court interpreter services.
- Supporting one in-person meeting of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP), which is established by rule 10.51. Supporting one in person meeting of the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (LAP). The Judicial Council approved the establishment of the Joint Working group to provide recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access throughout the courts. The end result will be a statewide Language Access Plan (LAP).
- Producing approximately 250 court interpreter identification badges per year, both to new interpreters and those requesting replacements, thus providing courts with a means for identifying interpreters.

Purpose

California is mandated by Government Codes 68561 – 68566 to provide certified and registered interpreters for litigants with limited English proficiency in all mandated cases. The Judicial Council is responsible for certifying and registering court interpreters and for developing a comprehensive program to ensure an available, competent pool of qualified interpreters.

From 2004-2008, the state's courts provided more than 1 million service days of spoken language interpretative services. Additionally, there are national and state efforts underway in providing broader language access services in all points of the court process; to this end the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) has collaborated with the Advisory Committee on Access and Fairness in establishing the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan.

The current programs and projects, for which funding is requested, support the statutory mandates discussed above and directly benefit all trial courts by ensuring that certified and registered interpreters meet the standards set by the Judicial Council.

Supporting the Court Interpreters Program at the current level of funding will provide, at a minimum, the ability to maintain the mandated requirements set forth in statute. With the increasing need for the expansion of language access services in the courts, as well as the mandate to provide certified and registered interpreters in all criminal and some civil proceedings, and anticipation of the authority to provide for interpreters in all civil matters, the recommended allocation level will allow the Court Language Access Support Program to sustain the delivery of vital services to the courts, ensuring a competent and available pool of qualified interpreters to serve the needs of those with limited English proficiency (LEP).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL AND COURT LEADERSHIP SERVICES DIVISION

Legal Services Office

Litigation Management Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$4.5 million; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

As it has been every year since the Litigation Management Program was established by the Judicial Council in December 1999, the funding will be spent to pay settlements, judgments (if any), and litigation costs, including attorney fees, arising from claims and lawsuits against the trial courts. In addition, at court request, the Legal Services Office will provide counsel to assist courts with responses to subpoenas or to assist judges with answers to disqualification statements. Over the past five years, the LSO has managed annually an average of 460 claims and lawsuits, including employment lawsuits, against the trial courts, and has provided counsel for, on average, 98 subpoenas and 68 judicial disqualifications per year.

Purpose

Government Code section 811.9 directs the Judicial Council to provide for representation, defense, and indemnification of claims and lawsuits against the judicial branch, including all trial courts. Rules 10.201 and 10.202 describe the procedures and responsibilities for managing and resolving claims and lawsuits. As anticipated by the Judicial Council, centralized management provides the benefit of consistency in defense strategy and permits the efficiencies of sharing legal research and pleadings in similar matters. The centralized program also enables the LSO to identify and assist courts in addressing similar issues that arise in different parts of the state, such as challenges to electronic record access or issues concerning disability-related leaves of absence

and reasonable accommodation. In addition, the courts do not have to bear the burdens of locating counsel, negotiating law firm contracts, directing outside counsel, editing briefs, and reviewing bills. Just as the trial courts benefit by having access to these services, the general public benefits because judicial officers and trial court staff can focus on providing access to justice, rather than defending against lawsuits.

Judicial Performance Defense Insurance

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$966,600, \$46,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

The funding for this program is used to pay the insurance premium for trial court judges and subordinate judicial officers for a master insurance policy for the defense of judicial officers in proceedings before the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP). The program, which began in 1999, is open to all justices, judges, commissioners, referees, and hearing officers. To obtain insurance coverage, judicial officers must agree to complete an ethics training program once every three years. All but six judicial officers are enrolled in the program.

Purpose

The program is not required by statute or rule of court. The program was developed as a result of a Judicial Council action in 1999 authorizing the Administrative Director to enter into an insurance policy contract to provide this coverage to all judicial officers. The benefit derived from this program is that all judicial officers are covered by the insurance policy. Formerly, each court decided individually whether it would provide coverage for its judicial officers. Consequently, some judicial officers had coverage and others did not.

The general public benefits because judicial officers are not distracted by CJP investigations, which can be time-consuming. In 2012, approximately 70 percent of the investigations were closed without discipline. Instead of the judicial officers spending time responding to allegations, defense attorneys compensated under the policy represent them and respond to the CJP on their clients' behalf.

Subscription Costs – Judicial Conduct Reporter

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$17,100, \$1,500 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

This quarterly publication is provided to all judicial officers as part of the AOC's ethics education program. It is also distributed to Judicial Council members and certain judicial branch employees and is posted on Serranus. In view of the California judiciary's budgetary issues, the publisher has provided an electronic version of the publication for a flat fee of \$18,200 per year, \$17,080 of which is paid for with funds from the IMF, with the remainder paid for from funds allocated to the appellate courts.

Purpose

There is no statute or rule that requires the Judicial Council to provide this publication. In 2000, the AOC made a decision to subscribe to the publication as part of the AOC's ethics education program. The specific benefit derived from this program is that the publication contributes to the ethics education of all judicial officers with all courts benefiting from its distribution. The general public benefits from the subscription because ethics education for judicial officers promotes the integrity of the judiciary and enhances public confidence in the judiciary.

Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$451,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

The Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program (TCTAP) was established within the LSO in FY 2001–2002 to respond to trial court requests for legal services on transactional and business operational matters. Initially the TCTAP fund was used to provide transactional legal assistance to the courts through outside counsel selected and managed by the LSO. Subsequently, the Judicial Council broadened authorized uses of the TCTAP funds to include all legal services required by the trial courts relating to trial court operations. Currently, the TCTAP fund is primarily used to provide legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel on labor matters, including approximately 69 labor arbitrations arising under trial court/union collective bargaining agreements per year and approximately 17 administrative proceedings before the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) per year.

In addition to providing legal assistance with trial court labor matters, and as a result of the reduced attorney staffing in LSO, it is anticipated that the TCTAP Fund will be used to engage outside counsel to assist trial courts in the following areas, if necessary: major transactions involving information services, finance, and significant transactional matters. The fund would also be used for tax and employee benefit-related legal advice, if necessary.

Purpose

As anticipated by the Judicial Council, centralized management of legal services provides the benefit of consistency in defense strategy and permits the efficiencies of sharing information, legal research, and pleadings in similar matters. The centralized program also enables LSO to identify and assist courts in addressing similar issues that arise in different parts of the state, such as challenges to disciplinary action, and to retain outside counsel with substantial experience in working with the courts under the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act. With respect to transactional matters, courts receive assistance from counsel with specialized and unique skills not possessed by LSO or court counsel, and from outside counsel when demand for legal services exceeds workload capacity of LSO's reduced staff. Courts benefit by not having to hire their own in-house counsel or retain outside counsel and bear the burdens of negotiating law firm contracts, directing outside counsel, reviewing and editing legal briefs, and reviewing bills. The general public benefits because judicial officers and trial court staff can focus on providing access to justice, rather than defending against labor-related claims and performing or purchasing legal services necessary to trial court operations.

Jury System Improvement Projects

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$19,000, \$1,000 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

The funding for this project comes from the royalties received from licensing and publishing the Judicial Council's official civil and criminal jury instructions. (See Gov. Code, § 77209(i) ("Royalties received from the publication of uniform jury instructions shall be deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund and used for the improvement of the jury system.")) Under rule 2.1050, the AOC requires commercial publishers to acquire a license before publishing the instructions and to pay royalties in exchange for permission to publish the instructions.

In 2013–14, the program funds will be used to (1) support the meeting expenses of the Advisory Committees on Criminal and Civil Jury Instructions; and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official publication of the Judicial Council’s jury instructions.

a) **Advisory Committee Meeting Expenses (approximately \$16,500/fiscal year)**

The two advisory committees play an integral role in updating the jury instructions. The advisory committees are charged with regularly reviewing case law and statutes affecting jury instructions and making recommendations to the council for updating, amending, and adding topics to the council’s criminal and civil jury instructions. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 10.58 and 10.59.) Each committee produces at least two releases of new and revised instructions each year and presents them to the council for adoption. On adoption, the AOC prepares and transmits the manuscript to licensed publishers for publication in print and other media. Royalties from these publications make up the fund.

