



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date

June 24, 2011

Action Requested

For Information Only

To

Members of the Judicial Council

Deadline

N/A

From

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts

Contact

Tina Carroll
Executive Office Liaison
415-865-4242 phone
Tina.Carroll@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Report on Activities of the
Administrative Office of the Courts

The following information outlines some of the many activities taking place to further the Judicial Council's goals and agenda for the judicial branch.

Issues and activities highlighted include the following:

- Budget (*p. 2*)
- Legislation (*p. 2*)
- Judicial Vacancies (*p. 5 & 24*)
- Court Facilities (*p. 8*)
- California Court Case Management System (*p. 9 & 17*)
- Advisory Committees, Task Forces, and Working Groups (*p.12 & 15*)
- Judicial and Court Employee Education (*p. 12 & 19*)
- *Attachment:* Letter to the Governor from the Chief Justice and the leadership of the Courts of Appeal and Superior Courts

Summary

* Please note: Page numbers next to summary items reference more detailed information.

Budget

With the Governor's veto of the budget bills on June 9, 2011, representatives from the Judicial Council, the chairs and vice-chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, the chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee, the chair of the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee, and other leaders of the judicial branch reconvened to further consider the Judicial Council's strategy to advocate against further reductions to the judicial branch budget. As a result of that meeting, following prior strategy sessions conducted by that group, letters were sent to all presiding judges, court executive officers, and administrative presiding justices, asking them to join together on a letter with the Chief Justice to the Governor and all legislators voicing their strongest opposition to the proposal to reduce the branch budget by \$150 million, or any other proposals that might surface to cut the branch budget. The letter follows on the themes stressed by the Chief Justice in the formal statement she issued on learning of the proposed additional \$150 million reduction. All six administrative presiding justices as well as all 58 presiding judges and 58 court executive officers lent their signatures to the letter, a copy of which is attached.

Additionally, information has been gathered from the trial courts on how the cumulative budget reductions would affect critical services to the public. Local court leaders also have been encouraged to contact the Governor separately, contact their local legislators, and educate the media, local bar associations, court users and local community on the impact of these reductions and engage them in standing with the courts in our efforts to oppose these reductions.

The Chief is seeking the earliest possible meeting with the Governor to directly address these issues with him.

Legislation

AB 109, Governor's Proposed Criminal Justice Realignment: In April, the Judicial Council's AB 109 Criminal Justice Realignment working group proposed to the Governor's administration various alternatives designed to mitigate, to the greatest extent possible, realignment's impact on courts. In response, the Governor's May Revision to the state budget augmented the judicial branch budget by \$41.8 million, which reflected the Governor's decision to narrow court involvement in parole proceedings to conducting final revocation hearings only, rather than the broader responsibilities enacted in AB 109.

Recent Developments:

After release of the May Revision, the working group and AOC staff proposed various statutory amendments to AB 109 to clarify the courts' narrower role. The Judicial Council's Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC) approved the amendments on June 3, 2011, and they were submitted to the Governor's office shortly thereafter. On Tuesday, June 14, 2011, the Governor's staff met via conference call with Judicial Council representatives, including Judge James Herman, Vice Chair of the PCLC, and members of the council's AB 109 ad hoc working group, to provide information about recent developments regarding realignment. The updates include:

- **Operative Date:** The *earliest* operative date for the entire Criminal Justice Realignment Act—including eliminating prison as a sentence alternative for many felonies—will be delayed from July 1, 2011, to October 1, 2011. The *actual* operative date, however, remains contingent on funding, either through tax extension or some other revenue source;
- **Two-Year Delay for State Parole Realignment:** The operative date regarding the courts' role in final revocation hearings will differ based on the supervised population. For offenders on state parole, courts will not be required to conduct revocation hearings until **July 1, 2013**. For offenders on community supervision, courts will be required to conduct revocation hearings on or after the operative date, i.e., no earlier than **October 1, 2011**. However, because community supervision will only involve offenders released from prison on or after the operative date, the community supervision population is expected to start small and increase gradually; and
- **Budget Adjustment:** The \$41.8 million augmentation in the May Revision of the state budget will be adjusted to reflect the changes in the two operative dates described above. The proposed augmentation is now \$17.7 million, which is based on the same estimate and assumptions as the \$41.8 million, but reflects the fact that (1) only about 55 percent of the estimated 9,200 final revocation hearings—i.e., those involving the community supervision population—will be within the court's jurisdiction in fiscal year 2011-2012; and (2) the funding reflects 3/4 of a fiscal year, based on the delay of the operative date to October.

Statutory Amendments:

The Governor's staff also indicated that nearly all of the working group's proposed statutory amendments to clarify the courts' narrower role have been accepted by the Governor. Although the statutory amendments are not yet in print, the Governor's staff indicated that AB 109 will be amended to:

- Provide maximum flexibility to courts to employ various types of hearing officers to conduct revocation proceedings, including judges, commissioners, referees, or other hearing officers;
- Eliminate court jurisdiction over parole supervision;

- Eliminate court involvement in appeals of denials of custody credits and decisions regarding discharge and retention on parole;
- Provide clear authority to supervising agencies to impose intermediate sanctions for violations, including flash incarceration without court involvement;
- Limit court involvement in postrelease proceedings to final revocations only, i.e., proceedings conducted only *after* the supervising agency has exhausted available intermediate sanctions without court involvement;
- Provide courts with flexibility to manage the new revocation caseload according to local needs and practices;
- Allow, but not require, the use of evidence-based programs in the court's discretion;
- Clarify that realignment will not interfere with existing parole reentry courts; and
- Require the Judicial Council to adopt rules of court and forms to implement the final revocation process.

Implementation Efforts:

In the meantime, the following implementation efforts have been initiated:

- The council's Criminal Law Advisory Committee has formed an informal working group to consider ways to assist courts in implementing realignment, including a new form for use as a petition for revocation and rules of court to govern revocation procedure;
- The AOC Education Division/CJER is considering relevant educational programs and materials; and
- The AOC Finance Division will present allocation recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Working Group, for eventual recommendations to the Judicial Council.

