

# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm)

---

## INVITATION TO COMMENT

[ItC prefix as assigned]-\_\_

---

Title	Action Requested
Judicial Administration: Rule for Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch	Review and submit comments by May 15, 2015
Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes	Proposed Effective Date
Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.63	July 1, 2015
Proposed by	Contact
Executive and Planning Committee Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair	Susan R. McMullan, 415-865-7990 <a href="mailto:susan.mcmullan@jud.ca.gov">susan.mcmullan@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary and Origin

The Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) recommends that rule 10.63 of the California Rules of Court, which concerns the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch, be amended to modify the description of its duties, provide more specificity to the membership criteria, and make technical changes.

### Background

Rule 10.63 was adopted by the Judicial Council, effective February 21, 2014, to establish by rule the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch (A&E).

### The Proposal

Subdivision (b) of rule 10.63 sets out A&E's additional duties, beyond the committee's area of focus. Subdivision (b)(2) would be amended to add that every odd year, A&E will review and report to the council on council expenditures for local assistance (benefitting one or more trial courts) and state operations, consistent with the recommendation of the California State Auditor (CSA) (formerly, Bureau of State Audits) to give this responsibility to an advisory body.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the CSA recommended, "The Judicial Council should create a separate advisory body, or amend a current committee's responsibilities and composition, to review the AOC's

---

<sup>1</sup> California State Auditor, *Judicial Branch of California, Report 2014-107* (Jan. 2015), p. 4, 54,  
[www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2014-107.pdf](http://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2014-107.pdf)

*The proposals have not been approved by the Judicial Council and are not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules and Projects Committee, or its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee. These proposals are circulated for comment purposes only.*

state operations and local assistance expenditures in detail to ensure that they are justified and prudent. This advisory body should be staffed with public and judicial branch finance experts.”<sup>2</sup> E&P has determined that A&E has the appropriate expertise for this responsibility and will, through the rule amendment, charge that committee with reviewing expenditures from funds designated for state operations and local assistance. In addition, the council will adopt guidelines for A&E to use in its review of state operations and local assistance expenditures.

E&P also recommends that the membership provision in rule 10.63 be amended, consistent with the CSA recommendation, to specifically require that members have expertise in public and judicial branch finance. Thus, subdivision (c) would be amended to provide that members from all membership categories must have “experience in public or judicial branch finance.” The amendment of this subdivision would also eliminate the provision that states, “The California Judges Association will recommend three nominees for a superior court judge position and submit its recommendations to the Executive and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council.” The California Judges Association may continue to submit recommendations for membership, but to so specify in the rule is unnecessary.

Subdivision (b)(1) would be amended to limit the additional duty of making annual recommendations to the council concerning any budget change proposals for funding Judicial Council staff (formerly the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)). Other advisory bodies, such as the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), and E&P, are responsible for recommending certain budget change proposals. For example, the JCTC recommends budget change proposals related to technology, such as trial court telecommunications for local area network/wide area network architecture. Thus, the rule would be amended to provide that A&E is responsible for recommendations for budget change proposals not within the purview of any other advisory body.

The rule would be amended to remove the additional duty of recommending any proposed changes to the annual compensation plan for council staff (formerly the AOC). The Judicial Council already is involved in review of Judicial Council staff compensation. In addition, salaries of council staff are subject to the approval of the Chair of the Judicial Council (Gov. Code, § 19825(b)). Maintaining this review as a responsibility of A&E would result in a duplication of efforts. Thus, E&P recommends removing it from the rule.

Subdivision (b)(3) would be amended to narrow the audit reports that A&E must review. The word “all” would be removed to reflect that A&E is not responsible for reviewing audit reports of the judicial branch conducted by outside entities such as the CSA. To expedite action relating to outside audits, the review and response will be done by either the council, council internal committees, or particular council members identified to assist with this duty. This will ensure timely action on audit reports from outside entities. A&E would retain responsibility for reviewing audits of the judicial branch performed by the council’s Audit Services.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Subdivision (b)(4) would be amended slightly to parallel new subdivision (b)(2) by adding “review and” before “report” and to provide that this duty occurs in even years. Other minor changes would be made to reflect the name change from “Administrative Office of the Courts” and “AOC” to “Judicial Council” and “Judicial Council staff,” as appropriate.

### **Alternatives Considered**

The rule could remain unchanged, but E&P believes that the proposed amendments are necessary to align A&E’s additional duties and membership criteria to the needs of the council and to respond to the CSA recommendations that the council (1) charge a new or existing advisory committee with responsibility for reviewing state operations and local assistance expenditures in detail to ensure they are justified and prudent, and (2) provide that the advisory committee is composed of subject-matter experts with experience in public and judicial branch finance.

### **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

On amendment of the rule, E&P will solicit nominations for all positions on A&E under the new membership criteria. This effort will require a special solicitation apart from the general spring solicitation for advisory committee membership nominations. Current members of A&E will be asked to reapply for appointment to the committee.

## **Request for Specific Comments**

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, E&P is interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.63, at pages 4–5

Rule 10.63 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2015, to read:

1 **Rule 10.63. Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the**  
2 **Judicial Branch**

3  
4 **(a) Area of focus**

5  
6 The committee makes recommendations to the council on practices that will promote  
7 financial accountability and efficiency in the judicial branch.  
8

9 **(b) Additional duties**

10  
11 In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee must:

12  
13 (1) Make recommendations annually to the council concerning ~~any~~ budget change  
14 proposals for funding of the ~~Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Judicial~~  
15 Council that are not within the purview of any other advisory body and any proposed  
16 changes to the annual compensation plan for the AOC;  
17

18 (2) Every odd year, review and report to the council on council expenditures for local  
19 assistance (benefiting one or more trial courts) and state operations;  
20

21 ~~(2)(3)~~ Review all audit reports of the judicial branch, recommend council acceptance of  
22 audit reports, and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the council on  
23 individual or systemic issues;  
24

25 ~~(3)(4)~~ Every even year, review and report to the council on AOC council contracts that  
26 meet established criteria to ensure that the contracts are in support of judicial branch  
27 policy; and  
28

29 ~~(4)(5)~~ Review proposed updates and revisions to the *Judicial Branch Contracting Manual*.  
30

31 **(c) Membership**

32  
33 The committee must include members ~~in~~ with experience in public or judicial branch  
34 finance from the following categories:  
35

36 (1) Appellate court justices;

37 (2) Superior court judges; and

38 (3) Court executive officers.  
39

40  
41  
42 ~~The California Judges Association will recommend three nominees for a superior court~~  
43 ~~judge position and submit its recommendations to the Executive and Planning Committee~~  
44 ~~of the Judicial Council.~~  
45

46 **Advisory Committee Comment**  
47

Rule 10.63 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2015, to read:

1 The purpose of the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial  
2 Branch is to promote transparency, accountability, efficiency, and understanding of the ~~AOC~~ Judicial  
3 Council and the judicial branch. The advisory committee fosters the best use of the work, information,  
4 and recommendations provided by ~~the AOC~~ Judicial Council staff, and it promotes increased  
5 understanding of the ~~AOC's~~ mission, responsibilities, accomplishments, and challenges of Judicial  
6 Council staff.

**DRAFT**

Date: 3-13-15

**Court Facilities Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Kelly Quinn, Assistant Director for Business and Planning, Judicial Council, Capital Program
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b>  Per Rule 10.62 that was adopted by the Judicial Council on February 20, 2014, the committee makes recommendations to the Judicial Council concerning the judicial branch capital program for the trial and appellate courts.	
<b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b>  Currently, there are a total of 21 members. Please see the attached Court Facilities Advisory Committee roster. Per Rule 10.62, the committee must include at least one member from each of the categories below. Presently, the composition of the committee is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appellate court justice – 2 members</li><li>• Appellate court clerk/administrator – 1 member</li><li>• Superior court judge – 8 members</li><li>• Court executive officer – 3 members</li><li>• Lawyer – 2 members</li><li>• Local government official or administrator – 1 member</li><li>• Public member with expertise in real estate acquisition, construction, architecture, or cost estimating, or facilities management and operations – 2 members</li><li>• The chair and vice-chair of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, as non-voting members – 2 members</li></ul>	

**Subcommittees:**

Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS) – Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair

CCRS Workgroups (by topic): Courtroom Standards, First vs. Long-term O&M Costs, and Courthouse Security – Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair

Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee – Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Chair

Subcommittee on Courthouse Names – Hon. Samuel K. Feng, Chair

**Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2015:**

The key objectives are the projects listed below.

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> All projects support 2006–2012 Strategic Plan Goal: Goal VI, A – Facilities Infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for conducting court business.</li> <li>2. Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners</li> </ol> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Coordination through Lead Staff to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Kelly Quinn, Judicial Council, Capital Program Contact: 818-558-3078; Kelly.Quinn@jud.ca.gov</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Reviews of courthouse projects in relation to budget. Submit recommendations for Judicial Council consideration on how projects should proceed with available budgets.
2.	Review and monitor implementation of recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant (IOC)	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Review and monitor of implementation of IOC recommendations.



#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	Oversee Judicial Council's process for and progress in reducing courthouse project costs	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Oversight of reductions to courthouse project costs. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.
4.	Coordinate with Executive and Planning Committee and the Judicial Council to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.
5.	Coordinate with the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council on the effort to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
6.	Review courtroom layouts for recommendation of adoption by Judicial Council	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above, as well as the Courtroom Standards Workgroup of the CCRS</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Summer 2015	Judicial Council adoption of a policy on courtroom layouts to apply to courthouse construction projects in design.

### III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	<b>Ongoing, as needed</b>
2.	Review and monitor recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant	<b>Ongoing</b>
3.	Oversee Judicial Council’s process for and progress in reducing courthouse project costs	<b>Ongoing</b>
4.	Coordinate with Executive and Planning Committee and the Judicial Council to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program	<b>Ongoing</b>
5.	Coordinate with the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council on the effort to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications	<b>Ongoing</b>
6.	Review and recommend changes to the interim Courthouse Naming Policy for future Judicial Council consideration and adoption	<b>Completed. Judicial Council adopted the revised <i>Courthouse Naming Policy</i> on April 25, 2014</b>

## IV. SUBCOMMITTEES

**Subcommittees:** Note: Each subcommittee is only composed of members of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee.

***Subcommittee name:* Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS)**

*Purpose of subcommittee:* The subcommittee was created with the purpose of proposing further cost reductions to the SB 1407 program. In October 2012, the Judicial Council directed that the subcommittee should oversee and have direct implementation authority to mandate project cost reductions for all capital-outlay projects in design managed by the judicial branch. The subcommittee is currently responsible for the review of the costs of all courthouse capital projects in design, in an effort to reduce expenditure of public funds without compromising safety, security, and functionality for the public and the courts.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 10

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* October 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets approximately seven times per year.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

*Workgroups of the Subcommittee:* Courtroom Standards, First vs. Long-term O&M Costs, and Courthouse Security:

***CCRS Workgroup name/topic:* Courtroom Standards**

*Purpose of workgroup:* To update standards on courtroom design to apply to projects in design phase, to reduce construction costs.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 8

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

*Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets:* This workgroup has met a total of four times.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Courtroom layouts were presented to the full advisory committee in March and December 2014 and are planned for presentation to the Judicial Council in summer 2015.

**CCRS Workgroup name/topic: First vs. Long-term O&M Costs**

*Purpose of workgroup:* To compare costs of one-time or initial costs to ongoing operations and maintenance costs for informing choices on courthouse building materials and systems, to reduce construction costs.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 7

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

*Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets:* This workgroup has met a total of two times.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* A pamphlet, titled *First Cost and Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Costs*, was approved for production by the CCRS in January 2014.

**CCRS Workgroup name/topic: Courthouse Security**

*Purpose of workgroup:* To review security issues in the courthouse construction program, to reduce construction costs.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 5

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

*Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets:* This workgroup has met a total of two times.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* A metric for central holding capacity/cells in new courthouse capital projects was approved by the CCRS in December 2013.

**Subcommittee name: Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee**

*Purpose of subcommittee:* The subcommittee was created with the purpose of overseeing the procurement of the independent outside oversight consultant that would review and assess the judicial branch's courthouse construction program. The subcommittee has been responsible for all processes involved with the outside consultant's procurement, including the final selection, the review and endorsement of the report findings and recommendations, and the review of the policies, procedures, and guidelines created by the Judicial Council in response to the report findings and recommendations.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 5

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* August 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets approximately two times per year.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

***Subcommittee name:* Subcommittee on Courthouse Names**

*Purpose of subcommittee:* The subcommittee was created to develop a recommended courthouse naming policy to the Judicial Council and implement the policy as it requires action by the subcommittee.

*Number of advisory committee members:* 8

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee):* None.

*Date formed:* December 2012

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets approximately one time per year.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

# Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee

Annual Agenda—2015

Approved by E&P/RUPRO: \_\_\_\_\_

## I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. David Edwin Power, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Solano
<b>Staff:</b>	Mr. Patrick McGrath, Facility Operations Manager, Real Estate and Facilities Management

### **Advisory Body's Charge: Rule 10.65. Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee**

#### **(a) Area of focus**

The committee makes recommendations to the council on facilities modifications, maintenance, and operations; environmental services; and utility management.

#### **(b) Additional duties**

In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee:

- (1) Makes recommendations to the council on policy issues, business practices, and budget monitoring and control for all facility-related matters in existing branch facilities.
- (2) Makes recommendations to the council on funding and takes additional action in accordance with council policy, both for facility modifications and for operations and maintenance.
- (3) Collaborates with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee in the development of the capital program, including providing input to design standards, prioritization of capital projects, and methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost.
- (4) Provides quarterly and annual reports on the facilities modification program in accordance with the council policy.

#### **(c) Membership**

The committee consists of members from the following categories:

- (1) Trial court judges; and
- (2) Court executive officers.

The committee includes the chair and vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, as non-voting members.

Advisory Committee Comment

The Judicial Council policy referred to in the rule is contained in the *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy* adopted by the council.

**Advisory Body’s Membership:** The committee consists of members from the following categories: Trial court judges; and court executive officers. The committee includes the chair and the vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, as non-voting members.

- Chair: Hon. David Edwin Power, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Solano (Voting Member)
- Vice Chair: Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Voting Member)
- Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Glenn (Voting Member)
- Hon. James L. Stoelker, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara (Voting Member)
- Hon. Vanessa W. Vallarta, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Monterey (Voting Member)
- Ms. Linda Romero-Soles , Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Merced (Voting Member)
- Ms. Christina M. Volkens, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino (Voting Member)
- Ms. Jeanine D. Tucker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne (Voting Member)
- Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego (Voting Member)
- Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Administrative Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District (Non-voting Member)
- Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara (Non-voting Member)

**Subgroups/Working Groups:**

**Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2015:**

- Implement Rule 10.65 – *Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee*
- Implement Policy – *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*;
- Implement Charge – *Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge*; and
- Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs.



## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) provides continuous review of proposed facility modification projects that have been identified as potential projects by judges, court staff, regional service providers, VFA, Inc., and Judicial Council staff. These potential projects are evaluated by the Judicial Council's Real Estate and Facilities Management staff and are evaluated using specific criteria pursuant to the Judicial Council policy and then presented for review to the advisory committee.</p> <p>Judicial Council staff and the TCFMAC meet in-person or via teleconference every 40 to 60 days to review the proposed projects. The advisory committee does not always agree with staff recommendations and does not always agree with the prioritization. The proposed project list is reviewed and upon concurrence of the advisory committee, projects are either approved or denied for execution by staff.</p>	<p>Implements Policy and Charge – See attached</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.B and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Capital Programs (CP), and Office of Emergency Response and Security (OERS).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Facility modifications are reviewed and either accepted or denied by the advisory committee.</p> <p>Approved projects receive funding allocations and then staff executes the projects.</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>As of December 14, 2012, the advisory committee is responsible for providing ongoing oversight of policy issues related to the operations and maintenance of existing facilities, noncapital-related real estate transactions, energy management, and environmental management and sustainability. Typical duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the Judicial Council Preventive Maintenance Plan</li> <li>• Support the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) in the development of the Capital Program with an emphasis on design methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost.</li> <li>• Implement an energy management plan that will leverage utility rebates, energy saving materials, and other energy conservation tasks to make the California courts as sustainable as possible.</li> <li>• Review and approve Court-Funded Facilities Requests including lease-related costs; allowable court operations expenditures under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court, and other facility improvements that are not allowable court operations expenditures under rule 10.810.</li> </ul>	<p>Implements Policy and Charge – See attached</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.B and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Capital Programs (CP), and Office of Emergency Response and Security (OERS).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Justify the ongoing operating expenses of the Judicial Council's existing building portfolio and assist the Capital Programs with design input that will reduce the long term operating and maintenance cost of future facilities.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2014–2015</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in January 2015. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of July 2014, August 2014, and September 2014.	Implements Policy and Charge – See attached	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.E and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	Submitted for the Judicial Council’s February 2015 meeting	Provided an information only report to the Judicial Council detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding in the specified quarter.
4.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 2 of Fiscal Year 2014–2015</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in February 2015. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of October 2014, November 2014, and December 2014.	Implements Policy and Charge – See attached	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.E and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p>	Submitted for the Judicial Council’s April 2015 meeting	Provided an information only report to the Judicial Council detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding in the specified quarter.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>		
5.	<p>The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2014–2015</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in June 2015. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of January 2015, February 2015, and March 2015.</p>	<p>Implements Policy and Charge – See attached</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>, Section 5.E and <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	<p>Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s June 2015 meeting</p>	<p>Provide an information only report to the Judicial Council detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding in the specified quarter.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
6.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 4 of Fiscal Year 2014–2015</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in August 2015. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of April 2015, May 2015, and June 2015.	Implements Policy and Charge – See attached	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.E and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s August 2015 meeting	To deliver to the council a report detailing the advisory committees activities and a list of projects authorized for funding in that quarter
7.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year 2015–2016</i> to the Judicial Council as an action item in July 2015.	Implements Policy and Charge – See attached	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.C and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p>	Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s July 2015 meeting	Request the Judicial Council review the facility modification and operations and maintenance budget report for fiscal year 2015-2016. If approved, staff will implement the budget.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>		
8.	<p>The advisory committee will submit the <i>Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2014-2015</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in December 2015.</p>	<p>Implements Policy and Charge – See attached</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>, Section 5.C and <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Office of Real Estate and Facilities Management (OREFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	<p>Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council’s December 2015 meeting</p>	<p>Provide the Judicial Council a report detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding from the past fiscal year.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9.	Develop and propose concepts for consideration for the branch Budget Change Proposals (BCPs). Submittal to the Judicial Council in July 2015.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Operational Plan Objective</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed by OREFM management team</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), and Capital Programs (CP)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council's July 2015 meeting	Increase funding allocations for the facility modification and operations and maintenance programs.
10	Finalization of the status of the Trial Court Facility Maintenance Pilot Program. This three-year pilot program will end in June 2015.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Operational Plan Objective</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed by Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), and Capital Programs (CP)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice</p>	To be completed before July 2015	Determine the status of the Trial Court Facility Maintenance Pilot Program.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.		
11	Finalize the Trial Court Methodology for Prioritizing and Ranking Facility Modifications.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Operational Plan Objective</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed by Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), and Capital Programs (CP)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  <b>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure For Service Excellence</b> - The judicial branch will enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.</p>	To be completed before July 2015	Update guidelines to align with updated Facility Modification Policy.



**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

<b>#</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Completion Date/Status</b>
<b>1</b>	Advisory Committee Meetings	Ongoing
<b>2</b>	Operations and Maintenance Oversight	Ongoing
<b>3</b>	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2013–2014	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on 1/23/2014
<b>4</b>	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 2 of Fiscal Year 2013–2014	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on 2/20/2014
<b>5</b>	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2013–2014	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on 6/26/2014
<b>6</b>	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 4 of Fiscal Year 2013–2014	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on 10/28/2014
<b>7</b>	Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year 2014–2015	Judicial Council reviewed and approved the budget report on 7/29/2014
<b>8</b>	Court Facilities: Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2013-2014	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on 1/22/2015
<b>9</b>	Implementation of Rule 10.75 <i>Open Meetings</i>	Completed July 2014, ongoing compliance
<b>10</b>	Budget Change Proposals for FY 15-16	Completed, but denied by the Department of Finance

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *None*

**CJER Governing Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Ronald Robie, Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District
<b>Staff:</b>	Bob Lowney, Senior Manager, Center for Judiciary Education and Research
<b>Committee's Charge:</b>  <b>California Rules of Court, rule 10.50</b> The committee makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through comprehensive and quality education and training for judicial officers and other judicial branch personnel. The committee must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Recommend rules, standards, policies, and procedures for judicial branch education;</li><li>(2) Recommend a strategic long-range plan for judicial branch education (last submitted in 2000-01; since then the committee has been required to submit a work plan/annual agenda);</li><li>(3) Evaluate the effectiveness of judicial branch education, the quality of participation, the efficiency of delivery, and the impact on service to the public;</li><li>(4) Review and comment on proposals from other advisory committees and task forces that include education and training of judicial officers or court staff in order to ensure coordination, consistency, and collaboration in educational services;</li><li>(5) Establish educational priorities for implementation of curricula, programs, publications, and delivery systems;</li><li>(6) Identify the need for and appoint education committees to implement the priorities, long-range plan, and programs and products of judicial branch education; create and adopt procedures for their operation; and review and approve their projects and products;</li><li>(7) Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with courts to promote and assure the availability of training at the local court level;</li><li>(8) Identify, analyze, and implement systems to enhance the delivery of education and training statewide; and</li><li>(9) Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with internal and external partners to maximize the resources dedicated to education and training.</li></ol>	

**Advisory Body Membership:**

14 Voting Members

- 10 sitting judicial officers;
- 1 appellate court justice; and
- 3 judicial administrators.

Advisory Members:

- California Judges Association (CJA) President or designee
- Court Technology Advisory Committee designee
- Administrative Director
- Dean, B.E. Witkin Judicial College or designee

**Subcommittees/Working Groups:**

*Subcommittee or working group name:*

1. Appellate Practice Curriculum Committee
2. Civil Law Curriculum Committee
3. Criminal Law Curriculum Committee
4. Family Law Curriculum Committee
5. Judicial Branch Access, Ethics & Fairness Curriculum Committee
6. Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee
7. Juvenile Law Curriculum Committee
8. Probate Law Curriculum Committee
9. Trial and Appellate Court Operations Curriculum Committee
10. B.E. Witkin Judicial College Steering Committee

**Committee's Key Objectives for 2015:**

1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.
2. Ensure that judicial branch members have appropriate and convenient access to relevant educational resources.
3. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.

## ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Education Plans</b></p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee will continue to successfully execute the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i>            Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence;            Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i>            Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i>            CJER Contact: Bob Lowney</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i>            #1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER</p>	Ongoing	<p>Execution of the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan will be complete on June 30, 2016 and a report will be submitted to the Judicial Council on the execution and completion of this education plan.</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.		
2.	Begin developing the 2016 – 2018 Education Plan.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i>            Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence;            Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i>            Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i>            CJER Contact: Bob Lowney</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i>            # 1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective</p>	December 31, 2015	A draft 2 year education plan ready to submit to the Judicial Council for review and approval in 2016. This education plan is dependent upon the availability of requisite staff and funding.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			manner.		
3.	<p>Enhance education for experienced judges.</p> <p>Recommendations from the Experienced Judge Workgroup include: lengthening some of CJER's Institutes; developing a weeklong program in family law; introducing roundtables as selected CJER live programs; developing a Listserve for judges; incorporating curriculum from the New Judge Orientation program throughout CJER's curricula as appropriate; and developing a course on judicial decision-making.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; Objective 3 – Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices.....</p> <p>Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Three factors contributed to the establishment of this effort. First, reductions to CJER's budget and staffing levels over the past several years has had a disproportionate impact on the education dedicated to experienced judges, (e.g., the phasing out of CJER's four Continuing Judicial Studies Programs as well as shifting most of the subject matter judicial Institutes to a biennial schedule). Second, results from a recently</p>	<p>These program and curricula efforts would be developed and launched during FY 15/16 and FY 16/17, depending upon the availability of staff and funding resources. That is, given restrictions in these two areas, some of these specific projects could not be completed in this time frame.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new week-long stand-alone program in family law.</li> <li>2. Longer Institutes in selected subject matter areas.</li> <li>3. A new live multi-day course on judicial decision making.</li> <li>4. Explore creating a listserv for judges in specific assignments.</li> <li>5. Develop education in the area of emerging technologies such as electronic filing and electronic evidence.</li> <li>6. Roundtable sessions incorporated at several live education events.</li> </ol>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>completed statewide survey to the judiciary on education indicated that there is a patent desire for expanding education for experienced judges. And third, the successful results from the Governing Committee's review and revision of the education it develops for new judges indicated that a similar effort for experienced judges could benefit the experienced judge audiences.</p> <p>Therefore, the CJER Governing Committee approved the appointment of a workgroup to examine education and educational needs for experienced judges (10+ years of service). This workgroup developed specific recommendations pursuant to the direction of the Governing Committee and submitted them for approval.</p> <p>After CJER staff assessed the resources needed to implement these recommendations, the CJER Governing Committee approved and prioritized the recommendations from the Experienced Judge Workgroup.</p>		<p>7. Explore revising selected judicial curricula to incorporate aspects of the Eight Pillars of Being a Judge contained in the current New Judge Education curriculum.</p>



#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>CJER contacts: Karene Alvarado</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</p> <p>#3. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>		
4.	Increase collaboration between CJER and the California Judges Association	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p>Origin of Project: The Chief Justice has made it a priority that where appropriate, Judicial Council and the CJA should try and collaborate on mutually beneficial education efforts for the benefit of Judges. This is already taking place with the involvement of CJA at both the Judicial College and New Judge Orientation.</p>	Ongoing	A course on judicial decision making to be delivered at the 2015 CJA mid-year conference.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Resources: CJER Contacts, Diane Cowdrey, Karene Alvarado, Stan Bissey, CJA Executive Director</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:  1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</p>		
5.	<p>Conclude item 2 from the 2014 Annual Agenda concerning court staff education in the area of processing cases for appeal by consulting with the trial court executive officers to ensure that the education developed will meet the educational needs for this area.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i>  Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; Objective 3 – Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices.....</p> <p>Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence;  Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal IV-Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i>  It has been noted in more than one</p>	December 31, 2015	<p>CJER will reach out to the Court Executive Advisory Committee and review the current education available for trial court staff in the area of preparing cases for appeal to ensure that this education is meeting the needs of their staff.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>district of the Court of Appeal that an increase in clerical errors on appellate cases is occurring, resulting in a significant expenditure of resources to correct them, including re-trials and other extensive administrative procedures.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER contact – Bob Lowney, Rhonda Sharbono</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</li> <li>2. Ensure that judicial branch members have appropriate and convenient access to relevant educational resources.</li> </ol>		
6.	Ensure that CJER continues to meet the educational needs of the judiciary, both in terms of accessing traditional education using distance technologies as well as	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V – Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1</p> <p>Goal VI – Branchwide</p>	March, 2016	<p>A new toolkit on technology will be developed.</p> <p>The Technology Workgroup will</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>providing education on emerging technologies which will impact the work of the judiciary.</p>		<p>Infrastructure for Service Excellence; Objective 4(c) – A single point of internet access to the Judicial Council.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i> As part of the multi year effort to upgrade and revise all of the judicial branch websites, the CJER Director requested that the education portions be combined into a single website/point of contact for judicial branch members. This ensures a more accessible resource for education throughout the judicial branch.</p> <p>Now the effort will be to ensure that this redesigned website will not only continue to provide traditional education topics using distance technologies but will also include education on emerging technologies which will impact the judiciary.</p> <p>A statewide survey which was sent out to all judges soliciting feedback on the effectiveness of CJER Online and its ease of use, accessibility, completeness of substantive coverage was</p>		<p>develop and submit to the Governing Committee recommendations on additional ways to enhance the ability of judges to use technology as well as enhance the use of CJER Online.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>compiled and the responses analyzed to determine what steps, if any, should be completed to ensure that CJER Online is meeting the education needs of the judiciary.</p> <p>The Governing Committee recently established a workgroup to further develop CJER Online and to provide input and guidance on additional ways to enhance the ability of judges to use technology.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER Contacts: Ralph McMullen</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i> 1. Ensure that judicial branch members have appropriate and convenient access to relevant educational resources..</p>		
7.	Conduct needs assessments for local courts in the area of administrative education, to determine what CJER can directly provide, as well as determining how CJER can assist courts in establishing their own local administrative education.	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i> This effort grows out of a need to find new ways to provide trial courts with administrative</p>	Ongoing	Trial court staff and management have increased opportunities to attend relevant educational opportunities over and above what CJER provides, if

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>education opportunities, given budget reductions and the increasing challenges of attending live statewide and regional education events.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER – Bob Lowney, Rhonda Sharbono</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i></p> <p>#6 - Continue to enrich the regional and local judicial education initiatives. #7. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>		<p>needed.</p> <p>This project will consist of reaching out to one or two courts as a pilot where CJER will get input on their local staff education needs and how best CJER can help them obtain that education, whether it is directly providing the education or assisting the court in establishing its own local education in key areas.</p>

## II. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p><b>Education Plans</b></p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee continues to oversee the successful execution of the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p> <p>CJER staff has reported to the Governing Committee on the progress on and changes to the Education Plan.</p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee has reviewed and prioritized all of its judicial publications, thereby enabling staff to allocate its resources to these efforts more efficiently.</p>	<p><u>February 6, 2014</u> CJER Governing Committee approves its 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p> <p><u>April 24, 2014</u> Judicial Council approves the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan</p> <p><u>July 1, 2014</u> The 2014 – 2016 Education Plan is launched.</p> <p><u>February 3, 2015</u> Six month update on the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan submitted to the CJER Governing Committee.</p>
2	<p><b>Processing cases for appeal</b></p> <p>Review and revise as appropriate court staff education in the area of processing cases for appeal.</p>	<p>The revised existing Court Clerk Training Institute courses, the regional courses, and the staff broadcast are all part of the current 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p> <p>The new Court Clerk Training Institute course on appellate procedures will be completed sometime during the existing 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p> <p>Before the end of 2015, CJER will reach out to the court executives to ensure that education in this area is meeting their staff’s needs.</p>
3	<p><b>CJER Online</b></p> <p>The CJER Online website has been launched and the communication and outreach plans have been successfully executed. A post-launch survey has been conducted to</p>	<p>Launch date – July 28, 2014</p>

	determine if the new website is effectively operating and easy to access and navigate.	
4	<p><b>Experienced Judge Workgroup</b></p> <p>The Experienced Judge Workgroup completed its review and provided the Governing Committee with specific educational recommendations which the Governing Committee considered and approved.</p>	<p>March 24, 2014 Experienced Judge Workgroup formed.</p> <p>April 9, 2014 Workgroup members appointed.</p> <p>November 3, 2014 Report submitted to the CJER Governing Committee for consideration and approval.</p> <p>February 3, 2014 Specific recommendations from the workgroup submitted to the CJER Governing Committee for consideration and prioritization. CJER staff completed its assessment of the resources needed to execute the recommendations.</p>
5	<b>Maintain multiple educational opportunities for Judicial Branch Judges and court staff</b>	March 2015 – This is an ongoing initiative within the 2014 – 2016 education plan and the education opportunities for these audiences are being developed and delivered.

## Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

### Subcommittees/Working Groups:

*Subcommittee or working group name:* CJER Curriculum Committees, Judicial College Steering Committee, Experienced Judge Workgroup, Technology Workgroup

*Purpose of subcommittee or working group:* The curriculum committees all have the same broad responsibility to provide the Governing Committee with draft education recommendations for their target audiences in the development of the Education Plan. In addition, the Curriculum committees serve on various program and education product workgroups and are consulted on a regular basis regarding any changes or revisions to the education plan that impacts their audiences. The Steering Committee develops the courses and curriculum for the B.E Witkin Judicial College. The Experienced Judge



Workgroup reviews existing education for experienced judges and makes recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee to enhance education to this audience. The Technology Workgroup reviews new and emerging technologies which could have application for judges and makes recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee on ways in which these technologies could benefit the judiciary and how education could be delivered to the judiciary.

