

Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)

Annual Agenda¹—2018

Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P): **12/14/2017REVISED TBD**

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Ms. Kimberly Flener, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Butte County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Claudia Ortega, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Under rule 10.48(a) of the California Rules of Court, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) is charged with making recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, rule 10.48(b) sets forth the additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>Per rule 10.48(c), CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts. Rule 10.48(d) establishes the Executive Committee of CEAC. The Executive Committee consists of 18 members.</p> <p>The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.</p>	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and Judicial Council staff resources.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

- [1. \(New\) TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Emergency Response Working Group](#)
- ~~1.2.~~ TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
- ~~2.3.~~ TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
- ~~3.4.~~ TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee
- ~~4.5.~~ TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement
- ~~5.6.~~ (New) Child Support Services Subcommittee (*formerly an ad hoc working group*)
- ~~6.7.~~ (New) JBSIS Subcommittee (*formerly a working group*)
- ~~7.8.~~ Nominations Subcommittee
- ~~8.9.~~ Records Management Subcommittee
- ~~9.10.~~ (New) Court Security Services for the Trial Courts Working Group
- ~~10.11.~~ (New) Standards of Judicial Administration Working Group
- ~~11.12.~~ Trial Court Facilities Working Group

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	<p><u>Project Title: Develop Resource for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers for Responding to Emergency Situations</u></p>	<p><u>Priority 2</u></p>
	<p><u>Project Summary:</u> In light of the significant impact the recent fires have had on trial court operations, and following up on the presentation by then-Assistant Presiding Judge Gary Nadler, Superior Court of Sonoma County, to the Judicial Council during its November 2017 business meeting, through a new TCPJAC/CEAC joint working group, develop a resource for presiding judges and court executive officers, an Emergency Response Playbook. Compile checklists for presiding judges and court executive officers to follow. Included would be information on what they need to consider and address before, during, and after a disaster. The playbook would include an evaluation of what happens resulting from a disaster and a compilation of procedures and processes already in place in several courts. Judge Nadler would serve as a resource and be consulted throughout this project.</p> <p><u>Status/Timeline:</u> 2018.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</u> Legal Services, Human Resources, Information Technology, and Facilities Services.</p> <p><u>Internal/External Stakeholders:</u> Superior Courts.</p> <p><u>AC Collaboration:</u> TCPJAC and the Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>	
1-2	<p><u>Project Title: Assess Issues Related to the Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement</u></p>	<p><u>Priority 2⁴</u></p>
	<p><u>Project Summary⁵:</u> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement is charged with assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues relating to the presence of body-worn cameras brought into the court by officers appearing on legal matters. Review and recommend policies and procedures for trial courts; and 	

³ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

⁴ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

⁵ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other related issues that may arise as the working group delves into this subject. <p>Status/Timeline: Projected completion date is 2018. Charge of the working group was reassessed and revised in light of the Digital Evidence Workstream established by the Information Technology Advisory Committee in August 2017.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Collaboration with the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and Information Technology Advisory Committee. Possible consultation with the Court Security Advisory Committee and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
2-3	<p>Project Title: Review and comment on issues related to Child Support Services, such as the Plans of Cooperation (POCs) and Agreements between the Department of Child Support Services, the Judicial Council, and the trial courts</p> <p>Project Summary: Through the new Child Support Services Subcommittee, CEAC will work in consultation with the Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to review and comment on future iterations of the model Plans of Cooperation (POCs) between the trial courts and DCSS. In response to issues that arose with the 2015 DCSS model POC, CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and CFCC staff to discuss and resolve concerns prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies. CEAC is requesting that this former ad hoc working group be converted to a subcommittee as the review of future model POCs will be ongoing and the additional work charged to the new subcommittee is also of an ongoing nature.</p> <p>The additional work charged to the subcommittee includes providing input on the language in the Agreements between DCSS and the Judicial Council that could have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee will develop comments and/or recommendations (for CEAC’s approval) concerning recommendations proposed by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee regarding the development of AB 1058 data for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). The subcommittee will also convene to address any other critical issues related to the POCs and AB 1058 that might arise in the interim.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>	<p>Priority 2</p>