AOC Audit: The state Department of Finance's Office of State Audits and Evaluations released to the public the results of an audit of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the appellate courts for the 2009-2010 fiscal year. The audit, which was requested by the AOC (and the AOC's response) is posted at http://www.dof.ca.gov/osae/audit_reports/. There were no major findings and only four areas where improvements were recommended. Corrective action is already being taken in those areas.

Attorney General Report to the Judicial Council on Electronic Interception Orders:

- Penal Code section 629.62 requires the Attorney General to prepare and submit an annual report to the Legislature, Judicial Council, and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Court regarding electronic interceptions conducted under Penal Code section 629.50 et seq. The 2010 report is available at the following link: http://ag.ca.gov/publications/report_legislature_2010.pdf. It contains detailed information on numbers and kinds of orders, the underlying offenses, and the number of resulting arrests, motions, and trials.
- Under Penal Code section 629.53, the Judicial Council may establish guidelines for judges to follow in granting orders authorizing interceptions. In 2008, the council's Criminal Law

Advisory Committee considered but declined to recommend any guidelines as necessary given that interception requests are infrequent, existing statutory requirements are clear, and courts have successfully implemented local practices.

Court-Appointed Counsel Program (Non-capital) Funding Increase: The program requested and received a deficiency in the amount of \$2.6 million due to a lack of permanent funding increase despite an increase in caseload and the number of claims processed each fiscal year.

Community Corrections Program:

- Chief probation officers and probation teams from the four California Risk Assessment Pilot counties (Napa, San Francisco, Santa Cruz, and Yolo Counties) attended a second workshop to further develop and refine evidence-based responses to probation violations.
- AOC staff visited the San Joaquin, San Francisco and Los Angeles Parolee Reentry Courts.
- Judge Richard Couzens continues to provide trainings at the courts on evidence-based practices and Senate Bill 678. To date, he has trained at seven different courts throughout the state and also taught a course at the Cow (Rural) Counties Judges Institute on reducing recidivism through use of evidence-based practice.

New Judgeships and Vacancies (*page 24*):

- There have been no new judicial appointments since January 1, 2011.
- Currently, there are one Supreme Court, three Court of Appeal, and twenty-eight trial court judicial vacancies.

Commission for Impartial Courts Ethics Recommendations: The Supreme Court Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics posted for comment several proposed changes to the Code of Judicial Ethics as recommended by the Commission for Impartial Courts. Comments are due by September 1, 2011.

Form 700 Security for Judges: In response to the Fair Political Practices Commission's (FPPC) intent to post judges' statements of economic interests on its Web site, a working group was convened on how best to mitigate risks related to the posting. Subsequently, the FPPC confirmed that it would not include 2010 Form 700s of justices and judges, and that it would work with the judicial branch to address security concerns. The working group has since reviewed information provided by the FPPC, as well as its practices, to ensure adequate protection for justices and judges, and will continue to work with the FPPC to address this issue.

Judicial Council/Chief Justice Liaison Meetings: As part of the judicial branch's collaborative efforts with justice system partners, the AOC coordinates liaison meetings with the Chief Justice, Judicial Council members, and justice system partners. Partners that participated in meetings during this quarter included: the California Defense Counsel, the Consumer Attorneys of

California, the California State Sheriffs' Association, the California State Bar, the Criminal Defense Bar, and the California District Attorneys Association.

State-Federal Judicial Council: The State-Federal Judicial Council provides a vehicle for direct and personal communication between judges of the state and federal courts in California on matters of mutual interest and concern. Its cochairs are Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye of the California Supreme Court and Senior Circuit Judge Arthur Alarcón of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The AOC helps staff the council. Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye was welcomed to her first meeting, over which Judge Alarcón presided. Chairs of the State-Federal Judicial Council's seven subcommittees each discussed their respective subcommittees' mission and gave a report. The Education Subcommittee introduced guest speaker Immigration Judge Anthony S. Murry of the San Francisco Immigration Court, which is under the federal Department of Justice. Judge Murry discussed immigration issues of mutual concern to the federal and state judiciaries.

Presiding Judges and Executive Officers Regional Meetings: The AOC sponsors regional meetings that offer judicial branch leaders an opportunity to plan and discuss topics of interest for courts in their region. The following meetings were held in May:

- *Bay Area/Northern Coastal Region:* 14 of 16 courts attended.
- *Northern/Central Region:* 28 of 31 courts attended.
- *Southern Region:* All 11 courts attended.
- Common agenda:
 - Panel discussion on budget, legislative, and CCMS issues.
 - Updates on:
 - Requirements and timeframe for compliance with the California Judicial Branch Contract Law.
 - The Office of Court Construction and Management.
 - The Assigned Judges Program.

Labor Relations: Direct labor negotiations assistance currently is being provided to 10 courts. Additionally, the AOC HR negotiations team is actively engaged in preparation meetings and scheduled negotiations with 11 trial courts with memoranda of understanding expiring between August and December 2011.

Trial Court Judicial Officer and Staff Workload Study: In order to reflect changes in the law, rules of court, new technology, and case management practice, the AOC's Office of Court Research, with the support of the SB 56 Working Group, is updating current workload standards. The current study of judicial officer workload will update case-weights that were developed over 10 years ago; the current study of staff workload will update case-weights that were developed over five years ago. In this period:

- Site visits were conducted at the Superior Courts of Imperial, Riverside, Siskiyou and Yolo Counties, and a focus group was conducted with four two-judge courts – Amador, Calaveras,

Inyo and San Benito Counties. The visits and focus groups document case-processing practices across courts, cross-validate these with time-study data, and refine the case-weight estimates for the staff workload model. They complete the qualitative assessment of case processing in all 16 courts that participated in the staff-workload time study and will inform the final judicial officer and staff case-weights.

- Trial courts participated in multiple focus groups to review preliminary case weights resulting from the judicial officer and staff time study, and make appropriate adjustments to incorporate various efficiency and quality of service considerations. Thirty judicial officers from 18 courts and 50 court staff from 21 courts served as expert panels. The revised case weights will be presented for final approval to the Senate Bill 56 (new judgeships) Working Group, leading to an updated benchmark for judicial and staff workload measures.

