



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm)  
[executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov](mailto:executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov)

## EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

### OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION AGENDA

Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

OPEN PORTION OF THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

---

**Date:** March 23, 2017  
**Time:** 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
**Location:** 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Third Floor, Sequoia Room  
**Public Call-In Number** 877-820-7831; passcode 846-8947 (listen only)

---

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

---

#### **I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))**

---

##### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

##### **Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the March 2, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee meeting and March 10, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee action by e-mail.

---

#### **II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))**

---

##### **Public Comment**

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least 30 minutes prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

**Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov](mailto:executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov) or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, California, 95833, Attention: Donna Ignacio Only written comments received by 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 22, 2017, will be provided to committee members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS**

---

**Item 1**

**2017 Advisory Body Annual Agenda Discussions (Action Required)**

Review 2017 annual agendas with advisory body chairs and staff for the following advisory bodies with the order subject to change:

- Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness
- Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee
- Court Facilities Advisory Committee
- Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
- Court Security Advisory Committee
- Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research
- Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force
- Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee
- Trial Court-State Court Forum
- Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
- Workload Assessment Advisory Committee

Presenters: Various

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn to Closed Session**

---

**V. CLOSED SESSION (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(D))**

---

**Item 1**

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

***Recommendation for Advisory Body Appointment***

Review materials and develop recommendations to be sent to the Chief Justice regarding out-of-cycle appointments to an advisory body.

**Adjourn Closed Session**



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm)  
[executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov](mailto:executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov)

## EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

Thursday, March 2, 2017

12:10 to 1:10 p.m.

Teleconference

---

**Committee Members Present:** Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson, (Vice Chair); Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng and David M. Rubin; Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, and Ms. Donna D. Melby

---

**Committee Members Absent:** Justice Harry E. Hull, Jr. and Judges Jeffrey B. Barton and Gary Nadler

---

**Other Attendees:** Hon. Patricia M. Lucas and Ms. Rebecca Fleming

**Committee Staff Present:** Ms. Jody Patel and Ms. Amber Barnett

**Staff Present:** Ms. Karene Alvarado, Ms. Heather Anderson, Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Ms. Debbie Brown, Mr. Mike Courtney, Ms. Natalie Daniel, Ms. Maureen Dumas, Ms. Kathy Fink, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Cristina Foti, Ms. Jessica Craven Goldstein, Ms. Bonnie Hough, Ms. Donna Ignacio, Mr. Errol Johnson, Mr. Greg Keil, Ms. Olivia Lawrence, Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Mr. Charles Martel, Ms. Anna Maves, Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Robin Seeley, Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf, Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Ms. Christy Simons, Mr. David Smith, Ms. Laura Speed, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic and Ms. Josely Yangco-Frona

---

### OPENING 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 voted to approve the following minutes:

- December 21, 2016, Executive and Planning Committee meeting
- January 18, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee action by e-mail
- January 31, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee meeting (closed session)

---

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

---

**Item 1**

**Subordinate Judicial Officer Reduction – Request from the Superior Court of Santa Clara County (Action Required)**

Review request from the Superior Court of Santa Clara County to eliminate five vacant subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships.

***Action: The committee approved the request from the Superior Court of Santa Clara County to eliminate five vacant subordinate judicial officer positions.***

**Item 2**

**Agenda Setting for the March 23-24 Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)**

Review draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in March.

***Action: The committee reviewed draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in March—currently scheduled to be a one-day meeting on March 24, 2017.***

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on \_\_\_\_\_.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm)  
[executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov](mailto:executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov)

Minutes of Action by E-mail Between Meetings for  
Executive and Planning Committee

**E-mail Proposal**

As part of the agenda setting for Judicial Council meetings, the Executive and Planning Committee was asked to review the report for new consent item Court Facilities: Transfer of San Diego County Courthouse and Old Jail, and Related Equity Exchange for approval to be included on the March 24, Judicial Council business meeting agenda.

**Notice**

On March 9, 2017, a notice was posted advising that the Executive and Planning Committee was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(B).

**Action Taken**

Members voted unanimously to approve the new item for the consent agenda of the March 24, 2017 Judicial Council business meeting.

Approved by the advisory body on \_\_\_\_\_.

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

**Annual Agenda—2017**

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

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chairs:</b>	Hon. Kathleen E. O’Leary, Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal Fourth Appellate District, Division Three Hon. Laurie D. Zelon, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal Second Appellate District, Division Seven
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Kyanna Williams, Lead Counsel, Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) Ms. Carolynn Bernabe, Administrative Coordinator, CFCC
<b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> Makes recommendations for improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. Recommends to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), proposals for the education and training of judicial officers and court staff. ( <a href="#">California Rules of Court, rule 10.55.</a> )	
<b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b> The advisory body’s current membership is 28 positions—with 3 appellate justices; 13 trial court judicial officers; 1 lawyer with expertise or interest in disability issues; 2 lawyers with expertise or interest in additional access, fairness, and diversity issues addressed by the committee; 2 lawyers from a trial court self-help center; 1 legal services lawyer; 1 court executive officer or trial court manager who has experience with self-represented litigants; 1 county law librarian or other related professional; 2 judicial administrators; and 2 public members.	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> None	
<b>Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2017:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council for policies that ensure that “The makeup of California’s judicial branch will reflect the diversity of the state’s residents”. (Goal I, <a href="#">The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch.</a>) This includes diversity in judicial officer, court leadership, court staff, and court volunteer positions.</li><li>2. Coordinate with other Judicial Council advisory bodies to improve access to the courts and improve the public’s perception of fairness in various case types and across subject matter areas.</li><li>3. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council for policies that improve access to the courts and improve the public’s perception of fairness in various case types and across subject matter areas. This includes, but is not limited to, recommendations for best practices, Judicial Council– sponsored legislation, Standards of Judicial Administration, California Rules of Court, and Judicial Council forms.</li></ol>	

## ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Collaborate and Provide Subject Matter Expertise:</b></p> <p>a) Serve as lead/subject matter resource for issues under the committee’s charge, in order to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action. Such efforts may include but is not limited to providing expertise and review to working groups, advisory committees, and subcommittees as needed on any item(s) under the committee’s charge. Items under the committee’s charge include issues related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Diversity in the branch</li> <li>ii. Fairness in the courts</li> <li>iii. Access to the courts and court services</li> <li>iv. Court process simplification; and</li> <li>v. Using user-centered design principles to improve court services.</li> </ul> <p>b) Serve as subject matter resource for other stakeholders on subjects under the committee’s charge to increase efficiency and avoid duplication of services within the branch.</p> <p>c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers in legal substance and</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Respective advisory bodies</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> To be determined. (This item may include collaboration with various Judicial Council advisory bodies, including, but not limited to: Traffic; Criminal Law; Civil and Small Claims; Information Technology; CJER Access, Ethics, and Fairness Curriculum Development; Family and Juvenile Law; Collaborative Court; Trial Court Presiding Judges; and Court Executive Officers.)</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b></p>	Ongoing	Coordination to ensure that matters under the committee’s charge are systematically addressed across subject matter areas; to lend the committee’s depth of expertise; and to avoid duplication of resources throughout the Judicial Council and the branch.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>procedure, useful technology and efficient business practices, and cultural and diversity awareness; make recommendations to the Judicial Council, as needed, regarding updates to the <a href="#">Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts</a> as provided by <a href="#">California Rules of Court, rule 10.960(e)</a>.</p>		1, 2 and 3		
2.	<p><b>Education</b></p> <p>a) Collaborate with CJER staff on improving and expanding educational resources in areas under PAF’s charge. This may include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Exploring with CJER staff ways to improve and expand resources that educate judicial officers, temporary judges, court employees, and/or court volunteers on unconscious bias.</li> <li>ii. Exploring with CJER staff, emerging and persistent access and fairness challenges that court-users with disabilities, particularly those with mental health disabilities, may face.</li> <li>iii. Collaborating with CJER staff and various advisory committees in exploring ways to improve education for temporary judges.</li> </ul> <p>b) Make a recommendation to Judicial Council staff to gather and share with courts, information on best practices for improving the user-friendliness of court resources and facilities, with an emphasis on</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge; Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge; prior annual agendas.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; CJER staff; and Criminal Justice Services staff working on traffic court.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1 and 3</p>	December 2017	<p>2(a) – Improved and expanded education for judicial officers, temporary judges, court employees, and court volunteers.</p> <p>2(b) – Information shared with courts regarding strategies for</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>the needs of self-represented litigants. This process may include, but is not limited to, consultation with courts, self-help centers, family law facilitator programs, legal services programs, and other justice system partners with expertise in the needs of self-represented litigants, court-users with disabilities, plain language translation, and the intersection of law and user-centered design.</p>				<p>making court resources and facilities more user-friendly, particularly for self-represented litigants.</p>
3.	<p><b>Diversity</b></p> <p>a) Explore strategies for sharing high-quality outreach information with judicial officers and branch leaders who are interested in performing outreach to diverse communities. This may include the development of an online resource.</p> <p>(Note: In 2016, PAF members identified updating the publication, <i>Pathways to Achieving Judicial Diversity in the California Courts</i> as a priority. This project developed in response to that need.)</p> <p>b) Review and consider ideas and recommendations that come out of the October 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit. (The Judicial Council co-hosted the summit. The Interagency Judicial Summit Planning Committee for the summit consisted of representatives from the State Bar’s Council on Access and Fairness, the Judicial Council, the California Judges Association, and staff from the State Bar and Judicial Council.)</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Accepted by the Judicial Council at its July 28, 2015, business meeting; Follow-up from the 2006 diversity summit held by the Judicial Council in collaboration with the State Bar of California.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> To Be Determined</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 1, 2, and 3</p>	December 2017	<p>3(a) – The committee will have provided feedback on a Judicial Council resource designed to assist judicial officers and branch leaders in performing outreach to diverse communities.</p> <p>3(b) – Committee discussion about and consideration of ideas and recommendations from the October 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p><b>Improving Access and Fairness through Technology:</b></p> <p>a) Coordinate with the Judicial Council’s Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) on developing a Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal. (See item #5 on <a href="#">ITAC’s 2017 Annual Agenda</a>. (See also, <a href="#">The Critical Role of the State Judiciary in Increasing Access for Self-Represented Litigants: Self-Help Access 360</a>)</p> <p>b) Discuss and explore with ITAC other intersections between access, fairness, and technology.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Committee Charge</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee Charge, prior annual agenda, and ITAC Annual Agenda.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff and ITAC staff</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 3</p>	Ongoing	<p>4(a) – ITAC will receive PAF’s expertise on issues of access and fairness for self-represented litigants throughout the development and implementation of the Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal.</p> <p>4(b) – Establishment of an ongoing relationship between PAF and ITAC on intersecting issues related to access, fairness, and technology.</p>
5.	<p><b>Improving Access and Fairness for SRLs in Traffic Court:</b> Consider ways to improve access and fairness for self-represented litigants in traffic court. This will include ongoing collaboration with the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC), Criminal Law Advisory Committee (CLAC), and other relevant Judicial Council advisory bodies and staff and will be conducted through the Judicial Council’s ordinary processes for policy adoption, rulemaking and legislative proposals. This work may include, but is not limited to:</p>	1(e)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I; Strategic Goal 3: Modernization of Management and Administration.</p> <p>Committee charge.</p>	December 2017	Approval and/or implementation of PAF’s policy recommendations for improving access and fairness for self-represented litigants in traffic court.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Working with TAC and CLAC on ability to pay issues, including the potential development of an ability to pay form.</li> <li>b) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation establishing that all traffic infraction penalties be established at a state level; work with counties to explore standardizing statewide penalties associated with traffic infractions.</li> <li>c) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation to amend Penal Code section 1463.007 or create rules of court adopting a statewide system of debt collection procedures.</li> <li>d) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation to provide community service as an option to all litigants who may be unable to pay their fines, penalties, and fees with a consistent statewide formula to convert traffic sentences to community service hours.</li> <li>e) Adopting a rule of court setting forth procedures with respect to local courts retaining jurisdiction over traffic matters and clarifying the situations in which they may use outside collection agencies.</li> <li>f) Adopting a court rule regarding individual traffic courts' use of high quality materials prepared by the Judicial Council to educate litigants when they appear in court.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b>  Committee charge; prior annual agenda, Judicial Council's <a href="#"><u>Statewide Action Plan For Serving Self-Represented Litigants</u></a>; and 2016 written request from Justice Hull, Chair of Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO), that TAC, CLAC, and PAF work together to improve access to the courts for traffic court litigants.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b>  None</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b>  2 and 3</p>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>g) Developing high quality informational materials, on the traffic court process, to be disseminated to all counties.</p> <p>h) Providing additional education to judicial officers hearing traffic matters, with an emphasis on how judicial offices should exercise their discretion in considering one's ability to pay before imposing traffic penalties.</p> <p>i) Evaluating the possibility of a statewide electronic Traffic Information Portal.</p>				
6.	<p><b>Low and Moderate Income Court Users (Economic Access):</b></p> <p>a) Work with stakeholders to build stronger collaborations between courts and legal aid providers, with the goal of improving access and fairness for low-income court users and other vulnerable court-user populations.</p> <p>b) Cosponsor one or more conferences with the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) and/or other relevant stakeholder(s), for court administrators, self-help center attorneys, family law facilitators, legal aid attorneys and paralegals, court and legal services information and technology experts, and other appropriate court and legal services staff on issues related to self-represented litigants and to encourage sharing of resources and best practices.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <i>Strategic:</i> Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.  <i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair; Goal IV, Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users</p>	December 2017	<p>6(a) – Ongoing discussion and collaboration with branch stakeholders.</p> <p>6(b) – Cosponsorship of one or more conferences with LAAC and/or other relevant stakeholder(s) on issues related to self-represented litigants.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>c) Consider ways to fully implement the Judicial Council’s 2001 <a href="#">Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</a>. (See item 2, <a href="#">Judicial Council minutes approving the policy</a>.) These recommendations include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Pilot test a change to the Judicial Council’s Invitation to Comment form.</li> <li>ii. Improve outreach and education for Invitations to Comment.</li> <li>iii. Encourage individuals working with low and moderate-income communities to apply for Judicial Council advisory body positions.</li> <li>iv. Coordinate with the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) and/or local bar associations to video-record another webinar on the Invitation to Comment process and the work of Judicial Council advisory bodies.</li> </ul> <p>d) Consider ways that simplification of court processes can be used to improve court services for low and moderate income court-users.</p>		<p>receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Previous annual agenda.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 3</p>		<p>6(c) – Approval and/or implementation of PAF recommendations for fully implementing the Judicial Council’s <i>Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</i>.</p> <p>6(d) – PAF will have reviewed one or more court processes and, in collaboration with appropriate advisory bodies and justice system partners, developed recommendations for</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
					ways to simplify that court process.
7.	<p><b>Mental Health Issues:</b></p> <p>a) Review and consider recommendations referred to PAF from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce. <i><a href="#">Final Report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce</a></i>. The Chairs of Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) and RUPRO referred these recommendations to PAF. PAF will recommend appropriate action within its purview and will collaborate with other advisory bodies and justice system partners as appropriate. PAF will likely focus its efforts on recommendations number 39, 106, and 108.</p> <p>b) Make recommendations for improving education that court staff receive on mental health issues. Appropriate training can help court staff, including self-help center staff, improve their communication with members of the public.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> As referred by the council</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Legal Services staff; CFCC staff; Criminal Justice Services staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 3</p>	December 2017	<p>7(a) – PAF will have reviewed the eight recommendations referred to the committee and collaborated with appropriate advisory bodies on action steps for those recommendations.</p> <p>7(b) – PAF will have assessed the mental health education currently made available to court staff and made recommendations for ways to improve the statewide education for court-staff on working with court-users with mental health disabilities.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
8.	<p><b>Inclusive Jury Pools:</b> Assess whether to make recommendations/what recommendations to make to the Judicial Council on the inclusiveness of jury pools.</p> <p>a) (<a href="#">Section 197(a)</a> of the California Code of Procedure requires that potential jurors be selected from sources that are “inclusive of a representative cross section of the population of the area served by the court.” Voting rolls and DMV registrations are commonly used for jury pools. Some courts are recognizing, however, that additional sources may assist them in improving the inclusiveness of jury pools.) This work will include looking at strategies to ensure the diversity of jury pools.</p> <p>b) PAF will also look at the needs of persons with serious, permanent disabilities that prevent them from participating in jury service. This work will be done in collaboration with Judicial Council staff and other relevant advisory bodies.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Strategic:</i> Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p><i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair; Goal IV, Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee charge</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 3</p>	December 2017	<p>8(a) – PAF will have considered the various sources that courts use for jury pools, identified new or innovative sources that courts may be using to improve the inclusiveness of jury pools, and developed recommendations to the Judicial Council for ways to assist courts in improving the inclusiveness of their jury pools.</p> <p>8(b) – PAF will have assisted in making recommendations related to the needs of persons with serious, permanent disabilities that prevent them from participating in jury service.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9.	<p><b>Assessing the Use of Temporary Judges:</b> Assess whether to make recommendations/what recommendations to make to the Judicial Council regarding the use of temporary judges. Temporary judges are used in a wide variety of cases. This work may include collaboration with CJER staff to assess the education that the Judicial Council provides to temporary judges.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Strategic:</i> Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p><i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee charge</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 3</p>	December 2017	PAF will have assessed the current use of temporary judges and if appropriate, made recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving the use of temporary judges and/or the education made available to temporary judges.
10.	<p><b>Form MC-410: Request for Accommodations by Persons with Disabilities and Response</b> Redesign Judicial Council form MC-410 to make it more user-friendly and in plain language. This will make it easier for court-users to understand the form and correctly complete it. This will also make it easier to translate the form into multiple languages.</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Strategic:</i> Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p>	2018	A more user-friendly and plain language version of the form will be made available to the public.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair; Goal IV, Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Committee charge</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> CFCC staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p><b>Key Objective(s) Supported:</b> 2 and 3</p>		