*Number of members:* Ranging from 7 to 11

*Date formed:* The curriculum committees were initially formed in 2010 and are standing with rotating membership every year.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

**Tribal Court–State Court Forum**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Judge Richard C. Blake and Justice Dennis M. Perluss
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Jennifer Walter, Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> The forum makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice in all proceedings in which the authority to exercise jurisdiction by the state judicial branch and the tribal justice systems overlaps.</p> <p>In addition to the general duties and responsibilities applicable to all advisory committees as described in rule 10.34, the forum must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Identify issues of mutual importance to tribal and state justice systems, including those concerning the working relationship between tribal and state courts in California;</li><li>2. Make recommendations relating to the recognition and enforcement of court orders that cross jurisdictional lines, the determination of jurisdiction for cases that might appear in either court system, and the sharing of services between jurisdictions;</li><li>3. Identify, develop, and share with tribal and state courts local rules of court, protocols, standing orders, and other agreements that promote tribal court–state court coordination and cooperation, the use of concurrent jurisdiction, and the transfer of cases between jurisdictions;</li><li>4. Recommend appropriate activities needed to support local tribal court–state court collaborations; and</li><li>5. Make proposals to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research on educational publications and programming for judges and judicial support staff.</li></ol> <p>[Excerpted from California Rules of Court, Rule 10.60]</p>	

**Advisory Body's Membership:** Thirty positions- 1 vacancy and 28 members representing the following categories:

- 12 Tribal Court Judges (nominated by their tribal leadership, representing 15 of the 23 tribal courts currently operating in California; these courts serve approximately 40 tribes)
- Director of the California Attorney General's Office of Native American Affairs
- Tribal Advisor to the California Governor
- 1 Appellate Justice
- 7 Chairs or their Designees of the following California Judicial Council advisory committees:
  - Access and Fairness Advisory Committee
  - Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee
  - Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
  - Criminal Law Advisory Committee
  - Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee (2 positions)
  - Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee
  - Traffic Advisory Committee
- 5 Trial Court Judicial Officers (selected from local courts in counties where tribal courts are situated)
- 1 retired judge

Members' appointment orders expire September 14, 2015, with the exception of members Ms. Jacqueline Davenport and Judge D. Zeke Zeidler, whose terms expire on September 14, 2017. In order to achieve staggered terms for positions on the forum, membership will be allocated such that approximately one third of the members will have one-year terms, one third will have two-year terms, and one third will have three-year terms. Initial terms as of September 14, 2015 will be allocated in this manner; thereafter, all terms will be for 3 years and staggered.

**Subgroups/Working Groups:<sup>1</sup>**

1. Education Subcommittee (group disbanded in favor of full committee input regarding educational activities)
2. Protocol Working Group (group disbanded in favor of full committee input into protocol development)
3. Forum/Probate Legislative Working Group (work completed and group disbanded)

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:**

1. Make policy recommendations that enable tribal and state courts to improve access to justice, to issue orders, and to enforce orders to the fullest extent allowed by law.
2. Increase Tribal/State Partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.
3. Make recommendations to committees developing judicial education institutes, multi-disciplinary symposia, distance learning, and other educational materials to include content on federal Indian law and its impact on state courts, including interjurisdictional issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
I.	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>A. Legislation-</b></p> <p>1. Make recommendation to sponsor or support amendment to the Family Code to expressly authorize tribal court judges to solemnize marriages</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Evaluate proposal</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendation to sponsor or support proposal</p> <p>2. Submit Comment to the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement on the <i>Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM): Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs</i> (as published in the Federal Register on</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability. Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration. Operational Plan Objective 5.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. Operational Plan Objective 4.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <p><i>Council Committees:</i> Forum and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC)</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC and Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: 1</b></p>	<p>2015</p> <p>January 16, 2015</p>	<p>Legislative proposal</p> <p>Comment submitted on federal legislation</p>

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>November, 17, 2014 (Vol. 79 FR No. 221 68548)</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Evaluate NPRM</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendation to PCLC to submit comment</p>		<p>Make policy recommendations that enable tribal and state courts to improve access to justice, to issue orders, and to enforce orders to the fullest extent allowed by law.</p>		
	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>B. Rules and Forms-Indian Child Welfare Act and Inter-Court Transfer of Cases</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Monitor pending California Supreme Court case <i>In re Abbigail (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1450 [173 Cal.Rptr.3d 191]</i>, review granted Sept. 10, 2014, S220187 for possible amendments to rules 5.482(c) and 5.484(c)(2); concurrently amend <i>Notice of Child Custody Proceeding for Indian Child (ICWA-030)</i> in light of that decision and <i>In re S.E. (2013) 217 Cal. App. 4th 610 (2nd District)</i>.</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendations to</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability. Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration. Operational Plan Objective 5.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. Operational Plan Objective 4.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Department of Social Services and Statewide Workgroup on the Indian Child Welfare Act</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <i>Council Committees:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Forum</p>	2015	Rule and form amendments

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>revise forms, ICWA-060 and JV-800, and amend rule 5.483 to ensure due process and that the order for transfer of a juvenile case from state court to tribal court addresses issues such as when and to whom physical transfer of the child shall take place and what necessary information from the court and agency files will be provided to the tribal court and tribal social service agency upon transfer.</p>		<p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC and LSO</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported: 1</i></b></p>		
	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b> <b>C. Technological Advances</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks</i></p> <p>(i) Consult with the California Attorney General’s Office regarding access to California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) by tribal courts.</p> <p>(ii) Recommend Judicial Council staff continue giving tribal courts access to the California Courts Protective Order (CCPOR) Registry.</p>	2(b)	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b> Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability. Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p>	Ongoing	<p>(i) Tribal court judges will be able to enter their protective orders into CLETS and enforcement will be improved</p> <p>(ii) State and tribal courts will be able to see each other’s protective orders, to avoid conflicting orders, and to promote</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>(iii) Recommend a pilot project that would provide electronic notice to tribes in Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases.</p> <p>(iv) Recommend continuation of tribal Domestic Assistance Self Help (DASH) Tribal/State Program</p>		<p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 4: Implement new tools to support the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Forum</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <b>Committees:</b> Forum</p> <p><b>Judicial Council Staffing:</b> Information Technology</p> <p><b>Collaborations:</b> California Attorney General's Office</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> 1</p>		<p>enforcement of these orders.</p> <p>(iii) Electronic notice would result in faster identification of children and application of ICWA's protections. It would also result in a considerable savings to the pilot counties in social worker and mailing expenses. It should also produce savings to the courts because of anticipated reduction in notice issues being raised on appeal.</p> <p>(iv) DASH improves access to justice for litigants by giving them legal assistance and other traditional services, including safety planning and social services. Litigants do not need to travel to an attorney or self-help center, but can get help from a tribal</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
					<p>advocate anywhere in California. Litigants, with the help of their advocates, are connected to a network of legal services so that they may obtain additional assistance with their restraining order case and also deal with other legal matters (like obtaining a dissolution of marriage).</p>
	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b>  <b>D. Other</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepare a request to the California Supreme Court’s Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics to amend the canons to permit a judge who sits concurrently on a tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.</li> <li>2. Potential ongoing work with the <u>California Law</u></li> </ol>		<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i>  Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 5.  Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence.  Operational Plan Objective 4.</p>	<p>2015</p> <p>2016</p>	<p>Proposal prepared and submitted</p> <p>Advise and consult on CLRC study</p>



#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u>Review Commission</u> (CLRC) on its study of the enforcement of tribal civil money judgments (see <u>SB 406</u>, Stats. 2014, Ch. 243, effective January 1, 2015).</p> <p>3. Develop a proposal to promote the education of federal Indian law in California law schools.</p>		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Forum and legislative study by CLRC</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <i>Committees:</i> Forum</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> CLRC</p> <p><b>Key Objective supported:</b> 1</p>		<p>Proposal prepared and vetted by State Bar of California and other stakeholders</p>
II.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>A. Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</b></p> <p>Major Tasks:</p> <p>(i) Identify council and other resources that may be appropriate to share with tribal courts.</p> <p>(ii) Identify tribal justice resources that may be appropriate to share with state courts.</p> <p>(iii) Identify grants for tribal/state court collaboration</p> <p>(iv) Share resources and information about</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, &amp; Diversity.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect, and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given an opportunity to be heard.</li> <li>• Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</li> <li>• Expand the availability of legal assistance, advice and representation for litigants with limited financial resources.</li> </ul>	Ongoing	<p>(i) E-Forum Updates</p> <p>(ii) Increased number of tribal/state partnerships in California</p> <p>(iii) Recommendations to feature partnerships</p> <p>(iv) Education to showcase</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>partnerships through Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter</p> <p>(v) Publicize these partnerships at conferences, on the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), and at other in-person or online venues.</p>		<p>Strategic Plan Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</li> <li>• Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices to leverage and share resources and to create tools to educate court stakeholders and the public.</li> </ul> <p><b>Origin of Projects:</b> Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  <i>Council Committees:</i> Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), Forum, and Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC, Court Operations Special Services Office, and Leadership Services Division</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i>  Local tribal and state courts</p>		<p>partnerships</p> <p>(v) Conferences and IKC feature tribal/state partnerships</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Key Objective Supported: 2</b> Increase Tribal/State Partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.</p>		
	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b> <b>B. Education and technical assistance to promote partnerships and understanding of tribal justice systems</b></p> <p>Major Tasks: (i) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to continue providing educational and technical assistance to local tribal and state courts to address domestic violence and child custody issues in Indian Country</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to continue giving technical assistance <u>to</u> tribal and state</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, &amp; Diversity.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect, and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given an opportunity to be heard.</li> <li>• Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</li> <li>• Expand the availability of legal assistance, advice and representation for litigants with limited financial resources.</li> </ul> <p>Strategic Plan Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and</li> </ul>	Ongoing	<p>(i) State/Tribal Education, Partnerships, and Services (S.T.E.P.S) to Justice— Domestic Violence and Child Custody (Information for Tribal Court and State Court Judges disseminated and services offered)</p> <p>(ii) Joint Jurisdictional Court(s) Established</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>courts interested in establishing a joint jurisdictional court.</p> <p>(iii) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to develop a toolkit for state and tribal court administrators interested in learning about each other's court operations and procedures.</p> <p><b>C. Tribal/State collaborations that increase resources for courts</b></p> <p>Major Tasks:</p> <p>(i) Develop and implement strategy to seek resources</p>		<p>outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices to leverage and share resources and to create tools to educate court stakeholders and the public.</li> </ul> <p><b>Origin of Projects:</b> Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  <i>Council Committees:</i> Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), Forum, and Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC, Court Operations Special Services Office, and Leadership Services Division</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Local tribal and state courts</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: 2</b></p> <p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Plan Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public. Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3:</p>		<p>(iii) Court administrators' toolkit developed</p> <p>Strategic plan to increase resources for</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</li> <li>• Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices to leverage and share resources and to create tools to educate court stakeholders and the public.</li> </ul> <p><i>Origin of Projects:</i> Forum</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>Council Committees:</i> Forum</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> CFCC</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Local tribal and state courts</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported: 2</i> Increase Tribal/State Partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.</p>		courts
III.	<b>Education:</b> <b>A. Judicial Education</b> Make recommendations to the Judicial Council’s CJER Governing Committee to incorporate federal Indian	2(b)	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Strategic Plan Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence. Operational Plan Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide relevant and accessible education and professional</li> </ul>	Ongoing, completion date depends on resources to incorporate recommendations.	Memorandum to CJER Governing Committee summarizing recommendations to existing educational programming.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>law into all appropriate educational publications and programming for state court judges and advise on content; revisions to include federal Indian law and the interjurisdictional issues that face tribal and state courts.</p>		<p>development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p><b>Origin of Projects:</b> Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012).</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  <i>Committees:</i> Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee and forum</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i>  CFCC, CJER, IT, and LSO</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make recommendations to committees developing judicial education institutes, multi-disciplinary symposia, distance learning, and other educational materials to include content on federal Indian law and its impact on state courts.</li> </ul>		
	<p><b>Education:</b>  <b>B. Education- Documentary</b>  Consult on and participate in the production of a documentary describing tribal justice systems and</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  Strategic Plan Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide relevant and accessible</li> </ul>	Ongoing, completion date depends on funding.	One-hour documentary on California Tribal Justice Systems

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>highlighting collaboration between these systems and the state justice system in California.</p>		<p>education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p><i>Origin of Projects:</i> Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012).</p> <p><i>Resources:</i>  <i>Committees:</i> Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee and forum</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i>  CFCC</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported: 3</i></p>		
	<p><b>Education:</b>  <b>C. Education- Court Extranet Name Change</b>  Recommend to the judicial council staff that it change the name of the Judicial Branch Court Extranet/Serranus (possible new name could be Court Online Resources and Education (CORE)).</p>	2(b)	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i>  Strategic Plan Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence. Operational Plan Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</li> </ul> <p><i>Origin of Projects:</i> Forum and California State-Federal Judicial</p>	Ongoing, completion date depends on website redesign date.	Website name is changed.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Council Resolution (June 1, 2012).</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  <i>Committees:</i> Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER)  Governing Committee and forum</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i>  IT</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: 3</b></p>		



### III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:


*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p><b>Sharing Resources (see page 8, item II.A.i.)</b>            Disseminated information to tribal court judges and state court judges on a monthly basis through the Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter with information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant opportunities;</li> <li>• Publications;</li> <li>• News stories; and</li> <li>• Educational events.</li> </ul>	Ongoing
2.	<p><b>Tribal Engagement and Consultation (see page 10, item II.B.i.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assisted the Los Angeles Superior Court in establishing the Indian Child Welfare Act Roundtable, a court-coordinated community response to Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases in Los Angeles County</li> </ul>	January, 2014
3.	<p><b>Grant Development to Support Forum Activities to Achieve Key Objectives (see page 8, item II.A.iii.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtained funding from the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice that is administered through the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES). This funding pays for the associated travel expenses for judges to participate in cross-court educational exchanges. These exchanges are judicially led and shaped by the host judges (one tribal court judge and one state court judge) and enable the judges to continue the dialogue on domestic violence and elder abuse in tribal communities, which began as part of a statewide needs assessment. At these exchanges, judges utilize a checklist of problems and solutions identified through the needs assessment to determine how they can work together to address these issues locally.</li> <li>• Obtained funding from the California Department of Social</li> </ul>	Ongoing

	Services. This funding pays for the associated travel expenses for forum members to improve compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act.	
4.	<b>Access to CLETS by Tribal Courts and Tribal Law Enforcement (see page 4, item I.C.i.)</b> In partnership with the California Department of Justice, this work is ongoing.	Ongoing
5.	<b>Legislative Proposal to Give Tribal Access to Juvenile Court Records (see page 3, item I.A.)</b> Jointly recommended with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee legislative amendments to Welfare and Institutions Code section 827 to give tribal access to juvenile court records. Following the Judicial Council's adoption of the proposal at its December 2013 meeting, <a href="#">AB 1618: Tribal Access to Confidential Juvenile Court Files</a> was introduced. Chaptered as Stats. 2014, Ch. 37, effective January 1, 2015.	Completed, June 25, 2014
6.	<b>Legislative Proposal to Simplify and Clarify the Process by Which Tribal Court Civil Money Judgments are recognized and enforced in California (see page 3, item I.A.)</b> In collaboration with the Office of Governmental Affairs, recommended amendments to <a href="#">SB 406</a> limiting the bill's application to civil money judgments. Chaptered as Stats. 2014, Ch. 243, effective January 1, 2015. The <a href="#">California Law Revision Commission</a> will be studying its implementation.	Completed, August 22, 2014
7.	<b>Access to the California Courts Protective Order Registry (see page 5, item I.C.ii.)</b> In collaboration with the Information Technologies Services Office, all tribal courts have been offered read-only access to the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). Courts that have access to this registry can view each other's protective orders, avoid issuing conflicting orders, and are better able to protect the	Ongoing

	<p>public, particularly victims of domestic violence. Through this project, tribal court judges and tribal law enforcement for the following California Tribes—Cahto Tribe of the Laytonville, Rancheria, Coyote Band of Pomo Indians, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Hoopa, Manchester Point Arena Band of Pomo Indians, Quechan, Redding Rancheria, San Manuel, Shingle Springs, Smith River, and Yurok—now have read-only access to domestic violence and other restraining and protective orders, along with the 31 state court jurisdictions that are currently participating in CCPOR.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Transfer Rule: Amendment to Rule 5.483 (see page 5, item I.B.ii.)</b>          Proposal to amend the rule to ensure that the order for transfer of a juvenile case from state court to tribal court addresses such essential issues such as when and to whom physical transfer of the child shall take place and what necessary information from the court and agency files will be provide to the tribal court and tribal social service agency upon transfer.</p>	September, 2015
9.	<p><b>Electronic Notice in ICWA Cases (see page 6, item I.B.iii.)</b>          Collaborating with the National Center for State Courts, the National Center for Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Cherokee Nation, the Los Angeles County Counsel’s Office. Adoption of National Information Exchange Model standards for a tribal/court/county exchange. Piloted a data exchange between the Los Angeles Office of the County Counsel and the Cherokee Nation.</p>	Ongoing
10.	<p><b>Information Sharing to Inform Policy-Makers (see page 9, item II.A.v.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted effective tribal/state collaborations by making presentations to the following groups: (1) council staff in San Francisco; (2) the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Judicial Symposium in Texas; (3) the Cow County</li> </ul>	Ongoing