Each of the advisory committees meets in person once or twice a year and by videoconference and teleconference as needed throughout the year. Advisory committee subcommittees or working groups also meet by teleconference, videoconference, or in person during the year, as needed.

b) **Copyright of Jury Instructions (approximately \$390/fiscal year)**

To protect the council’s copyright in the jury instructions, each time the council approves new or amended instructions, the AOC registers a copyright in them. Project funding will be used to pay for copyright application filing fees (\$65 per application). By doing the registrations in-house instead of using outside counsel, the branch will be saving approximately \$2610 per fiscal year.

Purpose

The program’s purpose is to support the development of the Judicial Council’s civil and criminal jury instructions, protect the instructions approved by the council, and provide for continued royalties to fund this program and other programs “for the improvement of the jury system.” (Gov. Code, § 77209(i).) The “jury instructions approved by the Judicial Council are the official instructions for use in California.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.1050.) The goal of the instructions is “to improve the quality of jury decision making by providing standardized instructions that accurately state the law in a way that is understandable to the average juror.” (Ibid.)

Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$75,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Historically, the ADR Program provided direct financial support to help courts plan, implement, maintain, and improve mediation and settlement programs for unlimited and limited civil cases and small claims, unlawful detainer, and civil harassment proceedings (civil cases). In FY2011–2012, the budget for the ADR Program was reduced from \$1,740,000 to \$75,000 to help address the \$20 million reduction to the Modernization Fund. If the ADR Program continues to receive \$75,000 in FY 2014–2015, the funds will be used, as they were in FY2011–2012 to FY 2013–2014, to contract for the development of materials to help support court-connected ADR programs across the state. Based on input provided by an ad hoc group of Court Executive

Officers and ADR Program Administrators, these statewide materials may include: (1) a resource manual for courts to help self-represented litigants access and effectively participate in court ADR programs; (2) resources to help courts determine the optimum ADR program types and service models to efficiently use their limited resources; and/or (3) templates to help courts efficiently review and analyze responses to post-mediation surveys.

Purpose

The ADR Program helps to resolve cases more quickly, reduce court workloads, save litigants' time and money, and improve user satisfaction with court services by promoting the availability, use, and quality of court-connected mediation and settlement programs for civil cases. The ADR Program also helps courts fulfill section 10.70(a) of the Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations, and implements Goal IV, Policy 6, of the 2006–2012 strategic plan for the California Judicial Branch, which is to: "Support and expand the use of successful dispute resolution programs."

All courts with ADR programs for civil cases may directly benefit from the development of statewide materials, including videos, surveys, and training materials, to promote the use and quality of these programs and materials to help self-represented litigants access and effectively participate in court ADR programs. The ADR Program benefits civil litigants across the state by helping courts provide mediation and settlement programs, and information about how to effectively participate in those programs. The program also benefits litigants and the public by helping courts increase the options for resolving disputes, reduce the public and private costs associated with trials and hearings, reduce the time required to resolve disputes, and increase trust and confidence in the courts.

Complex Civil Litigation Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$4,001,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

The following describes use of funds under the current program structure, which has remained the same since the program's inception. If the TCBAC would like to consider alternatives, such as distribution among a larger number of courts, or different allocations to the existing six program courts, staff will provide information about those alternatives.

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will be distributed to the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties. These funds are spent by the courts to maintain a total of 17 dedicated complex litigation departments in six superior courts with the following characteristics: assignment of each complex case to a single judge to handle all aspects of the litigation; judges who have experience, interest, and expertise in handling complex civil litigation; innovative case management techniques, technology designed for complex cases; and additional (beyond a typical civil department) experienced court personnel, including a dedicated research attorney for each department. The expenditures support the operation of courtrooms handling hundreds of complex cases with exceptional judicial management to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the court (as a whole) or litigants and to expedite the case, keep costs reasonable, and promote effective decision making by the court, the parties, and counsel. Hundreds of parties benefit from the program.

Purpose

Courts benefit from the focused and efficient case management techniques applied by experienced program judges to more expeditiously resolve complex cases. The program allows the most management-intensive cases to be removed from the pool of general civil cases where they would delay dispositions overall. This is explained by program courts in their responses to a 2012 survey. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County stated, “Experience has demonstrated that, when complex cases are mixed with a calendar of general jurisdiction cases, the litigation activity generated by even one ‘unmanaged’ complex case can occupy the law-and-motion calendar of a civil courtroom for days or even weeks. It is not an exaggeration to say that, in Los Angeles, it might take 9 months to a year to be able to calendar a motion in a general jurisdiction court if the [program] cases were spread among the general jurisdiction courts. The public, regardless of the size of their cases, would be severely adversely impacted.” Thus, through the program, members of the public with complex cases, as well as non-complex cases benefit.

In April 2010, the council recognized that the efforts and expertise of judges and staff dedicated to the program have resulted in the effective resolution of thousands of complex cases and reduced the time to resolution for many of them, and honored the judges, staff, and participating courts for their contributions in ensuring access to justice for all Californians.

Regional Office Assistance Group

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,460,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

The ROAG was established within LSO in FY 2004–2005 to provide direct legal services to trial courts from regional locations. In FY 2014–2015, as in prior years, ROAG attorneys will provide legal services in the areas of labor/employment, legal opinions, and transactional/business operations directly to trial courts. The following activities for FY 2013–2014 provide a measure of the anticipated scope/volume of direct legal services to courts in FY 2014–2015 provided by LSO attorneys including those in ROAG-funded positions.

Labor and Employment: Provided legal services on labor/employment issues, including wage/hour issues, leaves of absence, discrimination, harassment, unfair labor practices, workers’ compensation, workplace safety, complaint investigation/resolution, and personnel policies/procedures. During FY 2013–2014, handled approximately 400¹ inquiries, 52 prelitigation matters, 63 labor arbitrations, and 16 matters filed with the Public Employment Relations Board.

Legal Opinions: Responded to requests for legal opinions/advice from trial courts on numerous issues, from use of public funds to ethics. In FY 2013–2014, received 335 requests for legal opinions/ advice from trial courts and provided guidance responding to 321 requests.

Transactions and Business Operations: Provided legal assistance/advice on court business operations and transactions including negotiating and drafting contracts/MOUs, as well as business and legal issues involving procurement, outsourcing, security, intellectual property, and risk management. With the Judicial Council’s adoption of the *Judicial Branch Contracting Manual* on August 26, 2011, in response to the new California Judicial Branch Contract Law,

¹ The total number of inquiries for FY 2012–13 is currently not available. Report will be amended as soon as final statistic is developed.

LSO regional counsel continue to assist courts with interpretation and application of the new law to trial court procurement programs. Over 450 matters of varying complexity handled during FY 2013–2014.

Purpose

The Judicial Council has charged LSO with providing comprehensive legal services to the trial courts. The ROAG is a cost-effective means to meet that mandate through in-house attorneys who are subject matter experts within their specialized areas of law and experienced counselors possessing valuable background information on the local operations and workings of the trial courts. The program achieves cost savings in numerous ways: (1) salaried LSO attorneys are less costly than purchasing similar services from outside counsel; (2) a dedicated attorney group focused on trial court operations legal issues that is available as a single legal resource to all 58 trial courts promotes efficiency; and (3) the ROAG model allows for sharing of legal services among trial courts with similar needs and issues. The ROAG offers legal assistance to all 58 courts in the areas of labor and employment law, legal opinions, and transactional law. The program benefits the general public by relieving the courts of the need to engage and manage outside counsel for these types of legal services.

Internal Audit Services

Audit Contract

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$150,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

The audit contract funding has provided funding for external consulting firms to perform comprehensive audits and special projects for the superior courts to ensure the superior courts are audited on a timely basis and with a regular audit cycle as approved by the Judicial Council. This program in concert with General Fund monies provides the resources to perform superior court audits, special reviews, consulting and advisory services, and special investigations.

Purpose

The internal audit function, Internal Audit Services (IAS), was created “by the mandate of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 [Ch. 850, St. 1997], which gives the AOC fiscal oversight responsibilities of the trial courts.” The General Fund, TCIF, and State Court Facilities Construction Fund have provided the resources to perform audits, special reviews, consulting and advisory services, and special investigations of the superior courts. TCIF provides approximately 40% of the staff funding of IAS. TCIF also funds the costs of external consulting firms performing comprehensive audits and special projects for the superior courts to ensure the superior courts are audited on a timely basis and within a regular audit cycle as approved by the Judicial Council. In concert with the General Fund monies, this provides the resources to perform superior court audits, special reviews, consulting and advisory services, and special investigations.

