

## Item SP12-05 Response Form

### **Title: Strategic Evaluation Committee Report**

The Strategic Evaluation Committee (SEC) was appointed by Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye in March 2011 to conduct an in-depth review of the AOC with a view toward promoting transparency, accountability, and efficiency. The Chief Justice received the report and recommendations on May 25. At its meeting on June 21, 2012, the Judicial Council accepted the report and directed that it be posted for public comment for 30 days. Comments received will be considered public and posted by name and organization.

**PLEASE NOTE that all comments will be posted to the branch web site at [www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov) as submitted by the commentator as soon as reasonably possible after receipt.**

### **To Submit Comments**

Comments may be entered on this form or prepared in a letter format. If you are *not* submitting your comments directly on this form, please include the information requested below and the proposal number for identification purposes. Because all comments will be posted as submitted to the branch web site, please submit your comments by email, preferably as an attachment, to: [invitations@jud.ca.gov](mailto:invitations@jud.ca.gov)

Please include the following information:

**Name:** Mark Juhas    **Title:** Judge

**Organization:** Los Angeles Superior Court

**Commenting on behalf of an organization**

*General Comment:*

I applaud that the branch is engaging in deep self-reflection; any organization only becomes stronger through this process. As I read the report, many of the recommendations will require further, thoughtful review of the AOC. I have extensive experience with CFCC and CJER, so I limit my comments to those two divisions.

*Specific Comment - Recommendation/Chapter Number:*

7-3 In my experience, CFCC has been extremely supportive and helpful to the local courts and their litigants. Consideration should be given to allowing CFCC to remain a direct report to the Administrative Director. CFCC provides many unique services to the court, most of which do not fit nicely into other parts of the AOC. As noted by other commentators, much progress has been made in access to justice in California courts; in many cases we are a national leader. The advancements are due, at least in part, to the fact that innovation is focused state wide, while allowing room for local implementation. In this area, much systemic advancement requires centralized innovation; keeping CFCC

<b>DEADLINE FOR COMMENT: 5:00 p.m., Sunday, July 22, 2012</b>
---

*All comments will become part of the public record.*

separate allows greater opportunity to maximize the expertise in this area for the local courts.

7-20. I teach extensively for CJER. If the CJER teaching support positions that are currently attorney staffed are staffed by non-attorneys, education will necessarily suffer. Judicial Officers that teach have primary day-to-day court responsibilities and do not have the luxury of limitless time to plan and prepare a course. CJER attorneys help teachers develop substantive outlines, make sure that the content is well organized in an easily teachable form and generally keep a course legally and procedurally on track. The expertise that an attorney brings to this position is difficult to replicate in a non-legally trained individual. Without the support, the teaching Judicial Officer will necessarily have a much more difficult task in teaching.

Additionally, legal training is essential in assisting the curriculum committees in developing and planning both the substance and method of delivery of judicial education.

**DEADLINE FOR COMMENT: 5:00 p.m., Sunday, July 22, 2012**

*All comments will become part of the public record.*