	<p>Institute at Rancho Cordova; (4) the 2014 Family Law and Self Help Conference in San Francisco; (5) the 2014 Law and Society Association Annual Conference program: Law and Inequalities in Minneapolis; and (6) the 14th National Indian Nations Conference at Agua Caliente.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convened two cross-court educational exchanges on tribal lands at Karuk (Siskiyou County) and Washoe Paiute (Inyo County). These exchanges both model the collaborative relationships among tribal and state court judges at a local level and foster partnerships among tribal and non-tribal agencies and service providers. Through these exchanges, which are judicially-convened on tribal lands, participants identified areas of mutual concern, new ways of working together, and coordinated approaches to enforcing tribal and state court orders. Since no court order is self-executing, these exchanges serve to support both state and tribal courts by ensuring that those who are providing court-connected services are working together and understand jurisdictional complexity and the needs of tribal communities.</li> </ul>	
11.	<p><b>Develop and Facilitate Local Protocols to Promote Collaboration and Promising Practices (See page 8, item II.A.iv-v.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain resources for tribal/state collaborations. These resources include protocols, memoranda of understanding, and intergovernmental agreements relating to title IV-E and access to foster care and adoption funding, child custody, criminal procedures, cross-deputization, and domestic violence. <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/17422.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/17422.htm</a>.</li> <li>• Promote joint jurisdictional court established by the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians and the El Dorado Superior Court.</li> <li>• Promote tribal/state collaborations by submitting nomination forms describing local, innovative collaborations to the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee/Court Executives</li> </ul>	Ongoing

	<p>Advisory Committee Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group for their approval to add and post to the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC). As a result of the 7 submissions ranging from innovations in handling child support, civil, domestic violence, and juvenile cases, the IKC now has an icon featuring tribal/state collaborations.</p> 	
12.	<p><b>Elder Abuse and Probate Cases- Mutual Recognition and Enforcement of Orders (see page 3, item I.A. and page 12, III.A.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convened and participated in a joint working group of the members of the forum and the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee for the limited purpose of recommending legislative changes to the California Law Review Commission (Commission) in connection with the Commission’s recommendation for adoption of the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act in California (UAGPPJA). Recommended that comments be submitted to the Commission on behalf of the Judicial Council. These comments included a new Article 6 be added to the proposed California UAGPPJA, consisting of new Probate Code sections 2041–2047, to deal specifically with interactions between California tribal courts and state courts in matters covered by UAGPPJA and to address issues involving conservatorships for members of Indian tribes located in California. The Commission incorporated these comments into the bill, <a href="#">SB 940 Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA)</a>, which was chaptered as Stats. 2014, Ch. 553.</li> <li>• Wrote and published a tribal elder abuse benchguide, which stands alone as a benchguide and will also be incorporated into the soon-to-be-released Elder Abuse Benchguide.</li> </ul>	September 25, 2014

13.	<p><b>Traffic Cases- Mutual Recognition and Enforcement of Orders (See page 3, item I.A.)</b>  Concluded that legislation was needed to address the issues of public safety on tribal lands relating to recognition and enforcement of traffic violations and the lack of tribal access to confidential records maintained by the California Department of Motor Vehicles. After vetting the issues and exploring the feasibility of a legislative solution with the Governor’s Tribal Advisor and the California Business, Transportation &amp; Housing Agency, the forum concluded that such legislation would be beyond the purview of the California Judicial Council to sponsor.</p>	January, 2014
14.	<p><b>Judicial Education (see page 12, item III.A.)</b>  Working in collaboration with the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee to integrate federal Indian law into educational programs and resources conducted and developed by CJER. The CJER Governing Committee has placed this recommendation on the agenda for its February in-person meeting.</p>	Ongoing
15.	<p><b>Documentary: (see page 13, item III.B.)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested an informal opinion from the California Supreme Court Committee on Judicial Ethics Opinions (Committee) on whether the appearance in the film of one or more state court judges violates canon 2(B)(2) or any other provision of the California Code of Judicial Ethics. The <a href="#">Committee’s opinion</a> was that it did not (with certain cautionary comments).</li> <li>• The production team completed filming at Yurok; additional filming is scheduled for Quechan. It is expected that the film will be completed in 2015.</li> </ul>	December, 2015
16.	<p><b>Judicial Branch Court Extranet (see page 14, item III.C.)</b>  Recommended name change for Serranus; awaiting redesign of website for name change.</p>	Completion date depends on website redesign date

--	--	--

#### **IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail**

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[For each group listed in Section I, including any proposed “new” subgroups/working groups, provide the below information. For working groups that include members who are not on this advisory body, provide information about the additional members (e.g., from which other advisory bodies), and include the number of representatives from this advisory body as well as additional members on the working group.]*

*Subgroup or working group name:*

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:*

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*

*Date formed:*

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:*

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:*

**Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF)**

**Annual Agenda—2015**

**Approved by E&P/RUPRO: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Kathleen E. O’Leary and Hon. Laurie D. Zelon, Cochairs
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Kyanna Williams, Lead Counsel; Ms.Carolynn Bernabe, Senior Administrative Coordinator, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> Makes recommendations for improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. Recommends to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research, proposals for the education and training of judicial officers and court staff.	
<b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b> 28 members with 3 Appellate justices; 13 Trial court judicial officers; 1 Lawyer with expertise or interest in disability issues; 2 Lawyers with expertise or interest in additional access, fairness, and diversity issues addressed by the committee; 2 Lawyers from a trial court self-help center; 1 Legal services lawyer; 1 Court executive officer or trial court manager who has experience with self-represented litigants; 1 County law librarian or other related professional; 2 Judicial administrators; and 2 Public members.	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> None	
<b>Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2015:</b> 1. Complete unfinished items from the final annual agendas of the Judicial Council’s former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee and former Self Represented Litigants Taskforce. 2. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council on programs and tools that assist the branch in improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. 3. Provide recommendations for educational programming for judicial officers and court staff on methods of improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. 4. Coordinate with related advisory bodies and stakeholders to fulfill council directives in the areas of access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties.	



## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
I.	<p><b>Gender Fairness/Women of Color in the Courts Focus Groups:</b> The former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee conducted focus groups to gather information on the experiences of women, including women of color, in the branch. PAF will develop policy recommendations based on the focus group findings and will disseminate the focus group information to CJER and to relevant stakeholders, including other advisory groups, with an emphasis on incorporating the data into educational programming. As part of this work, PAF will share information about the Judicial Council’s Pilot Mentoring Program for Trial Court Staff and the</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 9.</p> <p>1. Identify and work to eliminate all barriers to access.</p> <p>2. Broaden and facilitate access to, understanding of, and trust and confidence in the judicial branch and court-connected programs and services for all persons and entities served by the judicial branch.</p> <p>4. Promote a state judiciary and judicial branch workforce that reflect California’s diverse population.</p> <p>9. Implement, enhance, and expand multilingual and culturally responsive programs, including educational programming, self-help centers, and interpreter services.</p>	December 2016	Information provided to Judicial Council units, advisory bodies and relevant stakeholders that will inform their policy work, including educational programming.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>accompanying Toolkit which was recently completed and is now on Serranus at <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/27486.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/27486.htm</a>.</p>		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The project is part of the advisory committee’s ongoing consideration of issues related to gender fairness and women of color in the courts. This project was approved by the Judicial Council’s Executive and Planning Committee in February 2011.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Judicial branch partners and perhaps CJER for space needs.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		
2.	<p><b>Review Court Processes Affecting Self-Represented Litigants:</b> The Judicial Council directed PAF to consider an access and fairness review of court processes affecting self-represented litigants.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Goal 3: Modernization of Management and Administration; Committee charge.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council’s Statewide Action Plan For Serving Self-Represented Litigants.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> None</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1, 2, 3 and 4.</p>	December 2016	Policy recommendations for improving access and fairness for self-represented litigants.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	<p><b>Economic Access:</b> PAF will examine whether there are economic barriers to litigants' abilities to enforce legal rights and/or to comply with legal obligations and will identify promising practices. As part of this work, PAF will consider the access and fairness impacts of fines and fees on court users, including self-represented litigants. PAF will share educational information about economic barriers with CJER and relevant stakeholders, including other advisory bodies.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <i>Strategic:</i> Goals I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p><i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair; Goal IV, Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b>  Approved in previous Annual Agendas of the former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  CFCC staff; Civil and Small Claims and Traffic Advisory Committees</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b>  1, 2 and 4</p>	December 2016	<p>Identification of economic barriers that affect access and fairness and policy recommendations addressing all or some of the identified barriers.</p>
4.	<p><b>Judicial Diversity:</b> The Judicial Council and the State Bar convened a summit on judicial diversity where participants developed</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  Directed by the Judicial Council at its October 25, 2012, business meeting.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p>	Ongoing	<p>Identification of Judicial Diversity Summit Report recommendations that merit Council action</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>recommendations to further the goal of a more diverse bench and issued a final report and recommendations. The Judicial Council reviewed those recommendations and directed the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee (now, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness) to initiate the review and approval process for those recommendations that merit council action. PAF presented its recommendations to E&amp;P, which then directed PAF to solicit Presiding Judge and CEO input on the various recommendations in the report. PAF presented its recommendations at the January 29, 2015 TCPJAC/CEAC meeting. PAF requested comments from both committees and will consider those comments before reporting back to E&amp;P. PAF will continue its work on the review and approval process.</p>		<p>Follow-up from the 2006 diversity summit held by the Judicial Council in collaboration with the State Bar of California.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> To Be Determined</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		<p>and recommendations made for Council approval of the identified recommendations.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
5.	<p><b>Benchcards on LGBTQ Issues:</b> PAF will contribute to the development of one or more benchcards to provide information to judicial officers on sexual orientation and gender identity terminology, effective communication with LGBTQ court-users, and common needs of LGBTQ litigants in different case types. PAF will also consider whether recommendations should be made for updating the existing publication “Bench Reference Guide: What Do I Need to Know about Lesbian, Gay, bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) Youth in Juvenile Court?”</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> This project grew from successful collaborations on LGBTQ education between CJER and the former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee’s Krieger Sexual Orientation Subcommittee (KSOC) and was recommended by KSOC prior to the expiration of the full committee.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>	Ongoing	Identification of needed LGBTQ benchcards and policy recommendations for the content and design of the identified benchcards.
6.	<p><b>Consider Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force Referrals:</b> Review and consider recommendations referred by the Judicial Council following the task force’s final report to the council. Recommend appropriate action within PAF’s purview.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> As referred by the council</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Legal Services, CFCC, Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b></p>	Ongoing	To Be Determined

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			4		
7.	<p><b>Rules Modernization Project:</b> Each advisory committee has been asked to include in their annual agenda for 2015 an item providing for the drafting of proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court related to their subject matter areas. This effort would be undertaken in coordination with CTAC, which is responsible for developing and completing the overall rules modernization project.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> CTAC</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 4</p>	January 1, 2017	To Be Determined
8.	<p><b>Subject Matter Resource:</b> a) Serve as lead/subject matter resource for other advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action. Such efforts may include providing expertise and review to working groups, advisory committees, and subcommittees as needed on access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Respective advisory bodies</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> To be determined</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3, and 4</p>	Ongoing	Coordination to avoid duplication of resources and to ensure that the Council’s goal of “improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties” is addressed across subject-matter areas.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>represented parties.</p> <p>b) Serve as subject matter resource for other stakeholders on subjects under the committee’s charge so as to increase efficiency and avoid duplication of services within the branch.</p> <p>c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers in legal substance and procedure, useful technology and efficient business practices, and make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding updates to the “Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts” as provided by CRC 10.960.</p>				
9.	<p><b>Educational Recommendations:</b></p> <p>a) Make recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee for educational programming for judicial officers and court staff on methods of improving access to the judicial system, fairness</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge; prior annual agendas.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff</p>	Ongoing	Educational recommendations to CJER for programming that falls under the committee’s purview: “Improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. Many of the educational recommendations are likely to relate to the subject-matter of items 1-6 above and item 9(b) below.</p> <p>b) Make recommendations regarding updates to the “Benchguide for Judicial Officers on Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants”.</p>		<p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3 and 4</p>		<p>judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties.”</p>
10.	<p><b>Court Technology:</b> PAF will remain available to provide information and subject-matter expertise to the Court Technology Advisory Committee as requested.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge, CTAC, and prior annual agendas.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff and CTAC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3 and 4</p>	Ongoing	<p>Coordination to avoid duplication of resources and to improve the access and fairness of court technology.</p>
11.	<p><b>Encourage Pro Bono:</b> Coordinate with the State Bar on ways the judicial branch can encourage pro bono service by</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p>	Ongoing	<p>Coordination to avoid duplication of resources and improved judicial officer</p>



#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>attorneys. With CFCC staff assistance, the “Judicial Officer Pro Bono Toolkit” was updated in celebration of the 2014 National Pro Bono Month and presented by PAF cochair Hon. Kathleen E. O’Leary as part of her October 28, 2014 presentation to the Judicial Council on the final report of the Taskforce for Self-Represented Litigants. <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/partners/56.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/partners/56.htm</a> and <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemP.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemP.pdf</a>. PAF will continue to educate judicial officers about the toolkit and make appropriate recommendations for updates to Judicial Council pro bono resolutions.</p>		<p>Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3 and 4</p>		<p>education about pro bono encouragement tools.</p>
12.	<p><b>Self-Represented Litigants in Family Law Conference:</b> Cosponsor conference with the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) for court administrators, self-help center attorneys, family law facilitators, legal aid attorneys,</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge; prior annual agendas. The Judicial Council cosponsored with LAAC on the March 2013, March 2014 and</p>	Ongoing	<p>Statewide conference providing affordable and timely education to relevant stakeholders while facilitating information sharing, interagency collaborations, and</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	and appropriate court staff on issues related to self-represented litigants in family law and domestic violence and to encourage sharing of resources and best practices.		<p>January, 2015 Family Law/ Self-Help Conferences.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; LAAC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3 and 4</p>		efficient use of resources throughout the branch.
13.	<p><b>Language Access and Interpreters in the Courts:</b> PAF cochair Hon. Laurie D. Zelon is a member of the Judicial Council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (ITF) which advises the council on implementation of the recommendations issued by the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (2013–2015). PAF will remain available to provide information and subject-matter expertise to ITF as requested.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge; ITF</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; ITF staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2, 3 and 4</p>	Ongoing	Coordination to avoid duplication of resources and to improve language access in the courts.

### III. STATUS OF 2013-2014 PROJECTS:

*Note: The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness formed on August 1, 2014 as the result of a merger between the former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee and the former Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants. The final annual agendas for those former entities were approved in 2013 and are attached.*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<b>Gender Fairness/Women of Color in the Courts Focus Group Project:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #1.
2	<b>Pilot Mentoring Program for Trial Court Staff:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i> In collaboration with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee, the committee will oversee a pilot mentoring program for court staff in the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, and Solano to determine the feasibility of instituting a statewide voluntary mentoring program for the courts.	Following completion of the pilot program, the Judicial Council approved production of the toolkit “A Model Mentoring Program for Court Staff in California's Superior Courts,” which is now available on Serranus at: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/27486.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/27486.htm</a> . PAF presented the toolkit at the January 30, 2015, Court Executives Advisory Committee meeting. PAF will continue to share information about the mentorship program and toolkit as part of the Gender Fairness/Women of Color in the Courts Focus Group Project. PAF’s work on this item is otherwise completed. See Advisory Body Project #1.
3	<b>Judicial Diversity:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #4.
4	<b>Language Access and Interpreters in the Courts:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i> <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #13.
5	<b>Revise Q &amp; A Informational Brochures on Rule 1.100 Project:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i> The Committee will provide input on existing court user and court personnel informational AOC publications to conform to recent changes in the law and to clarify issues relating to appellate review.	PAF provided recommendations for specific updates to a Q&A for the general public titled “Disability Accommodations in California Courts” and a Benchguide titled “Providing Disability Accommodations While Court is In Session”. The recommendations have been provided to CJER for consideration and PAF’s work on this task is now completed.
6	<b>Economic Access Project:</b> <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #3.