## II. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Collaborate and Provide Subject Matter Expertise	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #1 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed:</p> <p>PAF members used their expertise in fairness, access, and self-represented litigant needs to collaborate with the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee (CLAC) on a number of proposals to improve access and fairness for traffic court litigants.</p> <p>At the request of the Futures' Commission, PAF provided valuable feedback on a proposal to consolidate the juvenile delinquency and dependency systems. PAF indicated an overall support for the proposal while highlighting important issues related to racial disproportionality in those systems that should be considered.</p> <p>PAF established or maintained the following liaison relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ITAC's SRL E-Portal Workstream: A PAF member and Lead Staff to PAF were selected as members of this workstream.</li> <li>- CJER's Judicial Branch Access, Ethics, and Fairness (JBAEF) Committee: A PAF member was appointed as a member of this committee. Another PAF member and Lead Staff to PAF were selected as liaisons to this committee.</li> <li>- CLAC: A PAF member was approved as a liaison to this committee.</li> <li>- TAC: A PAF member was approved as a liaison to this committee.</li> <li>- The following committees have appointed liaisons to PAF: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee; Traffic Advisory</li> </ul>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
		<p>Committee; and Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p> <p>All of the above collaborations allowed PAF to become more aware of challenges related to diversity, fairness, and access to the courts. Through these relationships, PAF has been able to expand the scope of its work and ensure that the branch considers important issues of diversity, fairness, and access to the courts in more of its decisions.</p>
2.	<b>Education</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #2 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: In 2016, PAF contributed to education in the following ways:</p> <p>PAF Chair Justice Laurie Zelon participated in an educational presentation to the Judicial Council on the committee’s commitment to implicit bias education. See video of February 25, 2016, presentation <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>PAF Cochairs Justice Kathleen O’Leary and Justice Laurie Zelon presented to the Judicial Council on access to the courts for low and moderate-income court users (also referred to as “Economic Access”). See video of June 23, 2016, presentation <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>Lead Staff to PAF provided a number of implicit bias education sessions to judicial branch partners, Judicial Council staff, and worked with CJER on an implicit bias video training for court staff.</p>
3.	<b>Diversity</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #3 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: In 2016, Judicial Council staff began reviewing the 2010 publication, <i>Pathways to Achieving Judicial Diversity in the</i></p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
		<p><i>California Courts</i>, to determine whether/how to update the publication and make it more user-friendly. Judicial Council staff are reaching out to PAF members who have been providing helpful feedback on this effort.</p> <p>Lead Staff and several PAF members served on the Interagency Planning Committee for the 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit, which the Judicial Council cosponsored.</p>
4.	<b>Improving Access and Fairness through Technology</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #4 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed:</p> <p>A PAF member and Lead Staff to PAF were selected as members of ITAC’s workstream on the SRL E-Portal. This workstream’s work is ongoing.</p> <p>ITAC’s liaison to PAF participated in a majority of PAF’s 2016 meetings and provided the committee with periodic updates.</p> <p>These efforts helped PAF build a stronger relationship with ITAC.</p>
5.	<b>Improving Access and Fairness for SRLs in Traffic Court</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #5 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed:</p> <p>PAF finalized its recommendations for improving access and fairness for self-represented litigants in traffic court. PAF submitted those recommendations to the Chairs of CLAC and TAC for consideration. TAC and CLAC have since addressed some of PAF’s recommendations. PAF will follow up with both committees in 2017 regarding the status of the remaining recommendations.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
		<p>As directed by Justice Hull, Chair of RUPRO, PAF worked closely with CLAC and TAC on a number of proposals to improve access and fairness for traffic court users.</p> <p>The Chairs of PAF, CLAC, and TAC worked together to establish closer relationships between the committees. Member liaisons were then established between the committees.</p> <p>Lead Staff from PAF, CLAC, and TAC also worked together to better understand the work of each committee.</p>
6.	<b>Low and Moderate Income Court Users (Economic Access)</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #6 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed:</p> <p>PAF Cochairs Justice Kathleen O’Leary and Justice Laurie Zelon presented to the Judicial Council on access to the courts for low and moderate-income court users (also referred to as “Economic Access”). See video of June 23, 2016, presentation <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>PAF members continued to stay up-to-date on emerging issues related to state and national efforts to reform fines, fees, and other court-ordered debt.</p> <p>CFCC staff, including Lead Staff to PAF, collaborated with the Legal Aid Society of California (LAAC) to conduct a webinar on the Judicial Council, its advisory bodies, and its invitation to comment process. Lead Staff included a link to this webinar in outreach encouraging more people to apply to Judicial Council advisory bodies.</p> <p>To assist the Judicial Council in attracting a greater diversity of advisory committee applicants, Lead Staff to PAF developed an extensive list of bar associations, legal services associations, and stakeholder groups. Lead Staff shared these contacts with E&amp;P</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
		<p>staff who decided to add those contacts to the agency’s master distribution list for advisory committee application outreach.</p> <p>The Judicial Council cosponsored a conference with LAAC for court administrators, self-help center attorneys, family law facilitators, legal aid attorneys, and appropriate court staff on issues related to self-represented litigants in family law and domestic violence and to encourage sharing of resources and best practices. At the conference, Lead Staff to PAF provided a session on Implicit Bias in decision making, which was very well-received.</p>
7.	<b>Consider Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force Referrals</b>	<p>This project is ongoing. See project #7 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed:</p> <p>Pursuant to RUPRO’s request, PAF Cochairs used the 2016 application process to look for new PAF members with mental health expertise. PAF’s new members include a judicial officer and a public member with mental health expertise. PAF chose not to expand the size of the committee and instead used existing positions to gain members with the relevant expertise.</p>

**Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail**

**Subgroups/Working Groups:**  
*Subgroup or working group name:* None.

**Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P:**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Richard Vlavianos (Chair), Judge, Superior Court of San Joaquin County Hon. Rogelio Flores (Vice-chair), Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara, County
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Nancy Taylor, Principal Manager, Center for Families, Children & the Courts Ms. Francine Byrne, Manager, Criminal Justice Services
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> Rule 10.56 of the California Rules of Court charges the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Judicial Council on criteria for identifying and evaluating collaborative justice courts and for improving the processing of cases in these courts, which include drug courts, domestic violence courts, youth courts, and other collaborative justice courts. Those recommendations include ‘best practices’ guidelines and methods for collecting data to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of collaborative justice courts.</p> <p>Additional duties included under rule 10.56:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess and measure success and effectiveness of local collaborative justice courts;</li> <li>2. Identify and disseminate to trial courts locally generated best practices;</li> <li>3. Recommend minimum judicial education standards and educational activities to support those standards to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research;</li> <li>4. Advise the council of potential funding sources;</li> <li>5. Make recommendations regarding grant funding programs that are administered by the Judicial Council staff for drug courts and other treatment courts; and</li> <li>6. Recommend appropriate outreach activities needed to support collaborative justice courts.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b>  The committee currently has 24 members (nine judicial officers, two court administrators, one district attorney, one criminal defense attorney, one law enforcement officer, one treatment court coordinator, one probation officer, one treatment provider, one treatment court graduate, one representative from the mental health field, one social services representative, one non-profit community organization representative, and three public members).</p>	

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

Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee

Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee

Policy Subcommittee

Mental Health Subcommittee

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:**

1. Support local court efforts to increase effectiveness and efficiency of case processing for high risk/high needs cases by identifying and disseminating local court practices that apply collaborative justice to a broad range of high risk/high needs case types in both criminal and noncriminal cases;
2. Support local court efforts to assess evidence based practices in local collaborative justice courts as core functions in court operations that address high risk/high needs cases through studies of mental health courts, youth courts, and reentry courts;
3. Provide collaborative justice related expertise and support collaboration among justice system partners at the state and local levels through inter-branch efforts in areas such as parolee reentry courts, veterans courts and military families, and juvenile collaborative justice courts;
4. Identify potential funding and advise the Judicial Council regarding funding to sustain local collaborative justice courts during challenging times, including funding for juvenile and family collaborative courts, funding for family reunification in collaborative courts, realigned drug court funding, recidivism reduction funding, fiscal impacts of Proposition 47, federal funding for collaborative courts, and funding through the Mental Health Services Act;
5. Identify non-criminal issues that impact case outcomes in criminal and other collaborative courts, such as child support, child custody, juvenile court issues, and access to treatment and rehabilitative services through the Affordable Care Act and realigned treatment programs; and
6. Recommend and provide multi-disciplinary education that addresses the changing role of collaborative justice and application of collaborative justice principles across a broad range of case types, including elder law, family law, and mental health law.
7. Support efforts to address expungement of records, release of DMV holds resulting from outstanding fines/fees or child support cases, implementation of 1170.9, and other relief granted through collaborative courts.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

## ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects and are available to support local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California, as well as supplementing dependency drug courts with federal funding from the Court Improvement Project.</p> <p>a. Report to the Judicial Council on grant activities from fiscal year 2016–2017.</p> <p>b. Recommend to the Judicial Council grant allocations to local courts based on allocation method approved</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Legislative mandate reviewed annually by Judicial Council. The Substance Abuse Focus Grant was initiated in FY 2000–2001. Current year funding has been established through the Budget Act of 2014 (Stats. 2014, ch. 21; § 45.55.020, item 0250-101-0001).</p> <p>Resources: External legislatively earmarked funding for drug court implementation provides needed resources for committee activities</p>	<p>Ongoing/ annual dates below:</p> <p>1 a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p> <p>1b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p> <p>1c. <i>Completion Date:</i> October 31, 2017</p> <p>1d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p>	Allocation of grant funds to local courts

<sup>2</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>3</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>by the Judicial Council in FY2014–2015.</p> <p>c. Review biannual reports regarding funding distribution, invoicing, and deliverables reports from local courts.</p> <p>d. Recommend methods of allocation and grants administration for next annual funding cycle using Judicial Council approved allocation methodology.</p>		<p>for this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the judicial branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Budget Services, Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 4</p>		
2.	<p>Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance such as developing intern and mentor programs for local collaborative court projects.</p> <p>a. Identify funding in collaboration with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, California Office of Traffic Safety, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Improvement</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal I: Access, Fairness, &amp; Diversity</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all</p>	<p>Ongoing/annual dates below:</p> <p>2a. <i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2017</p> <p>2b. <i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2017</p> <p>2c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p> <p>2d. <i>Completion date:</i> December 31, 2017</p>	<p>Local courts will be provided access to a variety of funding sources, such as reentry and recidivism reduction grants that are allocated through the Judicial Council, and assistance from Judicial Council staff, national technical assistance providers, and mentor courts to implement mentor and intern programs.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Program, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance to support existing and planned collaborative courts.</p> <p>b. Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle.</p> <p>c. Share findings from collaborative court outcome and cost studies as well as compiled reports and studies from local collaborative courts with collaborative court coordinators in quarterly meetings to assist local courts in seeking local, federal, and private funding.</p> <p>d. Share effective practices, at the request of local courts, among courts that use intern programs involving law schools or graduate schools for human services professionals or mentor programs involving program graduates or support persons, such as veterans, to improve outcomes for collaborative court</p>		<p>levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Requested by local courts and justice system partners, including the California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, and Homeless Court Network; approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>participants.</p> <p>e. Assist local collaborative courts, with initial focus on veterans and mental health courts, by providing resources and materials in an accessible and user-focused online format.</p> <p>f. Assist development of technical assistance projects to support local collaborative courts, with initial focus on veterans and mental health courts, to assist case processing.</p> <p>g. At the request of local courts, identify the role of data collection, telecommunications, and web-based communications to identify and implement effective practices that improve case processing and outcomes.</p>		<p>Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Senate Bill 318; Assembly Bill 109, the Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act, President’s Office of National Drug Control Policy reporting duties; California Endowment and Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance funding.</p> <p>Resources: External funding for projects through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources required for committee activities.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1 and 2</p>		
3.	Continue to collaborate with Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of management and administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal</p>	<p>Ongoing/annual dates below:</p> <p>3a. <i>Completion Date:</i> June 30, 2017</p> <p>3b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p>	<p>Summary of recommendations, multidisciplinary education programs, and educational materials will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees; to provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative justice models for high risk/high needs cases, focusing on cases involving mental health, substance use disorder, veterans and military families, truancy, reentry, including family reunification issues and children of incarcerated parents, DUI, and human trafficking, as well as the impact on collaborative courts of policy changes such as expungement and release of DMV holds, resolution of child support issues, family reunification, Proposition 47, Diversion options, the Affordable Care Act and</p>		<p>operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act, and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides needed resources for these committee activities.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: CJER, Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and Trial</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>realignment of funding for treatment and services.</p> <p>a. Continue to confer with relevant CJER judicial education planning committees in criminal law and mental health, and juvenile and family law to address mental health, reentry, human trafficking, veterans' issues, substance use disorder, DUI and truancy.</p> <p>b. Continue to confer with the CJER Governing Committee and relevant judicial education planning committees, and provide guidance to committee staff regarding training activities developed in collaboration with justice system partners, including but not limited to the California Association of Collaborative Courts (CACC), National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP, NDCI, NCDC, Justice for Vets), the California Association of Youth Courts (CAYC), the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR),</p>		<p>Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>the Department of Veterans Affairs, California Judges Association (CJA), and the American Bar Association (ABA) including Standing Committee on Armed Forces Law, Commission on Homelessness and Poverty, and ABA Judicial Committee on Human Trafficking for training programs offered at quarterly or annual meetings and trainings for members of the judiciary, collaborative court coordinators and court teams that identify emerging models, such as Webinars regarding drug court standards and effective practices, veterans and military families, mental health and substance use disorder issues, family reunification and children of incarcerated parents, trauma informed services, effective and evidenced-based practice, practice standards and peer review, reunification courts, elder courts, reentry courts, truancy courts, and collaborative courts that address human trafficking, such as girls' courts and other effective practices as noted in</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	the ABA training on ‘Court-Community Based Programs for Human Trafficking Victims: A Strategy for Success’.				
4.	Upon request, identify methods to assist local courts in improving case outcomes and implementing policy changes including juvenile and adult mental health, Proposition 47, diversion, pretrial supervision, reentry, family reunification, juvenile competency, child support, veterans issues, sealing of records, and human trafficking through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices, including substance use disorder and mental health issues across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, courts that address human trafficking, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:  <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project:  Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee for the committee’s 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Senate Bill 318; Assembly Bill 109, the Budget Act; Proposition 47; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources:  External funding from the California Endowment and Mental Health Services Act was obtained to support all committee activities for these projects.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new</p>	<p>Ongoing/annual dates below:</p> <p>4a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p> <p>4b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p>	<p>Summary of programs and activities to identify case outcomes and evidence based approaches to be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>a. Provide guidance and act as subject matter experts for the dissemination of resources for judicial officers and court staff in the area of mental health, substance use disorder, DUI, veterans and military families, human trafficking, and collaborative courts addressing adult, juvenile, probate, and family cases.</p> <p>b. Provide guidance and act as subject matter experts to advise committee staff regarding a youth court study, studies of adult and juvenile mental health courts, a girls' court study, veterans court studies, and reentry court studies, dependent on available resources, to include approaches for improving outcomes, by addressing family reunification, children of incarcerated parents, substance use disorder, DUI, child support, housing, trauma, and mental health issues.</p>		<p>workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Public Affairs, CJER, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1, 2, 3, 5</p>		
5.	Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such	1	Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan</i> : Goal III: Modernization of management and administration	Ongoing through December 31, 2017	Summary of identified policies, assistance provided and recommendations to help

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>as Proposition 47, recidivism reduction, realigned funding and services, veterans and military families, DUI, and the Affordable Care Act that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate, mental health, and drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities.</p> <p>a. Track and review proposed legislation regarding court involved veterans and military families</p> <p>b. Work toward implementing legislation involving court involved veterans and military families</p>		<p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act; Proposition 47; and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources needed by the committee for these activities.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: CJER, Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law</p>		<p>local courts provided to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Advisory Committee, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.  Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5		
6.	Continue to consult with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education curriculum committees, and make recommendations for judicial education and court assistance materials in the areas of court-involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, and veterans courts, including implementation of the optional Judicial Council form to identify military status effective as of January 1, 2014; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education planning committees, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.  a. Make recommendations regarding use of judicial	1	Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  <i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.  Origin of Project: Project originated at the request of an Appellate Court Justice who served on the Judicial Council Task Force for Criminal Justice Collaboration on Mental Health Issues and members of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force, and local courts. Project was recommended by committee members to assist courts in responding to mandates of Penal Code section 1170.9.  Resources: Federal Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance funding was obtained	Ongoing/annual dates below:  6a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017  6b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017  6c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017  6d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017	Summary of recommendations and activities will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>education job aids in judicial education programs, including “Veterans in Criminal Court: A decision map of Penal Code section 1170.9” to assist veterans courts, homeless courts, and others in the court system to implement Penal Code section 1170.9.</p> <p>b. Make recommendations for implementing broad use of the form MIL-100, <i>Notification of Military Status</i>, to assist the courts in the identification of veterans involved in cases within the court system, with modifications developed in accord with policy changes.</p> <p>c. Identify educational materials and, at the request of relevant committees, serve as subject matter experts for preparation of toolkit for areas pertaining to military families and veterans courts, such as implementation of Penal Code sections 1170.9, 1001.3, and 1001.8; military sexual trauma; family reunification issues; trauma informed services and court programs; and reentry issues for incarcerated veterans by providing guidance to</p>		<p>to support all committee activities related to the project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Public Affairs, and CJER.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 3, 5</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p> <p>d. At the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education educational programs, identification of faculty, and review of content linked with CJER functions, such as Military Families and Veterans Court programs at the Juvenile Law Institute and Family Law Institute by providing guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p> <p>e. Provide advisement in review and analyze the recommendations from the 2016 survey of Veteran’s Treatment Courts related to domestic violence and batterers’ treatment programs, dependent on available resources.</p> <p>f. Assist in improvement of the user-experience of the website for veterans and military families</p> <p>g. Provide advisement and review to ensure an up to date</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>and publically accessible roster of Veterans Treatment Courts is maintained.</p> <p>h. In coordination with the California State Bar, ABA, the Department of Veterans Administration, Federal Department of Defense, local Veteran’s agencies, Veterans’ advocacy groups, county bar organizations, researchers, veterans groups and homeless groups follow trends and developments regarding court involved veterans and military families.</p> <p>i. Collaborate with CDCR on identifying and maintaining statistics on the number of inmates who are veterans and re-entering society.</p> <p>j. Research best practices for addressing the needs of women veterans and military families (i.e., domestic violence)in our courts to improve treatment and case processing</p>				
7.	Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as juvenile mental health courts, truancy,	1	<i>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan: Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</i>	June 30, 2017/in process/project dates below <i>7a. Completion Date:</i>	Summary of identified policy issues and best practices will be submitted to the Judicial Council by