The program as a whole, primarily the consultation services, has assisted the superior courts in saving tens of millions of dollars since 2001 and continues to assist the branch in visibly demonstrating its commitment to accountability (Goal II of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch 2006–2012).

Internal Audits

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$660,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will be used for ongoing costs associated with staff supporting the branch’s ongoing internal audit program.

Purpose

The internal audit program was initially approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2000–2001. Internal Audit Services conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) encompassing court administration, cash controls, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations at each of the 58 trial courts approximately once every four years. These activities improve accountability regarding the judicial branch’s use of public resources, assist the branch in identifying opportunities to improve operational efficiency, and evaluate the branch’s adherence to its statutory and constitutional mandates.

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

Fiscal Services Office

Budget Focused Training and Meetings

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$50,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description/Purpose

The proposed allocation will cover the costs of approximately six in-person meetings of the full Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC), four in-person meetings of its subcommittees, a number of TCBAC and statewide budget conference calls, and the non-staff cost of providing technical training to courts by the AOC Office of Budget Management (e.g., Schedule 7A, QFS) .

Treasury Services

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$238,000, no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will be used for ongoing costs associated with staff responsible for the accounting and distribution of civil fees collected by the trial courts. These two positions support the daily accounting and monthly distribution of Uniform Civil Fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts including, entering the information into the financial system application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions when due to the State and local agency recipients, and accounting for the function within the Phoenix financial accounting system.

Purpose

With the centralized financial system application, all 58 trial courts need only to generate a monthly UCF collection report and provide the report to the AOC’s Treasury Unit. The Treasury Unit then distributes and accounts for the activity significantly reducing the trial courts’ UCF processing and reporting

workload . These two positions also provide other cash management and treasury support for the trial courts.

Trial Court Procurement

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$244,000; no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funding in FY 2014–2015 will be used for ongoing costs associated with staff that support the statewide master agreement program being utilized by the trial courts.

Purpose

The program solicits agreements for goods and services commonly used by the courts, thus relieving the courts of the work involved in soliciting bids and proposals and negotiating and executing agreements on their own. It has been in place since 2005. The agreements have been widely used by the courts, and each year has seen increased participation by the trial courts. In addition, because of economies of scale associated with statewide agreements, these master agreements have resulted in pricing that is significantly below what most courts could receive on their own. Also, the master agreements provide for a consistent set of terms and conditions that better mitigate risk for the courts.

Enhanced Collections

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$0, change funding source to TCTF

Description

Funding in FY 2014–15 will be used for ongoing costs associated with staff supporting the AOC’s Enhanced Collections Unit. The unit provides professional and technical support to all 58 courts and counties, justice partners, and other affiliated organizations, in the establishment and enhancement of programs to improve efficiencies and performance in the collection of delinquent and non-delinquent court-ordered debt. The unit will work with the courts and counties on the discharge of uncollectable debt. In addition, the unit compiles and produces the annual report to the Legislature about the statewide performance of the collection of court ordered debt, which is required by Penal Code section 1463.010. In FY 2012–2013, statewide collections programs collected a total of \$668.8 million in delinquent court-ordered debt. Since reporting began in FY 2008–2009, a total of \$3.3 billion in delinquent court-ordered debt has been collected by court and county collections programs. Total outstanding delinquent debt at the end of FY 2012–2013 was \$8.3 billion.

Purpose

The Enhanced Collections Unit was established to provide program support to courts and counties in their efforts to develop or improve the collection of court-ordered delinquent debt.

Human Resources Services Office

Judicial Officer Assistance Program

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$0, eliminate funding of \$34,000 for the program

Description

FY 2013–2014 funds have been used to provide various assistance and support to approximately

1,500 judicial officers and their families in dealing with a wide range of personal, family, and financial matters. These functions are outsourced to a vendor, and the vendor is tasked with providing the following services:

- Maintain a toll-free telephone access line 24 hours per day for participant access to JOAP services. Specialists will be available through the telephone access line to assess the caller's problem and arrange for appropriate assistance;
- Link each participant who requests in-person counseling services to a counselor;
- Treatment compliance monitoring; will monitor the participant's compliance with a substance abuse treatment program, as needed; and
- Provide critical incident stress management services to employees to counter emotional distress caused by catastrophic or traumatic events and to foster sharing of reactions, normalizing of reactions, and education on appropriate coping strategies.

Workers' Compensation Program Reserve

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,231,000, \$511,200 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

This allocation is for the purpose of paying workers' compensation tail claims costs associated with trial courts leaving a county-administered workers' compensation program.

Purpose

Effective January 1, 2001, the Trial Court Employment Protections and Governance Act transferred trial court employees from employment with the county to employment with the court. Government Code section 71623.5(b) requires the court to provide workers' compensation coverage for trial court employees except where the County continues to provide such coverage pursuant to Government Code section 71623.5(b).

As a result of the establishment of the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (JBWCP) and the requirements above, 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.

HR – Trial Court Investigation

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$94,500, \$5,500 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The Trial Court Investigations Program provides investigative services by a contracted licensed attorney. Each request for assistance is evaluated by the labor and employment relations unit (LERU) team in cooperation with the Labor and Employment Unit (LEU) in the Legal Services Office. Generally investigative services are provided by AOC staff in LERU. However, in some situations LEU and LERU have determined that completion of the investigation would be best served by a third party investigator. This generally occurs when AOC staff is fully committed to other assignments or a particular situation requires objective review by an outside third party investigator.

Purpose

The Labor and Employee Relations Unit (LERU) provides key labor and employee relations

support to the trial courts and the state judicial branch. Investigative services are one of the key services provided to the trial courts. A great majority of the time LERU staff conduct the formal investigation; however, there are times when the matter needs immediate attention or is sensitive in nature. In those cases, it is best advised to utilize an external resource. The Human Resources Services Office has maintained contracts with two law firms to ensure that services are available when needed.

In prior years, spending on trial court investigations had been limited. Historically the requests for investigatory assistance have totaled 20-25 per year with the LERU staff handling 75-80% of the investigations. However, more recently, the requests for assistance have increased significantly with 41 requests for investigatory assistance in fiscal year 2012–2013. The external investigative services were utilized for 11 of the 41 requests with the remaining 30 investigations completed by in-house staff.

Labor Relations Academy

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$34,700, \$4,700 increase from FY 2013–14

Description

FY 2013–2014 funds will be spent on two statewide academy events, with monies covering trial court attendee costs related to travel expenses, hotels, meals, copying/mailing pamphlets, and supplies such as certificates, educational material, and other incidentals as needed.

During the financial crisis this program has served as a conduit for sharing critical labor information between trial courts while also providing guidance on best labor relations practices. More than 75% of the trial courts send a representative to at least one of the labor meetings. In FY 2009–2010 the program was funded at \$36,150, in FY 2010–2011 the program was reduced to \$30,004, and in FY 2012–2013, the program was reduced to \$23,004. In order to meet these reductions and still provide the valuable services to the trial courts, programs were reduced in duration and in FY 2011–2012 the budget was exceeded by \$265.

Purpose

The Labor and Employee Relations Unit develops and hosts annual Labor Relations Academies to assist trial court professionals in understanding and effectively working in a labor environment. The academies provide varying levels of discussion, education, and training that is based upon the needs of the trial courts each year and based upon their input. The forums provide a venue for courts to have an open dialogue between AOC staff and court staff on current events related to labor relations issues. During the academies and forums, labor relations experts from both the AOC and the courts share updates, best practices, and potential hazard areas with the participants. The academy provides court administrators and HR professionals with baseline, consistent strategies in managing expectations (and potentially costs) during negotiations, at no cost to each court.

The Labor Academies and Forums were developed to address two legal mandates:

- a) The Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (TCEPGA), effective January 1, 2001, mandates that the trial courts become the employers for the approximately 19,000 trial court employees, most of whom are union-represented. Under this mandate, the trial

courts must accomplish all of the attendant human resources responsibilities of an employer, including all labor and employee relations functions, by January 1, 2003.