Family Dispute Resolution Court Exchange Visits: Staff organized a court exchange visit project that facilitates collaboration among the trial courts' Family Dispute Resolution (FDR) programs across the state to educate FDR directors on a statewide level, provide opportunities for building and strengthening relationships across courts, and share strategies to improve the quality of service and justice to the public. In June, FDR directors for Yolo, Yuba and Butte Counties visited each other's courts to learn about their child custody mediation programs, share information, and provide "peer review" as required by Rule of Court 5.210. With the completion of these visits in June 2011, a total of 21 courts have participated in this program since 2007.

California Assembly Honor for Justice Moreno: In May, Assembly Member Jim Beall (D-San Jose), Chair of the Assembly Human Services Committee, presented an Assembly Resolution to retired Supreme Court Justice Carlos R. Moreno honoring his service to the judiciary and his work to improve the lives of children in foster care. Justice Moreno was the chair of the California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care and the cochair of the California Child Welfare Council.

Mental Health Court Evaluation: The Judicial Council's Task Force for Criminal Justice Collaboration on Mental Health Issues emphasized the need for information about promising practices, procedures, effectiveness, and outcomes of mental health courts. In May, AOC/CFCC staff began site visits in six mental health courts (three adult and three juvenile). These courts include Orange, San Mateo, Sonoma, Fresno, Santa Clara, and Ventura. The work is funded by the California Department of Mental Health.

Tribal Court Access to California Courts Protective Order Registry: Three tribal courts (Yurok, Quechan and Hoopa) and their affiliated tribal law enforcement agencies have been selected to participate in the pilot Protective Order Registry.

Emergency Planning—Earthquake Disaster Recovery Exercise: The AOC facilitated an Earthquake Disaster Recovery Exercise for the superior courts in the southern region. This is one of three planned exercises to support the courts in continuity of operations planning.

Entrance Screening Equipment Contracts: New statewide master agreements for x-ray machines and magnetometers used to purchase replacement equipment were put in place for October 2011. Staff surveyed the courts regarding screening equipment in place at each facility, including age and condition, to determine replacement needs. 44 magnetometers and 45 x-ray units were identified for replacement. Allocations were made for service agreement renewals for 29 magnetometers and 37 x-ray units.

Administrative Infrastructure Initiatives

Facilities

Capital Projects:

- ***52 Projects Moving Forward:*** Site selection and acquisition for 29 new courthouse projects are in progress, in addition to design on 19 projects (renovations and new construction). Construction starts for 5 projects are awaiting a bond sale, pending resolution of the State Budget; and construction of 3 new courthouses is under way.
- ***Award for Hollister Courthouse:*** The courthouse was awarded a Design Excellence Citation by the American Institute of Architects/Academy of Architecture for Justice (AIA/AAJ) Annual International Justice Facilities Review Awards. The award will be made at the International Conference in Los Angeles in November, at which the Chief Justice will speak. This national award is the highest commendation a courthouse design can receive from the AIA/AAJ.

State Public Works Board Approval:

- Site acquisition:
 - Kings – new Hanford courthouse.
 - Santa Clara – new Family Justice Center courthouse.
 - Monterey – new South Monterey courthouse.
 - Solano – Old Fairfield courthouse renovation.
- Site selection:
 - Tuolumne – new Sonora courthouse.
 - Imperial – new El Centro courthouse.
 - Placer – new Tahoe area courthouse.

Facility Modifications:

In progress: Eleven hundred and seventy-one active facility modifications at a value of \$58.6 million.

Facilities Management Process Re-engineering:

- Three firms were selected as the new regional service providers for court facilities maintenance and repairs. The firms are Enovity for the Bay Area/Northern Coastal region, PRIDE Industries for the Northern/Central region, and ABM for the Southern region. Contracts are expected to be signed in late June, with full performance beginning in the fall.
- The first project utilizing Job Order Contracting was completed in April. Approximately 50 projects are planned or under way.

Technology

California Court Case Management System (CCMS) (page 17):

Cost Benefit Analysis: On March 23, representatives from Grant Thornton and the AOC Finance Division met with BSA staff regarding questions raised in the BSA report released on March 3. At the March 23 meeting, BSA staff reported that the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) was thorough, detailed and comprehensive though some questions remained about how information was displayed in the report. Based upon this discussion, Grant Thornton is working on a revision of the CBA that will more clearly highlight specific areas of the review.

Development: The CCMS Executive Committee voted to approve the CCMS core product exit criteria, a necessary milestone before beginning the next phase of testing.

Independent Project Oversight (IPO) and Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) of Deployment: Following the recommendation of the Bureau of State Audits, separate companies will perform IPO and IV&V services on deployment.

Development and Code Reviews: Contracts have been fully executed with two firms to complete independent reviews on development and the quality of the underlying application code. Thus far, draft work plans have been submitted to the Projects Document Repository.

- Integrated Systems Diagnostics will complete the Standard CMMI Appraisal Method for Process Improvement (SCAMPI) review, which will examine the methodology used by Deloitte in developing CCMS. This assessment will determine if Deloitte developed the application using processes that are in line with an industry standard measurement known as Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3. The firm has created an Appraisal Preparation checklist to structure the appraisal process. The review is scheduled to be completed by the end of August.

- K3 Solutions LLC will conduct a series of tests to determine the quality of the underlying application code. The review is also scheduled to be completed by the end of August.

Deployment: The Superior Courts of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties have reviewed and approved their deployment plans.

Endorsement: The State Bar Board of Governors endorsed the statewide rollout of CCMS. Judge James Herman spoke on behalf of the council and the General Administrative Advisory Committee.

