



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

Thursday, November 19, 2015
12:10 to 1:10 p.m.
Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, David M. Rubin, and Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judge Gary Nadler and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Committee Staff Present: Ms. Jody Patel and Ms. Nancy Carlisle

Staff Present: Ms. Michele Allan, Mr. Cliff Alumno, Mr. Patrick Ballard, Mr. Chris Belloli, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. Linda Cox, Ms. Shelley Curran, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Nicole Giacinti, Mr. Bruce Greenlee, Ms. Angela Guzman, Mr. John Judnick, Ms. Maria Lira, Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Mr. Patrick McGrath, Mr. Douglas C. Miller, Ms. Karen Moen, Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Ms. Anne Ronan, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Mr. David Smith, Ms. Laura Speed, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Mr. Courtney Tucker, Ms. Catrayel Wood, Ms. Josely Yangco-Frona, and Ms. Carrie Zoller

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. and committee staff took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The committee approved the minutes of the following:

- October 8 meeting of the Executive and Planning Committee;
- October 16 e-mail action of the Executive and Planning Committee; and
- October 26 meeting of the Executive and Planning Committee.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Conversion of a Subordinate Judicial Officer Position in the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County

The committee reviewed the court's request to confirm the conversion of a vacant subordinate judicial officer (SJO) position in the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County to a judgeship.

Action: *The committee confirmed the conversion of the vacant SJO position in the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County to a judgeship effective November 19, 2015, and acknowledged that the court may temporarily fill the converted position until a judge is named and sworn in to fill it.*

Item 2

Agenda Setting for the December 11, 2015, Judicial Council Meeting

The committee reviewed available draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in December.

Action: *The committee approved the following items for placement on the December Judicial Council business meeting agenda:*

- **Court Facilities: Public Parking Rate Increase and Transition from Free to Paid Parking at the Orange Superior Court, Harbor Justice Center (Action Required)**
- **Court Facilities: Judicial Council Policy Limiting the Acceptance and Purchasing of Art for Court Facilities Center (Action Required) (approved as amended)**
- **Court Records: Electronic Signature Standards and Guidelines – Update to the Trial Court Records Manual (Action Required)**
- **Traffic: Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules, 2016 Edition (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Branch Administration: Audit Report for Judicial Council Acceptance (Action Required)**
- **Report to the Legislature: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 (Action Required)**
- **Report to the Legislature on the Statewide Collection of Delinquent Court-Ordered Debt for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 (Action Required)**
- **Report to the Legislature: Standards of Timely Disposition published in the 2015 Court Statistics Report (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Annual Report of Court Facilities Trust Fund Expenditures (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation (Criminal Justice Realignment): Court Jurisdiction Over and Calculation of Time During Supervision Revocation (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Disposition of the San Pedro Courthouse (Action Required)**

- **Proposal for Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Juvenile Competency (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Two Percent Reserve Held in the Trial Court Trust Fund (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Provisional Qualifications of American Sign Language of Interpreters (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council: 2015 Legislative Policy Summary (Action Required)**
- **Jury Instructions: New, Revised, and Renumbered Civil Jury Instructions and Verdict Forms (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council Forms: Gun Violence Restraining Orders (Action Required)**
- **Southern California Inter-County Transfer Protocol (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Administration: Amendment to the Conflict of Interest Code for the Judicial Council (Action Required)**
- **Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force: Final Report (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council: 2016 Legislative Priorities (Action Required)**
- **Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations: 2 Percent Reserve (Action Required)**
- **Judicial Council: Implementation of Judicial Council Directives on Judicial Council Staff Restructuring (Information Only)**
- **Court Facilities: Lease-Revenue Bond Issuance, Spring 2015 (Information Only)**
- **Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee Fiscal Year 2014–2015 (Information Only)**
- **Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report for Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2015-2016 (Information Only)**
- **Trial Courts: Quarterly Investment Report for Third Quarter of 2015 (Information Only)**

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

C L O S E D S E S S I O N

Item 3

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(6)

Non-final audit reports

During the open meeting, the committee indicated that it did not have comments to present and discuss regarding the non-final audit report that was to be reviewed (see Item 2), which resolved the need for this item to be reviewed during the closed session.

Approved by the advisory body on [insert date].



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY E-MAIL

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Action by E-Mail

Committee Members Who Participated:	Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, David M. Rubin, and Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby
Committee Members Who Did Not Participate:	None
Committee Staff:	Ms. Jody Patel and Ms. Nancy Carlisle

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

Advisory Body Appointment

Closed Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

The committee reviewed a request from Administrative Presiding Justice Brad R. Hill, chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC), that Judge David Edwin Power (Ret.) be reappointed to the CFAC effective immediately and through September 14, 2016.

Action: The committee developed its recommendation to be sent to the Chief Justice regarding the request.

ADJOURNMENT

The action by e-mail concluded on Friday, December 4, 2015.

Approved by the advisory body on [insert date].



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY E-MAIL

Friday, December 18, 2015
Action by E-Mail

Committee Members Who Participated: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, David M. Rubin, and Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby

Committee Members Who Did Not Participate: None

Committee Staff: Ms. Jody Patel and Ms. Nancy Carlisle

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

Appointment to Advisory Body Subcommittee

Closed Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

The committee reviewed a request from Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), that Ms. Kim Turner be appointed to CEAC's Subcommittee on Records Management.

Action: The committee unanimously approved the request to appoint Ms. Kim Turner to the Court Executives Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Records Management for a term effective January 1, 2016, to January 1, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

The action by e-mail concluded on Wednesday, December 23, 2015.

Approved by the advisory body on [insert date].