7	<p><b>Increase Diversity of Court-Appointed Counsel Project:</b>  <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i>  The Committee will provide input on an AOC-produced court-appointed counsel outreach brochure as a tool for the courts to encourage diverse attorneys to seek court-appointed counsel positions.</p>	PAF’s work on this item is completed. PAF provided its recommendations for updating the publication. CFCC staff are in the process of having it re-published.
8	<p><b>Educational Recommendations:</b>  <i>(Former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee Annual Agenda)</i>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i></p>	See Advisory Body Project #9.
9	<p><b>Cosponsor Statewide Conference on Self-Represented Litigants in Family Law:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i></p>	See Advisory Body Project #12.
10	<p><b>“Effective Practices for Court Self-Help Centers” Brochure:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>  Develop and disseminate a catalogue of effective practices for court self-help centers to provide services to self-represented litigants throughout the case process. This would include assistance from case initiation through disposition and post-disposition. Also included will be effective practices for the assessment of case needs, referrals to community based legal resources, and collaborative programs between courts and community based legal resources.</p>	PAF’s work on this item is completed. The document, “Effective Practices for Court Self-Help Centers” was published September 30, 2014 and is available for use by centers to determine what practices they might consider in their operations. The publication is also available on Serranus.
11	<p><b>Technical Assistance Projects:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i></p>	See Advisory Body Project #8(c).
12	<p><b>Report on Progress of Self-Represented Litigant Services:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>  Draft report to the Judicial Council on the progress of assistance to self-represented litigants in the courts over the last ten years.</p>	PAF’s work on this item is completed. Information regarding the progress of assistance to self-represented litigants in the courts over the last ten years was included in the final report on the Taskforce for Self-Represented Litigants. <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemP.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemP.pdf</a> .
13	<p><b>Encourage Pro Bono:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i></p>	See Advisory Body Project #11.
14	<p><b>CRC 10.960 Recommendations:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i></p>	See Advisory Body Project #8(c).
15	<p><b>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act:</b>  <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>  Coordinate in implementation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (AB 590, Feuer). Provide expertise regarding self-help services as part of continuum</p>	PAF’s work on this item is completed. PAF cochair Hon. Laurie D. Zelon is also Vice-Chair of the Judicial Council’s Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee.

	for services.	
<b>16</b>	<b>Court Technology:</b> <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #10.
<b>17</b>	<b>Reviewing Court Processes that Affect Those Without Attorneys</b> <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i>	See Advisory Body Project #2.
<b>18</b>	<b>Taskforce Status:</b> <i>(Former Self-Represented Litigants Task Force Annual Agenda)</i> Make recommendation to the Judicial Council that the Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants become a Judicial Council Advisory Committee.	PAF's work on this item is completed. The Judicial Council directed that the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Taskforce on Self-Represented Litigants merge to form the current Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF). PAF formed on August 01, 2014.

#### IV. SUBGROUPS/WORKING GROUPS - DETAIL

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[For each group listed in Section I, including any proposed “new” subgroups/working groups, provide the below information. For working groups that include members who are not on this advisory body, provide information about the additional members (e.g., from which other advisory bodies), and include the number of representatives from this advisory body as well as additional members on the working group.]*

*Subgroup or working group name:* None

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* N/A

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* N/A

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A

*Date formed:* N/A

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* N/A

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* N/A

**Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee**

**Annual Agenda—2015**

**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Earl Johnson, (Ret.)
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Bonnie Hough, Managing Attorney; Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Administrative Coordinator
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> This committee is required by Government Code section 68651(b)(5) in order to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Assem. Bill 590 [Feuer]; Stats. 2009 ch. 457). The act requires the Judicial Council to develop one or more model pilot projects in selected courts for three-year periods. The projects will provide legal representation to low-income parties on critical legal issues affecting basic human needs. At the direction of the Judicial Council, the implementation committee will make recommendations on which pilot projects will be selected and provide input into the design of the pilot projects evaluations, which are required by the authorizing legislation.	
<b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b> 15 Members, including 3 appellate justices; 1 retired judge; 4 legal aid attorneys, 4 private attorneys; 2 academics, 1 representative to the Chamber of Commerce, 1 former legislative staff member.	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> The committee acts as a committee of the whole.	
<b>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:</b> Continue to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel pilot project including reviewing reports from the evaluation and to provide guidance to staff.	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Research and data collection</b> Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects.</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Supports Strategic Goal II and III, Independency and Accountability and Modernization of Management and Administration, as well as Operational Plan Object 4, “Measure and regularly report branch performance...” and Operational Plan Objective 2, “Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.”</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code section 68651 requirement that evaluation of the pilot projects must be submitted to legislature on or before January 31, 2016.</p> <p>Resources: Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts Staff</p>	On-going	Evaluation due to legislature in January 2016. Initial results to be used in recommending new or on-going grants for 2014 – 2017.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objective Supported: Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.		
2.	<b>Implementation of pilot projects</b> Make grant recommendations to the Judicial Council if additional funding becomes available	1(a)	Judicial Council Direction: Supports Strategic Goal I, Access, Fairness and Diversity: As well as Operational Plan Objective 4: Expand the Availability of Legal Assistance, Advice and Representation for Litigants with Limited Financial Means.  Origin of Project: Government Code section 68651 requirement to establish pilot projects.  Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts Staff  Key Objective Supported: Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.	On-going	Grants awarded and 2nd round of projects underway to provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.



**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<b>Research and data collection</b> Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects	<b>Ongoing – see # 1 above</b>
2	<b>Make recommendations for second round of grant proposals</b>	<b>Completed August 2014</b>

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups: *N/A*

**Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee**

**Annual Agenda—2015**

**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Richard Vlavianos (chair), Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin Hon. Rogelio Flores (vice-chair), Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Nancy Taylor, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and Ms. Francine Byrne, Criminal Justice Services
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> Rule 10.56 of the California Rules of Court charges the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee to “make recommendations to the Judicial Council on criteria for identifying and evaluating collaborative justice courts and for improving the processing of cases in these courts, which include drug courts, domestic violence courts, youth courts, and other collaborative justice courts. Those recommendations include ‘best practices’ guidelines and methods for collecting data to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of collaborative justice courts.”</p> <p>Additional Duties included under Rule 10.56:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Assess and measure success and effectiveness of local collaborative justice courts;</li><li>2. Identify and disseminate to trial courts locally generated best practices;</li><li>3. Recommend minimum judicial education standards and educational activities to support those standards to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judiciary Education and Research;</li><li>4. Advise the council of potential funding sources;</li><li>5. Make recommendations regarding grant funding programs that are administered by the Administrative Office of the Courts for drug courts and other treatment courts; and</li><li>6. Recommend appropriate outreach activities needed to support collaborative justice courts.</li></ol>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b></p> <p>The committee currently has 23 members (eight judicial officers, two court administrators, one district attorney, one criminal defense attorney, one law enforcement officer, one treatment court coordinator, one probation officer, one treatment provider, one treatment court graduate, one representative from the mental health field, one social services representative, one non-profit community organization representative, and three public members).</p>	

**Subgroups/Working Groups:<sup>1</sup>**

Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee

Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee

Policy Subcommittee\*

Indicates new subcommittee.

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:**

1. Support local court efforts to increase effectiveness and efficiency of case processing for high risk/high needs cases by identifying and disseminating local court practices that apply collaborative justice to a broad range of high risk/high needs case types;
2. Support local court efforts to assess evidence based practices in local collaborative justice courts as core functions in court operations that address high risk/high needs cases through statewide evaluations of mental health courts and reentry courts;
3. Provide collaborative justice related expertise and support collaboration among justice system partners at the state and local levels through inter-branch efforts in areas such as parolee reentry courts, veterans courts and military families, and juvenile collaborative justice courts;
4. Identify potential funding and advise the Judicial Council regarding funding to sustain local collaborative justice courts during challenging times, including realigned drug court funding, recidivism reduction funding, fiscal impacts of Proposition 47, federal funding for collaborative courts, and funding through the Mental Health Services Act;
5. Identify non-criminal issues that impact case outcomes in criminal and other collaborative courts, such as child support, child custody, juvenile court issues, and access to treatment and rehabilitative services through the Affordable Care Act and realigned treatment programs; and
6. Recommend and provide multi-disciplinary education that addresses the changing role of collaborative justice and application of collaborative justice principles across a broad range of case types, including elder law, family law, and mental health law.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects, and are available to support local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report to the Judicial Council on grant activities from fiscal year 2014-15.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend to the Judicial Council grant allocations to local courts based on allocation method approved by the Judicial Council in</li> </ul>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Legislative mandate reviewed annually by Judicial Council. The Substance Abuse Focus Grant was initiated in FY 2000-01. Current year funding has been established through the Budget Act of 2014 (Stats. 2014, ch. 21; § 45.55.020, item 0250-101-0001).</p> <p>Resources: External legislatively earmarked funding for drug court implementation provides needed resources for committee activities</p>	On-going	Allocation of grant funds to local courts

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 <sup>remedy</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>FY14-15. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review biannual reports regarding funding distribution, invoicing, and deliverables reports from local courts.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> October 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend methods of allocation and grants administration for next annual funding cycle using Judicial Council approved allocation methodology</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p>		<p>for this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Fiscal Services Office, Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 4</p>		
2.	<p>Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance such as developing intern and mentor programs for local collaborative court projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying funding in collaboration with the</li> </ul>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices</p>	On-going	Local courts will be provided access to a variety of funding sources, including those, such as reentry and recidivism reduction grants that are allocated through the Judicial Council.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Bureau of Justice Assistance to support existing and planned collaborative courts.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share outcomes of drug and reentry court cost studies as well as compiled reports and studies from local collaborative courts with collaborative court coordinators in quarterly meetings to assist local courts in seeking local, federal, and private funding.</li> </ul>		<p>branch wide.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal I: Access, Fairness, &amp; Diversity</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i></p> <p>Objective 2. Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Requested by local courts and justice system partners, including</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share effective practices, at the request of local courts, among courts that use intern programs involving law schools or graduate schools for human services professionals or mentor programs involving program graduates or support persons, such as veterans, to improve outcomes for collaborative court participants.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion date:</i> December 31, 2015</p>		<p>the California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, and Homeless Court Network; approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: SB 318; AB109, the Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act, President's Office of National Drug Control Policy reporting duties; California Endowment and Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance funding.</p> <p>Resources: External funding for projects through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources required for committee activities.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1 and 2</p>		



#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	<p>Continue to collaborate with Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER) and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees; to provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative justice models for high risk/high needs cases, focusing on cases involving veterans</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:  <i>Strategic Plan:</i>            Goal III: Modernization of management and administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i>            Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project:            Approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act, and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources:            External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides needed resources for these committee activities.</p>	On-going	<p>Summary of recommendations, multidisciplinary education programs, and educational materials will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2016.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>and military families, truancy, reentry, human trafficking, and mental health as well as the impact on collaborative courts of policy changes such as Proposition 47, Diversion options, the Affordable Care Act and realignment of funding for treatment and services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to confer with relevant CJER judicial education planning committees in criminal law and mental health, and juvenile and family law to address mental health, reentry, human trafficking, veterans issues, and truancy.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> June 30, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to confer with the CJER Governing Committee and relevant judicial education planning committees, and provide guidance to committee</li> </ul>		<p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Center for Judiciary Education and Research, Office of Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>staff regarding training activities developed in collaboration with justice system partners, including but not limited to the California Association of Collaborative Courts (CACC), National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), the California Association of Youth Courts, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Bar Association offered at quarterly meetings and trainings for collaborative court coordinators and court teams that identify emerging models, such as veterans and military families, reentry courts, truancy courts, and human trafficking.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4	<p>Upon request, identify methods to assist local courts in improving case outcomes and implementing policy changes including Proposition 47, Diversion, pretrial supervision, reentry, juvenile competency, child support, veterans issues, sealing of records, and human trafficking through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, courts that address human trafficking, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide guidance and act as subject matter experts for the dissemination of resource guide for judges on elder abuse developed in</li> </ul>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: SB318; AB109, the Budget Act; Proposition 47; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding from the California Endowment, the Archstone Foundation, and the California Endowment was obtained to support all committee activities for these projects.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed</p>	On-going	Summary of local court approaches to identifying case outcomes and evidence based approaches to be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2016.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>partnership with University of California, Irvine, Medical School.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide guidance and act as subject matter experts to advise committee staff regarding a reentry court study and approaches for improving outcomes, by addressing family reunification, child support, housing, and mental health.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p>		<p>on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Office of Communications, Center for Judiciary Education Research, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1, 2, 3, 5</p>		
5	<p>Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such as Proposition 47, recidivism reduction, realigned funding and services, and the Affordable Care Act that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate, mental health, and</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of management and administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch</p>	On-going	<p>Summary of identified policies, assistance provided and recommendations to help local courts provided to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2016.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities.</p>		<p>wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act; Proposition 47; and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources needed by the committee for these activities.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Center for Judiciary Education and Research, Office of Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5		
6	Continue to consult with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education curriculum committees, make recommendations for judicial education and court assistance materials in the areas of court-involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, and veterans courts, including implementation of the optional Judicial Council form to identify military status effective as of January 1, 2014; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education planning committees, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:  <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  <i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Project originated at the request of an Appellate Court Justice who served on the Judicial Council Task Force for Criminal Justice Collaboration on Mental Health Issues and members of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force, and local courts. Project was recommended by committee members to assist courts in responding to mandates of PC 1170.9.</p> <p>Resources: Federal Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance</p>	Ongoing through December 31, 2015.	Summary of recommendations and activities will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2016.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="142 233 525 727">• Make recommendations regarding use of judicial education job aids in judicial education programs, including “Veterans in Criminal Court: A decision map of Penal Code 1170.9” to assist veterans courts, homeless courts, and others in the court system to implement PC1170.9. <i>Completion Date:</i> August 31, 2015</li> <li data-bbox="142 831 525 1325">• Make recommendations for implementing broad use of the form MIL-100, <i>Notification of Military Status</i>, to assist the courts in the identification of veterans involved in cases within the court system, with modifications developed in accord with policy changes. <i>Completion Date:</i></li> </ul>		<p data-bbox="726 233 1184 337">funding was obtained to support all committee activities related to the project.</p> <p data-bbox="726 376 1184 805">To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p> <p data-bbox="726 850 1117 883">Key Objective Supported: 3, 5</p>		



#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify educational materials and, at the request of relevant committees, serve as subject matter experts for preparation of toolkit for areas pertaining to military families and veterans courts, such as implementation of PC 1170.9, PC1001.3, military sexual trauma, and reentry issues for incarcerated veterans by providing guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <p>At the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education committees, serve as</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>subject matter experts and provide guidance in the development of educational programs, identification of faculty, and review of content linked with CJER functions, such as Military Families and Veterans Court programs at the Juvenile Law Institute and Family Law Institute by providing guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
7	<p>Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as truancy, youth courts, trafficking, girls' court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; identify members to participate in a joint working group with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force to address juvenile competency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the committee will collaborate with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, to consider developing recommendations to the Judicial Council to: (1) revise rule 5.645 to define committee staff to develop content, and follow up</li> </ul>		<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i>  <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013-14 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory</p>	June 30, 2015/ in process	Summary of identified policy issues and best practices will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2016.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>activities for the Youth Summit in partnership with the California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide subject matter expertise and guidance to committee staff in development of briefing papers on evidence based practices on assessments, girls' court, and human trafficking for inclusion in and distribution of a judicial officer toolkit.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide subject matter expertise and guidance, and coordinate with staff to other groups, in the area of human trafficking, which will include the development of briefing papers on evidence based</li> </ul>		<p>Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>practices, bench cards for judicial officers, sample scripts, a description of validated assessment and screening tools for trafficking victims, a discussion of girls' courts and specialized human trafficking courts, and the creation of a judicial officer toolkit.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> <i>December 31, 2015</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in the Branch coordination of efforts to support work done by the Child Welfare Council's Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team and other Branch entities, including the CJER Governing Committee and the Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP) Planning Committee, in the area of</li> </ul>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>human trafficking</p> <p>The Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative, funded by the State Justice Institute, has agreed to provide technical support for these projects and to the Judicial Branch in the area of human trafficking. The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, through the Juvenile Subcommittee, will oversee followup work from the HT and State Courts Collaborative Summit and Technical Assistance Project.</p> <p><i>Completion Date:</i> <i>December 31, 2015.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in Branch coordination efforts to address permanency for children in foster care by providing subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with the Permanency Committee of</li> </ul>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>the Child Welfare Council to promote and expand the use of Dependency Drug Courts as a best practice model. The work will include developing literature and data, improving data collection efforts, and increasing outreach efforts to courts that do not currently use Dependency Drug Courts. Continue to coordinate efforts with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the CJER Governing Committees, as well as relevant education and curriculum committees and to partner with Children and Family Futures, the federal technical assistance provider in this subject area, which has agreed to provide technical support for this project.</p> <p><i>Completion Date: December 31, 2015.</i></p>				