Justice Partner Data Integration Project:

- After extensive work with the Department of Justice, Santa Clara County, the San Jose Police, and the Superior Court of Santa Clara County, a proposal is being finalized on disposition reporting and using grant funds
- Discussions commenced with San Luis Obispo County law enforcement on aiding justice partners and vendors with data exchanges needed in implementing CCMS.
- The team participated in meetings with California's Data Sharing Workgroup Task Force and the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (funding source for e-citation grants), and data sharing efforts with the COPLINK working group (COPLINK is an application used by law enforcement to integrate information from multiple sources and used to create a regional information sharing network).
- The outreach and deployment teams began work with the Superior Courts of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties and county administration to utilize the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs grant award for adapters.

Administrative & Management Systems

Uniform Civil Fees System (UCF):

- Deployment of a new interface from the Phoenix financial system, which provides daily bank balance and capital share balances to UCF, was completed.
- A new audit report was developed that provides information regarding distributions to county law libraries.

Infrastructure & Security

Savings for Trial Court Satellite Equipment: The satellite downlink equipment for 60 trial court locations was replaced. The equipment consists of satellite dishes used to receive statewide training and educational broadcasts from the AOC to the trial courts. Completing this project will reduce the broadcast transmission fees paid by the State by approximately thirty percent annually.

Local Area Network/Wide Area Network (LAN/WAN) Program:

- Four cycles of technical refreshes have been completed since the initial telecommunications project was offered in 2002.
- For the fifth cycle, network evaluation and design is complete for 53 participating courts. Deployment began in May. The Superior Court of Mariposa County will begin participation in the project in June.

Phoenix Financial System

Court Interpreter Data Collection: After a successful pilot project, the Phoenix System underwent reconfiguration to capture court interpreter language and session type data and associated costs, including mileage and per diem rates. Collection of this information will enhance the courts' ability to manage resources and will be used for planning purposes such as accommodating language trends and forecasting costs. This issue was presented at the May Court Executives Advisory Committee meeting, prompting additional courts (Imperial, Kern, Merced and Tulare Counties) to request the system enhancement. It is anticipated that these and other courts will be added in the near future.

SB 78 (Public Contracting) Reporting Requirements: Staff developed a technical solution to capture information regarding trial court vendors or contractors receiving payments pursuant to SB 78 and Public Contract Code 19206 (*Mandatory Reporting of Judicial Branch Contracting Information*). This solution will enable the AOC to generate reports twice a year as mandated in legislation.

National Activities

Election of California Judge to National Center for State Courts Board of Directors: Hon. Stephen Baker, Judicial Council member and judge of the Superior Court of Shasta County has been elected to the NCSC board, for a term to commence on August 1, 2011.

Federal Court Improvement Program Meeting: Staff participated in a national meeting of Court Improvement Program grantees hosted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Staff presented to the Time-to-Permanency Working Group and met with the federal court improvement project manager to discuss upcoming program reauthorization.

State Child Access and Visitation Program Coordinators: Staff participated in a national meeting held in Washington, D.C. to discuss access to visitation program planning and administration; state monitoring of services; and how states can make these services more effective, accountable, and goal-oriented. The meeting was hosted by the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement.

Advisory Committees, Task Forces, and Working Groups (page 15):

Advisory committees will hold only one in-person meeting per year until the fiscal situation improves. Other meetings will be convened using video- or audio-conferencing.

The following committees met since the Judicial Council's April meeting:

1. Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency of the Judicial Branch
2. Appellate Advisory Committee
3. Appellate Indigent Defense Oversight Advisory Committee
4. California Appellate Court Clerks Association
5. Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
6. Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee
7. Court Executives Advisory Committee
8. Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
9. Criminal Law Advisory Committee
10. Sargent Shriver Civil Representation Pilot Project Implementation Committee
11. Trial Court Budget Working Group Subcommittee on Modernization Fund Reduction
12. Trial Court Facilities Modification Working Group
13. Tribal and State Court Forum
14. Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee

Education and Training Programs (page 19):

Judicial Education

1. Advanced Capital Case Roundtable
2. Basic Felony Sentencing
3. Civil Law Institute
4. Civil Law Update and Recent Developments in Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP) Motions
5. Criminal, Juvenile, and Family Restraining Orders –Who's On First?
6. Criminal Primary Assignment Orientation
7. Cow (Rural) County Judges Institute
8. Elder Abuse Cases
9. Handling Self-Represented Litigants: Improving Skills and Practices
10. Judicial Benchguides Review on Federal Indian Law
11. Juvenile Court Regional Training: Juvenile Delinquency Dispositions and Juvenile Dependency Jurisdiction
12. Orientation for Experienced Civil Law Judges
13. Primary Assignments Orientation and Criminal Assignment Courses Program
14. Qualifying Judicial Ethics Training
15. Sexually Violent Predators
16. Traffic Primary Assignment Orientation
17. Tribal/State Court Forum Educational Sessions

Judicial Officer, Court Employee, and Justice System Stakeholder Education

18. 2011 Conference on Self-Represented Litigants
19. Access to Visitation Grant Training
20. Best Practices Approach Initiative
21. Court-Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Directors Education Program
22. Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Scholarships
23. Court Community Communication
24. Court Contact Training for the Assigned Judges Program
25. Excel Basics
26. Fundamentals of Case Flow Management
27. Grant Seeking and Writing Workshops
28. Indian Child Welfare Act Services
29. Human Resources Investigations
30. Leadership and Training Tools
31. Managing Technology Projects and Technology Resources
32. Minute Taker's Workshop
33. New Mediator Training
34. Sixth District Appellate Program Spring Training Seminar for Court-Appointed Counsel
35. Untangling the Intermittent Leave Web

Broadcasts

36. Continuing the Dialogue: Neuroscience and the Psychology of Decisionmaking (for judges)
37. Everyday Managing and Supervising: The Art of Interpersonal Communication (for court staff)
38. Family Adoptions of Minors (for court staff)
39. Great Minds Broadcast: Considering Cultural Responsiveness in Domestic Violence Cases (for justices and judges)
40. Protective Orders: The Basics (for court staff)
41. Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment (for judges, managers and supervisors)

Updated Online Courses

42. Small Claims Court: Consumer and Substantive Laws

Online Resources

43. Criminal Motions Series: Bail, Video Lecture
44. Introduction to Competency to Stand Trial, Video Lecture
45. Cow County Institute videos
46. Effective Communication with Self-Represented Litigants
47. Family Institute videos