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)

Annual Agenda—2016

Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Brian L. McCabe, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Merced County
Staff:	Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Leadership Services Division
Advisory Body's Charge: The Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee contributes to the statewide administration of justice by monitoring areas of significance to the justice system and making recommendations to the Judicial Council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. (Cal Rules of Court, rule 10.46(a)-(b)): <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Recommend methods and policies within its area of focus to improve trial court presiding judges' access to and participation in council decision making, increase communication between the council and the trial courts, and provide for training programs for judicial and court support staff;(2) Respond and provide input to the Judicial Council, appropriate advisory committees, or Judicial Council staff on pending policy proposals and offer new recommendations on policy initiatives in the areas of legislation, rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations concerning court administration; and(3) Provide for liaison between the trial courts and the Judicial Council, its advisory committees, task forces, and working groups, and Judicial Council staff.	
Advisory Body's Membership: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TCPJAC: Per rule 10.46(c), TCPJAC consists of the presiding judges from the 58 California Superior Courts.• TCPJAC Executive Committee: Consists of 18 members—all presiding judges from the nine counties with 48 or more judges; two presiding judges from counties with 2 to 5 judges; three presiding judges from counties with 6 to 15 judges; and four presiding judges from counties with 16 to 47 judges.	

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group
- New TCPJAC Working Group on Penal Code 808 Revision

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016:

- Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs;
- Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms;
- Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration;
- Review, comment, and make recommendations regarding policies, procedures, standards, projects, and other actions related to the development, maintenance, and enhancement of technological improvements for the trial courts;
- Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice;
- Review, comment, and make recommendations on policies, standards, and actions related to the implementation of criminal justice realignment efforts;
- Review, comment, and recommend policies related to acquisition, design, and construction of new court facilities and renovation and maintenance of existing facilities;
- Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration; and
- Meet periodically with the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council's Administrative Director and division chiefs regarding matters affecting the operation of trial courts.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS), monitor proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p> <p>The JLS will also review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 2. Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety,</p>	Ongoing	<p>Comments on proposed legislation and recommendations to PCLC on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC.</p> <p>Identify high-priority legislative proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC’s consideration of these proposals</p>

¹ 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.

² 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 ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.46(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of subcommittee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>Develop, Review, and/or Provide Input on Proposals to Establish, Amend, or Repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards on Judicial Administration, and Forms; Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS), develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts.</p> <p>The JRS focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the JRS makes recommendations to RUPRO concerning the overall rule making process.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure and Service Excellence</p> <p>Objective 4: Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p>	Ongoing	Comments on proposals concerning rules, standards, forms, and recommendations to RUPRO on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.46(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Legal Services (LS). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of subcommittee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms.</p>		
3.	<p>Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group, continue ongoing maintenance and management of the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; and ongoing marketing and encouraging use of the IKC.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 2: Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety,</p>	Ongoing	Maintenance of the online IKC resource pages.

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: Directive of the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Information Technology.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs. Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice. 		
4.	<p>Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</p> <p>B. Technology Infrastructure</p>	Ongoing	<p>Input into the development and future adoption of court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>TCPJAC and CEAC will review and provide, on an as needed basis, early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p>		<p>Policy 1: Encourage and sustain innovation in the use of new information-sharing technologies.</p> <p>Policy 2: Establish a branchwide technology infrastructure that provides the hardware, software, telecommunications, and technology management systems necessary to meet the case management, information-sharing, financial, human resources, education, and administrative technology needs of the judicial branch and the public.</p> <p>Policy 3: Develop and maintain technology strategic plans for the judicial branch that are coordinated with the branch’s technology initiatives and address needs such as business continuity planning and meaningful performance standards.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services and Information Technology. Subject matter presentation and expertise.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <p>Review, comment, and make recommendations on policies, standards, and actions related to the development, maintenance, and enhancement of technological improvements for the trial courts;</p>		<p>impact on court operations.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration.		
5.	<p>The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees provides an opportunity for presiding judges and court executive officers to examine the many complex issues associated with courts' practices relating to charging government entities, other courts, and the public for various services and records.</p> <p>The working group will also assess any new and related legislation.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Governmental Affairs, Finance, and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or</p>	2017	Analysis of related issues and possible recommendations to the Judicial Council; input on related legislation.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</p> <p>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration.</p>		
6.	<p>Identify Mechanism for Access to Criminal History Information for Guardianship, Conservatorship, and Family Law Child Custody Cases.</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, possibly propose changes to the rules of court, possibly propose legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship, and possibly seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to criminal history information for guardianship, conservatorship, and family law child custody cases.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services: support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide. 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> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC (November 6, 2014 business meeting) Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Governmental Affairs, Legal Services, Center for</p>	2017	Identify a process to access criminal background information for probate investigators and child custody mediators.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>When this project began in 2014, the focus was on gaining information through the Criminal Law Enforcement, maintained by the Department of Justice (DOJ). The working group is currently exploring other avenues to access criminal background information.</p>		<p>Family, Children & the Courts, possibly the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, possibly the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and possibly the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration</p>		
7.	<p>Seek Amendment of Rules 2.810 and 10.742 (Pertaining to the Requirement to Report on the Use of Court-Appointed Temporary Judges)</p> <p>The TCPJAC and CEAC recommend (1) the amendment of rule 10.742, to eliminate that rule’s reporting requirements concerning the use of court-appointed temporary judges and (2) the amendment of subdivision (d) of rule 2.810 to delete the</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: RUPRO: Request by RUPRO Chair for rule proposals to achieve cost savings.</p> <p>In the same spirit of Judicial Council Directive 23: E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the courts and the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.</p>	2016	Amendments to rules 2.810 and 10.742