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>youth courts, trafficking, girls' court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; continue to assist in effort to address juvenile competency through legislation and implementation of policy changes in this area.</p> <p>a. To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the committee will collaborate with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, to consider developing recommendations to the Judicial Council to committee staff to develop content, and follow up activities for the Youth Summit in partnership with the California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p>b. Continue to provide subject matter expertise and guidance to committee staff in developing and maintaining updates of briefing papers on evidence-based practices on assessments, girls' court, and human trafficking, including</p>		<p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive &amp; Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013–14 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Public Affairs, and CJER.</p>	<p>December 31, 2017</p> <p>7b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p> <p>7c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2018</p> <p>7d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017.</p> <p>7e. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017.</p> <p>7f. <i>Completion Date:</i> October 31, 2017.</p> <p>7g. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017</p>	<p>June 30, 2018.</p> <p>7b. Subject matter expertise has been provided to committee staff. Briefings and best practices on assessments have been included in the judicial officer toolkit on human trafficking.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>a briefing on juvenile collaborative court models.</p> <p>c. Provide subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with staff to other groups in the area of human trafficking, which will include the development of briefing papers on evidence based practices, bench cards for judicial officers, sample scripts, a description of validated assessment and screening tools for trafficking victims, a discussion of girls' courts and specialized human trafficking courts, and the creation of a judicial officer toolkit. This includes an evaluation of the Los Angeles STAR Court.</p> <p>d. Assist in the branch coordination of efforts to support work done by the Child Welfare Council's Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team and other branch entities, including the CJER Governing Committee and the Violence Against Women</p>			<p>7c. This toolkit was completed in November 2016 and is currently under internal review.</p>	<p>7c. This product is complete and is currently under internal review. The toolkit should be ready for submission to the Judicial Council by June 2017.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Education Project (VAWEP) Planning Committee, in the area of human trafficking The Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative, funded by the State Justice Institute, has agreed to provide technical support for these projects and to the judicial branch in the area of human trafficking. The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, through the Juvenile Subcommittee, will oversee follow-up work from the Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative Summit and Technical Assistance Project, including a Human Trafficking Summit to be held in 2017 and supporting education efforts of the ABA on collaboration in human trafficking.</p> <p>e. Assist in branch coordination efforts to address permanency for children in foster care by providing subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with the Permanency Committee of the Child Welfare Council</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>to promote and expand the use of Dependency Drug Courts as a best practice model. The work will include developing literature and data, improving data collection efforts, and increasing outreach efforts to courts that do not currently use Dependency Drug Courts. Continue to coordinate efforts with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the CJER Governing Committees, as well as relevant education and curriculum committees and to partner with Children and Family Futures, the federal technical assistance provider in this subject area, which has agreed to provide technical support for this project. Continue support of the child welfare system and dependency drug courts by exploring the issue of women in prison and the impact of parental incarceration on children.</p>				

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>f. Support completion of the legislative proposal process for proposed juvenile competency legislation, in coordination with the Governmental Affairs, and assist in implementation of any legislative changes, as well as assisting courts in identifying and implementing effective practices in juvenile competency and juvenile mental health courts.</p> <p>g. Support juvenile collaborative court judges by creating a data dashboard of offenders and court participant demographics and other data points for each county and identifying and distributing effective practices in juvenile drug courts, juvenile mental health courts, and court programs to address issues regarding children of incarcerated parents.</p>				
8.	Review the following recommendations from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force (MHIITF), that were identified as within Judicial Council	1	<i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  <i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1:	Project plans developed and implementation begun by September 1, 2017.	Project plan to be developed and implementation initiated with summary provided

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>purview and in need of continuing work for implementation, but which are not shared with another advisory committee to develop a project plan of next steps in implementation as regards collaborative justice:</p> <p>1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 28, 38, 84, 94, 114, 115, 128, 130, 131, 132</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serve as lead committee to develop and initiate a plan to implement the following recommendations, in coordination with advisory committees that are also assigned to review and work on the recommendations: 18, 37, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66, 67, 71, 72, 76, 80, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 113, 118- attorney training portion, 122</li> <li>• Partner with advisory committee serving as lead in developing a plan and implementing the following recommendations, or if</li> </ul>		<p>Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council meeting- December 2015, at which the final report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force was submitted and council indicated that advisory committees would implement follow-up work; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013–2014 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness;</p>		<p>to Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>out of purview, referring to partner agencies:</p> <p>17, 21, 22, 23, 27, 35, 36, 93, 95, 105, 107,108,109, 110,111,115,116,117,118-judicial officer training portion,124</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendations may be found at the following link: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/MHIITF-Final-Report.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/MHIITF-Final-Report.pdf</a></li> <li>• Continue the work of the MHIITF to assist staff in the Governmental Affairs by weighing in on legislative proposals involving mental health issues</li> <li>• Assist in identifying emerging issues and needs for litigants with mental health issues, such as accommodation needs, issues related to incompetence to stand trial, and confidentiality. Identify opportunities for collaboration with mental health initiatives and programs (e.g., Stepping Up Initiative).</li> </ul>		<p>and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee; Public Affairs, and CJER.</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9.	Develop a plan to identify and address mental health issues through application of collaborative court principles in noncriminal case types, including civil, probate, family, and juvenile.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i>  <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: December 2015 Judicial Council meeting at which the final report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force was submitted and the council indicated that advisory committees would implement follow-up work and identified noncriminal case types as part of the ongoing work regarding cases involving mental health issues; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates:  2013–2014 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed</p>	Initial plan developed: December 31, 2017	Initial plan to be developed with summary provided to Judicial Council by June 30, 2018.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specification	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>on trial courts or the branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee; Public Affairs, and CJER.</p>		

DRAFT

## II. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of, the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects, and are available to local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California.</p>	<p><b>Status: Complete, December 31, 2016.</b>            On recommendation of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, the Judicial Council allocated funding to local collaborative courts located in 49 jurisdictions. Courts received \$1.16 million of Substance Abuse Focus Grants with an additional \$75,000 in supplemental grants to 20 Dependency Drug Courts allocated through federal Court Improvement Plan funding.</p>
2.	<p>Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance such as developing intern and mentor programs for local collaborative court projects.</p>	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2016.</b>            Courts are informed of funding opportunities and provided assistance with applications on request. Information about funding is provided at all education programs, as well as through meetings with collaborative court coordinators and email notices to courts. Student projects assisted in studies of youth courts and juvenile mental health courts. Visits to mentor courts and education programs that concern the use of mentors were provided through partnerships with the California Association of Collaborative Courts, Children and Family Futures, and the California Association of Youth Courts.</p>
3.	<p>Collaborate with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees, provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative justice as the impact of policy changes such as the</p>	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2016.</b>            Multidisciplinary education programs were held in the areas of drug, and reentry courts, including development of a Webinar series on drug court standards developed in partnership with the National Association of Drug Court Professions, human trafficking, youth courts, veterans' courts, and mental health with toolkits prepared and posted on veterans issues, mental health issues, and human trafficking.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
	Affordable Care Act and realignment of funding for treatment and services on collaborative courts.	
4.	Identify methods to assist local courts, at their request, in improving case outcomes through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts in order to develop recommendations to the Judicial Council.	<p><b>Status: Completed, December 31, 2016.</b>            Provided guidance and acted as subject matter experts for the youth court roundtables and Youth Court Summit, veterans' court education programs, drug court standards statewide training, and best practices education programs at the California Association of Collaborative Courts statewide conference.</p>
5.	Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such as realigned funding and services and the Affordable Care Act, Proposition 47, and recidivism reduction that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate, mental health, and drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2016.</b>            Multidisciplinary education was provided in these areas at the statewide California Association of Collaborative Courts program, the statewide drug Court standards training, the Youth Court Summit, and meetings of the Child Welfare Council that concerned Dependency Drug Courts.</p>
6.	Continue to consult with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education curriculum committees, and make recommendations for judicial education and court assistance materials in the areas of court- involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, and veterans courts, including implementation of the optional Judicial Council form to identify military status effective as of January 1, 2014; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education planning committees, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2016.</b>            Educational programs were prepared in conjunction with the Family Law Institute, Juvenile Law Institute, and programs addressing collaborative courts in the criminal justice system, including veterans, DUI, homeless, and reentry courts. A drug court standards Webinar series was developed in partnership with the National Association of Drug Court Professionals to assist in implementing effective practices in local courts.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
7.	Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as truancy, youth courts, trafficking, girls' court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; propose to the Executive and Planning Committee and the Rules and Projects Committee that a joint working group be established with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force to address juvenile competency.	<p><b>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2016.</b></p> <p>The committee participated in development of a legislative proposal regarding juvenile competency that was approved by the Judicial Council. The Child Welfare Council continued to support Dependency Drug Courts as an effective practice. The human trafficking toolkit was drafted and studies of girls' court and juvenile mental health courts commenced.</p>

DRAFT

### III. Subgroup/Working Groups - Detail

*Subgroup or working group name:* Policy Subcommittee

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

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*10 *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A *Date formed:* June 2015

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

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

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

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

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*4 *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A *Date formed:* November 2013

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

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

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

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

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 6 *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A *Date formed:* March 2012

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

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing. The Youth Court Summit is an annual event. Bi-monthly meetings are held during the planning of the event and one in-person board meeting annually. There will also be a strategic planning in-person meeting this spring 2017 to brainstorm a strategic plan for the California Association of Youth Courts, Inc.

*Subgroup or working group name:* Mental Health Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To respond to the directive of the Judicial Council to ensure that the recommendations for on-going work related to the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force is addressed.

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

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A *Date formed:* March 2016

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The work of this subcommittee will be conducted via conference calls or in conjunction with meetings of the CJCAC.

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

**Court Facilities Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

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

**Subcommittees:**

- Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS) – Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair
- Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee – Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Chair
- Subcommittee on Courthouse Names – Hon. Keith D. Davis, Chair

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:**

The key objectives are the projects listed below.

DRAFT

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> All projects support the following two policies under <i>Goal VI.A – Facilities Infrastructure</i> of the council’s <i>Justice in Focus: The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch, 2006–2016:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for conducting court business</li> <li>2. Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners</li> </ol> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Coordination through Lead Staff to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee:</p> <p>Kristine Metzker, Capital Program Contact: 916-263-5052; Kristine.Metzker@jud.ca.gov</p> <p>Chris Magnusson, Capital Program Contact: 415-865-4041; Chris.Magnusson@jud.ca.gov</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Reviews of courthouse projects in relation to budget. Submit recommendations for Judicial Council consideration on how projects should proceed with available budgets.
2.	Review and monitor implementation of recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant (IOC)	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p>	Ongoing	Review and monitor implementation of IOC recommendations.