- b) The Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act ("TCIELRA" or "the Act") (Stats. 2002, Ch. 1047), effective January 1, 2003, created a new employment system for court interpreters under Government Code Section 71800 et seq. To more efficiently allocate scarce interpreter resources, the Act required trial courts to employ spoken language interpreters as court employees rather than as independent contractors on or after July 1, 2003 based upon specified criteria. Ultimately, this Act created new human resources responsibilities for the trial courts, adding four new regional labor agreements and approximately 800 union-represented employees.
- c) With labor relations becoming increasingly challenging over the past three years the need for a labor forum is critically important. Additionally there are new challenges which have created a need for an increased allocation, the first of which is the lack of a sufficient sized meeting space in the Burbank AOC offices, resulting in the need to have the academies at a southern California hotel. Secondly, the southern California courts have expressed the need for a Labor Relations Academy I, which has been eliminated due to the reductions to the budget.

Information Technology Services Office

Telecommunications Support

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$11,705,000, \$3,903,480 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The goal of the refresh cycle funded from the FY 2014–2015 allocation is to replace 250 routers and controllers. The reduced allocation for FY 2014–2015 is directly related to the type of equipment and less expensive routers and controllers that require refresh during the upcoming refresh cycle. Since the annual refresh cycles are based on outdated equipment that is no longer supported by the vendor, the FY 2014–2015 cycle is simply just less expensive than the equipment that needed to be replaced in FY 2013–2014, therefore resulting in savings for the program for FY 2014–2015.

In FY 2011–2012 no funds were allocated to support the technology refresh program for the trial courts, followed by a smaller than normal allocation in FY 2012–2013 which only allowed for 144 switches to be refreshed at 23 courts. In FY 2013–2014, the program was allocated an augmentation of \$6,868,480 to replace 548 network switches at 17 courts and keep the project on schedule. Failure to continue funding the refresh at the requested level will impact the scheduled replacement of hardware and may result in hardware failure and lost connectivity to courts' local networks as well as the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). If failed hardware is no longer supported, court outages may occur until the court acquires and installs new hardware and maintenance agreements. The refresh of the routers and remaining network equipment will be targeted the following two fiscal year, pending approved allocations.

This program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local and enterprise system applications such as Phoenix and case management systems, via shared services at the CCTC, which eases deployment and provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources.

The network technology refresh program has been offered each year to courts that participated in the initial telecommunications LAN WAN Initiative. The core objective of the program is to maintain the investment made in the original telecommunications project by updating local network equipment that is no longer supported due to aging technology. The project forecasts the refresh cycle by working with our service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement while reviewing both existing and new technologies available to the branch.

Network Maintenance

The network maintenance component affords trial courts critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure. Contracts for maintaining equipment have been negotiated to leverage the volume of the entire branch, resulting in savings that allowed the program to cover these charges, relieving individual courts of this burden and allowing them to redirect funding to other operational needs. The program negotiated a branch-wide agreement that saves the branch 31% over five years. Fifty-four trial courts currently participating in the network technology refresh are covered by this program.

The Network Security Services program maintains 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. These network security tools mitigate the risk of court data being erroneously exposed without proper authority and ensure continuous court operations to the public. Currently, 55 trial courts subscribe to at least one of the security services. Fifty-five courts subscribe to the managed firewall and intrusion prevention system; Alpine, Los Angeles and San Diego are scheduled to subscribe to the security services this fiscal year.

The Network Technology Training program affords court IT staff the opportunity to attend foundational and specialized network training courses via state-of-the-art training centers and comprehensive on-line courses. This ensures that the courts have the necessary skill sets to operate, maintain, and expand their infrastructure in response to local and enterprise needs.

In the ad hoc network consulting program, independent consultants are engaged to provide expert network engineering and program management as part of the network technology refresh project. These consultants are commonly utilized by the individual trial courts to offer local engineering services for court projects and issues outside of technology refresh projects.

The Network Equipment Trade-in program provides an avenue for the courts to dispose of outdated network technology. This option allows the branch the opportunity to reinvest old technology in order to maximize the branch purchasing power of future court technology refresh projects.

The core objective of the program is to maintain the investment made in the original telecommunications project by updating equipment that is no longer supported due to aging technology. The project forecasts the refresh cycle by working with our service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement while reviewing both existing and new technologies available to the branch.

Purpose

The program provides a secure, robust and scalable network infrastructure aligned with emerging

needs of enterprise court services. The LAN WAN initiative was responsible for providing the trial courts with the infrastructure required to physically separate from their county partners. The network technology refresh component continually refreshes equipment and technology to ensure the courts have the infrastructure required to offer the public reliable and continuous court access. All courts have now benefited from this program since its inception in 2003.

The branch is able to leverage better hardware and service discounts and benefit from a pool of expert network engineering resources. The same efforts would cost the courts much more in resources and funding if done from an individual court basis. The current support model allows us to pool resources, funding and ensures a standard network infrastructure and security architecture across the branch.

Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$5,268,500, \$145,700 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

This budget primarily funds the Oracle Branch-wide License Agreement (BWLA), which includes four components: enterprise database; advanced security; BEA WebLogic Suite; and identity manager with additional options. In addition, this budget funds the ITSO enterprise architecture (EA) and enterprise methodology and process (EMP) programs. The increase in program funding is due to the projected increase in program software.

The Oracle BWLA provides the entire branch with the identified Oracle products and unlimited use of these licenses. The enterprise architecture program identifies interdependencies between branch-wide data and systems to improve investments in technology, while the enterprise methodology and process program is dedicated to improving the organization's project management discipline and delivery, by developing a standard set of project artifacts, implementing project management best practices and standards, and maintaining a centralized information repository. This program does not directly distribute funds to the trial courts.

Purpose

The Oracle BWLA provides the entire branch with unlimited use of the covered Oracle software licenses, which frees local courts from having to burden resources with complex software asset management and costly annual maintenance renewals for the four components. Instead, local courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment, whenever needed, without the expense of license administration. Enterprise architects provide support to guide the development and implementation of statewide applications and ensure compatibility with CCTC infrastructure, communications and security protocols. The EMP develops and promotes standardized, repeatable processes to reduce complexity and increase efficiencies throughout the solution development lifecycle (SDLC), on both application and infrastructure efforts.

The efforts of the Enterprise Architecture (EA) and EMP programs align with Judicial Council Goal 3, Modernization of Management and Administration and Goal 6, Branch-wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. In addition, the EMP program promotes standardized, repeatable processes throughout the system development lifecycle that were requested by the Bureau of State Audits and the California Technology Agency in their review of the CCMS program, and recommended to be applied to all future technology projects.

The products included in the Oracle BWLA are key components to the courts' current and future application infrastructure throughout the branch, for both production and non-production environments. These Oracle products are an intrinsic part of CCMS V2 and V3, Phoenix, the Computer-Aided Facilities Management program (CAFM), Appellate Courts Case Management System (ACCMS), and the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). The licenses are also widely used by applications that are hosted at local superior court facilities. Courts may also request consultation from enterprise architects to assist with their local initiatives.

With responsibility for optimizing the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information, and the technical delivery of key branch-wide systems, ITSO supports and coordinates the application of technology throughout the judicial branch and manages centralized statewide technology projects. The Oracle BWLA, EA and EMP programs support a sound technological infrastructure and effective case management, facilities, finance, human resource, and other court systems to meet the needs of the public.

Interim Case Management System

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,246,800, \$403,800 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The budget for the ICMS program for FY 2014–2015 is being reduced. The cost reductions are related to continued deferment of various SJE projects while primarily focusing on those maintenance and operations projects that are required, along with incorporating minimal enhancements, while the SJE Court Consortium evaluates alternatives to replacing the SJE application. Additionally, there are one-time savings for FY 2014–2015 from deferred expenditures which are available for use that will not be available in subsequent years.

The ICMS Unit provides program support to trial courts running the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. The ICMS budget is used to fund project management support and technical expertise for the CCTC-hosted courts as well as the Sustain User Group. Support includes maintenance and operations activities such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades and patch management. Locally hosted SJE courts use ICMS program resources, as needed, for legislative updates and SJE support. A benefit available to SJE courts is the volume discount on licensing, provided by the vendor for courts hosted at the CCTC. The greater the number of users, the lower the licensing cost per user.