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>related reference to this reporting requirement.</p> <p>Rule 10.742 governs the use of attorneys as court-appointed temporary judges. Subdivision (c) of the rule requires each trial court that uses attorneys as temporary judges to report quarterly to the Judicial Council the number of attorneys used as temporary judges each month, the number and types of cases on which they were used, and whether any of the appointments were made under the exception in rule 2.810(d). This exception allows, in extraordinary circumstances, for appointment of an attorney as a temporary judge who has not met all of the requirements for such appointment.</p> <p>TCPJAC and CEAC recommend these changes because the information that rule 10.742(c) requires courts to report on is in part duplicative of information collected and reported to the council in other reports, and thus the rule places an unnecessary burden on the courts.</p>		<p>Origin of Project: Proposal submitted by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to the TCPJAC and CEAC.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services (LS), and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms;</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>This rule proposal was included in the Winter 2015 rule proposal cycle and it was circulated for public comment December 2014 to January 2015. Due to concerns and opposition expressed by commissioners, the Rules and Projects Committee referred the proposal back to TCPJAC and CEAC to further explore the commissioners' concerns. The chairs of TCPJAC and CEAC expect to meet with commissioner representatives in 2016 to discuss their concerns.</p>				
8.	<p>Propose Amending Penal Code Section 808 to include “court commissioners” within the definition of “magistrate.”</p> <p>This proposal was developed at the request of presiding judges to expand the pool of judicial officers who are authorized to perform magistrate duties, provide courts with greater flexibility to equitably address judicial workloads, and increase access to justice.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC (March 19, 2015)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Criminal Justice Services Office, Governmental Affairs, Legal Services, and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p>	2017	Legislative change to Penal Code Section 808.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration</p>		
9.	<p>Seek Ways to Clarify and Encourage Judicial Involvement in Local Justice Partnerships</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Origin of Project: In 2015 members of the Criminal Traffic Working Group of the Futures Commission raised the issue of a perceived lack of judicial involvement in justice partner meetings. The chairs of the Futures Commission think this issue is more appropriate for TCPJAC.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Legal Services.</p>	2017	<p>Analysis of related issues, rules of court, and the canons of the California Code of Judicial Ethics; take or recommend actions to clarify and encourage judicial involvement.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice.</p>		
10	<p>Encourage Innovation in Domestic Violence Cases</p> <p>Encourage presiding judges to foster innovation in domestic violence calendars and/or to pilot programs based on current research advances.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>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>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> <p>Origin of Project: Suggested by a TCPJAC member at October 28, 2015 Executive Committee meeting.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Center for Family, Children & the Courts, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <p>Identify efficient and effective trial</p>	2017	Discussion and sharing of best practices within the presiding judge community.

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice		
11	<p>Serve as a Resource</p> <p>Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Rule 10.46(b)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies.</p> <p>Resources: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: All</p>	Ongoing	Provide input, feedback, data, and/or recommendations to requesting Judicial Council division or council advisory body

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee - The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee remained active throughout 2015 providing review, and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts. In 2016, this subcommittee will also meet as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p>	Ongoing
2	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee – Provided review and input on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, submitted comments on rules, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts.</p>	Ongoing
3	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group - Continued ongoing maintenance and management of the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; and ongoing marketing and encouraging use of the Knowledge Center.</p>	Ongoing
4	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee. – Provided review and input on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC on several Judicial Council facility-related policies: Water Conservation Policy, Judicial Council Policy on Art Acquisition for Court Facilities, and the Court Public Parking Management Policy.</p>	<p>Subcommittee will sunset in 2016. TCPJAC/CEAC will continue to provide input into the development of court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations at the request of the Judicial Council Court Facilities Work Group, the Court</p>

		Facilities Advisory Committee and/or the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.
5	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee – Provided review and input on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. Initiatives reviewed included disaster recovery and next generation hosting assessments, interim case management systems for Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) courts, and a draft security framework manual for trial court information systems controls.	Ongoing
6	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees – Held a meeting in April 2015 with judicial branch and commercial stakeholders to hear their concerns and recommendations regarding trial courts charging for certain services. The working group was poised to provide input to the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs office regarding any legislation that would negatively impact the trial courts in this regard, but none was proposed.	2017
7	CLETS Working Group –The working group met three times in 2015 to discuss judicial access to criminal background information in child custody and visitation (parenting time) proceedings and probate guardianship cases. The working group examined the various statutes and policies that specify in which instances a court is authorized to obtain criminal background information; the avenues available to courts to obtain criminal background information; and any potential areas for improvement and possible solutions.	2017
8	Amend rule 10.620 (Public Access to Administrative Decisions of Trial Courts) – TCPJAC and CEAC recommended the amendment of rule 10.620 to repeal the provisions that apply the rule’s requirements for public notice and input to the decisions of trial courts to close court facilities or reduce the hours of a court location, as these provisions are inconsistent with statutory requirements. Amendments to Government Code section 68106, which took effect on January 1, 2012, created new requirements for public notice and comment when trial courts decide to close court facilities or reduce hours. These requirements are inconsistent with the requirements of rule 10.620, and trial courts have faced confusion in determining how notice is to be provided. The proposed amendments are intended to resolve this confusion, leaving Government Code section 68106 as the sole authority governing decisions to close court facilities or reduce hours. In 2015, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Subcommittee. The proposal was available for public comment from April to June 2015. The Judicial Council approved the proposed amendments to this rule at its October 2015 business meeting. The amendments became effective on January 1, 2016.	January 2016

9	<p>Revise Procedure for Presiding Judges’ Review and Investigation of Complaints Against Subordinate Judicial Officers (SJOs) At the Judicial Council’s April 17, 2015 meeting, the TCPJAC recommended amending rules 10.603 and 10.703 of the California Rules of Court to (1) simplify the procedures a presiding judge must follow while reviewing and investigating complaints against subordinate judicial officers (SJOs); (2) clarify a presiding judge’s authority in conducting an investigation and determining the appropriate action to be taken; and (3) clarify the circumstances under which discipline against an SJO must be reported to the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP).</p>	<p>Approved at the Judicial Council’s April 17, 2015 meeting, and took effect on January 1, 2016.</p>
10	<p>Strengthen Role of Presiding Judges in Legislative Outreach The Presiding Judges Legislative Outreach Working Group works with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Finance, to develop strategy and discussion points for conversations with key members of the legislative and executive branches regarding trial court funding.</p>	<p>In 2015, the Legislative Outreach Committee was disbanded as a formal group; supporting legislative outreach remains a top priority for the TCPJAC</p>
N/A	<p>Amendment of Rules 2.810 and 10.742 (Pertaining to the Requirement to Report on the Use of Court-Appointed Temporary Judges) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Subcommittee. This rule proposal was included in the Winter 2015 rule proposal cycle and it was circulated for public comment December 2014 to January 2015. Due to concerns and opposition expressed by commissioners, the Rules and Projects Committee referred the proposal back to TCPJAC and CEAC to further explore the commissioners’ concerns. The chairs of TCPJAC and CEAC expect to meet with commissioner representatives in 2016 to discuss their concerns.</p>	<p>2016</p>

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee

This standing subcommittee meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, and/or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms. As necessary, the subcommittee will refer matters to the TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members determine need broader consideration. The subcommittee convenes throughout the year by conference call to review proposals and evaluate the fiscal/operational impact of proposals on the trial courts.