**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of, the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects, and are available to local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California.</p>	<p><b>Status: Complete, December 31, 2014.</b>            On recommendation of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, the Judicial Council allocated funding to local collaborative courts located in 51 jurisdictions. Courts received \$1.16 million of Substance Abuse Focus Grants with an additional \$75,000 in supplemental grants to 19 Dependency Drug Courts allocated through federal Court Improvement Plan funding.</p>
2	<p>Collaborate with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees, provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative justice models for high risk/high needs cases, focusing on cases involving veterans and military families, truancy, reentry, human trafficking, and mental health as well as the impact of policy changes such as the Affordable Care Act and realignment of funding for treatment and services on collaborative courts.</p>	<p><b>Status: Partially complete, December 31, 2014.</b>            Multidisciplinary education programs were held in the areas of community justice, human trafficking, youth courts, homelessness, and mental health with toolkits prepared and posted on veterans issues, mental health issues, and human trafficking.  <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/3079.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/3079.htm</a></p>



3	Support local courts in implementing effective practices by providing oversight to internship program, which, upon request from local courts, places law students and master's level graduate students in the mental health and policy research professions into local collaborative courts to help on the local level with issues such as identifying best practices in case processing and outcomes.	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2014.</b></p> <p>Student projects since the inception of this effort have included restorative justice projects in Alameda Court, assisting with the mental health court in San Francisco, and placement of law student interns in San Joaquin, as well as developing a statewide roster of collaborative courts. Seven students participated during the past 3 years, assisting in the areas of youth courts, human trafficking, and mental health court evaluation.</p>
4	Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding for local collaborative court projects.	<p><b>Status: Completed and ongoing, December 31, 2014.</b></p> <p>The Judicial Council approved funding allocation of \$ 3 million from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to existing and planned reentry courts. All local courts were provided notice of federal funding opportunities and, upon request, were assisted in applying for federal funding. Eighteen collaborative courts statewide received a total of \$5.2 million in federal funding from Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in 2014.</p>
5	Identify methods to assist local courts, at their request, in improving case outcomes through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts in order to develop recommendations to the Judicial Council.	<p><b>Status: Completed, December 31, 2014.</b></p> <p>Provided guidance and acted as subject matter experts for the development of resource guide for judges on elder abuse developed in partnership with University of California, Irvine, Medical School.</p>

6	<p>Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as truancy, youth courts, trafficking, girls' court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; propose to the Executive and Planning Committee and the Rules and Projects Committee that a joint working group be established with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force to address juvenile competency.</p>	<p><b>Status: Substantially Complete, December 31, 2014.</b>  A Human Trafficking Forum was held November 19-20, 2014. At the Forum, local court teams met and identified effective practices for collaborative courts addressing human trafficking in delinquency and dependency cases; the Juvenile Competency Workgroup formed and proposed revision to Welfare and Institutions Code section 709; and the Child Welfare Council endorsed Dependency Drug Courts as an effective practice for replication statewide to address permanency planning for children in foster care.</p>
7	<p>Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such as realigned funding and services and the Affordable Care Act that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate, mental health, and drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities.</p>	<p><b>Status: Substantially Complete and ongoing, December 31, 2014.</b>  Multidisciplinary education was provided in these areas at the Community Justice Summit, the statewide Collaborative Justice Summit, the Reentry Court Summit, and meetings of the Child Welfare Council that concerned Dependency Drug Courts.</p> <p><a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/bpai.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/bpai.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-delinquency.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-delinquency.htm</a>  <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/MHC_Eval_Fact_Sheet_5_-_11_FINAL.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/MHC_Eval_Fact_Sheet_5_-_11_FINAL.pdf</a></p>
8	<p>Make recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee for judicial education and court assistance in the areas of court-involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, veterans courts, and the legislative amendment of Penal Code §1170.9; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p>	<p><b>Status: Initial Phase Complete, December 31, 2014.</b>  The Veterans Subcommittee developed modifications to the MIL100 form to identify military status for use in all case types, with consideration of use in cases subject to PC1170.9. Educational programs were prepared in conjunction with the Family Law Institute, Juvenile Law Institute, and programs addressing collaborative courts in the criminal justice system, including veterans, homeless, and reentry courts.</p> <p><a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/11181.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/11181.htm</a></p>

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

##### **Subgroups/Working Groups:**

*Subgroup or working group name:* Policy Subcommittee (New)

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding legislation and other policy matters, including rules and forms.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*10

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

*Date formed:* June 2015

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Quarterly conference calls

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* On-going

*Subgroup or working group name:* Veterans' Court and Military Families Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding veterans and military families in the courts. To identify and disseminate best practices regarding court responses to veterans and military families in the court system primarily focused on high risk/high needs cases, including veterans' courts, child support and family safety/reunification issues, and responses to legislative changes and mandates.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*4

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

*Date formed:* November 2013

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Quarterly conference calls

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* On-going

*Subgroup or working group name:* Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding collaborative justice courts that address the needs of children and families, with a focus on juvenile collaborative justice courts addressing high risk/high needs cases.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 6

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

*Date formed:* March 2012

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* One annual in-person meeting held in conjunction with either the Youth Court Summit or the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee's in person meeting. Bimonthly conference calls.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: On-going*

**Court-Ordered Debt Task Force**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Judge Mary Ann O’Malley, Co-chair and Judge David S. Wesley, Co-chair
<b>Staff:</b>	Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer and Jody Patel, Chief of Staff
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> Penal Code section 1463.02: The Judicial Council established a task force to evaluate criminal and traffic-related court-ordered debts imposed against adult and juvenile offenders and evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature regarding the priority in which court-ordered debts should be satisfied and the use of comprehensive collection programs authorized pursuant to section 1463.007, including associated cost-recovery practices.</p>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b> The Court-Ordered Debt Task Force is comprised of 20 members plus 1 in an advisory role as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Two members appointed by the California State Association of Counties.</li> <li>(2) Two members appointed by the League of California Cities.</li> <li>(3) Two court executives, two judges, and two Judicial Council employees appointed by the Judicial Council.</li> <li>(4) One member appointed by the Controller.</li> <li>(5) One member appointed by the Franchise Tax Board.</li> <li>(6) One member appointed by the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board.</li> <li>(7) One member appointed by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.</li> <li>(8) One member appointed by the Department of Finance.</li> <li>(9) One member appointed by each house of the Legislature.</li> <li>(10) A county public defender and a city attorney appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.</li> <li>(11) A defense attorney in private practice and a district attorney appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules.</li> <li>(12) One judge in an advisory role.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collections Working Group</li> <li>2. Data Collections Working Group</li> <li>3. Priorities Working Group</li> </ul>	

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:**

The task force's primary objectives are to:

1. Evaluate various aspects of the criminal and traffic-related court-ordered fees, fines, forfeitures, penalties;
2. Prioritize the order in which those court-ordered debts are satisfied; and
3. Collect data concerning the revenue and expenditures associated with these fees.

In 2015, the task force will focus on:

- Training entities that perform collections to accurately distribute revenue in accordance with the State Controller's Appendix C, the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule, and legislation.
- Continuing efforts to develop a standard revenue distribution template for use in the trial courts to be tested by 3 volunteer courts in the form of a pilot project.

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Deliver enhanced training to county/court/city staff that participates in revenue distribution activities to promote a common approach.</p> <p>The JCC and the State Controller’s Office have partnered to deliver remedial and new changes training in San Diego and Sacramento in May 2015. The legislative changes impacting Appendix C and their effect on revenue distribution will be communicated to participants.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: This project speaks to the Judicial Council’s Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence, specifically to “provide ongoing professional development, education, and training to address many concerns including... new management, operational, and service-level expectations.”</p> <p>Origin of Project: This effort was undertaken in response to the requirements of <i>Penal Code 1463.02</i>.</p> <p>Resources: JCC staff on the task force, CJER, JCC subject matter experts, and staff in the State Controller’s Office.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #1</p>	<p>May 2015</p> <p>Training to be delivered statewide bi-annually.</p>	<p>Accurate revenue collection and distribution will have a positive impact on the state’s budget.</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>Continue the 3-year pilot project to review adherence to the State Controller’s Appendix C, the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule, and legislation.</p> <p>Santa Clara, Ventura, and Shasta Superior Courts continue their active participation in a pilot program with the long-term goal of simplifying the distribution process. Distribution methodologies continue to be discussed and evaluated to assess compliance with applicable statutes and Appendix C. The goal is to develop a standard methodology that can be implemented statewide.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: This project speaks to the Judicial Council’s Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration, specifically, the “developing and implementing appropriate accountability and compliance measures.” This project promotes the accuracy and statewide uniformity of revenue distribution.</p> <p>Origin of Project: This effort was undertaken in response to the requirements of <i>Penal Code 1463.02</i>. One of the statutory requirements in the Penal Code is that the task force develops and recommends processes to simplify or streamline the distribution of revenues to the various government entities.</p> <p>Resources: JCC staff to the task force, JCC subject matter experts, and staff in the Superior Courts of Santa Clara, Ventura, and Shasta.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #1</p>	January 2017	<p>The anticipated outcome of this project is to build a foundation for establishing statewide guidelines for effectively and efficiently managing revenue distributions.</p> <p>An anticipated end product is the development of a standardized template to be used statewide, ensuring greater accuracy in revenue distribution efforts.</p>



**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Perform a review of new legislation to determine impact to the State Controller’s Manual of Accounting and Audit Guidelines for Trial Courts (Appendix C) and work with the State Controller’s Office (SCO) to further amend the document.	Completion of legislative review: December 2014  Revision efforts are ongoing as legislation passes which impacts the SCO’s Appendix C.
2	Deliver enhanced training to county/court/city staff who participates in revenue distribution activities to promote a common approach.	Completion: June 2014 A subsequent training was delivered in November 2014.  Training conducted bi-annually on an ongoing basis.
3	Initiate a 3-year pilot project to review adherence to the State Controller’s Appendix C.	In progress. Completion anticipated January 2017.

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[For each group listed in Section I, including any proposed “new” subgroups/working groups, provide the below information. For working groups that include members who are not on this advisory body, provide information about the additional members (e.g., from which other advisory bodies), and include the number of representatives from this advisory body as well as additional members on the working group.]*

*Subgroup or working group name:* Collections Working Group

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To ascertain what information is already available through Enhanced Collections and what would be needed going forward as part of the task force goal to “evaluate and make recommendations regarding the use of comprehensive collection programs authorized by Penal Code section 1463.007.”

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 12

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 0

*Date formed:* March 4, 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Anticipated to meet quarterly.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* December 2015

*Subcommittee or working group name:* Data Collections Working Group

*Purpose of subcommittee or working group:* To resolve issues specific to the citations of statutes that no longer exists and the clarification of how to apply the distribution of those fines/fees collected, to determine whether new citations need to be added to the Appendix C, and to develop a common approach to the lack of uniformity in the current statewide distribution methodology.

*Number of advisory group members:* 6

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group):* 0

*Date formed:* September 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the group meets:* Quarterly

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* December 2015

*Subcommittee or working group name:* Priorities Working Group

*Purpose of subcommittee or working group:* To examine current county practices with respect to priorities and rankings of distributions and report their findings to the Task Force as one way to meet the Task Force goal to “evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding the priority in which court-ordered debts should be satisfied.”

*Number of advisory group members:* 9

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group):* 0

*Date formed:* March 4, 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the group meets:* This working group will not begin its work until 2017 after the other stages of the project are completed.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* TBD

# Workload Assessment Advisory Committee

## Annual Agenda—2015

Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_

### I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Lorna Alksne
<b>Staff:</b>	Leah Rose-Goodwin and Deana Farole, Court Operations Services, Office of Court Research (OCR)
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> The committee makes recommendations to the council on judicial administration standards and measures that provide for the equitable allocation of resources across courts to promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. The committee must recommend: (1)Improvements to performance measures and implementation plans and any modifications to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study Model; (2)Processes, study design, and methodologies that should be used to measure and report on court administration; and (3)Studies and analyses to update and amend case weights through time studies, focus groups, or other methods.	
<b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b> 16 members: 8 judicial officers, 8 court executives	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> Special Circumstances Subcommittee	
<b>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Finalize the project plan and methodology for conducting an update to the staff workload study.</li><li>• Conduct the staff workload study update and produce preliminary results.</li><li>• Improve data quality of filings data in the RAS categories.</li></ul>	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Staff workload study update. The update will consist of a time study of a sample of trial courts and is intended to update the caseweights and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload need. The committee's work in 2015 will consist of discussing the study parameters and methodology, advising council staff on and assisting with recruitment of courts to participate in the study, and directing council staff in carrying out the study and conducting a preliminary analysis of the results.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> In February 2013, the Judicial Council approved the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by council staff as the data become available. The need for regular updates to the workload model has become more urgent now that RAS is used as the foundation piece of the model used to allocate trial court funding (WAFM).</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The SB 56 Working Group was formed in 2009 at the direction of the Administrative Director to provide trial court input and oversight to the Office of Court Research in its ongoing work to revise and improve the workload estimates for judges and court staff. In October</p>	Ongoing. A preliminary analysis will be completed by the end of 2015, with review of preliminary results, caseweight adjustments, and finalization of the caseweights to continue through 2016.	Updated caseweights to measure trial court staff workload. These caseweights are used to estimate trial court staff need, which is then used for the WAFM model.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>2013, the advisory committee voted to update the studies every 5 years, as resources permit. In December 2013, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to establish the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee to succeed the SB 56 Working Group and to continue its work. In April 2014, the committee was renamed to the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC).</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.25 FTE Manager, 1.0 FTE Supervising Research Analyst, 2.5 FTE Senior Research Analyst, 0.5 FTE Staff Analyst II (2 FTE Senior Research Analysts are pending recruitment; all others are existing staff); ITSO support to create web-based data collection interface; subject matter expert consultants from the Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts and Criminal Justice Services.</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> #1 and #2</p>		
2.	Convene Special Circumstances Subcommittee to study the impact of special circumstances cases on the felony caseload and make recommendations to		<b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> In February 2013, the Judicial Council approved the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the	Anticipated completion date is May 2015.	The subcommittee will formulate recommendations for consideration by the full committee on how

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	the full committee on how to handle such cases.		<p>understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by council staff as the data become available.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> At its January 16, 2014 meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee passed a motion to recommend to the Judicial Council that WAAC consider establishing a casetype for special circumstances cases. The motion was intended to highlight the extraordinary resource needs for those cases and also the criticality of the workload models to direct resources to courts based on workload. At the February 20, 2014 Judicial Council meeting, the Council refined the TCBAC's recommendation to recommend that WAAC specifically study homicide-death penalty cases.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.1 FTE Supervising Research Analyst, 0.25 FTE Senior Research Analyst, nominal time from Manager (existing OCR staff). Subcommittee consists of representatives from the trial courts who are current WAAC members. Meeting expenses will be absorbed into existing IMF allocation for</p>		to approach special circumstances cases in terms of data collection and the analysis of court resource needs in this area.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			WAAC.  <b>Key Objective Supported: #1</b>		
3.	<p>Improve data quality of filings data in the RAS categories, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with courts to ensure that data are reported in all of the RAS casetype categories</li> <li>• Evaluate court reporting practices for filings data to ensure they meet current JBSIS standards; update and clarify JBSIS standards as needed</li> <li>• Develop different possibilities for validating the filings data used in the RAS model, including establishing a data auditing process for filings data.</li> </ul> <p>This project is a partnership with the Court Executive Advisory Committee.</p>		<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> The Judicial Council approved the judicial workload study (December 2011) and the Resource Assessment Study (February 2013) as the methodologies used to estimate judge and staff workload need. Both studies use filings as the driver to estimate resource need. The accuracy of the estimates rely on the accurate and complete reporting of filings data by the trial courts. The Council’s motions to approve the two studies also anticipated the need for ongoing technical adjustments to the models as better data became available.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The need for better data reporting and data auditing were discussed at the last SB 56 Working Group meeting (October 2013). The issue has also been raised at various forums, including CEAC; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meetings; and Funding Methodology Subcommittee meetings.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> COS-OCR staff (existing</p>	Ongoing	The result of this work will be an improvement in the data presently collected from the courts for the RAS model.