- 48. Monthly Online Interactive Articles and Quizzes
- 49. Relevance and Its Limits
- 50. Probate Institute videos
- 51. What Decision Makers Need to Know: Substance Abusing Youth and Effective Treatment

Videos

- 52. Court Security: Personal Security
- 53. Courthouse Security: Perimeter, Interior, and Courtroom
- 54. How the Courts Failed Germany

Benchguides (Revised)

- 55. Bail and Own-Recognizance Release (Benchguide 55, rev. 5/11)
- 56. Juvenile Dependency Proceedings: Initial or Detention Hearing (Benchguide 100)
- 57. Juvenile Dependency Proceedings: Jurisdiction Hearing (Benchguide 101)
- 58. Juvenile Dependency Proceedings: Disposition Hearing (Benchguide 102)
- 59. Juvenile Dependency Proceedings: Selection and Implementation Hearing (Benchguide 104)

Benchbook

- 60. California Judges Benchbook: Search and Seizure Update
- 61. California Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings—Before Trial Update

Additional Detail on Summary Items

Advisory Committees/Task Forces/Working Groups

Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency of the Judicial Branch:

- Reviewed draft audit reports completed in 10 superior courts. The reports will be submitted to the council for review and acceptance, along with a separate discussion item addressing individual or systemic issues highlighted as part of this process.

Appellate Advisory Committee:

- Voted to endorse the response of the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee to recommendations 31 (requiring appellate courts to send details to parties on how to acquire campaign contribution information) and 32 (recommending that appellate justices' campaign finance disclosures should be maintained and made accessible electronically) from the report of the Commission for Impartial Courts, which the Judicial Council had referred to both advisory committees.

Appellate Indigent Defense Oversight Advisory Committee:

- In auditing the work of attorneys and reviewing the work performed by the appellate project, audited 140 compensation claims paid during January–March 2011. One reconsideration denial and 13 adjustment letters were approved at the audit committee meeting.
- The Chief Justice appointed Justice Nathan Mihara of the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District to the committee.

California Appellate Court Clerks Association:

- Discussed operational issues including: budget reductions, the status of appellate court technology projects, and the impact of SB 78 (public contracting).

Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee:

- Approved a proposal to amend an unlawful detainer form for submission to the Rules and Projects Committee for circulation for public comment; reviewed pending legislation that could impact civil courts; and approved a legislative proposal to adopt new procedures for state court recognition and enforcement of civil judgments by tribal courts for presentation to the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee for approval to circulate for comment.

CJER Governing Committee:

- Reviewed the first six-month progress report on the Education Plan for the branch, noting changes that were due to budget cuts.
- Provided an update on the invitation to comment on proposed amendments to education rules resulting from evaluation for the first three-year period, which is currently circulating for comment.

Court Executives Advisory Committee:

- Discussed new requirements for judicial branch contracts, rule revisions recommended by the Presiding Judges/Court Executive Officers Rules and Roles Analysis Working Group; cost saving recommendations from the Operational and Budget Impact Working Group; trial court facilities standards, and the potential development of a request for proposal for electronic simultaneous sound equipment for court interpreters.
- Reviewed the Phoenix financial system court interpreter data collection pilot project; the CCMS Readiness Assessment Toolkit; and the current status of Assembly Bill 109, concerning the transfer of parole revocation hearing responsibilities to the trial courts.

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel:

- Progress report provided by the subcommittee for American Sign Language (ASL) on draft guidelines and a pilot program for the use of video remote interpretation for ASL.
- Reported on the transition to written and oral court interpreter exams developed and utilized by the National Center for State Courts' Consortium for Language Access in the Courts. The majority of those who have passed the examinations recently have completed coursework or degree programs in interpreting.

Criminal Law Advisory Committee:

- Reviewed pending criminal law legislation and a proposal from the Appellate Advisory Committee regarding the required record on appeal; and formed an informal working group to advise the committee on ways to implement the Criminal Justice Realignment Act (AB 109).

Sargent Shriver Civil Representation Pilot Project Implementation Committee:

- Reviewed the proposed program evaluation design for the seven proposals approved for funding by the Judicial Council.

Trial Court Budget Working Group Subcommittee on Modernization Fund Reduction:

- Reviewed programs, services, and projects currently provided to trial courts that are funded through the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund—slated for a \$20 million reduction for the next fiscal year—and made recommendations for suspensions, deferrals or deletions of programs, so that only those that are critical will be funded with the remaining appropriation for fiscal year 2011–2012.

Trial Court Facilities Modification Working Group:

- Approved the group's draft annual report for posting to the Serranus Web site to allow for review and comments by the courts. The final report will be submitted to the Executive and Planning Committee later this summer.

Tribal and State Court Forum:

- Worked on developing rules and forms proposals regarding registry of protective orders issued by tribal courts, as well as tribal access to juvenile court records, and legislative proposals for possible Judicial Council sponsorship.

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee:

- Nominated candidates to be considered by the Chief Justice for appointment as committee chair.
- Discussed implications to the trials courts of pending legislation such as AB 109 (which proposes the transfer of parole revocation hearings to the trial courts) and pension reform proposals affecting judicial officers; and recommended rule revisions related to the responsibilities of presiding judges and court executives.
- Reviewed the CCMS Readiness Assessment Toolkit and a proposed bench card concerning issues relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Other Activities

Technology

California Court Case Management System

Governance: A joint Executive Committee and General Administrative Advisory Committee meeting was held in June to review the financial impact of revised deployment strategies. The Budget subcommittee is working with staff to improve financial reporting formats.

Independent CCMS Code Quality Review: The selection process for a vendor to do a quality assessment of the code used to develop the software behind CCMS is in the final stages.

Evaluation of Standard Capabilities for Process Improvement: The selection process for a vendor to evaluate the overall CCMS project and technical processes used to develop the software is in the final stages.