Number of members: 12

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has six (6) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): In addition to the members from TCPJAC, there are six (6) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC).

Date formed: 2001

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: The subcommittee meets by conference call approximately 7 times a year.

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee

This standing subcommittee meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) review and comment on bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. As necessary, the subcommittee will refer matters to TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members determine need broader consideration. The subcommittee convenes throughout the year by conference call. In 2016, this subcommittee will also meet as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).

Number of members: 20

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has ten (10) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): In addition to the members from TCPJAC, there are ten (10) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC).

Date formed: 2001

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: The working group meets via conference call every three –four weeks about two weeks prior to each PCLC meeting, and as issues spring up.

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees

The working group provides an opportunity for presiding judges and court executive officers to examine the many complex issues associated with courts' practices relating to charging government entities, other courts, and the public for various services and records. The working group will also assess any new and related legislation.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: The TCPJAC has four (4) members participating in the TCPJCA/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): In addition to the four members from TCPJAC, there are four (4) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC).

Date formed: November 7, 2014

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: The working group will probably need to meet by conference call approximately 3 times a year in 2016 and possibly in-person again.

2017

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, the TCPJAC and CEAC will work to develop proposed rule of court changes, proposed legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship, will seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to criminal history information for guardianship, conservatorship, and family law child custody cases.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: The TCPJAC has three (3) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): In addition to the three members from TCPJAC, there are three (3) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC).

Date formed: 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 5 times a year. An in-person meeting may also be required.

2017

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Continue ongoing maintenance and management of the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; and ongoing marketing and encouraging use of the IKC.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: There are no current TCPJAC members, they are brought in on an ad hoc basis, when needed.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): The CEAC has four (4) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group

Date formed: 2015 (formerly the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group)

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group conducts its work by e-mail.

Ongoing

TCPJAC Penal Code 808 Working Group

The TCPJAC Penal Code 808 Working Group will work with the Criminal Justice Services Office, Legal Services, and Governmental Affairs to propose an amendment to Penal Code 808 to include “court commissioners” to the definition of “magistrate” to expand the pool of judicial officers who are authorized to perform magistrate duties, provide courts with greater flexibility to equitably address judicial workloads, and increase access to justice.

Number of members: 3

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has 3 members participating in the TCPJAC Penal Code 808 Working Group.

Date formed: 2015

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the subcommittee will meet by conference call approximately 2-3 times.

2017

Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P:

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Napa County
Staff:	Ms. Claudia Ortega, Senior Analyst, Leadership Services Division
<p>Advisory Body’s Charge: <i>[Insert charge from Cal. Rules of Court, or the specific charge to the Task Force.]</i></p> <p>The Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) makes recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.48(a)).</p> <p>In addition to this charge, the committee has the following additional duties (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.48(b)):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Recommend methods and policies to improve trial court administrators' access to and participation in council decision making; 2) Review and comment on legislation, rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations concerning court administration proposed to the council; 3) Review and make proposals concerning the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System or other large-scope data collection efforts; 4) Suggest methods and policies to increase communication between the council and the trial courts; and 5) Meet periodically with the Judicial Council’s executive team to enhance branch communications. 	
<p>Advisory Body’s Membership: <i>[Insert total number of members and number of members by category.]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEAC: Per rule 10.48(c), CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts. • Executive Committee of CEAC: 18 members. Per rule 10.48(d), the Executive Committee consists of the following members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The nine court executive officers or interim/acting court executive officers from the nine trial courts that have 48 or more judges; ▪ Four court executive officers from trial courts that have 16 to 47 judges; ▪ Two court executive officers from trial courts that have 6 to 15 judges; ▪ Two court executive officers from trial courts that have 2 to 5 judges; and ▪ One at-large member appointed from the trial courts by the committee chair to a one-year term. 	

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.¹]*

Subcommittee or working group name:

1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees
4. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group
5. Nominations Subcommittee
6. Records Management Subcommittee
7. JBSIS Working Group

¹ 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 2016:

[An objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or "end of action" to be achieved. Enter as bullet points the advisory body's objectives for the coming year.]

- Address the current level of branch-wide underfunding by working with the Judicial Council to secure equitable, adequate, and sustainable funding for the trial courts that provides resources necessary to fully fund essential court operations;
- Partner with the Judicial Council and other advisory bodies to identify and develop strategies that assist courts in developing operational and programmatic efficiencies thereby maximizing existing financial resources;
- Develop programs to assist trial courts with the review, reengineering, and enhancement of court processes and programs to provide increased access to justice services;
- Increase the legislative branch's and executive branch's understanding of trial court operations and the resource requirements necessary to adequately meet the justice service needs and expectations of California residents;
- Review, comment, and make recommendations regarding policies, procedures, standards, projects, and other actions related to the development, maintenance, and enhancement of technological improvements for the trial courts;¶
- Advance the role of the professional administrator on key branch advisory groups and projects by demonstrating the value of sound administrative principles and practices to the successful delivery of justice services throughout the state;
- Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues;
- Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts;
- Assist staff in the Judicial Council's Governmental Affairs office with proposed legislation addressing new laws or the amendment of existing laws including: 1) reviewing and recommending draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding draft proposals from other advisory bodies for legislation; 3) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration; and 4) directly participating in and otherwise supporting legislative advocacy and related activities;
- Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration; and
- Meet periodically with the Chief Justice, Judicial Council's Administrative Director, and division chiefs regarding matters affecting the operation of trial courts.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS), monitor proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p> <p>The JLS will also review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 2. Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.</p> <p>Objective 3. Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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>Comments on proposed legislation and recommendations to PCLC on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Identify high-priority legislative proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC’s consideration of these proposals</p>

² 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.