#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>resources); ITSO staff (existing resources); a more extensive data validation project (3rd bullet) could require additional staff resources.</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: #3</b></p>		

DRAFT

### III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Staff and judge workload studies update: the workload studies update will consist of a time study of a sample of trial courts and is intended to update the caseweights and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload need. The committee's work in 2014 will consist of discussing the study parameters, methodology, and securing the resources to conduct the time study data collection.	<b>Ongoing.</b> The staff workload study parameters and methodology are under continued discussion and will be finalized in Summer 2015, with the study to be conducted in the Fall. The judge workload study will trail the staff workload study in order to minimize the burden on participating courts. JC staff have submitted one PAR to recruit a research position in OCR to support the project; a second PAR will be submitted for another position to start in July 2015. These positions are key to the ability of OCR staff to support the project, because of loss of several key staff who previously were assigned to the project and in light of the recommendation by OCR and agreement by the Executive Office that the entire study should be done in-house, rather than contracted out to the National Center for State Courts as was the case with the previous study.
2.	Update the Judicial Needs Assessment: this project involves using updated filings data to project the need for judicial officers. Biennial updates in even-numbered years are required by Government Code Section 61614(c)(1).	<b>Complete.</b> The Judicial Council approved the report for transmission to Legislature and Governor on December 12, 2014.
3.	Review the method for prioritizing judicial need and determine if changes should be made to the current method.	<b>Complete.</b> The committee's recommendation to lower the eligibility threshold to get on the list for a new judgeship from 1.0 to 0.8 FTE was approved by the council on December 12, 2014.
4.	<p>Improve data quality of filings data in the RAS categories, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with courts to ensure that data are reported in all of the RAS casetype categories</li> <li>• Evaluate court reporting practices for filings data to ensure they meet current JBSIS standards; update and clarify JBSIS standards as needed</li> <li>• Develop different possibilities for validating the filings</li> </ul>	<b>Ongoing.</b> Key milestones achieved in 2014 include modifying the JBSIS web portal to accept filings in the disaggregated family law-other category (DV, parentage, child support, and family law-other petitions). Portal modifications for probate and civil limited will be completed in early 2015. Additionally, a working group of CEAC has been convened to compile and prioritize a list of JBSIS reporting issues.

	<p>data used in the RAS model, including establishing a data auditing process for filings data.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Subordinate Judicial Officer Conversion Program:</b> Provide to E&amp;P updated information that would show how the remaining 54 subordinate judicial officer conversions authorized under Government Code section 61695 would be allocated if more current workload data were used.</p>	<p><b>Ongoing.</b> This project was delayed because of the need to update the number of authorized subordinate judicial officer FTE in the courts. A census was conducted in September 2014, and E&amp;P reviewed changes made in several courts at its October 9, 2014 meeting. An updated analysis will be reviewed by WAAC in January 2015 and, if approved, will be presented to E&amp;P in early 2015.</p>

DRAFT

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[For each group listed in Section I, including any proposed “new” subgroups/working groups, provide the below information. For working groups that include members who are not on this advisory body, provide information about the additional members (e.g., from which other advisory bodies), and include the number of representatives from this advisory body as well as additional members on the working group.]*

*Subgroup or working group name:* Special Circumstances Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To study the impact of special circumstances cases on the felony caseweight and make recommendations to the full committee on how to handle such cases.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 5

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A

*Date formed:* 11/20/2014

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Approximately 4 monthly meetings are anticipated.

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Work is expected to be completed by May 2015.

# Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch

## Annual Agenda—2015

Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_

### I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Richard D. Huffman, Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One
<b>Staff:</b>	John Judnick, Senior Manager, Audit Services
<p><b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> Under rule 10.63 of the California Rules of Court, the advisory committee is charged with the following responsibilities and making recommendations to the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council of California (JCC), and the Administrative Director on practices that will promote financial accountability and efficiency in the judicial branch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Make recommendations each year on any Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for funding of the JCC prior to submission to the State Department of Finance. Such recommendations would be based upon information in the BCPs and a review of information on budget and staffing levels at the JCC.</li><li>• Make recommendations each year on any proposed changes in the annual compensation plan for the JCC. Such recommendations would include a review of compensation adjustments of comparable entities in the judicial branch and in state and local government. The Chief Justice is charged by law with making the final decision.</li><li>• Review all audit reports for the Judicial Branch, including appellate courts, trial courts and the JCC, and where appropriate, make recommendations on individual or systemic issues for the Judicial Council's consideration at the time it receives and considers audit reports.</li><li>• Report biennially to the Judicial Council on all JCC contracts for which there is no other external oversight body and that meet established review criteria to ensure such contracts are in support of judicial branch policy as set by the Judicial Council.</li><li>• Review proposed updates and revisions to the <i>Judicial Branch Contracting Manual</i>.</li><li>• Make recommendations on any practices that will promote efficiency in the Judicial Branch.</li><li>• Make recommendations on any practices that will improve financial accountability in the Judicial Branch.</li><li>• Advise on other issues related to the committee charge as requested by the Chief Justice, Judicial Council, or the Administrative Director.</li></ul>	

**Advisory Body’s Membership:** 14 members total:

Justices of the Courts of Appeal – 2

Superior Court Judges – 7 (including one California Judges Association Board Member)

Court Executive Officers – 5

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *N/A*

**Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2015:**

- Review all audit reports for the Judicial Branch, including appellate courts, trial courts and the Judicial Council of California (JCC).
  - As appropriate, make recommendations on individual or systemic issues compiled from recent audit reports reviewed for the Judicial Council’s consideration.
- Report to the Judicial Council on the biennial review of all JCC contracts for which there is no other external oversight body and that meet established review criteria to ensure such contracts are in support of judicial branch policy as set by the Judicial Council.
- Review and make recommendations on Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for funding of the JCC prior to submission to the Department of Finance.
- Participate in review of periodic updates and revisions to the *Judicial Branch Contracting Manual*.
- Promote transparency, financial accountability and efficiency, and understanding of the JCC and the Judicial Branch.

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>JCC Contracts Review</b> Report on the committee's biennial review of JCC contracts for which there is no other external oversight body and that meet established review criteria to ensure such contracts are in support of judicial branch policy as set by the Judicial Council.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability Objective B.4: Establish fiscal and operational accountability standards for the judicial branch to ensure the achievement of and adherence to these standards throughout the branch.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Assigned by the Judicial Council to the A&amp;E Committee at its August 23, 2013 meeting.</p> <p>Resources: Ongoing resources from JCC Audit Services, Finance and Legal Services Offices, and possibly other Offices as contracts are being reviewed.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: <i>Bullet #2</i></p>	Report to the Judicial Council in April on the results of the biennial review.	A&E Committee will review current JCC contracts and report on the results of its review with recommendations where necessary on possible enhancements to financial and operational accountability.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p><b>Judicial Branch Contracting Manual Review</b> Report on the committee's review of proposed updates and revisions to <i>the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual</i>.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability Objective B.4: Establish fiscal and operational accountability standards for the judicial branch to ensure the achievement of and adherence to these standards throughout the branch.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Assigned by the Judicial Council to the A&amp;E Committee at its August 23, 2013 meeting.</p> <p>Resources: Legal Services Office</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Bullet #4</p>	<p>Ongoing: Annual update based on submission.</p> <p>Periodic as required by specific circumstances.</p>	<p>A&amp;E Committee will review updates and revisions to <i>the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual</i> ensuring that Judicial Branch standards are upheld and report on the results of its review including any recommendations.</p>
3.	<p><b>Review Budget Change Proposal Requests</b> Report on the committee's review of BCPs for funding prior to their submission to the State Department of Finance.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability Objective B.4: Establish fiscal and operational accountability standards for the judicial branch to ensure the achievement of and adherence to these standards throughout the branch.</p>	<p>Annually in August and February prior to submissions to Department of Finance</p>	<p>A&amp;E Committee along with the JCC's Finance and other submitting offices will report on the result of the reviews with any recommendations.</p>



#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: Committee Charge</p> <p>Resources: JCC offices prepare the BCP concepts and supporting materials with Finance Office's review prior to submission to the Committee</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #3</p>		
4.	<p><b>Judicial Branch Audit Report Reviews</b> Report on the committee's review audit reports on the Judicial Branch, including appellate courts, trial courts and the Judicial Council of California (JCC), and where appropriate, make recommendations on individual or systemic issues for the Judicial Council's consideration.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective B.4: Establish fiscal and operational accountability standards for the judicial branch to ensure the achievement of and adherence to these standards throughout the branch.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Committee Charge</p> <p>Resources: Audit Services</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Bullet #1:</p>	Ongoing	A&E Committee will review audit reports and report on the results of its review with recommendations, as appropriate.
5.	<p><b>Advise on Practices or Issues Related to Committee's Charge As Assigned</b> Report on the committee's review of practices or issues to</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective B.4: Establish fiscal and</p>	As requested or assigned.	A&E Committee will report and make recommendations based on its review of the practices or issues.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	promote efficiency or improve financial accountability in the Judicial Branch.		<p>operational accountability standards for the judicial branch to ensure the achievement of and adherence to these standards throughout the branch.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Committee Charge</p> <p>Resources: Audit Services Key Objective Supported: Bullet #5</p>		

**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

*[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]*

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Reviewed Judicial Branch Contracting Manual Updates	Project anticipated to be completed in May 2015 on submission of updates and revisions. Report to Judicial Council in June 2015.
2	Review Budget Change Proposal request	Completed. Submitted Judicial Council Reports in August 2014 and February 2015.
3	Judicial Council Branch Audit reviews	Ongoing.
4	JCC Classification and Compensation	Project anticipated to be completed May/June 2015 on submission of final report to the Committee. Report to Judicial Council in June 2015.

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups: *N/A*

**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Laurie Earl, Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County
<b>Staff:</b>	Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Finance office Mr. Steven Chang, Manager, Judicial Council Finance office Mr. Bob Fleshman, Supervisor, Judicial Council Finance office
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule 10.64. Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Area of focus</u>                  The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for the trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding.</li> <li>• <u>Additional duties</u>                  In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee may make recommendations to the council on:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trial court budget priorities to guide the development of the budget for the upcoming fiscal year;</li> <li>○ The allocation of trial court funding, including any changes to existing methodologies for allocating trial court budget augmentations and reductions; and</li> <li>○ Budget policies and procedures, as appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In addition to the duties described above, the advisory committee may also make recommendations to the council on proposed expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.</p> <p>The advisory committee currently plans to meet in-person approximately 7 times in 2015 and several more times by teleconference, contingent on available funding.</p>	

### **Advisory Body's Membership:**

- Membership
  - The advisory committee consists of an equal number of trial court presiding judges and court executive officers reflecting diverse aspects of state trial courts, including urban, suburban, and rural locales; the size and adequacy of budgets; and the number of authorized judgeships. For purposes of rule 10.64, "presiding judge" means a current presiding judge or an immediate past presiding judge.
  - No more than two members may be from the same court.
  - The chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee serve as ex-officio voting members.
  - Notwithstanding rule 10.31(e), a presiding judge is qualified to complete his or her term on the advisory committee even if his or her term as presiding judge of a trial court ends.
  - The Judicial Council's chief of staff, chief administrative officer, chief operating officer, and director of Finance serve as non-voting members.
- This year marks the first time committee membership has included staggered appointments for one, two, and three year terms and are timed to coincide with Judicial Council roster changes each fall.
- Committee membership requires a commitment of several hours per month on average, but may vary considerably from month to month, depending on the budget issues in any given year.

### **Subgroups/Working Groups:**

- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee
- Funding Methodology Subcommittee
- Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee
- 2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee\*
- 2% Reserve Policy Working Group\*
- Benefits Working Group\*
- Children's Waiting Room Working Group\*
- Court-appointed Dependency Counsel Working Group\*
- Security Growth Working Group\*

\*Indicates advisory bodies established since the last annual agenda was approved.

**Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2015:**

- Review allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund to ensure consistency with Judicial Council goals and objectives and propose solutions to address any structural shortfall in either fund.
- Ongoing review and refinement of the council-approved Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) to address unresolved issues.
- Develop definitions and policies governing local assistance and state operations expenditures tied to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund allocations.
- Develop an allocation methodology for Prop. 47 funding.
- Develop new allocation methodology for Court Appointed Dependency Counsel funding.

II. **ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS:** The committee does not have any proposed projects for the year ahead, but is expected to focus on continued efforts indicated in the key objectives section above. Of note:

- As indicated in the charge outlined in the rule, the committee performs an active role in the development of the statewide trial court budget. This includes surveying courts and providing input on trial court budget priorities as well as submitting recommendations to the council, typically in June, on trial court budget change proposals for the upcoming fiscal year.
- In January 2015, the committee conducted new member orientation that was open to Judicial Council members as well as new trial court presiding judges. Due to the significant interest and attendance, the committee intends to follow through with a similar orientation in the next cycle.

III. **STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

Not Applicable: The committee did not have specific projects for 2014, but instead addressed a variety of issues throughout the year, including fund balance restrictions, shortfalls in funds supporting trial courts, and funding methodology implementation, among others.

## IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

### Subgroups/Working Groups:

- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee: This subcommittee, formed in July 2013, includes 13 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The primary focus of this group is the ongoing review of allocations supporting trial court projects and programs as well as any systemic cash flow issues affecting the trial courts. In 2015, a subset of this advisory body will develop recommendations for council consideration relating to the definitions and policies governing local assistance and state operations expenditures tied to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund allocations. This subcommittee meets at least twice per year.
- Funding Methodology Subcommittee: This subcommittee, also formed in July 2013, includes 15 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance with support from the Office of Court Research. This group will continue to focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology approved by the council in April 2013. This subcommittee is expected to meet at least twice per year.
- Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee: This subcommittee, which formed in 2013, includes 11 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. This group's focus will be funding methodology and allocations relating to criminal justice realignment, specifically Proposition 47 workload. This subcommittee meets at least twice per year.
- 2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee: This subcommittee, formed in October 2014, includes 7 presiding judges and court executives and is staff by JCC Finance. This group reviews and makes recommendations on court supplemental funding requests received in conjunction with the 2% emergency reserve funding process and that relate to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses. The group meets as needed.
- 2% Reserve Policy Working Group: This subcommittee, formed in 2014, includes six presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. This group is charged with working with the Court Executive Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, and the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, to recommend proposed amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, to be included as trailer bill language to the 2015 Budget Act. The working group will meet as needed to develop recommended language and is not expected to continue beyond the current fiscal year.
- Benefits Working Group: This group, formed in 2014, includes 9 presiding judges and executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The working group has been working on various benefit cost and related funding allocation issues over the past several months and is expected to wrap up its duties in the spring of 2015.



- Children’s Waiting Room Working Group: This group, formed in late 2014, includes 6 presiding judges and executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The working group is developing recommendations that include changes and additions to the Judicial Council’s policy regarding children’s waiting room distributions. Work is expected to be completed in spring 2015.
- Court-appointed Dependency Counsel Working Group: This group has existed in one form or another, supporting Judicial Council advisory bodies, for several years. The current iteration, which includes 9 presiding judges and court executive officers and is primarily staffed by the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, is focused on the allocation methodology for court-appointed dependency counsel funding. The group is expected to conclude its work in the current fiscal year.
- Security Growth Working Group: This group, formed in 2014, includes 5 presiding judge and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. Their focus is to address the growth in non-sheriff, court-provided security costs. The group’s work is expected to run through calendar year 2015.