Independent Project Oversight (IPO) and Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) of Deployment: Following the Bureau of State Audit's recommendation, separate companies will perform IPO and IV&V services on deployment. It is expected that vendors will be selected by the end of June. Existing IPO/IV&V continues until product acceptance and will allow for a transition to the new IPO/IV&V vendors. Until the new contracts are signed and the companies begin their oversight efforts, the AOC will operate under industry guidelines and standards of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, as included in its Project

Management Body of Knowledge materials, and the California Technology Agency's guidelines in its Information Technology Project Oversight Framework handbook.

Development:

- The beginning of product acceptance testing for CCMS external components - which includes the portals, statewide reporting data warehouse, data exchanges, and e-filing - has been extended four weeks to allow for the completion of integration testing. Testing is estimated to be completed by the end of August 2011. Formal acceptance of CCMS will occur after the independent quality review is completed and plans are in place to address any issues identified by the review. The objective is to resolve issues during the warranty period and before the early adopter courts go live with CCMS.

Deployment:

- Due to budget uncertainties, early adopter deployment activities were halted as of April 1, 2011, to focus on risk mitigation and additional cost analysis. The Executive Committee and General Administrative Advisory Committee held a meeting to review the revised start date for deployment options. A decision was made to re-engage with deployment activities on July 1, 2011.
- Deployment will begin after product acceptance and the legislatively mandated external review.
- The Superior Courts of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties have approved their deployment plans and are ready to proceed. Budget models are being revised to contemplate changes in scope and schedule for the early adopter courts hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). San Diego will implement electronic document management and e-filing prior to converting to CCMS on all case types.
- A Statement of Work is being negotiated to create a set of "blueprints" that will serve as a guide to system processes with the purpose of configuring the application for each court during deployment.
- The CCMS team is focused on the first phase of deployment involving the development of local configurations for the early adopter courts. This includes the standardization of operational processes and configurations to the greatest extent possible, as well as the development of tools that will be used for future courts deploying CCMS. A number of deployment readiness tools currently are being evaluated by courts considering CCMS.

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

- The V3 courts (Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties) are now live on version 10.03, and collectively continue to process 25 percent of civil cases statewide. User acceptance testing for patch 10.04 will begin in June with a "go live" date scheduled for September 2011.
- The Superior Court of Orange County is electronically filing civil, small claims, and probate case categories through V3.

Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2):

- A phased reduction in the number of servers deployed in production and staging has begun, and it is expected to be completed in July 2011. The goal is to keep 12 application servers out of the existing 26, resulting in an annual cost savings of \$240,000. The next software maintenance release is in development, targeting September 2011 for implementation.

Outreach:

- Activities included product demonstrations and presentations to: the Judicial Council; the Civil Law Institute; legislators and their staff; court staff, judges, and justice partners of the Superior Court of Shasta County; judges at the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County; and the Probation Information Technology Managers Association.

Education Programs

Judicial Education

Cow County Judges Institute:

- The institute provides a single forum for judges handling multiple types of calendars and issues impacting small courts.
- The Violence Against Women Education Project delivered three workshops at the institute: (1) Domestic Violence and Rural Courts: Selected Issues, (2) Handling Sexual Assault, and (3) The Use of Technology in Domestic Violence Cases. Staff also presented a workshop covering federal Indian law entitled "Tribal and State Jurisdiction in California Indian Country."

Criminal Assignments Week: This program targeted experienced judges in a criminal assignment. Multi-day courses included an Advanced Capital Case Roundtable, Sexually Violent Predators, Elder Abuse Cases, and Basic Felony Sentencing.

Juvenile Court Regional Training: Twenty-five judicial officers participated in a one-day training on In-Depth Delinquency Dispositions and Dependency Jurisdiction: The Role of Current Risk. This program will be repeated regionally in the fall to reduce travel and other costs.

Orientation for Experienced Civil Law Judges: A three-day program was offered to judges returning to a civil assignment after more than two years in another assignment.

Primary Assignments Orientation and Criminal Assignment Courses Program: The Violence Against Women Education Project delivered three courses at the Primary Assignment

Orientation and Criminal Assignment Courts Program in June: (1) Sexually Violent Predators; (2) Handling Elder Abuse Issues; and (3) Issues Unique to Domestic Violence Cases.

Qualifying Judicial Ethics Training: Five core ethics classes were held in San Francisco, San Diego, Rancho Cordova, and Los Angeles.

Traffic Primary Assignment Orientation: The program was offered to judges and subordinate judicial officers new to a traffic assignment or returning to traffic after more than two years in another assignment.

Tribal/State Court Forum: Educational sessions were held for forum members and state court judges on the history of California Indians and dynamics of domestic violence in native communities, the structure of tribal governments, tribal court development in California, and models of tribal court state court collaboration.

Judicial Officer, Court Employee, and Justice System Stakeholder Education

2011 California Conference on Self-Represented Litigants: More than 250 people participated in this conference for self-help center staff and attorneys, family law facilitators, small claims advisors, law librarians, interpreters, and legal aid agencies providing assistance to self-represented litigants. Forty-two classes were offered on topics such as enhancing services with technology, providing effective workshops, and a broad range of minimum continuing legal education topics. The Violence Against Women Education Project also sponsored an all-day workshop and two breakout sessions providing basic information about domestic violence and its impact, skill building, and providing adequate services to litigants.

Access to Visitation Grant Training: Staff provided a three-day training on Standard 5.20, Understanding the Uniform Standards of Practice for Providers of Supervised Visitation, to help ensure statewide compliance with Family Code sections 3201 and 3202. The training assisted multidisciplinary professionals with development of a best practices framework for model policies and requirements for implementing Standard 5.20.

Best Practices Approach Initiative: As part of the Corrections Standards Authority's Best Practices Approach Initiative (BPAI), staff and Assessments.com, the lead consultant on the project, held Evidence Based Practices Education seminars in San Diego. Approximately 850 attorneys, probation staff, and juvenile justice partners attended the four-hour seminar, "Applying Evidence Based Practices to Youthful Offenders: What Works in Reducing Recidivism," to discuss implementing evidence based practices in San Diego. A separate lunch hour session on "BPAI Implementation in San Diego" aimed at judicial officers and policy makers was held in June.