³ 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 ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).		<p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.48(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of subcommittee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist staff in the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs office with proposed legislation addressing new laws or the amendment of existing laws including: 1) reviewing and recommending draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding draft proposals from other advisory bodies for legislation; 3) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration; and 4) directly participating in and otherwise supporting legislative advocacy and related activities 		
2.	Develop, Review, and/or Provide Input on Proposals to Establish, Amend, or Repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3. Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to</p>	Ongoing	Comments on proposals concerning rules, standards, and forms. Recommendations to RUPRO

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Forms; Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS), develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The JRS focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the JRS makes recommendations to RUPRO concerning the overall rule making process.</p>		<p>achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure and Service Excellence</p> <p>Objective 4. Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.48(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of subcommittee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the 		<p>on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts		
3.	<p>Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group continue ongoing maintenance and management of the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; and ongoing marketing and encouraging use of the IKC.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 2: Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: Directive of the Judicial Council</p>	Ongoing	Maintenance of the online BPR and IKC resource pages.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Information Services</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop programs to assist trial courts with the review, reengineering, and enhancement of court processes and programs to provide increased access to justice services • Increase the legislative branch’s and executive branch’s understanding of trial court operations and the resource requirements necessary to adequately meet the justice service needs and expectations of California residents 		
4.	<p>Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations</p> <p>TCPJAC and CEAC will review and provide, on an as needed basis, early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</p> <p>B. Technology Infrastructure</p> <p>Policy 1: Encourage and sustain innovation in the use of new information-sharing technologies.</p> <p>Policy 2: Establish a branchwide technology infrastructure that provides the hardware, software, telecommunications, and technology management systems necessary to meet the case management, information-sharing, financial, human resources, education, and administrative technology needs of the judicial branch and the public.</p> <p>Policy 3: Develop and maintain technology strategic plans for the judicial branch that are coordinated with the branch’s technology initiatives and address needs such as business continuity planning and meaningful performance standards.</p>	Ongoing	Input into the development and future adoption of court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services, and Information Technology Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration 		
5.	<p>Study Issues Related to Courts Charging Government Entities, Other Courts, and the Public for Services and Records</p> <p>The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees provides an opportunity for presiding judges and court executive officers to examine the many complex issues</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Judicial Council and Trial Court</p>	2017	Analysis of related issues and possible recommendations to the Judicial Council; Input on related legislation

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>associated with courts' practices relating to charging government entities, other courts, and the public for various services and records. The working group will also assess any new and related legislation.</p>		<p>Leadership, Governmental Affairs, Finance, and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist staff in the Judicial Council's Governmental Affairs office with proposed legislation addressing new laws or the amendment of existing laws including: 1) reviewing and recommending draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding draft proposals from other advisory bodies for legislation; 3) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration; and 4) directly participating in and otherwise supporting legislative advocacy and related activities • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration 		
6.	<p>Identify Mechanism for Access to Criminal History Information for Guardianship, Conservatorship, and Family Law Child Custody Cases</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations,</p>	2017	<p>Identify a process to access criminal background information for probate investigators and child custody mediators</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, possibly propose changes to the rules of court, possibly propose legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship, and possibly seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to criminal history information for guardianship, conservatorship, and family law child custody cases.</p> <p>When this project began in 2014, the focus was on gaining information through the Criminal Law Enforcement, maintained by the Department of Justice (DOJ). The working group is currently exploring other avenues to access criminal background information.</p>		<p>and services: support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC (November 6, 2014 business meeting)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Governmental Affairs, Legal Services, Center for Family, Children & the Courts, possibly the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, possibly the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and possibly the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues • Assist staff in the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs office with proposed legislation addressing new laws or the amendment of existing laws including: 1) reviewing and recommending draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding draft proposals from other advisory bodies for 		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			legislation; 3) reviewing and developing recommendations regarding bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration; and 4) directly participating in and otherwise supporting legislative advocacy and related activities		
7.	<p>Seek Amendment of Rules 2.810 and 10.742 (Pertaining to the Requirement to Report on the Use of Court-Appointed Temporary Judges)</p> <p>The TCPJAC and CEAC recommend (1) the amendment of rule 10.742, to eliminate that rule’s reporting requirements concerning the use of court-appointed temporary judges and (2) the amendment of subdivision (d) of rule 2.810 to delete the related reference to this reporting requirement.</p> <p>Rule 10.742 governs the use of attorneys as court-appointed temporary judges. Subdivision (c) of the rule requires each trial court that uses attorneys</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: RUPRO: Request by RUPRO Chair for rule proposals to achieve cost savings. In the same spirit of Judicial Council Directive 23: E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the courts and the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Proposal by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to the TCPJAC and CEAC.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services (LS), and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial 	2016	Amendments to rules 2.810 and 10.742