Funding for FY 2014–2015 will support:

- Production support
- Patch management
- Database stack upgrade including hardware refresh
- Legislative updates (e.g., Uniform Bail Schedule)
- Application enhancements (e.g. Imperial GC Services Interface)
- Disaster Recovery Exercises
- Infrastructure support and hosting services
- Support for testing and training

The ICMS unit also provides support, upon request, to courts with failing legacy case

management systems, analytical and consultative support to the Judicial Council Technology Committee for courts requesting funding assistance for deployment of a commercial case management system, and assists with drafting of Budget Change Proposals to request additional branchwide funding related to case management systems. In addition, the ICMS team has been assigned to support the SJE Path Forward Court Consortium in developing a go-forward strategy for courts currently deployed on Sustain Justice Edition.

ICMS costs that are reimbursed by the trial courts are funded from the TCTF while all other costs are funded from the IMF. IMF funds on average approximately 51% of the CCTC hosting cost for those trial courts who have SJE hosted at the CCTC. The remaining 49% is funded by the TCTF and reimbursed by the trial courts. There are no funds distributed directly to the courts from this program.

Purpose

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) is deployed in 16 courts across 40 court locations. The SJE courts include the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Imperial, Lake, Madera, Merced, Modoc, Monterey, Plumas/Sierra, San Benito, Trinity, Napa, Placer, Santa Barbara, Tulare, and Tuolumne counties. Nine courts are hosted in the California Courts Technology Center while six are hosted locally. The Sierra court processes their traffic citations using the Plumas Court's SJE instance.

The nine SJE Sustain courts hosted at the CCTC are deployed on a common architecture. Among other benefits, this common architecture enables a single solution for interfaces to justice partners such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Because interfaces such as DMV and DOJ are common among the nine SJE courts, enhancements can be leveraged for the benefit of all the courts. Locally hosted courts require separate efforts for their interfaces, including connectivity to the DMV.

The Interactive Voice Response (IVR) and Interactive Web Response (IWR) functions provide key benefits to the courts. The interfaces which support these functions were developed to provide the public an electronic mechanism for payment of fees and infractions. The IVR and IWR interface provides the public the ability to submit payments electronically 24/7, with the exception of downtime needed for hardware maintenance. Currently, 10 of the 16 courts are using the IVR and IWR function.

Data Integration

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$3,903,600, \$3,300 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The Data Integration (DI) program currently provides services that enable the secure and efficient exchange of information between the courts and their justice and integration partners. Funding for the DI program enables the technical infrastructure and support necessary to facilitate this integration. Funding is not distributed directly to the courts. The slight decrease in funding required for FY 2014–2015 is due to a minor cost adjustment in the program.

The technical infrastructure includes hardware and software hosted at the CCTC that comprises the Integration Services Backbone (ISB). The ISB is used to exchange information between systems, both internal and external to the branch.

The technical infrastructure includes sophisticated hardware and software hosted at the CCTC to facilitate communication with the California Department of Justice's (CA DOJ) and the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) infrastructure. Many of the applications hosted at the CCTC rely on the ISB infrastructure, including California Courts Protective Order Registry to function with external justice and integration partners.

The technical support provided by the Data Integration program is necessary to ensure the hosted technical infrastructure is adequately maintained and enhanced. Technical support is provided in the following ways:

- Hardware maintenance is funded for the refresh of aging and out of support hardware.
- Software maintenance is funded for TIBCO products (the foundation of the ISB); the Omnixx product, which supports DOJ access through CLETS; and the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products, which facilitate ad hoc DMV access. For all of these products, the maintenance allows for product support necessary to obtain version upgrades, patches and vendor support for production issues.
- TIBCO development services maintain and support the ISB infrastructure and the production interfaces, as well as, the common services that are used to simplify interface development and support.
- Datamaxx services provide updates and enhancements for the Omnixx infrastructure as needed in support of CLETS access.
- Concepts2000 services provide steady-state support for the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products.

Purpose

The ISB infrastructure provides a central communications hub that reduces the complexity and cost of maintaining numerous point to point interfaces between centrally hosted systems, court systems, and their justice and integration partners.

The number of courts benefitting from data integration steady state support of the following products and production ISB interfaces are identified below:

- DOJ California Restraining and Protective Order System interface in support of 23 courts using CCPOR.
- Warrants/FTA (Failure to Appear), Justice Partner web portal, and credit card payment interfaces for three courts.
- Phoenix HR and Financial interfaces for five courts and seven integration partners.
- Support for different partners and systems are funded by DI, not by individual programs, in a leveraged model, where personnel and system resources are shared among various programs; costs are not easily attributable to specific programs.
- Web portal for submitting JBSIS information, supporting 37 courts.
- Document Management System (DMS), index, file service and Employment Development Department interfaces for three V3 courts.
- The Omnixx product and Datamaxx services support seven courts that currently access CLETS directly, as well as the 23 courts and their local agencies using CCPOR.
- DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products, which facilitate ad hoc DMV access, support 12 CCTC-hosted courts that use the Sustain and V2 case management systems.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$10,487,200, \$1,022,100 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

This augmentation is needed to maintain the baseline services for the program, including upgrade of the end-user application access and security system, and to pay monthly invoices as obligated by the existing CCTC vendor contract. The existing end-user application access and security system is no longer supported by the vendor, and any outage may cause significant impacts to the courts' access to applications hosted at the CCTC.

The CCTC provides consistent, cost effective, and secure hosting services, including ongoing maintenance and operational support; data network management; desktop computing and local server support; tape back-up and recovery; help desk services; email services; and a dedicated service delivery manager. Today, the CCTC hosts service for all 58 California Superior Courts.

CCTC also provides a comprehensive disaster recovery program for court management systems, including Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Systems (SAP), California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR), Court Case Management, (V2, V3), Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS), and the Computer-Aided Facilities Management System (CAFM). The CCTC also provides a complete suite of IT services to five hosted Superior Courts (Madera, Modoc, San Benito, Lake, and Plumas).

Funding from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (STCIMF) and the TCTF for FY 2014–2015 will be expended on maintaining core services and court requested services. These services allow the courts to rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support within the CCTC to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues. Core services include:

- Data center application hosting services
- Local court server monitoring and remote site backup
- Data Center and local network management
- Help desk services
- Desktop and local server management and support services
- Hosted email services for 6 trial courts
- Disaster Recovery

None of the funding is distributed directly to the courts.

Purpose

In alignment with Judicial Council directives to affirm development and implementation of statewide technology initiatives, the CCTC program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center for use by all courts. Benefits to the courts through the CCTC include enterprise-wide hardware and software license agreements, including bulk volume discounts in purchasing. Centralized changes (e.g., hardware and software patches) are more efficient to install. Centralized help desk support provides the courts a single point of contact and minimizes the impact of major incidents.

In the event of a significant interruption of court services, the disaster recovery program ensures

that infrastructure and network services and trial court applications hosted in the CCTC can be safely and securely backed-up, redirected, and restored. Disaster recovery exercises routinely test the strength of the CCTC recovery strategy and ensure that vital court services, as well as data and communications, can be restored at a designated location.

This program supports Judicial Council objectives to allow the courts to take advantage of operational efficiencies and cost effective services, eliminating redundant expenditures, and providing a coordinated approach to addressing statewide technology initiatives.

The program provides public benefit by utilizing technology to achieve efficiencies in the superior courts. It provides ongoing cost-effective maintenance and support for programs which allows the consistent and accessible administration of justice throughout the state.

Jury Grant Program Support

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$600,000, no change from FY 2013–2014

Description

All trial courts are eligible to apply for the jury grant funding to improve their jury management systems. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the number and size of grant requests received from the trial courts. In FY 2013–2014, jury grant applications were received from 22 trial courts, which included 39 different projects, and totaled \$802,899. Of the 22 trial courts submitting jury grant applications, all 22 received some level of grant funding to assist with 33 of the 39 submitted projects. Funded projects ranged from keeping existing functionality intact by replacing aging hardware or upgrading jury management systems to implementing newer technology such as a juror self check-in module and a short message service (SMS) module that sends jury reminders via text/phone messages.