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Office of Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Department of Child Support Services.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; and Workload Assessment Advisory Committee.</p>	
3-4	Project Title: Identify Issues and Develop Recommendations Concerning the Provision of Court Security Services for the Trial Courts	Priority 2
	<p>Project Summary: CEAC, through a new working group, will assess the statewide scope of a growing problem concerning inadequate sheriff staffing levels in the trial courts or potential reduction of current security staffing levels by the sheriff. This working group is also charged with analyzing solutions and developing recommendations, for CEAC’s approval, regarding court security services for the trial courts. In recent years and in an increasing number of counties, county sheriff’s offices have provided fewer officers than provided for in the courts’ MOUs with these offices. Other courts have experienced decreased court security services for other reasons, such as the opening of new and larger court facilities. Because decreased levels of sheriff’s presence has significant implications for the safety of judicial officers, court employees, and the public, CEAC has determined that it is essential to begin assessing the statewide scope of this problem and to develop recommendations.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Legal Services; and Security Operations.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: California State Association of Counties (CSAC); California State Sheriffs' Association (CSSA); and Department of Finance.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Security Advisory Committee; Judicial Branch Budget Committee; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; and TCPJAC.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
4.5	Project Title: Review Standards of Judicial Administration that Relate to Trial Court Performance Measures	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC, through a new working group and in consultation with TCPJAC (as needed), will review the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommend additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures to improve the branch’s ability to communicate the trial courts’ objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort would seek to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self-help center hours, clerks’ office hours, etc.). This project was conceived as a way to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Legal Services; and other related Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO); TCPJAC; and other related advisory bodies.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws	<i>Priority 1⁴</i>
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Governmental Affairs; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: TCPJAC.</p>		
2.	Project Title: Develop, Review, and/or Provide Input on Proposals to Establish, Amend, or Repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards on Judicial Administration, and Forms; Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) develops, reviews, and provides input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to RUPRO concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: RUPRO; chair and/or staff of proposing advisory committees when necessary; and TCPJAC.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
3.	Project Title: Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee reviews and provides early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: TCPJAC.</p>		
4.	Project Title: Support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force; Focus on Local Operational Matters Related to the Future Implementation of the Language Access Plan in All Trial Courts; and Consider Amending Judicial Council Form INT-120	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC will support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force in fulfilling its charge by providing any needed data, fiscal and other estimates, and input on its proposals and recommendations when requested by its chair.</p>		
<p>As the task force continues with its work, CEAC will also focus on local operational matters related to the future implementation of the Language Access Plan in all trial courts. These local operational matters include the following:</p>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify local resources and strategies for the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; 2. Evaluate and recommend opportunities for trial courts to share and leverage innovations and enhancements related to the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; and 3. Recommend best practices related to the local management of language access resources and services including how best to integrate them into other areas of local court operations in a manner that increases interpreter and other language access effectiveness. 		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>CEAC, via an ad hoc working group, will also review and possibly propose amendments to Judicial Council Form INT-120 (Certification of Unavailability of Certified or Registered Interpreter) based on a recommendation of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel and per Recommendations 9, 19, 69, and 70 in the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i>.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Court Interpreters Program; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Interpreters and litigants.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Interpreters Advisory Panel; and Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force.</p>	
5.	Project Title: Trial Court Facilities Working Group	Priority 2
	<p>Project Summary: Through this new working group, CEAC will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and provide, on an as needed basis, early court executive officer input on facility related proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations; and • Discuss strategies and best practices for courts facing delayed court construction projects and provide input, as appropriate, to the Court Facility Advisory Committee (CFAC) on advocacy efforts. <p>The working group will also provide input and feedback on various facility issues being addressed by the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) and CFAC. The working group is charged with providing preliminary feedback on facility proposals on behalf of CEAC. Input on more substantive facility policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented CEAC for final review.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Facilities Services; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Possible consultation with CFAC and TCFMAC.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
6.	Project Title: Strengthen the Role of Court Executive Officers in Outreach to the Legislative and Executive Branches	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC will conduct outreach with the legislature with a focus on legislative staff in both the local districts and in the Capitol. This effort will entail the development of outreach materials for court executive officers and perhaps educational sessions with legislative staff to educate them on the judicial branch budget and the fiscal/operational needs of the trial courts.</p>		
<p>CEAC will also seek to strengthen communication with the Executive Branch and with the Department of Finance in particular. It will do so in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Budget Services.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Judicial Council’s Administrative Director; Budget Services; and Governmental Affairs.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
7.	Project Title: Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) and Review and Make Recommendations to Statutes and Rules of Court Governing Trial Court Records Management	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Through the Records Management Subcommittee, CEAC will continue to develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. It will also continue to review and make recommendations on various statutes and rules governing trial court records management.</p>		
<p>The subcommittee identified the following projects:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop standards and guidelines governing electronic signatures on documents filed by the parties and attorneys for inclusion in the TCRM. The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) developed a legislative proposal to amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(b)(2) in 2016. To conform to this legislative proposal, ITAC will also develop a rule proposal in 2017 to amend California Rules of Court, rule 2.257, to authorize electronic signatures on documents filed into the courts by the parties and attorneys. 		