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>as temporary judges to report quarterly to the Judicial Council the number of attorneys used as temporary judges each month, the number and types of cases on which they were used, and whether any of the appointments were made under the exception in rule 2.810(d). This exception allows, in extraordinary circumstances, for appointment of an attorney as a temporary judge who has not met all of the requirements for such appointment.</p> <p>TCPJAC and CEAC recommend these changes because the information that rule 10.742(c) requires courts to report on is in part duplicative of information collected and reported to the council in other reports, and thus the rule places an unnecessary burden on the courts.</p> <p>This rule proposal was included in the Winter 2015 rule proposal cycle and it was</p>		Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>circulated for public comment December 2014 to January 2015. Due to concerns and opposition expressed by commissioners, the Rules and Projects Committee referred the proposal back to TCPJAC and CEAC to further explore the commissioners' concerns. The chairs of TCPJAC and CEAC expect to meet with commissioner representatives in 2016 to discuss their concerns.</p>				
8.	<p>Support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force and Focus on Local Operational Matters Related to the Future Implementation of the Language Access Plan in All Trial Courts</p> <p>CEAC will support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force in fulfilling its charge by providing any needed data, fiscal and other estimates, and input on its proposals and</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Court Interpreter's Program</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the current level of branch-wide underfunding by working with the Judicial Council to secure equitable, adequate, and sustainable funding for the trial courts that provides resources necessary to fully fund essential court operations • Partner with the Judicial Council and other advisory bodies to identify and develop strategies 	2017	<p>Conveyance of information to the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force regarding implementation of the Language Access Plan in all trial courts, development of policies, best practices, recommendations, and resources that focus on local operational matters</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>recommendations when requested by its chair.</p> <p>As the task force continues with its work, CEAC will also focus on <i>local</i> operational matters related to the future implementation of the Language Access Plan in all trial courts. These local operational matters include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify local resources and strategies for the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; 2. Evaluate and recommend opportunities for trial courts to share and leverage innovations and enhancements related to the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; and 3. Recommend best practices related to the local management of language access resources and services including how best to integrate them into other 		<p>that assist courts in developing operational and programmatic efficiencies thereby maximizing existing financial resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration 		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>areas of local court operations in a manner that increases interpreter and other language access effectiveness.</p>				
9.	<p>Consider Whether the Base Per Diem Rate for Contract Court Interpreters Should be Raised</p> <p>CEAC will do the following to develop its recommendations to the chairs of the Judicial Council’s internal committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist in identifying and evaluating compensation practices now utilized by trial courts. • Evaluate and report on actual recruitment and retention needs. • Provide input into policy and operational impact of compensation rate changes. • Provide recommendations to assist in ensuring the effective use of contract interpreter resources. 	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Request by the chairs of the Judicial Council’s internal committees.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Request by the chairs of the Judicial Council’s internal committees that CEAC formulate a recommendation on whether to pursue the Translators and Interpreters Guild’s request and the appropriate next steps for responding to the request.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Court Interpreter’s Program, Finance, Governmental Affairs, and Human Resources</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: N/A</p>	2016	<p>Recommendations to the chairs of the council’s internal committees</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
10.	<p>Develop Guidance Concerning Reciprocal Assignments and Case Transfers</p> <p>CEAC will develop policies, guidelines, or effective practices concerning reciprocal assignments and the transfer of cases between courts. Trial courts have expressed confusion regarding the statutory requirements and varying court practices surrounding administration and adjudication of a case transferred from one court to another. At a recent trial court training session, all participants conveyed the need for information that would clarify the processes and help the courts identify best practices to use in accordance with relevant law. CEAC may also consider development of guidance concerning change of venue processes for civil matters.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration 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: CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Assigned Judges Program, and possibly Legal Services</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with the Judicial Council and other advisory bodies to identify and develop strategies that assist courts in developing operational and programmatic efficiencies thereby maximizing existing financial resources • Develop programs to assist trial courts with the review, reengineering, and enhancement of court processes and programs to provide increased access to justice services 	2017	Policies, guidelines, or effective practices concerning reciprocal assignments and the transfer of cases.
11.	<p>Strengthen the Role of Court Executive Officers in</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p>	Ongoing	Develop legislative strategy.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Outreach to the Legislative and Executive Branches</p> <p>CEAC will conduct outreach with the legislature with a focus on legislative staff in both the local districts and in the Capitol. This effort will entail the development of outreach materials for court executive officers and perhaps educational sessions with legislative staff to educate them on the judicial branch budget and the fiscal/operational needs of the trial courts.</p> <p>CEAC will also seek to strengthen communication with the Executive Branch and with the Department of Finance in particular. It will do so in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Finance.</p>		<p>Objective 2. Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.</p> <p>Objective 3. Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership , Governmental Affairs, and Finance</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the legislative branch’s and executive branch’s understanding of trial court operations and the resource requirements necessary to adequately meet the justice service needs and expectations of California residents 		<p>Strengthen relationships with leaders in the legislative and executive branches.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
12.	<p>Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) and Review and Make Recommendations to Statutes and Rules of Court Governing Trial Court Records Management</p> <p>Through the Records Management Subcommittee, CEAC will continue to develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. It will also continue to review and make recommendations on various statutes and rules governing trial court records management.</p> <p>The subcommittee identified the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulate rule and legislative proposals to amend rule 10.855 of the California Rules of Court, which governs the records sampling program and Government Code section 68153, which mandates the 	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services: support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>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> <p>Origin of Project: Regarding the subcommittee - California Rule of Court 10.854; regarding review of rule 10.855 - Proposal by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to CEAC and other advisory committees;</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Information Technology, and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of subcommittee.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with the Judicial Council and other advisory bodies to identify and develop strategies that assist courts in developing operational and programmatic efficiencies thereby maximizing existing financial resources • Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data 	<p>TCRM Updates – Ongoing</p> <p>Rule 10.855 Amendments –2016 and GC § 68153 – 2018</p> <p>GC §68152 – 2017–2018</p>	<p>Updated Trial Court Records Manual and amendments to rule 10.855 and GC §§ 68152 and 68153</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>reporting requirement in the rule. This combined rule and legislative proposal has already been recommended for circulation for public comment by CEAC. The proposal will be circulated during the winter cycle. If the rules proposal is adopted by the council, it would go into effect on July 1, 2016. If the legislative proposal is sponsored by the Judicial Council and enacted by the Legislature, it would go into effect January 1, 2018. The TCRM would need to be updated to reflect any changes to rule 10.855.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review statutes and rules of court pertaining to the contents of registers of action to determine whether amendments to statutes or rules are necessary. The subcommittee would also like to develop additional guidelines on the contents of electronic registers of 		<p>and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts 		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>action remotely accessible by the public for inclusion in the TCRM to provide clarity and consistency among courts statewide. Currently, courts from different jurisdictions have varying practices on what to include in the electronic registers of action that are remotely accessible by the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review standards and guidelines that govern maintaining electronic court records as data. • Develop standards and guidelines governing electronic signatures on documents filed by the parties and attorneys. The Information Technology Advisory Committee will be primarily responsible for developing legislative and rule amendments to amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(b)(2) and Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.257, to authorize electronic signatures on documents filed into the 				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>courts by the parties and attorneys. If the amendments to the statute and rule are adopted by the council, the subcommittee would like to develop the standards and guidelines for inclusion in the TCRM to implement the proposed amendments to the statute and rules of court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the need to propose amendments to Government Code section 68152 to clean up the records retention statutes. The technical amendments will include fixing statutory conflicts regarding the retention of original wills and codicils, retention of Prop 47 petitions, and retention of criminal realignment filings. In the future, the subcommittee would also like to circle back and review retention periods for Family and Juvenile cases. 				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
13.	<p>Provide Input to Update the JBSIS Filings Information Definitions</p> <p>CEAC will continue to provide input to a working group (staffed by the Office of Court Research (OCR)) that is reviewing and updating the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings information definitions. The working group is focusing on these higher priority definitions, rather than reviewing and updating all definitions in the JBSIS manual.</p> <p>The working group has developed some preliminary recommendations and responses to the courts' feedback and questions concerning JBSIS reporting. It will continue with its work and expects to release the final JBSIS recommendations and updated definitions sometime in 2016.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Recommended Policy A2: Ensure that data collected by the judicial branch are complete, accurate, and current and provide a sound basis for policy decisions, resource allocations, and reports to other branches of government, law and justice system partners, and the public.</p> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC (November 2013 business meeting)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration 	2016	Updated JBSIS filings information definitions