CASA Directors Education Program: The AOC hosted a two-day training for directors of Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) programs. Representatives from 41 programs and three developing programs from 47 counties, in addition to staff from the California CASA Association and the National CASA Association, attended the training. Highlights included a luncheon address by Hon. Trina Thompson, Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court of the Alameda County Superior Court, and an engaging discussion on the implementation of AB 12: Extending Foster Care to 21 and its implications for CASA practice. Sessions also included family finding and engagement, safety and permanency for LGBTQ foster youth, board development, and male and Latino volunteer outreach.

Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Scholarships: The program, created by Assembly Bill 1058, provided scholarships for family law justice partners to attend two trainings this period: 21 scholarships for family law facilitators to attend the 2011 Child Support Attorney College sponsored by the Child Support Directors Association of California, and 20 scholarships for child support commissioners and family law facilitators to attend the Straus Institute 21st Annual Summer Professional Skills Program in Dispute Resolution.

Court Community Communication: This program for 30 managers and supervisors included content on the importance of managing effective communication programs as a means of supporting public trust and confidence in the judicial system by making courts open, transparent, and understandable to the citizens they serve. The course also gave court administrators a wide range of specific strategies and tactics for managing effective court community communication programs.

Court Contact Training for the Assigned Judges Program: Eighty superior court judicial assignment contacts from courts in the Southern and Northern Central regions participated in the first-ever judicial assignments overview courses for those regions. Staff served as faculty, providing an overview of the Assigned Judges Program and moderating a group discussion of assignment scenarios. The program also included a panel discussion with veteran assigned judges and administrators.

Fundamental Issues of Case Flow Management: Thirty managers and supervisors focused on the fundamentals of case flow management and the skill sets necessary to perform effective case management.

Grant Seeking and Writing Workshops: The workshops consisted of two half-day sessions for court and AOC employees responsible for researching, locating, and/or writing grants.

Indian Child Welfare Act Services Trainings: Trainings were offered in various venues to judges, attorneys, social workers, tribal advocates, law enforcement, mediators, and others,

including: (1) Ukiah, in collaboration with State Adoptions; (2) Glenn County, in collaboration with the Attorney General's Office of Native American Affairs; (3) the Annual Family Law Conference; (4) the Annual National Indian Child Welfare Association conference in Alaska; (5) Eureka, in collaboration with Two Feathers and the California Indian Legal Services; and (6) an AOC Brown Bag forum on the history of federal Indian law.

Human Resources Investigations: The course provided two full-day regional sessions for approximately 50 human resources professionals in the trial and appellate courts. Course participants summarized the purpose and goals of the investigative process, discussed how outside investigators analyze facts to determine whether misconduct has occurred, and analyzed the components of an investigative report.

Leadership and Training Tools: Two three-day regional sessions for approximately 60 lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors included topics on effective leadership behaviors, leading former peers, building successful work relationships, group dynamics, principles of adult learning, and responding to challenging workplace situations.

Managing Technology Projects and Technology Resources: Thirty managers and supervisors learned how technology can be used in all of the National Association for Court Management's core competencies, as well as the role technology should play in organizational performance.

New Mediator Training: The Institute for New Court Professionals provided 20 hours of mandatory initial training in mediation skills, domestic violence, and family law for 31 child custody mediators, evaluators, and juvenile dependency mediators who had joined their trial courts in the past year.

Sixth District Appellate Program Spring Training Seminar: Approximately 75 court-appointed attorneys received minimum continuing legal education credit for the seminar addressing a range of issues relating to direct representation of appellants on appeal.

Untangling the Intermittent Leaves Web: Two webinar sessions were held for approximately 65 human resources professionals in the trial and appellate courts. The sessions identified typical challenges associated with intermittent family and medical leave; methods for tracking leave use; and best practices.

Broadcasts

Family Adoptions of Minors: A new broadcast for court staff provided an introduction to family adoption processing and addressed several topics, including: types of adoption;

questions to ask the petitioner; Indian Child Welfare Act inquiry and noticing requirements; and notice, investigation, appeal, and completion of the adoption process.

The Art of Interpersonal Communication: A new broadcast for court supervisors and managers addressed the effect of behavior on communication and gave participants an opportunity to review and practice skills for handling conflict and other interactions.

Protective Orders: The Basics: The program introduced different types of protective orders; defined the purpose of each; identified differences and similarities; and discussed key information across forms.

Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment: In compliance with Government Code section 12950.1, the broadcast was provided for court managers and supervisors.

Online Courses

Relevance and Its Limits: A new judicial course produced using a multi-media approach provided a brief refresher on this crucial evidence issue.

JUDICIAL VACANCY REPORT**Number of Judgeships Authorized, Filled, and Vacant as of June 15, 2011**

TYPE OF COURT	NUMBER OF COURTS	NUMBER OF JUDGESHIPS					
		Authorized	Filled	Vacant	Vacant (AB 159 positions)	Filled(Last Month)	Vacant(Last Month)
Supreme Court	1	7	6	1	0	6	1
Courts of Appeal	6	105	102	3	0	103	2
Superior Courts	58	1662	1584	28	50*	1590	72
All Courts	65	1774	1692	82		1699	75

* Authorized January 1, 2008, 50 new (AB 159) judgeships are added. However, the funding for these 50 new (AB 159) judgeships has been deferred.

SUPREME COURT

Appellate District	Vacancies	Reason for Vacancy	Justice to be Replaced	Last Day In Office
Supreme Court	1	Retirement	Hon. Carlos R. Moreno	02/28/11
TOTAL	1			

COURTS OF APPEAL

Appellate District	Vacancies	Reason for Vacancy	Justice to be Replaced	Last Day In Office
Third Appellate District	1	Elevated	Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye	01/02/11
Fourth Appellate District, Division Three	1*	Retirement	Hon. David G. Sills	05/31/11
Sixth Appellate District	1	Retirement	Hon. Richard J. McAdams	02/28/11
TOTAL	3			

* The Chief Justice selected Associate Justice William F. Rylaarsdam to serve as Acting Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three in Santa Ana. Justice Rylaarsdam, who sits on Division Three, will temporarily fill the vacancy created by the recent retirement of Presiding Justice David G. Sills until the Governor appoints a replacement, who must then be confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments.