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

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	Ongoing, as needed
2.	Review and monitor recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant	Ongoing
3.	Oversee Judicial Council’s process for and progress in reducing courthouse project costs	Ongoing
4.	Coordinate with Executive and Planning Committee and the Judicial Council to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program	Ongoing
5.	Coordinate with the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council on the effort to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications	Ongoing
6.	Review and approve the scope, budget, and schedule for the Downtown Sacramento Capital Project for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the advisory committee’s recommendation on the Downtown Sacramento Capital Project on February 26, 2016
7.	Review and approve for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council that until proper funding of the Immediate and Critical Needs Account is restored, and with exception of the capital projects currently under construction, the schedules of the active Senate Bill 1407 projects be modified or put on hold	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the advisory committee’s recommendation on the active Senate Bill 1407 projects on August 26, 2016

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
8.	Review and approve, for submission to the state Department of Finance, the annual update of the <i>Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan</i> for fiscal year 2017–2018 for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the five-year infrastructure plan for FY 2017–2018 on December 16, 2016
9.	Review and approve a courthouse naming request for the new juvenile courthouse under construction in the Southwest Justice Center in the City of Murrieta for the Superior Court of Riverside County, for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the courthouse naming request on December 16, 2016

DRAFT

## IV. SUBCOMMITTEES

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

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

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

*Number of advisory committee members:* 10

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

*Date formed:* October 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets as needed and typically 2–7 times per year.

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

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

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

*Number of advisory committee members:* 5

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

*Date formed:* August 2011

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets as needed and typically 1–2 times per year.

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

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

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

*Number of advisory committee members:* 7

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

*Date formed:* December 2012

*Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets:* This subcommittee meets as needed and typically 1–3 times per year.

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

DRAFT

**Court Interpreters Advisory Panel**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P:**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Brian McCabe, Judge, Superior Court of Merced County
<b>Vice Chair:</b>	Mr. Shawn Landry, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Yolo County
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf, Lead Staff, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel Ms. Anne Marx, Lead Staff, Language Access Subcommittee Ms. Olivia Lawrence, Principal Manager, Court Operations Services
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> Consistent with the general responsibilities of advisory bodies generally under rule 10.34 of the California Rules of Court, the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) makes recommendations to the Judicial Council on the following two topics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Interpreter use and need in court proceedings, including reviewing and making recommendations to the Judicial Council on the findings of the Language Need and Interpreter Use study in court proceedings, conducted by the Judicial Council every five years under Government Code section 68563; and</li><li>2. Certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters.</li></ol> <p style="text-align:right"><i>(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.51 and Gov. Code, §§ 68561–68565 )</i></p>	

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

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

The Chief Justice may also appoint nonmember advisors to assist panel. Currently, CIAP membership includes four advisory non-voting positions, each offering a perspective not represented by the voting members:

- A representative of those who serve the deaf and hard of hearing community;
- A representative of court users of interpreter services, such as a public defender, legal aid attorney, or other public advocate;
- A representative familiar with the hands-on supervision of day-to-day court interpreter operations; and
- A representative with legal experience within the court. (In the past, this position has been filled by a representative in the field of interpreter education.)

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

1. Professional Standards and Ethics (Established 1999 under name of *Interpreter Standards and Procedures*)
2. Language Access Subcommittee (approved 2013)

*In addition, CIAP is collaborating with the following subcommittee from the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF):*

3. The Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee (collaboration on project #1)

---

<sup>1</sup> California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:**

1. Develop court interpreter post-credential discipline process
2. Revise California Rules of Court, rule 2.893, *Use of Noncertified and Nonregistered Spoken Language Interpreters*
3. Develop Limited English Proficient Party waiver of court appointed interpreter services
4. Update *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons*
5. Update *Recommended Guidelines for the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters*
6. Develop a policy for de-designation of certified languages

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
1	<p><b><u>Develop Court Interpreter Post-Credential Discipline Process</u></b> Continue work on developing a comprehensive proposal and for a post-credential discipline procedures. The proposal will outline a process through which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements can be fairly reviewed. Proposal will include recommending an amendment to existing rule 2.891 and possibly rule 2.890, and/or new rules of court, in addition to the recommended guidelines and procedures. Recommendation may also include proposed legislation as appropriate.</p>	1	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b> <u>Government Code section 68562 (d)</u> The Judicial Council shall adopt standards and requirements for interpreter proficiency, continuing education, certification renewal, and discipline. The Judicial Council shall adopt standards of professional conduct for court interpreters.</p> <p><u>Government Code section 68564 (g)</u> The Judicial Council shall establish a procedure for Judicial Council and local court review of each court interpreter's skills and for reporting to the certification entity the results of the review.</p>	<p><b><u>Anticipated Completion Date:</u></b> <b><u>January 2019</u></b></p> <p>This work is ongoing from prior year.</p> <p>It may be possible to complete the initial proposals by the end of 2017, with review and revisions in 2018, and a potential implementation date of early 2019. However, this project will involve extensive work across subject matter areas, in addition to engagement of stakeholders and</p>	<p>A comprehensive <i>post-credential discipline process</i> proposal for review and consideration by the Judicial Council. Proposal is anticipated to include (1) a revised rules of court and/or new rules of court; (2) policies and procedures; and, (3) include proposed legislation as needed. Proposal will include a forecast and analysis of projected costs of implementation and funding needs. A recommendation will</p>

<sup>2</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>3</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<p>The approach will be complaint based, initiated at the local court level. Procedures will ensure due process, including an appeal and review process, and will comport with all laws and be informed by labor agreements.</p> <p>The proposal will outline criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process. It is anticipated that the proposal will outline graduated sanctions up to, and including, the permanent revocation of an interpreters' certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> Costs of implementing this process may be substantial. The proposal will include an analysis of likely costs, as well as additional staffing needs necessary to implement the proposal.</p>		<p><b>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal IV:</b> Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><b>Supports Operational Objective 2:</b> Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The origin for this project is embodied in existing Government Code sections 68562 (d) and 68564 (f), and rule 2.891.</p> <p>On January 22, 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts (LAP) recommendation #64: <b>Complaints regarding court interpreters:</b> <i>The Judicial Council, together with stakeholders, will develop a process by which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements can be reviewed. This process will allow for appropriate remedial action, where</i></p>	<p>forecasting a firm date for implementation is difficult.</p>	<p>be included of an entity outside the Judicial Branch (e.g., Office of Administrative Hearings) to be involved in the proposed procedures.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<p><b>Note:</b> This project takes into account the requirements established by Government Code section 71811 under the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, and regional Memoranda of Understanding.</p> <p>Text of rule 2.891 <b>Periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct</b>  <i>Each trial court must establish a procedure for biennial, or more frequent, review of the performance and skills of each court interpreter certified under Government Code section 68560 et seq. The court may designate a review panel, which must include at least one person qualified in the interpreter's language. The review procedure may include interviews, observations of courtroom performance, rating forms, and other evaluation techniques.</i></p>		<p><i>required, to ensure certified and registered interpreters meet all qualification standards. Development of the process should include determination of whether California Rules of Court, rule 2.891 (regarding periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct) should be amended, repealed, or remain in place. Once the review process is created, information regarding how it can be initiated must be clearly communicated to court staff, judicial officers, attorneys, and in plain language to court users (e.g., LEP persons and justice partners).</i></p> <p>It is anticipated the proposal will include a recommendation of an entity outside the judicial branch to be involved in certain processes surrounding complaint review, assessment of sanctions, and due process hearings, to the degree allowed by the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual.</p>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sub>3</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<p><b><u>Subcommittee: Professional Standards and Ethics</u></b></p>		<p><b><u>Resources:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal Services and Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) staff (not assigned);</li> <li>• LAPITF Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee (has developed a statewide model complaint form and process);</li> <li>• Communicate with and seek input from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) regarding the development of appropriate review processes, procedures and tools;</li> <li>• Human Resource professionals in local courts (including court interpreter regional bargaining unit chairs) and within the Judicial Council staff;</li> <li>• Contractual services of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to provide recommendations on interpreter assessment approaches and disciplinary procedures;</li> <li>• Input from California Federation of Interpreters (CFI) and Independent Interpreter</li> </ul>		

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sub>3</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p>Associations through public meetings and public comment once draft procedures are ready for public comments; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional stakeholders as appropriate for consultative purposes.</li> </ul>		
2	<p><b><u>Revise California Rules of Court, rule 2.893, Use of Noncertified and Nonregistered Spoken Language Interpreters and applicable forms</u></b></p> <p>Continue the comprehensive evaluation of existing rule 2.893 and applicable interpreter forms.</p> <p>Determine if rule 2.893 requires amendments; consider the possible scope of amendments and updates to current forms; and consider development of additional forms, and make recommendations accordingly.</p> <p><b><u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u></b></p>	1(c)	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b></p> <p>Government Code section 68561 requires the use of certified and registered spoken language interpreters and outlines the process for provisional qualification of a noncertified/nonregistered spoken language interpreter. Effective January 1, 2015, legislative changes expanded the information required on the record and expanded the court’s authority to provide court interpreters in civil proceedings.</p> <p><b><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal I:</u></b> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><b><u>Operational Objective 5:</u></b> Increase qualified interpreter services in mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court</p>	<p><b><u>Anticipated completion date: December 2017</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Effective date January 1, 2018.</u></b></p> <p>This work is ongoing from prior year.</p> <p>CIAP has completed its initial proposed revisions to rule 2.893, regarding appointment of noncertified interpreters, INT-100, the instructions to related forms, INT-110, regarding qualifications of provisional interpreters, and the new INT-140,</p>	<p>Provide the Judicial Council with recommendations on amendments to rule 2.893 and corresponding Judicial Council INT forms and instructions.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p>venues; increase the availability of language-assistance services to all court users.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b></p> <p>Assembly Bill 1657: Interpreters in Civil Proceedings (Stats. 2014, ch.721; effective January 1, 2015)</p> <p>Authorizes courts to provide interpreters to all parties in civil matters, regardless of income, and sets forth a priority order when courts do not have sufficient resources to provide interpreters for all LEP court users.</p> <p>Assembly Bill 2370 (Stats. 2014, ch. 424; effective January 1, 2015) expanded upon the previous Government Code section 68561 by requiring that certain statements be made on the record whenever an interpreter interprets in a court proceeding, including statements that confirm that the court is following the procedures for provisional qualification.</p>	<p>regarding temporary interpreters. As of March 2017, these items are in the RUPRO public comment process. It is anticipated final changes and proposals will be complete by the end of 2017 and will be effective January 1, 2018.</p> <p>CIAP's work includes only a partial review of INT-120, Court administration responsibilities to document unavailability of a certified or registered court interpreter. The subject matter has been referred to CEAC for further review and possible action.</p>	

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p><b><u>LAP Recommendations:</u></b>            #9: Provisional qualification requirements; #19: Verifying credentials of interpreters; #69 Procedures and guidelines for good cause, and #70 Amend rule of court for appointment of interpreters in civil proceedings. (Refers to rule 2.893)</p> <p><b><u>Resources:</u></b> CEAC (Re: INT-120: not confirmed), Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, Regional Bargaining Unit Chairs, Court Subject Matter Experts, Legal Services, Human Resources Labor Relations Unit, LAPITF</p>		
3	<p><b><u>Develop Limited English Proficient Party Waiver of Court Appointed Interpreter Services</u></b></p> <p>Develop a policy and process, per LAP recommendation #75, for an LEP litigant’s right to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter; including whether a corresponding rule of court is needed in order to implement the recommended policy.</p>	2 (b)	<p><b><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal I:</u></b> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><b><u>Operational Objective 1:</u></b> Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given the opportunity to be heard.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project: LAP Recommendation #75:</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Completion date unknown.</u></b></p> <p>Work may commence late 2017, contingent upon the completion of full review of revised rule 2.893 and corresponding INT forms and staff availability.</p>	<p>Policy and process as specified in LAP recommendation #75, with a corresponding standardized waiver form. A new rule of court, if required, to implement the policy and process for requesting a waiver of</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sub>3</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u>		<p>Policy regarding waiver of interpreter. LAPITF will develop a policy addressing an LEP court user's request of a waiver of the services of an interpreter. The policy will identify standards to ensure that any waiver is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; is made after the person has consulted with counsel; and is approved by the appropriate judicial officer, exercising his or her discretion. The policy will address any other factors necessary to ensure the waiver is appropriate, including: determining whether an interpreter is necessary to ensure the waiver is made knowingly; ensuring that the waiver is entered on the record, or in writing if there is no official record of the proceedings; and requiring that a party may request at any time, or the court may make on its own motion, an order vacating the waiver and appointing an interpreter for all further proceedings. The policy shall reflect the expectation that waivers will rarely be invoked in light of access to free interpreter services and the Implementation Task Force</p>		a court interpreters services.