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Staff from OCR has also been providing ongoing support to a separate JBSIS subcommittee of the California Tyler Users Group (CATUG). Court Executive Officers and staff members of CATUG recommended that a small group of courts work with Tyler and OCR to establish a consistent approach for JBSIS reporting from this new case management system. This subcommittee identified a list of JBSIS reporting questions for OCR, many of which overlap with those questions being considered by the JBSIS working group. OCR will circulate any draft responses to the CATUG questions to the JBSIS working group to ensure that consistent and accurate information is being shared with all courts regardless of their case management system.</p>				
14.	<p>Provide Input on Potential Audit Program for Filings Data</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p>	2016	Provide input to OCR

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>The Office of Court Research (OCR) will develop an audit program for filings data. However, the development of this audit program is contingent on the above-described JBSIS working group's completion of its review and update of the JBSIS filings information definitions. Given CEAC's charge per rule 10.48(b)(3), CEAC would like to assist with the planning for this program and provide input on it when OCR begins work in this area. OCR will update the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) on this audit program to ensure that it will evaluate all the filings data used in the workload models.</p> <p>OCR has started to formulate a project plan with various options of how an audit program could be implemented. The first component of this plan is an expansion of the current data quality control process, which</p>		<p>Recommended Policy A2: Ensure that data collected by the judicial branch are complete, accurate, and current and provide a sound basis for policy decisions, resource allocations, and reports to other branches of government, law and justice system partners, and the public.</p> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend, review and comment on policies, procedures, and technologies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration 		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>OCR has already planned to implement before the end of 2015. This work will focus on data from fiscal year 2014-15 that will be used in the next budget development process and published in the 2016 Court Statistics Report as well as data from the current fiscal year. Additional components of a Data Audit project plan will be new functions within OCR so staff will be providing several options along with an estimate of the resource and workload needs for each option.</p> <p>Staff expects to develop a draft plan for this Data Audit Program in 2016, though implementation of the plan may depend on securing additional resources so that timeframe may extend into 2017. The Audit Program itself would be an ongoing process/function within OCR so it would not have a final completion date.</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
15.	<p>Review and Recommend Court Administrator Candidates for Membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and Other Advisory Groups</p> <p>Pursuant to rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and recommend to the council's Executive and Planning Committee candidates for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of CEAC's Executive Committee; • Nonvoting court administrator members of the council; and • Members of other advisory committees who are court executives or judicial administrators. 	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: California Rule of Court 10.48(e)(2)</p> <p>Origin of Project: N/A</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advance the role of the professional administrator on key branch advisory groups and projects by demonstrating the value of sound administrative principles and practices to the successful delivery of justice services throughout the state 	Ongoing	Provide nomination recommendations to the Executive and Planning Committee

#	Project ²	Priority ₃	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
16.	<p>Serve as a Resource</p> <p>Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: California Rule of Court 10.48(b)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Respective Judicial Council divisions and advisory bodies</p> <p>Resources: Respective Judicial Council divisions and advisory bodies</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: All</p>	Ongoing	Provide input, feedback, data, and/or recommendations to requesting Judicial Council division or advisory body

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee – The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee remained active throughout 2015 providing review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that had a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts. In 2016, this subcommittee will also meet as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).	Ongoing
2	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee – Provided review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, submitted comments on rule, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts.	Ongoing
3	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Vetting Group – Continued ongoing maintenance and management of the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature, and ongoing marketing and encouraging use of the Knowledge Center.	Ongoing
4	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee – Provided review and input on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC on several Judicial Council facility-related policies: Water Conservation Policy, Judicial Council Policy on Art Acquisition for Court Facilities, and the Court Public Parking Management Policy. Subcommittee will sunset in 2016. TCPJAC/CEAC will continue to provide input into the development of court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations at the request of the Judicial Council, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, and/or the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.	2015
5	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee – Provided review and input on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. Initiatives reviewed included disaster recovery and next generation hosting assessments, interim case management systems for Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) courts, and a draft security framework manual for trial court information systems controls.	Ongoing
6	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees – Held a meeting in April 2015 with judicial branch and commercial stakeholders to hear their concerns and recommendations regarding trial courts charging for certain	2017

	services. The working group was poised to provide input to the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs office regarding any legislation that would negatively impact the trial courts in this regard, but none was proposed.	
7	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group – The working group met three times in 2015 to discuss judicial access to criminal background information in child custody and visitation (parenting time) proceedings and probate guardianship cases. The working group examined the various statutes and policies that specify in which instances a court is authorized to obtain criminal background information; the avenues available to courts to obtain criminal background information; and any potential areas for improvement and possible solutions.	2017
8	Provide Input to Update the JBSIS Filings Information Definitions – The working group met by conference call during 2015 and developed some preliminary recommendations and responses to the courts’ feedback and questions about JBSIS reporting. The working group intends to finalize JBSIS reporting recommendations and update the JBSIS definitions; however, its progress was delayed due to staff departures in the Office of Court Research.	2016
9	Provide Input on Potential Audit Program for Filings Data – The Office of Court Research has started to formulate a project plan with various options of how an audit program could be implemented.	2016
10	<p>Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) – CEAC and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend updating the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> to include new standards and guidelines governing the use of electronic signatures by trial courts and judicial officers. These standards and guidelines implement Government Code section 68150(g), which authorizes electronic signatures by a court or judicial officer “in accordance with procedures, standards, and guidelines established by the Judicial Council.” The update also includes new sections in the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> that (1) outline the various provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure, Penal Code, and California Rules of Court that authorize electronic signatures submitted to the courts by attorneys, parties, and law enforcement officers; and (2) state the effect of digitized signatures created by scanning paper court records. Lastly, the update contains technical changes to align the manual with intervening legislative and form changes.</p> <p>Section 6.2 of this update was circulated to the trial courts for comment from September 8 to 25, 2015. Three courts submitted responses. The technical changes were not circulated because they update the manual to conform to existing law and to make non-substantive revisions. At its December 11, 2015 meeting, the council approved the proposed revisions to the manual, which became effective on January 1, 2016.</p>	<p>TCRM Updates – January 1, 2016</p> <p>Rule 10.855 Amendments – July 1, 2016 and Government Code section 68153 – January 1, 2018</p>