Purpose

Funding for the jury grant program started in FY 2000–2001 for trial courts to improve their jury management systems. The impetus for providing technology funding was implementation of one-day or one-trial juror service in all superior courts, which required courts to summon and process many more jurors than the earlier practice of two-week availability for service common throughout the state. When the program began, courts were working with outdated DOS versions of jury management systems that were vendor- or in-house developed. These systems had reached the end of their useful life and required upgrading as they could not adequately support the new requirements of one-day or one-trial.

All 58 trial courts have an opportunity to participate and take advantage of this program and, to date, 55 of 58 courts have received some level of funding.

As a result of this program, system improvements have provided benefits to potential jurors, jurors, and the courts. Courts have been able to meet Judicial Council goals of modernization and service to the public by receiving funding to implement their jury system improvement projects.

The public has benefited by being able to use technology to streamline communication with the court as a potential juror. Potential jurors are able to use either a computer or telephone to change their address, postpone, or decline service as permitted. Courts that have implemented

IVR, for example, report that when they formerly summoned a large pool, the jury office voice mailbox would quickly fill up. Jurors no longer encounter that obstacle to communicating with the court. Jurors no longer have to listen to long telephone messages the night before reporting, but are able to go directly to their own record by keying in their bar code on their telephone or personal computer.

The courts have benefited by being able to free up staff from dealing with routine, repetitive tasks that occur when a new pool is summoned. Data entry has been greatly reduced, with accuracy improved by direct entry of personal data by the juror. Courts report that IVR systems pick up between 50 and 75 percent of routine callers, far exceeding typical IVR projects in other businesses that normally pick up 30 to 40 percent of callers. Staff is now available to deal with more complex matters in the jury office, or can be reassigned to other court operations.

The Branch has benefited by receiving more accurate statistical information about jury service. Courts have reported high levels of satisfaction with their completed projects. This program provides courts the ability to introduce new, more efficient solutions for managing their jury programs.

California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$433,400, \$81,800 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

Funds in FY 2014–2015 will be used to provide ongoing support for continuing operations and expansion of access to CLETS, for both direct access by the courts and for the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). The funds allocated for support and local assistance provides support for requirements gathering, California Department of Justice (CA DOJ) approval, implementation, training, and system updates. Support is also provided for security policy compliance and audit related activities for the benefit of both the AOC and the Courts.

The program reduction is the result of the refresh of server equipment that was needed for FY 2013–2014, but is not needed this fiscal year. The CLETS program has no funds directly distributed to the courts; however, the program does pay for the associated licensing costs on behalf of the courts.

Purpose

The CLETS Program supports access to the statewide law enforcement network provided by the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ). This access provides trial court judicial officers with criminal justice information from California and various national databases to support complete and timely adjudication. CLETS access is also used by CCPOR as its sole method to provide and update restraining and protective orders to the CA DOJ and the NCIC (FBI) databases.

Working closely with the CA DOJ, the purpose of the CLETS Program is to provide staff support and consultation to the trial courts, as well as the CCPOR team, regarding setup, access approval, and security policy compliance relating to the access to CLETS. A timely response to issues that arise is critical to the court's efficiency and timeliness in preparing court calendars and case preparation; compliance with audit requirements; and accommodating employee transfers, turnover or reduction in staff.

Currently superior courts in eight counties, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Plumas, San Francisco, Tulare and Yolo, utilize the AOC-sponsored CLETS Access Program through the services resident within the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). One additional court, Placer Superior Court, is in the process for approval by the CA DOJ and subsequent CLETS access deployment. In addition, CLETS access support is currently provided to courts and/or local law enforcement agencies in 26 counties that utilize the CCPOR application for the timely submission of restraining and protective orders to the CA DOJ and subsequently to NCIC (FBI). The courts are required to complete a review of selected data prior to issuing restraining and protective orders, supported by CCPOR and the CLETS Program. The courts have the ability to also utilize CLETS to directly submit restraining and protective order to the CA DOJ. Benefits to the courts and the public derived from the CLETS Program include:

- Facilitating access to state and national databases with minimal direct cost to the trial courts. Infrastructure, licensing, training, consulting, deployment, and software support service agreements are provided and managed by the program on behalf of the supported courts.
- Providing direct access to the databases, ensuring more efficient, accurate, and complete research and providing information needed by the bench to make timely and informed decisions, often with a direct impact on public and officer safety.
- Providing the necessary staffing, methodology, and relationship management with the CA DOJ to facilitate the on-boarding process. Services provided by the program reduce the need for the courts to add and dedicate staff as CLETS subject matter experts.
- Hardware maintenance is funded for refresh of aging and out of support hardware.

California Courts Protective Order Registry

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$585,600, \$90,200 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The CCPOR team provides primary production support for this centralized application, and develops court-requested enhancements and defect fixes, as well as system updates required by legislative changes and corresponding modifications to the Department of Justice California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). The CCPOR program does not directly distribute funds to the courts, only services. The reduction for the program from the previous fiscal year is the result of hiring an FTE to provide ongoing maintenance and support for the application, rather than using more expensive consulting services.

Purpose

CCPOR creates a statewide repository for restraining and protective orders that contains both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. CCPOR was developed by the trial courts and the AOC, based on a recommendation to the Judicial Council submitted by the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force to provide a statewide protective order registry.

CCPOR provides major improvements to victim safety and peace officer safety in domestic violence cases and cases involving violent crimes. CCPOR counties depend on the CCPOR system for operational cost savings and improvements to victim and officer safety. Without CCPOR these counties would need to print and file the currently 80,000-plus restraining and protective order files currently managed in CCPOR, reverting to a manual business processes.

The courts have committed significant staff resources for training and use of the CCPOR system, in some cases deferring other vital projects. They have convinced their law enforcement partners to do the same because of the difference CCPOR makes in their counties. Law enforcement also benefits by using CCPOR by having the ability to retrieve the electronic copy of an order in seconds to ensure the mandated hit confirmation occurs, thus reducing the manual process of retrieving the hardcopy orders.

Issuance of restraining and protective orders is authorized in statutes Pen. Code, § 136.2 and 136.3; Pen. Code, § 646.91 and 646.91a; Gov. Code, § 77209(b)(f) (g) and (j); and Fam. Code 6380, 6404. CCPOR facilitates the entry of these orders into CARPOS, which is a specific court responsibility. In addition, by promoting victim safety and perpetrator accountability, CCPOR supports the Judicial Council's strategic plan Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public, and the related operational plan objective (IV.1.e) for "[i]mproved practices and procedures to ensure fair, expeditious, and accessible administration of justice for litigants in domestic violence cases."

Currently, 32 courts and their law enforcement partners depend on CCPOR for restraining and protective order processing. Due to budget reductions in FY 2011–2012 and FY 2012–2013, planned deployments to additional counties were canceled, and support for the application was reduced to a minimum level. The program received an NCHIP grant from the California DOJ for FY 2013–2014 to deploy CCPOR to an additional 12 counties by November 1, 2013 which has been successfully completed. The AOC, working with the California DOJ has obtained additional grant funding through the NCHIP 19 grant to onboard 1 large and 5 small counties by September 2014. These grant funds are restricted to deployment activities.

CCPOR provides judges with critical information necessary to prevent issuance of multiple protective orders with conflicting terms and conditions. It also provides law enforcement with complete images of these orders, including handwritten notes and enforcement warnings that are not captured by any other system. By creating a system that is shared by courts and their law enforcement partners, CCPOR bridges communication gaps and improves inter-agency cooperation. These benefits work together to safeguard victims of crime, and peace officers in the field.

Enterprise Test Management Suite

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$624,300, \$41,800 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) is a program that provides a suite of software quality assurance tools, staff and testing expertise. Funding in FY 2014–2015 will continue to be used to operate the ETMS software on AOC servers, purchase software maintenance for the programs that comprise the ETMS, fund a technical analyst to provide systems administration/technical support for the software, and extend some of the functionality available to the Criminal and Traffic CMS and to the Civil, Probate and Mental Health CMS. The increase in funding for FY 2014 – 2015 is due to projected annual increases in software maintenance costs.