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sub>3</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p>will track waiver usage to assist in identifying any necessary changes to policy.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal Services and RUPRO staff (not assigned)</li> </ul>		
4	<p><b><u>Update Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons</u></b></p> <p>California will be reviewing options for testing American Sign Language (ASL)-related court interpreters. The Language Access Subcommittee will review options and may recommend or provide input on an approach to staff. A review and modification of the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines must be done concurrently with the plan being developed. Changes to the underlying guidelines must be recommended to the Judicial Council for approval.</p>	2(b)	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Goal I:</u></b> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b></p> <p>The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) is the approved testing entity for ASL court interpreter testing for the state of California. In August 2015, RID stopped testing for legal interpreters. Further, certain changes in testing accommodations (provided by RID prior to stopping testing) requires a review of our underlying testing guidelines, when resources are available. There is no obvious and available solution for testing ASL interpreters. Additionally, subcommittee input will be required to</p>	<p><b><u>Work may begin late 2017.</u></b></p> <p>Completion date unknown.</p>	<p>Updated <i>Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons.</i></p> <p>Identification of a new way of evaluating ASL interpreters, which may include the need for exam development.</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u>		recommend any changes to the underlying testing guidelines.		
5	<p><b><u>Update Recommended Guidelines for the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</u></b></p> <p>Updating these guidelines may also require a change to the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines for consistency. The <i>Recommended Guidelines on the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</i> (DI Guidelines) would be reviewed by the entire CIAP panel. Changes to the testing related guidelines would need to be recommended to the Judicial Council.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u></p>	2(b)	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction: Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, and Diversity</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b></p> <p>California began accepting applications for a new category of interpreter: the Enrolled Deaf interpreter. This change requires an updating of the DI Guidelines. This may also require a change to the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines.</p>	<b><u>Start date unknown, completion date unknown.</u></b>	<p>Updated <i>Recommended Guidelines on the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</i>.</p> <p>Also requires updated guidelines on ASL testing entities.</p>
6	<p><b><u>Develop a policy for de-designation of languages</u></b></p> <p>Re-consider development and recommend the Judicial Council adopt a policy on the de-</p>	2(b)	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b></p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal: Goal I – Access, Fairness &amp; Diversity</p>	<p><b><u>Start date unknown, completion date unknown.</u></b></p> <p>In 2015 CIAP considered this issue</p>	<p>Recommend to the Judicial Council a comprehensive policy for de-designation of a language, and delegate</p>

#	Project <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<p>designation of previously designated languages whose use in the courts has declined.</p> <p><b><u>Subcommittee: To Be Determined</u></b></p>		<p><b>Operational Plan Objective 2:</b> Identify and eliminate barrier to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient and perceived as fair.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> A result of the recommendation made in the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study.</p>	<p>and declined to take action at that time, and decided to reconsider recommending a de-designation policy for adoption by the Judicial Council in 2016.</p> <p>This topic was not addressed in 2016, yet remains important.</p>	<p>future authority to the Administrative Director to de-designate a language.</p> <p>Administrative Director currently has delegation of authority to designate a language.</p>

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Continue to research, develop and recommend method and means by which a biennial periodic review on court interpreter skills can be fairly and consistently assessed throughout the courts. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.891).</p> <p>Consideration will be given to include in the revised rule that courts <b>may</b> still recommend and initiate a review process of performance skills and abilities.</p> <p>Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process to include remedial actions up to and including the permanent revocation of an interpreters' certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure, as per LAP Recommendation #64.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> An analysis of costs will need to be undertaken, as well as determining additional staffing needs necessary to implement revised and or new rule(s) of court, remedial action procedures, including proposed legislation costs.</p> <p><i>Note: This project takes into account the requirements established by Government Code section 71811, Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, and regional Memoranda of Understanding.</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing:</b> During 2016, the subcommittee continued to build upon progress made in 2015 on this important and complex project. This work will continue in 2017 (See 2017 Annual Agenda Project #1, Develop Court Interpreter Post-Credential Discipline Process)</p>
2.	<p>A comprehensive evaluation of existing rule 2.893, <i>Appointment of noncertified interpreters in criminal cases and juvenile delinquency proceedings</i>, and rules related to court interpreters and Judicial</p>	<p><b>Ongoing:</b> This work will continue in 2017. (See 2017 Annual Agenda Project #2, Revise Rule 2.893 <i>Use of Noncertified and</i></p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
	<p>Council INT forms and instructions, and recommend any appropriate revisions to the current forms and rule of court.</p> <p>Determine if rule 2.893 requires amendments, consider the possible scope of amendments, and make recommendations accordingly.</p>	<p><i>Nonregistered Spoken Language Interpreters</i> and applicable forms.</p>
3.	<p>Develop a policy and process, per LAP recommendation #75, for an LEP litigant's right to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter; including whether a corresponding Rule of Court is needed in order to implement the recommended policy.</p>	<p>Not yet begun. This work will carry over to 2017.(See 2017 Annual Agenda Project #3, Develop Limited English Proficient Party Waiver of Court Appointed Interpreter Services.)</p>
4.	<p><b>Consultative Only- from 2015 Annual Agenda:</b> Consult with Information Technology Advisory Committee, the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee and/or Judicial Council Technology Committee in the execution of a Video Remote Interpreting pilot project for spoken languages.</p>	<p>No request for consultation was made.</p>
5.	<p>Develop and recommend a policy on the de-designation of previously designated languages whose use in the courts has declined.</p>	<p>No action taken in 2016. Carrying over to 2017.(See 2017 Annual Agenda Project #6, Develop a Policy for De-designation of Languages.).</p>
	<p><b>Update on Annual Agenda 2015 item:</b> Request for Interpreter in Civil Action form.</p>	<p><b>Work Completed, effective July 1, 2016</b> California Rules of Court, rule 2.895, Requests for an interpreter was adopted and form INT-300, Request for an interpreter (civil), was also adopted as a model form with automatic rollover to an optional form at a future date.</p>

#### IV. Subcommittees/Working Groups – Detail

***Subcommittee or working group name: Professional Standards and Ethics***

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process to include remedial actions up to and including the permanent revocation of an interpreter’s certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; and including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 7 members (includes 1 advisory member)

*Number and description of additional members:* 1 non-CIAP member approved by E&P: Steve Cascioppo; Assistant Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Diego County

*Date formed:* 1999

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Every 4–6 weeks (one in-person meeting with entire CIAP body)

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Fall 2017

***Subcommittee or working group name: Language Access***

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing rule 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms, and continue development of form(s), rule and process for requesting interpreters in civil actions. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms. Develop form and rule, if required, for litigants to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter.

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

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

*Date formed:* 2013

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 8–15 times per year (one in-person meeting with entire CIAP body)

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Work on rule 2.893 and forms, December 2017; remainder of projects, December 2018.

**Note:** CIAP will provide consultation as required:

Consult with the Information Technology Advisory Committee and Technological Solutions Subcommittee (subcommittee of LAP Implementation Task Force) on Video Remote Technology.

- *Request ability to have subcommittees meet in person (in addition to the once a year full panel meeting) due to the complex nature of the projects in question.*

**Court Security Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Thomas M. Maddock, Judge, Superior Court of Contra Costa County
<b>Staff:</b>	Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Real Estate and Facilities Management
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> The Court Security Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.	
<p><b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b> The committee must include at least one member from each of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appellate court justice</li> <li>• Appellate court administrator;</li> <li>• Trial court judge;</li> <li>• Trial court judicial administrator;</li> <li>• Member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee; and</li> <li>• Member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.</li> </ul> <p>At least one member of the committee should be from a trial court that uses a marshal for court security services; this is not, however, a separate category of membership.</p> <p>The committee currently has 10 members, including 1 appellate justice, 1 appellate court administrator, 5 trial court judges, and 4 trial court administrators, 1 of whom is a member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee. It does not have a member from the Court Facilities Advisory Committee or from a trial court that uses a marshal.</p>	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> None.	
<p><b>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch.</li> <li>• Advocate for funding to support those functions/existing emergency and security-related programs.</li> </ul>	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, and make additional recommendations as needed.	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Rules of Court, rule 10.61(a), Area of Focus</li> <li>• Goal III. Modernization of Management and Administration               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Objective 3. Improve safety, security—including disaster preparedness—at all court locations for all court users, judicial officers, and staff.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome</u> a. Emergency preparedness and continuity of operations plans and programs in all courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part A: Facilities Infrastructure, Objective 2. Facilitate the acquisition of sites for, and the construction, renovation, maintenance, and expeditious transfer of, court facilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome</u> b. Models and guidelines for acquiring sites for new facilities and maintaining facilities and for transferring existing facilities.</p>	Ongoing, as part of committee's charge	Reports to Judicial Council as needed, which may include recommendations that the council direct its facilities and budget advisory committees on specific or urgent priorities.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><u>Outcome c.</u> Shared practices in place for building courthouses to better meet the needs of all court users and judicial branch staff.</p> <p><u>Outcome d.</u> Funding and operational standards for small construction and renovation projects for the courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 3. Ensure that all technology decisions are compatible with the judicial branch enterprise technology master plan.</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome a.</u> New technologies compatible with and integrated into branchwide infrastructure, including the California Courts Technology Center, telecommunications, security systems, and educational technology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 4. Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcome c.</u> A single point of Internet access to the Judicial Council for the California courts, justice partners, and the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 7. Develop, support, and implement a statewide business continuity and emergency preparedness technology</li> </ul>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>infrastructure—with emphasis on key system features.</p> <p><u>Outcome a.</u> Threat and vulnerability assessment systems/technology funded and in place.</p> <p><u>Outcome b.</u> Funding structure for actual disaster recovery/continuity of operations.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction, rule 10.61.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch.</p>		
2.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit’s Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> </ul>	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as Project 1.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Lack of dedicated funding.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Information and support for the Judicial Council’s facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>		<p>Key Objective Supported: Advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency and security-related programs.</p>		
3.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Trial Court Security Grant Program for trial courts, which provides and maintains systems such as access, camera, duress, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as Project 1.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Lack of dedicated funding.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency and security-related programs.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Information and support for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as Project 1.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Lack of dedicated funding.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency and security-related programs.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Information and support for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Court Security Plans services—specifically, the online planning module in Project 2, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e).</li> </ul>	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as Project 1. Additional Judicial Council Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Rules of Court, rule 10.172, Court Security Plans</li> </ul> <p>Origin of Project: Lack of dedicated funding.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Information and support for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts</li> </ul>		<p>Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency and security-related programs.</p>		
6.	Consider results of the Court Security Advisory Committee survey about the trial courts' security needs and priorities.	2(b)	Same as Project 1.	In progress, June 2017	Information needed to support key objectives.

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit’s Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	<p>December 2016 and ongoing—The committee accomplished what was necessary and possible given the circumstances. The committee’s objective was to advocate for funding to support this program; and it reviewed and played a role in successful submission of the relevant BCP. Because the funding request in the BCP was not approved, there was no discussion regarding spending, and no budget committee discussion related to security funding.</p>
2.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit’s Trial Court Security Grant Program for trial courts, which provides and maintains systems such as access, camera, duress, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	<p>Same as #1.</p> <p>Lead Staff is liaison to Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee, participating in meetings as part of regular duties and involving Chair as needed.</p>
3.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit’s Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	<p>Same as #1.</p> <p>Replacement equipment is still being funded, and staff informed the trial courts that they must pay for years 6–8 of maintenance.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
4.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Court Security Plans services, which involve the online planning module in Project 2, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority.</li> <li>• Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made.</li> <li>• If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.</li> </ul>	Same as #1.
5.	Court Security Advisory Committee survey to obtain information about the trial courts' security needs and priorities.	In progress and ongoing—The Trial Court Security Survey was performed from October to December 2016. To date, a total of 50 responses were received. The results are currently being reviewed and analyzed, and summary results was discussed by the committee at its January 11, 2017, meeting. It was determined that additional time is needed for review and follow up; that will be a 2017 project.