Ongoing Projects and Activities³

If the legislative proposal is enacted by the Legislature and rule proposal is adopted by the Judicial Council, the amendments will take effect January 1, 2018.

- Review and develop standards and guidelines for electronic court records maintained as data in case management systems. Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of court records in the form of data.
- Review statutes and rules of court pertaining to the contents of registers of action and indexes to determine whether amendments to statutes or rules are necessary. The subcommittee would also like to develop additional guidelines on the contents of indexes and electronic registers of action remotely accessible by the public for inclusion in the TCRM to provide clarity and consistency among courts statewide. Currently, courts from different jurisdictions have varying practices on what to include in the electronic registers of action that are remotely accessible by the public.
- Determine the need to propose amendments to Government Code section 68152 to clean up the records retention statutes. The technical amendments will include fixing statutory conflicts regarding the retention of original wills and codicils, retention of Prop 47 petitions, retention of criminal realignment filings, and retention periods for Family and Juvenile cases.
- Develop best practices in maintaining original paper court records. Provide guidance on whether certain court records should be maintained in paper form. Several courts have approached Legal Services office with questions about specific types of court records that the original paper document need to be retained for policy reasons.
- Develop additional guidelines for exhibits management.
- Monitor the progress of proposed 2017~~8~~ Judicial Council-sponsored legislations, which include amendments to Government Code section 68153, which eliminates the reporting requirement that superior courts must report destroyed court records to the Judicial Council and Government Code section 68152(a)(6), which include a retention period for court records in gun violence cases.

Status/Timeline: TCRM Updates – Ongoing. GC §§ 68152(a)(6) and 68153 – 2019.

Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.

Internal/External Stakeholders: None.

AC Collaboration: Possible consultation with Information Technology Advisory Committee; and Probate Mental Health Advisory Committee.