Purpose

The ETMS program helps the courts receive more reliable AOC-developed software. Its value is in identifying priorities for fixing defects, documenting steps taken to remedy the defect,

measuring the resolution of defects, and is specifically beneficial to custom developed software under AOC oversight.

ETMS provides a centralized repository for detailed descriptions of defects, service requests and requested enhancements. This facilitates prioritization, provides a repository for documenting actions, and allows the team to record the steps to test and ensure that defects have been fixed and enhancements are working properly. From this repository, release notes are generated for every major release of software and reviewed with court staff before installation and court testing. Reports from the repository are used to track the numbers of defects, service requests and enhancements over time, look for trends, and help the AOC proactively identify areas which need further improvement.

Included in the testing suite are tools to help automate the testing process, enabling quality assurance staff to run a greater number of tests. This helps to ensure a higher standard of reliability and fewer defects in software delivered to the courts, with fewer resources. These tools are part of the larger quality assurance program, which develops and uses continuously improving processes to improve the quality and reliability of software. Software benefitting the trial courts that utilize the ETMS tools includes: the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR); Civil, Probate and Mental Case Management System (V3), Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2), Computer-Aided Facilities Management (CAFM), Contact and Position System (CAPS), Serranus, and the California Courts Web site.

Uniform Civil Fees

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$343,000, \$42,000 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The current UCFS allocation funds two full-time ITSO staff that provide ongoing maintenance and support. The decrease is due to the conversion of two contractors to full-time ITSO staff resulting in cost savings. FY 2014–2015 funding for UCFS will support the following activities:

- Support for legislated and mandated changes to distribution rules to ensure accurate and timely civil fee distributions to appropriate entities within the mandated timeframes.
- Full support that provides a high level of system availability and reliability in order to help trial courts avoid penalties to state, county, court, and third parties for late reporting and distribution of funds.
- Support for system improvements to address changes to the business process.

UCFS provides services to the following business units:

- Trial Court Trust and Treasury Services
- Trial Court Budget & Technical Support Services
- Internal Audit Services

Purpose

UCFS was originally intended to be a temporary application (6-12 months) until the required functionality was incorporated into Phoenix or CCMS. This application has now been in place for seven years and modified many times to keep up with changing legislation and business processes.

UCFS supports the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 superior courts, with an average of \$52 million distributed per month. In July 2005, the Legislature, through section 68085.1(b), required that the 58 trial courts submit a schedule of AB 145 remitted civil fees by code section at the end of each month to the AOC. Under section 68085.1, the AOC is responsible for the reporting and remittance of Uniform Civil Fees (UCF) cash collections. Accordingly, the Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) was developed to support the centralized reporting and distribution of UCF cash collections. A failure to distribute fees to the appropriate entities within 45 days after the end of the month would result in the state assessing penalties up to \$24,000 per day that the distribution is late. The UCF System is used to calculate the correct distribution of 192 categories of fees collected by the 58 superior courts. The fees are distributed to up to 22 different funds or entities, such as the Trial Court Trust Fund's children's waiting room program, or a county law library. The distributions vary depending on the court, the fee, and the fund or entity receiving the funds. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. Calculations are used by the AOC Fiscal Services Office to distribute funds to various entities as required by law.

UCFS benefits the public by minimizing the amount of penalties paid to the state for incorrect or late distributions and ensuring that the entities entitled to a portion of the civil fees collected, as mandated by law, receive their correct distributions.

Justice Partner Outreach/E-Services (JPO&E)

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$200,700, \$371,300 decrease from FY 2013–2014

Description

The JPO&E allocation funds two full-time ITSO staff to support the analysis, assessment, and implementation of e-services statewide. The TCBAC recommended that the local assistance funding for this program be eliminated for FY 2014–2015. The proposed FY 2014–2015 allocation is reflective of the TCBAC recommendation.

JPO&E continues to provide support and recommendations to the Judicial Council Technology Committee, the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the Judicial Council on statewide e-service and integration partner outreach initiatives. In FY2013–14, Phase two of a collaborative effort on improving disposition reporting with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), California Department of Justice, Santa Clara Superior Court and Santa Clara County continued with funding from a NCSC grant. The successful outcome will provide a model for trial courts to utilize in reporting out dispositions with the DOJ as they implement case management systems. The JPO&E has no funds directly distributed to the courts.

This program also provides representation for the Judicial Branch at key partner forums, including: the Data Sharing Task Force, chaired by the California Sheriff and Chief of Police Associations; Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC), and strategic planning subcommittee providing direction on OTS grant funding and reporting to the feds on national highway traffic safety (NHTSA); and numerous local, state and national associations and technology forums.

Purpose

The program purpose is to implement 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, the Courts of Appeal, Supreme Court, and local and state justice/integration partners.

JPO&E promotes and supports the Judicial Council's recommendations of creating statewide business and technology solutions for e-services as an approach to drive operational and technical efficiencies, resulting in cost savings for the branch and its 58 superior courts. Benefits include:

- Provide a foundation to develop a plan for a uniform, secure, standardized statewide portal platform to provide simple e-filing capability for courts statewide that would be extensible to all court case management systems and e-filing service providers (EFSP), specifically benefiting trial courts with no e-filing or limited capabilities.
- Collaborate with trial courts on efforts to improve and implement e-services to Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs).
- Explore feasibility, requirements and funding for document management systems.
- Create access to simple court processes and training statewide for court staff, thereby allowing staff to better focus on customer support.
- Provide courts with documentation and information for future implementation of case management systems as it relates to e-filing and e-services.
- Promote and enhance judicial branch e-filing and information sharing initiatives through involvement in partner forums.
- Provide a mechanism for ongoing information sharing and communication to justice/integration partners, and vendors.
- Promote and support e-services and e-filing priorities of the Judicial Council.

Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$133,700, \$3,900 increase from FY 2013–2014

Description

Adobe Forms are used throughout the trial courts. There are nearly one thousand state-wide forms and over 2,000 local forms in use in the trial courts today. A PDF form, by default, can be “fillable”, but it can also be made “savable” for later updates with licenses for Adobe LiveCycle Reader Extended Forms. The minor increase in this project is due to the projected increases in the branch-wide license maintenance fees.

Purpose

In addition to making forms “savable”, Adobe LiveCycle Reader Extended Forms allows many other form innovations such as:

- Data validation
- Auto-population of data fields
- XML tagging of data fields (to ease data integration)
- File embedding
- E-Filing

In 2012 approximately 5.5 million “savable” forms were downloaded from the Judicial Council web-site. Nearly 2 million of these forms were for Family Law.

In 2010, the Orange County Superior Court purchased the branchwide license for \$700,000. Until FY 2013 - 2014, the ongoing maintenance costs have been equally shared by Orange, Sacramento and San Bernardino. Starting in FY 2013–2014, the AOC agreed to pay the branch-wise license maintenance fees on behalf of the trial courts.

Using 2012 data, the \$130,000 license maintenance fees spread across 5.5 million downloads translates into \$0.024/form. The forms downloaded are predominantly associated with self-represented litigants (SRLs). Therefore, the benefit to each court is through SRLs being able to download, save, modify and complete forms. There is an assumed benefit of access, convenience and accuracy.

Beyond the “savable” benefits, Orange and Sacramento Courts have developed “smart” forms which provide many of the more innovative benefits of LiveCycle. Sacramento built Smart Forms in support of Unlawful Detainer. Orange has created nearly 100 forms in support of Family Law and Small Claims.

In Orange County, the benefits of a “smart form” are very similar to any e-filed document. Orange has estimated that, on average, an e-Filed document saves the Court approximately \$2.00/document in labor attributable to working with a paper case file. Finally, the nature of the LiveCycle license is branch-wide and is applicable to ANY form created by the Judicial Branch.

V2 (Criminal and Traffic) Case Management System

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$647,500, \$1,999,200 decrease from FY 2013–2014. In FY 2013-14, the program’s allocations were funded with TCTF.

Description

Savings and technology efficiency initiatives reduced estimated costs for FY 2014–2015 by \$1,999,200 from the FY 2013–2014 allocation. These savings were achieved through infrastructure cost reductions, consolidating processing onto fewer servers, and will be aimed at reducing FY 2014–2015 infrastructure costs. In addition, the Fresno Superior Court initiated a project in January 2014 to convert their criminal and traffic case types from CMS V2 to Tyler Odyssey. The project is targeted to be complete in April 2015, with CMS V2 decommissioned by August 2015. Costs are therefore ramping down in FY 2014–2015.