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

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** None.

**CJER Governing Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Theodore Weathers, Judge, Superior Court of San Diego County
<b>Staff:</b>	Karene Alvarado, Supervising Attorney, Center for Judicial Education and Research
<b>Committee's Charge:</b> <b>California Rules of Court, rule 10.50</b> The Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER Governing Committee) makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through comprehensive and quality education and training for judicial officers and other judicial branch personnel. The committee must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Recommend rules, standards, policies, and procedures for judicial branch education;</li><li>(2) Recommend a strategic long-range plan for judicial branch education (last submitted in 2000–2001; since then the committee has been required to submit an annual agenda);</li><li>(3) Evaluate the effectiveness of judicial branch education, the quality of participation, the efficiency of delivery, and the impact on service to the public;</li><li>(4) Review and comment on proposals from other advisory committees and task forces that include education and training of judicial officers or court staff in order to ensure coordination, consistency, and collaboration in educational services;</li><li>(5) Establish educational priorities for implementation of curricula, programs, publications, and delivery systems;</li><li>(6) Identify the need for and appoint education committees to implement the priorities, long-range plan, and programs and products of judicial branch education; create and adopt procedures for their operation; and review and approve their projects and products;</li><li>(7) Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with courts to promote and assure the availability of training at the local court level;</li><li>(8) Identify, analyze, and implement systems to enhance the delivery of education and training statewide; and</li><li>(9) Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with internal and external partners to maximize the resources dedicated to education and training.</li></ol>	

**Advisory Body Membership:**

15 Voting Members

- 9 sitting judicial officers
- 1 appellate court justice
- 5 judicial administrators

Advisory Members:

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

**Subcommittees/Working Groups:**

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

**Committee's Key Objectives for 2017:**

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

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Education Plans</b></p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee will continue to successfully execute the 2016–2018 Education Plan.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i></p> <p>Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i></p> <p>Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i></p> <p>CJER Contact: Karene Alvarado</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i></p> <p>#1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</p>	June 30, 2018	The 2016–2018 Education Plan will be complete on June 30, 2018, and a report will be submitted to the Judicial Council on the execution and completion of this education plan.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	Begin developing the 2018–2020 Education Plan.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i>            Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i>            Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i>            CJER Contact: Karene Alvarado</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i>            # 1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</p>	December 31, 2017	<p>A draft two-year education plan ready to submit to the Judicial Council for review and approval in 2018. This education plan is dependent upon the availability of requisite staff and funding.</p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee will ensure that the recommendations from the Mental Health Implementation Task Force as well as the Language Access Implementation Task Force will be implemented, as appropriate.</p>
3.	Enhance education for experienced judges through the Advanced Judicial Studies Institute, which will contain education on electronic evidence, neuroscience, and other topics of interest to experienced judges.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i>            Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; Objective 3 – Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices</p> <p>Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p>	June 28, 2017	<p>A new, partially grant-funded, multi-day stand-alone program for experienced judicial officers.</p> <p>Because of limited funding, participants will be required to pay for</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project:  Three factors contributed to the establishment of this effort. First, reductions to CJER’s budget and staffing levels over the past several years has had a disproportionate impact on the education dedicated to experienced judges. For example, the phasing out of CJER’s four Continuing Judicial Studies Programs (CJSP) as well as shifting most of the subject matter annual judicial Institutes to a biennial schedule.</p> <p>Second, results from a completed statewide survey to the judiciary on education indicated that there is a patent desire for expanding education for experienced judges.</p> <p>And third, a report from a workgroup appointed by the CJER Governing Committee to examine education provided to experienced judges concluded that a program dedicated to this audience needed to be developed and offered.</p> <p><i>Resources</i>  CJER Contact: Karene Alvarado</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:  1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.</p>		lodging and other costs without reimbursement.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			#3. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.		
4.	Continue the development of a leadership certification program for court leaders. A certification program would (a) support the judicial branch goal of excellence in administration, (b) support succession planning in courts, (c) develop skills and abilities that relate to specific leadership competencies, and (d) build connections between courts.		<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Goal V-Education for Branch wide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff; and Objective 2 – Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Suggested by the Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> CJER Contacts: Rhonda Sharbono, Mary Ann Koory, and Kristine Van Dorsten</p> <p>Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> #4. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>	Draft by February 2018, to be reviewed by CJER Governing Committee and CEAC	<p>Draft leadership certification program, to be reviewed by the CJER Governing Committee and CEAC</p> <p>If approved, implementation of the certification program would commence in calendar year 2018.</p> <p>Any new leadership broadcasts or courses needed for this certification program would be a part of the 2018–2020 Education Plan, using slots already allocated for leadership education.</p>
5.	Monitor and revise education toolkits on CJER Online to accommodate and account for advances in distance		<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional</p>	December 2018	Current and relevant content on the education website CJER Online that

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	mediated education techniques and products.		<p>development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i> Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee's education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER Contact: Mary Ann Koory</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i> #4. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>		continues to meet the needs of judicial officers.

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Education Plans</p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee will continue to successfully execute the 2014–2016 Education Plan and conclude it on June 30, 2016.</p>	<p>Completed</p>
2	<p>Launch the 2016–2018 Education Plan</p>	<p>The CJER Governing Committee continues to oversee the successful execution of the 2014–2016 Education Plan.</p> <p>CJER staff continues to report to the CJER Governing Committee on the progress on and changes to the Education Plan.</p> <p>It is expected that the 2016–2018 education plan will be successfully concluded on June 30, 2018.</p>
3	<p>Enhance education for experienced judges.</p>	<p>An Advanced Judicial Studies Institute is currently being planned. This program will be delivered June 26–28, 2017.</p>
4	<p>Develop and launch new distance mediated education products, such as podcasts and use technology to more effectively enable judges to access and use CJER Online.</p>	<p>Completed and ongoing.</p> <p>Podcasts have been developed, and this work is ongoing. Subscription services to the podcasts have been developed and launched, enabling judges to more effectively access and use CJER Online.</p> <p>CJER plans to use the podcast platform to publicize other distance education products.</p> <p>CJER now offers subscribable toolkit e-mail news alerts, which alert subscribers when new content is added to the toolkits.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
5	Conduct needs assessments for local courts in the area of court staff education, to determine what CJER can directly provide, as well as determining how CJER can assist courts in establishing their own local administrative education.	Completed
6	Expand judicial branch education in the area of unconscious bias.	Completed and ongoing.  Education in the area of unconscious bias is now being offered at all CJER institutes and has also been more fully incorporated into court staff education.
7	Explore the development of a leadership certification program for court leaders. A certification program would (a) support the judicial branch goal of excellence in administration, (b) support succession planning in courts, (c) develop skills and abilities that relate to specific leadership competencies, and (d) build connections between courts.	In progress. A model has been designed for the three levels of certification, and now competencies are being identified for each level and education and experiential learning projects are being mapped out to the competencies.  Expected completion date is June 2018

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

*Subcommittee or working group name:* CJER Curriculum Committees, Judicial College Steering Committee, CJER Online Users Workgroup

*Purpose of subcommittee or working group:* The curriculum committees all have the same broad responsibility to provide the CJER Governing Committee with draft education recommendations for their target audiences in the development of the Education Plan. In addition, the curriculum committees serve on various program and education product workgroups and are consulted on a regular basis regarding any changes or revisions to the education plan that impacts their audiences. The Steering Committee develops the courses and curriculum for the B.E. Witkin Judicial College. The CJER Online Users Workgroup monitors and provides feedback on the education toolkits on CJER Online to accommodate and account for advances in distance mediated education techniques and products.

*Number of members:* Ranging from 7 to 11

*Date formed:* The curriculum committees, Steering Committee, and CJER Online Users Workgroup were formed since 2010 and are standing with rotating membership every year.

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

**Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar, Associate Justice, California Supreme Court
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Olivia Lawrence, Principal Manager; Mr. Douglas G. Denton, Supervising Analyst; Ms. Elizabeth Tam-Helmuth, Analyst, Court Operations Services
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> The Judicial Council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force supports the California judicial branch’s efforts to implement the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i> (adopted by the Judicial Council on January 22, 2015, and developed by the Joint Working Group for California’s Language Access Plan between 2013 and 2015). To support its implementation mission, the Task Force advises the Chief Justice and the Judicial Council, and includes representatives of key stakeholders in the provision of language access services in the courts — including, but not limited to, judicial officers, court administrators, court interpreters, legal services providers, and community representatives. The Task Force's charge is to turn the Language Access Plan into a practical roadmap for courts by helping the branch achieve full implementation in all 58 superior courts. Additional responsibilities of the task force include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create an implementation plan for the Language Access Plan to present to the Judicial Council and to guide the work of the Task Force and the courts to make the strategic plan a reality;</li> <li>• Develop cost estimates of implementing the recommendations;</li> <li>• Assess the feasibility of the phasing process outlined in the plan based upon resources available and adjust where necessary based on operational feasibility and resource availability;</li> <li>• Propose rules of court, forms, and Judicial Council–sponsored legislation for the council and its internal committees to consider;</li> <li>• Create and distribute work products (including bench guides, tool kits, and others);</li> <li>• Coordinate with related advisory groups on implementation efforts where appropriate; and</li> <li>• Develop mechanisms to oversee and monitor the implementation of the plan.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b> There are a total of 26 current Task Force members, representing the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Supreme Court Justice</li> <li>• 4 Appellate Court Justices</li> <li>• 7 Trial Court Judicial Officers</li> <li>• 5 Court Administrators</li> <li>• 3 Court Interpreters</li> <li>• 3 Legal Services Representatives</li> <li>• 3 Community Representatives</li> </ul>	

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** The Task Force has established four ad hoc subcommittees: Budget and LAP Monitoring; Technological Solutions; Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts; and Language Access Education and Standards.

**Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2017:**

The [\*Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts\*](#) (hereafter “Language Access Plan” or “LAP”) contains 75 recommendations that enumerate the policies and operational changes that will make comprehensive language access a reality in the California courts. Forty-seven (47) of the LAP recommendations are designated as Phase 1 recommendations (meaning that the recommendation should already be in place or work to implement it should have commenced in 2015). An additional 23 of the LAP recommendations are designated as Phase 2 recommendations (meaning that work to implement these recommendations should begin no later than 2016 or 2017). The Task Force is coordinating its work with related advisory groups and Judicial Council staff on implementation efforts. In addition to developing and providing cost estimates for the council regarding LAP implementation, the implementation process also includes the monitoring and updating of the plan, as the trial courts and other stakeholders provide information, feedback, suggestions and innovative solutions.