	<p>Amend rule 10.855 (Superior court records sampling program) and Government Code section 68153 (Elimination of Reporting Requirement) – The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee proposes amending rule 10.855 of the California Rules of Court and Government Code section 68153. The rule proposal would amend rule 10.855 by (1) eliminating the requirement that courts preserve forever systematic, subjective, and augmented sample court records; (2) revising the requirement that they preserve forever longitudinal sample court records; and (3) revising the comprehensive records requirement. The legislative proposal would seek amendment of Government Code section 68153 to eliminate the statutory requirement that superior courts must report destroyed court records to the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Overall, the rule proposal would substantially reduce the number of court records that superior courts are required to keep under rule 10.855, while still ensuring that courts preserve a statistically significant sample of court records for future research purposes. By eliminating the reporting requirement, the legislative proposal would decrease the amount of time necessary to destroy court records.</p> <p>The proposals will be circulated for public comment during the winter cycle. It is anticipated that the rule proposal takes effect on July 1, 2016 and the TCRM would need to be updated to reflect any changes to rule 10.855. It is anticipated that the legislative proposal takes effect in January 1, 2018.</p>	
11	<p>Amend rule 10.620 (Public Access to Administrative Decisions of Trial Courts) – TCPJAC and CEAC recommended the amendment of rule 10.620 to repeal the provisions that apply the rule’s requirements for public notice and input to the decisions of trial courts to close court facilities or reduce the hours of a court location, as these provisions are inconsistent with statutory requirements. Amendments to Government Code section 68106, which took effect on January 1, 2012, created new requirements for public notice and comment when trial courts decide to close court facilities or reduce hours. These requirements are inconsistent with the requirements of rule 10.620, and trial courts have faced confusion in determining how notice is to be provided. The proposed amendments are intended to resolve this confusion, leaving Government Code section 68106 as the sole authority governing decisions to close court facilities or reduce hours. In early 2015, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Subcommittee. The proposal was available for public comment from April to June 2015. At its October 2015 business meeting, the council approved the proposed amendments to this rule, which became effective on January 1, 2016.</p>	January 2016
12	<p>Amendment of Rules 2.810 and 10.742 (Pertaining to the Requirement to Report on the Use of Court-Appointed Temporary Judges) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules</p>	2016

<p>Subcommittee for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Subcommittee. This rule proposal was included in the Winter 2015 rule proposal cycle and it was circulated for public comment December 2014 to January 2015. Due to concerns and opposition expressed by commissioners, the Rules and Projects Committee referred the proposal back to TCPJAC and CEAC to further explore the commissioners' concerns. The chairs of TCPJAC and CEAC expect to meet with commissioner representatives in 2016 to discuss their concerns.</p>	
---	--

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.]*

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This standing subcommittee meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) review and comment on bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. As necessary, the subcommittee will refer matters to TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members determine need broader consideration. The subcommittee convenes throughout the year by conference call. In 2016, this subcommittee will also meet as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 10 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 10 PJs
- *Date formed:* 2001
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The subcommittee meets via conference call every three – four weeks about a week prior to each PCLC meeting, and as issues arise.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This standing subcommittee meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, and/or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms. As necessary, the subcommittee will refer matters to the TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members determine need broader consideration. The subcommittee convenes throughout the year by conference call to review proposals and evaluate the operational and/or administrative impact of proposals on the trial courts.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 6 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 6 PJs
- *Date formed:* 2001

- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The subcommittee meets by conference call approximately 7 times a year.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

Ad Hoc TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Working Group

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* The ad hoc TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Working Group serves as a resource to the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). Through this ad hoc working group, TCPJAC and CEAC will provide comment and input on technology policy recommendations when necessary and at a stage where input can be thoughtfully considered.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 4 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 4 PJs
- *Date formed:* 2015 (formerly a standing subcommittee)
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* As needed.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* The working group provides an opportunity for presiding judges and court executive officers to examine the many complex issues associated with courts' practices relating to charging government entities, other courts, and the public for various services and records. The working group will also assess any new and related legislation.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 4 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 4 PJs
- *Date formed:* November 7, 2014
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The working group will probably need to meet by conference call approximately 3 times in 2016 and possibly in-person again.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* 2017

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, the TCPJAC and CEAC will work to develop proposed rule of court changes, proposed legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship, and will seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to criminal history information for guardianship, conservatorship, and family law child custody cases.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 3 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 3 PJs
- *Date formed:* 2015

- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 5 times a year. An in-person meeting may also be required.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* 2017

Records Management Subcommittee

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This standing subcommittee will develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. It will also continue to review and make recommendations on various statutes and rules governing trial court records management.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 3 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 2 Chief Information Officers, 1 Appellate Assistant Clerk/Administrator, 1 Deputy Executive Officer, and 1 Retired CEO.
- *Date formed:* The subcommittee was originally formed on June 19, 2006. The subcommittee changed its name on January 8, 2010.
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Approximately 3 to 5 times a year by conference call
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

Nominations Subcommittee

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Review and recommend court administrator candidates for membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and other advisory bodies.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 6 (CEAC chair, CEAC vice-chair, and the last 4 CEAC chairs who are currently serving as court executive officers if possible). If four former chairs are not available to serve, the current chair may appoint additional members from the Executive Committee as necessary to establish a quorum. (CEAC Bylaws, Article VII, Section IV.)
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A
- *Date formed:* Approximately 2004
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Approximately 6 times a year by conference call
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

Date: 01/20/16