V2 is a case management system for criminal and traffic cases, deployed in 2006 and currently operating in Fresno Superior Court. Maintenance and support was successfully transitioned from Deloitte Consulting, LLP to the Information Services Technology Office at the AOC in September 2009. The project broke even in June 2010. Fresno Superior Court is satisfied with the system performance and is supportive of the ITSO maintenance and support team.

During FY 2014–2015, V2 maintenance and operations projected budget will support:

- Support for data conversion to Tyler Odyssey
- Hardware and software maintenance.
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC).
- Day to day operational application support and service requests.
- Product releases to address judicial branch requirements, including biannual legislative changes if necessary.

Purpose

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. 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. 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.

V3 (Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health) Case Management System

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$5,658,100, \$868,900 increase from FY 2013–2014. In FY 2013-14, the program's allocations were funded with TCTF.

Description

The proposed allocation increase in FY 2014–2015 compared to last fiscal year is due to an increase in infrastructure and CCTC costs in order to replace aging equipment. In addition, one time cost savings used in FY 2013–2014, which were achieved through earlier infrastructure and CCTC cost reductions, are not available in FY 2014–2015.

Starting in 2006, the civil, small claims, probate and mental health interim case management system (V3) was deployed in six superior courts (Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura). Five of the six courts rely on this production application for daily case management processing. As of June 2012, the Los Angeles Superior Court no longer enters new transactions into the V3 Court, using V3 for inquiry purposes only. The V3 case management system (CMS) was developed by a software development vendor, Deloitte Consulting, LLP. In July 2011, support for V3 was transitioned from Deloitte to the Information Services Technology Office at the AOC. Projected savings are \$5.7 million dollars through FY 2013-14.

The projected budget for FY 2014-15 will support the following:

- 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 California Courts
- Technology Center (CCTC) and locally hosted courts.
- User support.
- Product releases including court enhancement requests, judicial branch requirements, and bi- annual legislative changes.
- Future product enhancements as directed by the Court Technology Committee.

Purpose

The civil, small claims, probate and mental health interim case management system (V3) processes 25 percent of all civil cases statewide. V3 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. All V3 courts are now using the latest version of the V3 application. 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 County and San Diego courts, saving time and resources. Sacramento Superior Court has also deployed e-filing for their Employment Development Department cases. Sacramento and Ventura 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.

The V3 team has the ability to control product development and functionality to meet ongoing changes requested by the courts, legislature, public and justice partners that may not be available in a vendor controlled, off the shelf product.

Trial Court Administrative Services Office

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$8,336,885 (TCAS) (No change from FY 2013–2014.

(Total proposed amount for Phoenix is \$13,885,300 for both TCAS and ITSO from all sources.)

Description

The Phoenix Program provides daily centralized administrative services to the trial courts including accounting and financial services, trust accounting services, purchasing services, a centralized treasury system, human capital management services, and core business analysis, training and support. Program staff also design, test, deploy, maintain, and manage the Phoenix System which enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations. The objectives of the system are to:

- Standardize accounting and business functions;
- Ensure uniformity of financial record keeping and maintenance;
- Provide consistency of data and quality of management information;
- Provide judicial partners with timely and comprehensive financial information on a regular and timely basis;
- Maximize investment opportunities and timely use and disbursement of cash; and
- Provide comprehensive payroll services and solutions to trial courts.

Funds are primarily used to fund required staffing, licensing, hardware, maintenance and operations (M&O), technology center support costs, and end user training in direct support of the trial courts.

Purpose

The Phoenix Program was established in response to the Judicial Council's directive for statewide fiscal accountability and human resources support as part of the council's strategic plan, specifically, then-Goal

IV: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. The branch benefits from an integrated, state-administered program promoting statewide consistency in court administrative practices. The financial component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in all 58 courts and allows for uniform process, accounting, and reporting. The human capital management component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in 9 courts to date, providing human resources management and payroll services. The general public is not a direct recipient of the benefits provided by the Phoenix Program.

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$3,597,400 (ITSO) no change for FY 2013–2014.

Description

Funds are primarily used to fund required licensing, hardware, maintenance and operations (M&O), technology center support costs, and end user training in direct support of the trial courts. In addition, this funding supports AOC staff in the Phoenix Program's Enterprise Resource Planning Unit. The unit performs the following support functions:

- Deployment and management of technology projects, including Phoenix-specific projects, and ITSO enterprise technology projects
- Configuration of new development and enhancements.
- Management and system support for upgrades, patches and enhancement packs
- Configuration and support for courts' tickets
- Management for six Phoenix environments, 46 servers, and related hardware.
- Development and maintenance of 37 interfaces: vendor; financial institution; court and county
- Maintain SAP application software and nine complementary tools and applications.

Three distinct Information Technology Services Office areas perform Phoenix-related activities:

- Staff critical for maintenance and operations of the 37 Phoenix interfaces, support, troubleshoot, and provide external vendor support for ING, Bank of America, CalPERS and court health and benefit providers. Additionally, this unit supports the complete security and role maintenance for all 58 courts, and for TCAS and supporting organizations. This supports the ITSO technical team's management of court relationship for Phoenix-to-court technical leads, the relationship management to the CCTC, and all the various supporting application vendors. Supervising staff manage cost and expenses, and perform budget forecasting for ISD. This staff prepares all Phoenix ISD reports to the Judicial Council and AOC executive management, and provides leadership in the technical roadmap for Phoenix, including patching, refresh, disaster recovery, update application for tax rules and regulations, and constant monitoring and tuning of all Phoenix environments, both at the AOC, and CCTC Tempe and CCTC Omaha data centers.
- The second area supports the development team for Phoenix and the trial courts including requests from courts with respect to changes in regulations, research and resolution of errors for courts and court staff, and maintenance of workflow for processing purchase orders and those approvals, as well as the development of reporting tools for the courts and TCAS support staff. This staff provides business analysis and project management for rollout and support of new vendor interfaces, implementation of new tools, and management of security and encryption software for all 58 courts and AOC users. The technical application development lead serves as a liaison to vendor partners for knowledge transfer and has primary ownership for code reviews, and technical and functional specifications.

- This third ITSO area provides end user steady state support for desktops, laptops, printers, software, and other computing infrastructure used by TCAS, as well as project support including system and application deployments, and refreshes and upgrades.

Purpose

The purpose of the Phoenix Program is to provide daily centralized administrative services to the trial courts, including accounting and financial services, trust accounting services, purchasing services, a centralized treasury system, human capital management services, and core business analysis, training and support. Program staff design, test, deploy, maintain, and manage the Phoenix System which enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations.

Judicial Council’s Court-Ordered Debt Task Force

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$25,000, no change from FY 2013–14

Description

The Judicial Council formally established the Court-Ordered Debt Task Force in April 2011 to satisfy the requirements set forth in Penal Code 1463.02 “to evaluate criminal and traffic-related court-ordered debts imposed against adult and juvenile offenders.” As stated in statute, the 21-member task force has undertaken the evaluation and exploration of the means to streamline the existing structure for imposing and distributing criminal and traffic fines and fees in the State of California and make recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature.

Purpose

The task force was established to accomplish the following goals:

- Identify all criminal and traffic-related court-ordered fees, fines, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments imposed under statute.
- Identify the distribution of revenue derived from those debts.
- Evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature for consolidating and simplifying the imposition and distribution of the revenue derived from the debts with the goal of improving the process for those entities that benefit from the revenues.
- Consult with state and local entities that would be affected by the simplification and consolidation of court-ordered debts.
- To the extent feasible, document recent annual revenues from the various penalty assessments and surcharges and determine the amount of each penalty assessment and surcharges impacts total annual revenues and the actual amounts assessed.
- Evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature regarding the priority in which court-ordered debts should be satisfied. Based on statutory requirements, a report was submitted in June 2011. However, due to the complexity of the legislative requirements, the task force will submit final recommendations to the council and the Legislature at a future date.
- Evaluate and make recommendations regarding the use of comprehensive collection programs authorized by Penal Code Section 1463.007 to the Judicial Council and the Legislature.