SUPERIOR COURTS

County	Vacancies	Reason for Vacancy	Judge to be Replaced	Last Day In Office
Imperial	2	Retirement	Hon. Joseph Zimmerman	11/10/10
Imperial		Deceased	Hon. Barrett J. Foerster	11/10/10
Los Angeles	7	Retirement	Hon. Andrew C. Kauffman	05/15/11
Los Angeles		Retirement	Hon. Charles E. Horan	05/06/11
Los Angeles		To Fed Court	Hon. John A. Kronstadt	04/25/11
Los Angeles		Retirement	Hon. Marlene A. Kristovich	03/31/11
Los Angeles		Retirement	Hon. Jerry E. Johnson	03/02/11
Los Angeles		Retirement	Hon. Conrad Richard Aragon	02/17/11
Los Angeles		Retirement	Hon. Dennis A. Aichroth	02/17/11
Madera	1	Dis Retirement	Hon. Eric C. Wyatt	05/23/11
Mendocino	2	Retirement	Hon. Jonathan M. Lehan	03/04/11
Mendocino		Dis Retirement	Hon. Ronald Brown	01/31/11
Napa	1	Dis Retirement	Hon. Stephen Thomas Kroyer	05/23/11
Riverside	3	Retirement	Hon. W. Charles Morgan	01/31/11
Riverside		Retirement	Hon. Paul E. Zellerbach	01/02/11
Riverside		Elevated	Hon. Carol D. Codrington	01/02/11
Sacramento	1	Retirement	Hon. James L. Long	03/10/11
San Bernardino	1	Retirement	Hon. W. Robert Fawke	04/22/11
San Francisco	1	Retirement	Hon. Mary Carolyn Morgan	03/03/11
San Mateo	1	Retirement	Hon. Rosemary Pfeiffer	03/31/11
Santa Clara	4	Retirement	Hon. Kevin J. Murphy	05/31/11
Santa Clara		Retirement	Hon. Alfonso Fernandez	04/12/11
Santa Clara		Retirement	Hon. Eugene Michael Hyman	03/01/11
Santa Clara		To Fed Court	Hon. Edward J. Davila	03/01/11

Solano	1	Retirement	Hon. Allan P. Carter	02/25/11
Stanislaus	1	Retirement	Hon. John G. Whiteside	04/15/11
Tuolumne	1	Retirement	Hon. Douglas C. Boyack	12/31/10
Ventura	1	Retirement	Hon. David W. Long	05/16/11
SUBTOTAL:	28			
Butte	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Contra Costa	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Del Norte	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Fresno	4	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Kern	3	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Kings	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Los Angeles	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Madera	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Merced	2	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Monterey	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Orange	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Placer	2	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Riverside	7	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Sacramento	6	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
San Bernardino	7	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
San Joaquin	3	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Shasta	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Solano	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Sonoma	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
Stanislaus	2	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Tulare	2	(AB 159)*	New Positions	1/1/2008
Yolo	1	(AB 159)*	New Position	1/1/2008
TOTAL VACANCIES:	78			

**Number of Judgeships Authorized, Filled and Vacant as of the End of Each Month,
from January 2009 through June 2011***

Month	Superior Court				Court of Appeal			
	Authorized	Filled	Vacancy	Vacancy Rate	Authorized	Filled	Vacancy	Vacancy Rate
Jan-09	1,628	1,531	97	6.0%	105	98	7	6.7%
Feb-09	1,629	1,527	102	6.3%	105	96	9	8.6%
Mar-09	1,630	1,547	83	5.1%	105	96	9	8.6%
Apr-09	1,630	1,540	90	5.5%	105	96	9	8.6%
May-09	1,630	1,541	89	5.5%	105	96	9	8.6%
Jun-09	1,630	1,530	100	6.1%	105	100	5	4.8%
Jul-09	1,639	1,535	104	6.3%	105	101	4	3.8%
Aug-09	1,640	1,532	108	6.6%	105	102	3	2.9%
Sep-09	1,642	1,540	102	6.2%	105	102	3	2.9%
Oct-09	1,642	1,538	104	6.3%	105	102	3	2.9%
Nov-09	1,643	1,529	114	6.9%	105	102	3	2.9%
Dec-09	1,643	1,545	98	6.0%	105	102	3	2.9%
Jan-10	1,645	1,535	110	6.7%	105	102	3	2.9%
Feb-10	1,645	1,542	103	6.3%	105	101	4	3.8%
Mar-10	1,646	1,537	109	6.6%	105	101	4	3.8%
Apr-10	1,646	1,550	96	5.8%	105	102	3	2.9%
May-10	1,646	1,548	98	6.0%	105	102	3	2.9%
Jun-10	1,646	1,558	88	5.3%	105	101	4	3.8%
Jul-10	1,646	1,563	83	5.0%	105	102	3	2.9%
Aug-10	1,646	1,560	86	5.2%	105	103	2	1.9%
Sep-10	1,646	1,558	88	5.3%	105	103	2	1.9%
Oct-10	1,661	1,562	99	6.0%	105	102	3	2.9%
Nov-10	1,661	1,556	105	6.3%	105	102	3	2.9%
Dec-10	1,661	1,588	73	4.4%	105	102	3	2.9%
Jan-11	1,662	1,606	56	3.4%	105	104	1	1.0%
Feb-11	1,662	1,606	56	3.4%	105	104	1	1.0%
Mar-11	1,662	1,594	68	4.1%	105	103	2	1.9%
Apr-11	1,662	1,592	70	4.2%	105	103	2	1.9%
May-11	1,662	1,590	72	4.3%	105	103	2	1.9%
Jun-11	1,662	1,584	78	4.7%	105	102	3	2.9%

* As of June 15, 2011

Trial Court Authorized Positions and Vacancies