**Court Interpreters Advisory Panel**  
**Annual Agenda—2015**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Steven K. Austin
<b>Vice Chair:</b>	Ms. Christina Volkers
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf, Ms. Catharine Price
<p><b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> Makes recommendations to the Judicial Council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Interpreter use and need for interpreters in court proceedings; and</li><li>○ Certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters.</li><li>○ Reviews and makes recommendations to the Judicial Council on the findings of the study of language and interpreter use and need for interpreters in court proceedings that are conducted by the Judicial Council staff, as required by statute, every 5 years. <i>(Sen. Bill 1304; Stats. 1992, ch.770, Rule 10.51 and GC §68561-68565)</i></li></ul>	

**Advisory Body's Membership:** 15 Member Panel – Rule of Court 10.51 provides that the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel will consist of 11 members, a majority of whom must be court interpreters. The panel must include representatives from the following categories:

- One appellate court justice;
- Two trial court judges;
- Two court administrators, including at least one trial court executive officer;
- Four certified or registered court interpreters working as employees in the trial courts, one from each of the four regions established by Government Code section 71807; and
- Two certified or registered court interpreters in a language other than Spanish, working in the trial courts as independent contractors or in an educational institution.

There are also four advisory non-voting positions, each offering a perspective not represented by the voting members. They currently are:

- A representative of the American Sign Language (ASL) community;
- A representative of court users of interpreter services, such as a public defender, legal aid attorney, or other public advocate;
- A representative familiar with the hands-on supervision of day-to-day court interpreter operations; and
- A representative with legal experience within the court (This position has also been held by a representative in the field of interpreter education)

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[List the names of each subgroup/working group, including groups made up exclusively of advisory body members and joint groups with other advisory bodies, and provide additional information about the subgroups/working groups in Section IV below. To request approval for the creation of a new subgroup/working group, include “new” before the name of the proposed subgroup/working group and describe its purpose and membership in section IV below.<sup>1</sup>]*

1. **Professional Standards and Ethics** (Established 1999 under name of *Interpreter Standards and Procedures*; suspended activities in 2013; members became part of the Joint Working Group for Language Access)
2. **Language Access Subcommittee** (approved 2013; suspended activities in 2013; members became part of the Joint Working Group for Language Access)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:** (May change due to possible directives/assignments from the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force)

1. Maintain performance standards of current interpreters by developing a means of fairly and consistently assessing court interpreter knowledge, skills and abilities in the courtroom, per Rule of Court 2.891, and by developing procedures through which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements are fairly reviewed and assessed. (Upon completion of this objective, move to the next step, establishing grounds and procedures for revocation of certification or registration and removal of interpreter from the Master List.)
2. Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing Rules of Court 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms.
3. Complete review and submit proposed changes for Evidence Code 754 to PCLC.

In addition, the following projects have been identified by other advisory committees naming CIAP as resources. CIAP will provide consultation as required on the following.

4. Consult with the Court Technology Advisory Committee on Video Remote Technology.
5. Consult with Civil and Small Claims Committee on Request for Interpreter in Civil Action Forms.

*Objectives 1-2 are anticipated to take two years to complete; as they may require revising existing rules of court and Judicial Council forms.*

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>A) Research, develop and recommend method and means by which a biennial periodic review on court interpreter skills can be fairly and consistently assessed throughout the courts. (Rule of Court 2.891) May include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research professional associations, licensing entities, and other organizations that utilize interpreters to identify methods for assessing performance.</li> <li>• Work with the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) on the assessment of research findings and develop appropriate review processes, procedures and</li> </ul>	1	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b> <u>GC §68562 (d)</u> The Judicial Council shall adopt standards and requirements for interpreter proficiency, continuing education, certification renewal, and discipline. The Judicial Council shall adopt standards of professional conduct for court interpreters</p> <p><u>GC§68564 (f)</u> A procedure for Judicial Council and local court review of each court interpreter's skills and for reporting to the certification entity the results of the review</p> <p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal IV</u> – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><u>Operational Objective 1.</u> Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory</p>	Ongoing, completion of Project 1A: anticipated late 2016.	<p>Recommended processes, procedures and tools for courts to implement Rule of Court 2.891 consistently and fairly.</p> <p><i><u>Note: This project will be fully informed by:</u></i> <i><u>GC§71811 Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, and regional Memoranda of Understanding.</u></i></p>

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>tools.</p> <p><b><u>Subgroup: Professional Standards and Ethics</u></b></p> <p>Upon completion of the above project, (late 2016) which the courts have communicated and identified as a priority, CIAP will undertake the next step as follows:</p> <p>B) Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for permanent revocation of an interpreters' certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure.</p> <p><b><u>Rationale:</u></b> There has been a standing need for the Judicial Council to adopt policies and criteria for permanent revocation of certified or registered status and removal of the interpreter from the Master List. Currently, interpreters are removed from</p>		<p>services and outcomes.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> <u>Language Access Plan (LAP)</u><sup>4</sup> recommendation 64: <i>Develop a procedure by which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements can be reviewed including a determination of whether California Rule of Court 2.891 should be amended, repealed, or remain in place.</i></p> <p><u>Rule of Court 2.891 Periodic Review of Court Interpreter Skills and Professional Conduct</u> calls for biennial review of court interpreters by courts. Courts have identified the need for recommendations to carry out rule 2.891 as a critical priority.</p> <p><b><u>Resources:</u></b> CEAC, LERU/Legal Services, Court Human Resources, Language Access Plan Implementation Taskforce, and other stakeholders as needed for consultative purposes.</p> <p><b><u>Key Objective Supported:</u></b> Maintain</p>	<p>Projected to commence early 2017 with a projected completion of December 2018</p>	

<sup>4</sup> LAP refers to the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	the Master List, but may re-qualify, only if they fail to complete annual compliance requirements.		performance standards of current interpreters by developing a means of fairly and consistently assessing court interpreter knowledge, skills and abilities in the courtroom, per Rule of Court 2.891, and by developing procedures through which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements are fairly reviewed and assessed.		
2	<p>Undertake a comprehensive evaluation of existing Rule of Court (2.893) and Judicial Council INT forms and instructions, and recommend any appropriate revisions.</p> <p>Investigate whether Rule of Court 2.893 should be amended, consider the possible scope of amendments, and made recommendations accordingly. (As per Recommendation 70 in the LAP.)</p> <p><b><u>Subgroup: Language Access</u></b></p>	1(b)	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b> GC §68561 requires the use of certified and registered interpreters and outlines the process for provisional qualification of a non-certified /non-registered. Effective January 1, 2015, legislative changes expanded the information required on the record. (Relates to LAP Recommendation 19)</p> <p><u>Rule of Court 2.893</u> Appointment of noncertified interpreters in criminal cases and juvenile delinquency proceedings.</p> <p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal I</u> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><u>Operational Objective 5</u> Increase qualified interpreter services in</p>	January 2017	Provide recommendations on ways Rule of Court 2.893 and Judicial Council INT Forms and Instructions should be amended.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court venues; increase the availability of language-assistance services to all court users.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b>  AB 2370 (Stats. 2014, ch. 424; effective January 1, 2015) expanded upon the previous GC 68561 by requiring that certain statements be made on the record whenever an interpreter interprets in a court proceeding, including statements that confirm that the court is following the procedures for provisional qualification.</p> <p><b><u>LAP Recommendation 9:</u></b> Proposed amendments to this rule and the INT forms.</p> <p><b><u>Resources:</u></b> TCPJAC, CEAC, Chairs of the Bargaining Regions, Court Subject Matter Experts, Legal Services, Human Resources Labor Relations Unit, Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force.</p> <p><b><u>Key Objective Supported:</u></b> Conduct</p>		



#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			comprehensive evaluation of existing Rule of Court 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms.		
3	<p>Develop Policy recommendation(s) to update Evidence Code 754. Update to include parallel provisional qualification language in addition to terminology updates and clarifications in the Code. Consider additional changes, formally respond to commentators and determine the need to go out for additional public comment.</p> <p><b>Subgroup: Language Access</b></p>	1(f)	<p><u>Strategic Plan Goal I</u> Access, Fairness and Diversity</p> <p><u>Operational Plan Objective 2</u> Identify and Eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; insure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient and perceived as fair.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Continuation of work that commenced with the 2012 Annual Agenda arising from selected courts that expressed concern to leadership about ASL interpreter shortages and the need for provisional qualification.</p> <p>[Rules and Forms Proposals Priority Level:]1(f)</p>	<p>Proposed language has been developed and was posted for public comment. Extensive work with stakeholders ensued following review of public comment.</p> <p>Submit to Governmental Affairs in Fall 2015 for PCLC consideration.</p>	<p>Have a proposed amended version of Evidence Code 754, and affected INT forms and Rules, ready for submission to Judicial Council to consider for legislative sponsorship.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4	<p><b><u>Consultative Only:</u></b> Consult with Court Technology Advisory Committee (name changing to ITAC in July) and Judicial Council Technology Committee in the execution of a Video Remote Interpreting pilot project for spoken languages.</p> <p>CIAP cannot serve as the lead, and cannot commit to committee or staff resources on an ongoing basis.</p>	1	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b> Component of the Chief Justice’s “Access 3D” initiative that highlights physical, remote, and equal access to the justice system.</p> <p>The Information Technology Committee identified this project on their current Annual Agenda as follows: Tactical Plan for Technology: Courthouse Video Connectivity, p.22 (Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2014; notice from JC Legal Services regarding the pilot program; member recommendation)</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> <i>LAP recommendation 16: The Judicial Council should conduct a pilot project, in alignment with the Judicial Branch’s Tactical Plan for Technology 2014-2016. This pilot should, to the extent possible, collect relevant data on: due process issues, participant satisfaction, whether remote interpreting increases the use of certified and registered interpreters as opposed to provisionally qualified interpreters, the effectiveness of a</i></p>	December 2016 (per CTAC)	<p>Provide consultation services.</p> <p>Outcomes as stated in CTAC’s Annual Agenda are:</p> <p>Technical Standards</p> <p>Implementation of VRI Pilot Program</p> <p>Rule Proposal</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<i>variety of available technologies (for both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation), and a cost-benefit analysis.</i>		
5	<p><b><u>Consultative Only:</u></b> Consult with the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee on the new form for requesting an interpreter.</p> <p>This would be consultative only and CIAP would not be the lead and cannot commit committee or staff resources on an ongoing basis.</p>	2	<p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> The Judicial Council directed the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee to create a new form for parties to use to request court interpreters in civil matters; <i>Request for Court Interpreter, Civil Actions</i>, the form will be consistent with the requirements of AB 1657. Initial Public comments were received (January 23, 2015)</p>	December 2015	Finalized form for request for interpreter services for civil matters.

**III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:**

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Continue to develop and complete the Comprehensive California Language Access Plan	Complete – Final plan was adopted by Judicial Council on January 22, 2015
2	Review and address public comment to proposed changes for Evidence Code 754.	Further review required; identified as Project # 4 on the 2014 Annual Agenda, and Project number #3 on this Annual Agenda.
3	Conduct Legislatively Mandated 2015 Interpreter Need and Language Use Study(GC §68563)	Complete by June 2015— The 2015 Language Need and Use Study will be finalized and reviewed by CIAP on April 16, 2015, and is scheduled for review and approval by the Judicial Council (June 2015) prior to submission to the Legislature.

#### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups – Detail (To be completed once determine subgroup structure and assignments)

##### **Subgroups/Working Groups:**

###### ***Subgroup or working group name: Professional Standards and Ethics***

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Phase 1: Maintain performance standards of current interpreters by developing a means of fairly and consistently assessing court interpreter knowledge, skills and abilities in the courtroom, per Rule of Court 2.891, and by developing procedures through which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements are fairly reviewed and assessed. Upon completion, subgroup will undertake phase 2, establishing grounds and procedures for revocation of certification or registration and removal of interpreter from the Master List.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 8 members (includes 1 advisory member)

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* NA

*Date formed:* 1999

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 4-6x per year (once in person with entire CIAP Body)

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Phase 1, Late 2016 or early 2017

###### ***Subgroup or working group name: Language Access***

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing Rules of Court 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms. Complete review and submit proposed changes for Evidence Code 754 to PCLC in Fall of 2015.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 7 member (includes 3 advisory members)

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* NA

*Date formed:* 2013

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 4-6x per year (once in person with entire CIAP Body)

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* EC754 work December 2015; balance January 2017

**Note:** The following projects have been identified by other advisory committees naming CIAP as resources. CIAP will provide consultation as required on the following; CIAP cannot commit committee or staff resources on an ongoing basis.

- Consult with the Court Technology Advisory Committee on Video Remote Technology.
- Consult with Civil and Small Claims Committee on Request for Interpreter in Civil Action Forms.

***As formed by the Chief on January 22, 2015: Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force***

*Members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel appointed to the Implementation Task Force on March 4, 2015, chaired by Associate Supreme Court Justice Mariano Fiorentino-Cuéllar*

Hon. Steven K. Austin, Chair, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel

Hon. Miguel Márquez

Hon. Manuel Covarrubias (appointed vice-chair of the Implementation Task Force)

Ms. Ivette Peña (CIAP Advisory Member)

(In addition to judicial branch appointees, nominations are currently being solicited for interpreters and community stakeholders.)

**Court Security Advisory Committee**

**Annual Agenda—2015**

**Approved by E&P/RUPRO: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
<b>Staff:</b>	Ed Ellestad, Acting Manager—Office of Security, Court Operations Services
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> The Court Security Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.	
<b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b> The committee must include at least one member from each of the following categories: Appellate court justice; Appellate court administrator; Trial court judge; Trial court judicial administrator; Member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee; and Member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.  At least one member of the committee should be from a trial court that uses a marshal for court security services; this is not, however, a separate category of membership.  The committee current has 10 members, including one appellate justice, four trial court judges, one appellate court administrator, and four trial court administrators, one of whom is a member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, and one of whom is a member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> Ad Hoc Short Term Subcommittee on Office of Security Functions and Duties	
<b>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:</b> Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch and organization of the Office of Security, in accordance with Judicial Council Directive 125.	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Develop recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch and organization of the Office of Security.	1	Judicial Council Direction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Rules of Court, rule 10.61(a), Area of Focus</li> <li>• Goal III. Modernization of Management and Administration               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Objective 3. Improve safety, security—including disaster preparedness—at all court locations for all court users, judicial officers, and staff. Outcome (c) a. Emergency preparedness and continuity of operations plans and programs in all courts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part A: Facilities Infrastructure, Objective 2. Facilitate the acquisition of sites for, and the construction, renovation, maintenance, and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	June 2015	Report to Judicial Council

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.



#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>expeditious transfer of, court facilities.</p> <p>Outcome b. Models and guidelines for acquiring sites for new facilities and maintaining facilities and for transferring existing facilities.</p> <p>Outcome c. Shared practices in place for building courthouses to better meet the needs of all court users and judicial branch staff.</p> <p>Outcome d. Funding and operational standards for small construction and renovation projects for the courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 3. Ensure that all technology decisions are compatible with the judicial branch enterprise technology master plan.</li> </ul> <p>Outcome a. New technologies compatible with and integrated into branchwide infrastructure, including the California Courts Technology Center, telecommunications, security systems, and</p>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>educational technology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 4. Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security. Outcome c. A single point of Internet access to the Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts for the California courts, justice partners, and the public.</li> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 7. Develop, support, and implement a statewide business continuity and emergency preparedness technology infrastructure—with emphasis on key system features. Outcome a. Threat and vulnerability assessment systems/technology funded and in place. Outcome b. Funding structure for actual disaster recovery/continuity of operations.</li> </ul>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council Directive 125 and <i>Court Emergency Response and Security Task Force, Final Report</i> (Dec. 2012).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Court Operations Services, and its Office of Security.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch and organization of the Office of Security, in accordance with Judicial Council Directive 125.</p>		
2.	In conjunction with the report discussed above, consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, develop annual agenda for March 2016, and make additional recommendations as needed.		<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as above.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Same as above.</p> <p>Resources: Same as above.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Same as above.</p>	Ongoing	

### III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

*Not applicable—while the Judicial Council established the committee effective October 25, 2013, appointments were not made until February 10, 2014, and the committee did not have its first meeting until June 18, 2014. This is the committee’s first annual agenda.*

### IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

#### **Subgroups/Working Groups:**

*Subgroup or working group name:* Ad Hoc Short Term Subcommittee on Office of Security Functions and Duties

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Functions and duties

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* Four

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* None

*Date formed:* September 4, 2014

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* One in-person meeting (scheduled on the same date as the one annual in-person meeting of the full committee) and telephone meetings as needed

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* June 2015