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
8.	Project Title: Update JBSIS Filing Definitions and Implementation of New Reporting Standards	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC will continue to provide input to a subcommittee (staffed by the Judicial Council’s Office of Court Research) that is reviewing and updating the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings information definitions. The existing JBSIS Working Group is focusing on these higher priority definitions, rather than reviewing and updating all definitions in the JBSIS manual. Because of the ongoing nature of its work, the CEAC leadership requests that this working group be converted to a subcommittee.</p> <p>The working group has developed a final set of JBSIS revised definitions and reporting categories based on court input and comment. These new definitions and reporting categories will be presented to CEAC along with a final report and recommendations for approval. Upon approval by CEAC, these new definitions and reporting categories will be presented to the Judicial Council for approval in January 2018 with a recommended effective date of July 1, 2018. Office of Court Research will work with the JBSIS Subcommittee to update and release a new JBSIS Manual based on these revised definitions and new reporting categories.</p> <p>The JBSIS Subcommittee will continue to provide input and support for courts during implementation of these new definitions and reporting categories in JBSIS. The subcommittee will establish a subgroup of court staff with subject-matter expertise in JBSIS to review and respond to questions about the revised definitions. Office of Court Research will coordinate all court questions about JBSIS during the implementation process and convene the subgroup to determine the appropriate JBSIS reporting practice. The JBSIS Subcommittee will develop a formal Dispute Resolution process where courts can bring disagreements about JBSIS reporting and/or responses to their questions by the subgroup. Issues identified during the subgroup review and dispute resolution process will guide areas for future study by the JBSIS Subcommittee.</p> <p>The subcommittee will also assist courts in coordinating these changes to JBSIS reporting with their case management system vendors. Staff from Office of Court Research has already been providing ongoing support to a separate JBSIS subcommittee of the California Tyler Users Group (CATUG), and will continue to support CATUG in implementing these changes to JBSIS. The subcommittee and Office of Court Research will work with other courts using different case management systems than Tyler to ensure that their vendors implement these JBSIS changes in a consistent and accurate manner across courts and different systems.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Office of Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts; and case management system vendors.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.	
9.	Project Title: Provide Input on JBSIS Data Verification Standards	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Under California Rules of Court, rule 10.48(b)(3), CEAC has a responsibility to “review and make proposals concerning the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) or other large-scope data collection efforts.” Given the importance of court-reported case filing data (via JBSIS) as a key input to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) — and ultimately to court budget allocations—CEAC would like to assist with providing the Judicial Council with recommendations on data quality and documentation standards that could enhance efforts to audit and verify the reported data.</p> <p>Further, California Rules of Court, rule 10.63 establishes the Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch (audit committee). The Judicial Council’s Audit Services periodically performs audits of the superior courts where each audit’s scope is guided by an annual audit plan that is approved by the audit committee. One audit scope area listed in the annual audit plan for fiscal year 2017-18 is the review of court-reported case filing data for compliance with existing JBSIS rules.</p> <p>To further improve data quality, Audit Services will periodically notify the Office of Court Research of JBSIS-related audit findings and the potential need for CEAC to develop further guidance on data quality standards. On behalf of CEAC, Office of Court Research will take the lead role with guidance from the JBSIS subcommittee in developing recommendations on new policy and JBSIS reporting standards for CEAC’s consideration and ultimate approval. Audit Services will be available to consult with Office of Court Research and CEAC, upon request, to further describe the specific circumstances surrounding JBSIS-related audit findings at the superior courts.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Audit Services; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Office of Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
10.	Project Title: Review and Recommend Court Administrator Candidates for Membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and Other Advisory Groups	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Pursuant to rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and recommend to the council's Executive and Planning Committee candidates for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of CEAC's Executive Committee; • Nonvoting court administrator members of the council; and • Members of other advisory committees who are court executives or judicial administrators. <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Executive and Planning Committee.</p>		
11.	Project Title: Serve as a Resource	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Respective Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Respective advisory bodies.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Budget Advocacy. Throughout the year, CEAC leadership worked closely with the Judicial Council’s executive level staff to advocate for appropriate funding of the judicial branch and to provide input on other critical proposals. As part of this effort, CEAC leadership worked with Budget Services staff to develop educational sessions for Department of Finance representatives concerning the history of trial court budgets and current trial court fiscal challenges. CEAC leadership and Judicial Council executive level staff also arranged for DOF representatives to meet with them and several CEOs at various courts to discuss the fiscal goals and challenges of the judicial branch. CEOs from the following courts participated in these in-person meetings: Butte; Contra Costa; El Dorado; Glenn; Lake, Los Angeles; Merced; Orange; Placer; San Bernardino; San Diego; San Francisco; San Joaquin; Santa Barbara; Santa Clara; Shasta; and Ventura. The meetings were held at the following trial courts: El Dorado; Glenn; San Bernardino; San Francisco; Santa Barbara; and Ventura.</p>
2.	<p>Educational Opportunities. TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to provide eleven educational breakout sessions on eight key areas of court operations as part of the August 2017 TCPJAC/CEAC Statewide Business Meetings. The topics of the educational breakout sessions included: Collaborative Courts; Court Budgeting – Techniques and Tools; Effective and Efficient Traffic Procedures; Evidence-Based Practices in Misdemeanors; Facilities Management & Maintenance; Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) and the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model; New Budget Advocacy Strategies for Fiscal Year 2018–2019; and Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM). Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers.</p>
3.	<p>Mentoring Program. To assist a growing number of newer court executive officers, CEAC leadership developed an informal mentoring program that connects experienced court executive officers with newer peers.</p>
4.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017, holding 11 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that had a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2017, the subcommittee will set its schedule for 2018 and continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts. The subcommittee will continue to recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee.</p>
5.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017 to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and input on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and submit comments on rules, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2018 and meet as needed.</p>
6.	<p>JBSIS Working Group. The working group and staff from Office of Court Research are in the process of reviewing and updating the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings information definitions for: Civil (Unlimited, Limited, and Small Claims); Family Law; Felony; Juvenile Delinquency; Juvenile Dependency; Mental Health; Misdemeanor and Infractions; and Probate. CEAC is expected to submit a final report to the Judicial Council for its review and approval at its January 12, 2018, business meeting.</p>
7.	<p>Trial Court Facilities Working Group. The working group convened by conference call twice to provide input on proposed updates to the Judicial Council’s 2001 Energy Conservation Guidelines. Most of this input was incorporated in the final version. The Trial Court</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	Facility Modification Advisory Committee proposed updates to these guidelines as part of a statewide effort to reduce utility costs in courthouses and conserve monies in the Court Facilities Trust Fund.
8.	New Ad Hoc Working Group Regarding Child Support Services. In response to the issues that arose with the 2015 Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) model Plan of Cooperation (POC), CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and staff in the Judicial Council’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) to discuss and resolve such issues prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies (LCSAs). The working group met several times by telephone to review the DCSS’s 2017 draft model POC proposal over several weeks. Its members then met in person with the State DCSS Chief Counsel and CFCC staff to recommend a large number of changes that would better meet the needs and requirements of the trial courts, as well as foster a more effective approach of mutual support and cooperation at the local level. It was hoped that doing so would ultimately contribute to increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of child support case processing throughout the state. With the exception of one, all of the working group’s suggested changes were accepted by DCSS.
9.	Study Issues Related to Courts Charging Government Entities, Other Courts, and the Public for Services and Records. [Disbanded in September 2017.]
10.	Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts. [Disbanded in September 2017.]