To support implementation of LAP recommendations as quickly and effectively as possible, the Task Force assigned each of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations to one of four Task Force Ad Hoc Subcommittees. (Additionally, the Task Force has assigned certain Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations regarding court interpreter issues [#9, #43, #64, #69, #70, #73 and #75] to the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel and/or the Court Interpreters Program for implementation.) The Task Force last met in person on January 30, 2017. During that meeting, the Subcommittees discussed progress and presented their initial plans for 2017 priority projects (described in Section II below) drawn from among the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The following are the Task Force’s major objectives for 2017, organized by Task Force Subcommittee:

- 1. Budget and LAP Monitoring** (Chaired by Judge Steve Austin): This Subcommittee is charged with supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding funding and monitoring. A major priority among these is securing adequate funding for expanded use of court interpreters in civil cases and for all court-ordered, court-operated programs, services and events. Other key objectives of the subcommittee include developing Rules of Court to codify a statewide complaint process, and working with courts and language access stakeholders to develop and implement recruitment strategies that will help expand the pool of qualified bilingual staff and court interpreters. Objectives for 2017 also include developing recommendations for a 2018–2019 Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for presentation to the council that would increase court and Judicial Council funding in the upcoming fiscal year (2018–2019) in order to help support ongoing LAP implementation.
- 2. Technological Solutions** (Chaired by Associate Justice Terrence Bruiniers): This Subcommittee is responsible for supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding technology, including 1) data collection to identify language access needs, and 2) appropriate use of video-remote technology. Major objectives for 2017 include a review of case information systems for language service tracking, and the launch of a Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) pilot program for use with spoken-language court interpreters. This pilot will help the branch gather data regarding successful VRI court practices (including due process issues, participant satisfaction, and effectiveness of available technologies) and establish minimum technical guidelines for appropriate use of VRI with spoken-language court interpreters.

- 3. Translation, Signage, and Tools for Courts\*** (Chaired by Associate Justice Laurie Zelon and Mr. Jose Varela): This Subcommittee will support implementation of LAP recommendations regarding translation, signage and other tools to assist the trial courts and limited English proficient (LEP) court users, including development of templates for multilingual signs and notices, benchcards for judicial officers, and translation protocols. Major objectives for 2017 include continuing refinement of the Language Access Toolkit hosted on the California Courts public web page, which includes resources for courts such as I-Speak cards and multilingual signs and templates. The Subcommittee will also be researching and recommending policies and best practices for providing language access services when bilingual staff are unavailable and when court-mandated services are provided outside of the courtroom.
- 4. Language Access Education and Standards** (Chaired by Judge Janet Gaard and Ms. Ana Maria Garcia): This Subcommittee is charged with supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding language access education and standards, including education and standards to assist judges, court staff and court interpreters with successful implementation of LAP policies and procedures, and creation of multilingual videos to assist LEP court users with navigating the court system. Major objectives for 2017 include development and enhancement of existing course content and development of new educational programs and products that will enhance judicial branch training regarding the Language Access Plan.

\* The Language Access Plan recommended that the Judicial Council create a translation committee to develop and formalize a translation protocol for Judicial Council translation of forms, written materials, and audiovisual tools (see LAP Recommendation #36). The Task Force's Translation, Signage, and Tools for Courts Subcommittee is serving in and fulfilling that function for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of LAP implementation, and the Subcommittee and Task Force Chairs will recommend to the council at a future date whether an ongoing and separate translation committee should be established.

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Develop and complete a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for 2018–2019 to increase trial court and Judicial Council funding to support LAP implementation.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations # 8 (Expansion of court interpreters to all civil proceedings); #56 (Advocacy for sufficient funding).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Budget Services; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch; Task Force Consultant, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	September 2017 for 2018–2019 BCP; ongoing for future BCPs.	BCP for 2018–2019.
2.	<p>Develop and complete a detailed work plan and cost estimates for full LAP implementation.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations # 8 (Expansion of court interpreters to all civil proceedings); #10 (Provision of qualified interpreters in all court-ordered/court-operated proceedings); #28 (Recruitment of bilingual staff);</p>	Ongoing. As of June 2016, the NCSC, in consultation with the subcommittee, developed rough cost estimates regarding implementation of the	BCP requests will be ongoing to help support LAP implementation.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>#56 (Advocacy for sufficient funding); #58 (Pursuit by the Judicial Council of other funding opportunities); #59 (Pursuit by courts of other funding opportunities); #60 (Language Access Implementation Task Force).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Budget Services; Task Force Consultant (NCSC).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	<p>various LAP recommendations, in order to assist with future BCPs and other funding requests.</p>	
3.	<p>Develop and complete a statewide complaint form and process, including interaction with local trial court complaint processes.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #62 (Single complaint form); #63 (Complaints at local level regarding language access services).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services; Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO); Task Force Consultant (NCSC).</p>	<p>January 2018 for related rules of court. In September 2016, the Task Force distributed a model complaint form and procedures to courts and posted these documents to the Language Access Toolkit. A draft Invitation to Comment (ITC) regarding related rules has been submitted to RUPRO for the January 2018</p>	<p>New rules of court for the January 2018 rules cycle.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objective Supported: Objective 1	rules cycle. If approved by RUPRO, the ITC will go out for public comment between February 27 and April 28, 2017.	
4.	<p>Adoption of relevant portions of the LAP by the California Supreme Court and California Courts of Appeal.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring; Appellate Courts Working Group</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #67 (Adoption of Language Access Plan by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services; California Supreme Court and California Courts of Appeal.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	June 2018. The Task force approved a report with recommendations in October 2016. The Task Force plans to submit a report on these recommendations to the Judicial Council in 2017, with a supplemental report regarding implementation status to be presented to the council at a future meeting.	Adoption of relevant portions of the LAP by the California Supreme Court and California Courts of Appeal. The Task Force will provide additional oversight and assistance regarding implementation.
5.	Work with courts, educational providers, community-based organizations, and interpreter organizations to develop and implement recruitment strategies, including consideration of market conditions, to encourage bilingual individuals to pursue the interpreting profession or	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #49 (Recruitment strategies for language access providers).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services</p>	Ongoing. The Task Force submitted a BCP in 2016 to garner additional resources. The Court Interpreters Program (CIP) is currently developing a statewide recruitment initiative. The NCSC is assisting the CIP regarding affirmation	<p>Development and implementation of recruitment strategies to increase the pool of qualified bilingual staff and court interpreters.</p> <p>Garner additional resources to support the Judicial Council and</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>employment opportunities in the courts as bilingual staff.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>		<p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	<p>and refinement of recruitment strategies, along with strategies to help near-passers of the bilingual interpreting exam.</p>	<p>local courts in these efforts.</p>
6.	<p>Sponsor legislation to amend Government Code section 68560.5(a) and Civil Code of Procedure section 116.550 dealing with court interpreters in small claims actions.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #71 (Legislation to delete exception for small claims proceedings); #72 (Legislation to require credentialed interpreters for small claims).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Governmental Affairs; Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee; Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	<p>January 2019. The Task Force approved proposed statutory amendments at its October 2016 meeting. The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee requested that the Task Force delay this legislation for one year (to take effect in 2019, instead of 2018). The Task Force and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee plan to submit a joint proposal to PCLC in Fall 2017.</p>	<p>Revised statutes for 2019.</p>
7.	<p>Develop recommendations to expand the existing formal regional coordination system to improve efficiencies in interpreter scheduling for court proceedings and cross-assignments between courts throughout the state, and</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #20 (Expansion of regional coordination system) and #21 (Methods for calendaring and coordination of court interpreters).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p>	<p>December 2017. The NCSC is assisting the Judicial Council regarding development of recommendations for this project.</p>	<p>Recommendations regarding expansion of the cross-assignment system, and methods for calendaring and coordination of court interpreters.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>methods for calendaring and coordination of court interpreters.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>		<p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services; Court Interpreters Advisory Panel; Task Force Consultant (NCSC)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>		
8.	<p>Develop a new Judicial Council policy stating that, when and where appropriate, new or revised Judicial Council forms should include a data field regarding court user language access needs to (1) assist courts with early identification of LEP court users and (2) ensure that LEP court users receive appropriate language access services; also ensure that the proposed data fields would also be transferable to hot docs or perhaps case management systems.</p> <p><i>Subcommittees: Budget and LAP Monitoring and Technological Solutions</i></p>	2b	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #68 (Implementation Task Force to evaluate need for updates to rules and statutes).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services, Information Technology (IT), and Legal Services; RUPRO</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objectives 1 and 2</p>	December 2017	New Judicial Council policy regarding need for Judicial Council forms to identify language access needs to help courts with early identification of LEP court users.
9.	<p>Evaluate existing law, including a study of any negative impacts of the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act on the</p>	2b	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #74 (Evaluation of Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act).</p>	January 2020. Due to the scope of the Act, this review and development of any recommendations is	Recommendations regarding any proposed changes to the Trial Court Interpreter

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>provision of appropriate language access services. The evaluation should include, but not be limited to, whether any modifications should be proposed for existing requirements and limitations on hiring independent contractors beyond a specified number of days.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>		<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services, Human Resources, Legal Services, and Governmental Affairs; Court Interpreters Advisory Panel; RUPRO</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	likely to be a long-term project.	Employment and Labor Relations Act.
10.	<p>Design and conduct a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot with spoken-language court interpreters in up to ten courts, and collect relevant data.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #16 (Pilot for video remote interpreting).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT, Human Resources (Labor and Employee Relations Unit) and other offices, as appropriate, with expertise in technology, interpreting (including remote interpreting), and court-wide operations; members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel as needed for additional input and consultation.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>	March 2018 for report on pilot progress, including data report. The VRI pilot will commence in three courts in 2017.	VRI pilot and report on data collected.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
11.	<p>Develop and establish guidelines for VRI with spoken-language court interpreters, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i></p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations #12 (Preference for in-person interpreters); #13 (Remote interpreting in the courtroom); #14 (Remote interpreting minimum technology requirements); and #15 (Use of video for remote interpreting).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT, Human Resources (Labor and Employee Relations Unit), and other offices, as appropriate, with expertise in technology, interpreting (including remote interpreting), and court-wide operations; members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel as needed for additional input and consultation.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>	March 2018 for report on guidelines, including minimum technology requirements. The VRI pilot will commence in three courts in 2017.	VRI for spoken language guidelines, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements, functional guidelines, and training guidelines
12.	<p>Establish (1) guidelines for courts to early identify language access needs and document the needs in their case management system and/or case record or file; (2) guidelines to track provision or denial of language access services and document same in</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations #1 (Language access needs identification); #2 (Requests for language services); #3 (Protocol for justice partners to communicate language needs); and #4 (Mechanisms for LEP court users to self-identify).</p>	June 2018 for guidelines and protocols. This project is likely to require ongoing updates to case management systems including future upgrades.	Guidelines regarding documenting language access needs identification and requests for language services; protocols for justice partners to communicate LEP

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>their case management system and/or case record or file; and (3) protocols for justice partners to early communicate LEP court user language needs to the court.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i></p>		<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT; as appropriate, staff in Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts (CFCC) to help and consult regarding preliminary guidelines or protocols.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>		<p>court user language needs to the court.</p>
13.	<p>Provide a glossary of terms in plain language and translated into eight languages for the most common and relevant signs likely to be used in a courthouse, and provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized symbols to limit need for text.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendation #39 (Provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized symbols to limit need for text)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC and Capital Program.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>	June 2017	<p>A glossary of signage terms that are used in most courthouses have been edited for plain language and translated into eight languages, for placement on the Toolkit. The glossary will also recommend icons, as appropriate.</p>
14.	<p>Develop best practices for courts to follow to ensure LEP court users obtain adequate language access services when bilingual staff are not available.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendation #29 (Develop written procedures to help LEP court users when bilingual staff not available)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p>	June 2017	<p>Best practices for courts, including sample language for written procedures and protocols to follow when bilingual staff unavailable. Best practices to take into account different</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC; Task Force Consultant (NCSC)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>		<p>approaches depending on point of contact in courthouse.</p>
15.	<p>Develop a policy for the sharing of bilingual staff and certified and registered court interpreters among courts, using remote technologies, for language assistance outside of court proceedings.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendation #30 (Judicial Council to consider adopting policies that promote sharing of bilingual staff for language assistance outside of court proceedings)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>	June 2017	<p>A policy for consideration by the Judicial Council to increase the availability of language access services in court-mandated services outside of the courtroom through the use of technology.</p>
16.	<p>Identify multilingual standardized videos to assist court users, and update existing online course (“Interpreter Orientation: Working in the California Courts”) for new and prospective interpreters.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #44 (Online orientation for new interpreters); #18 (Creation of multilingual standardized videos).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CJER; Task Force Consultant (NCSC).</p>	<p>June 2017 to evaluate cost of dubbing existing video into additional languages. December 2017 for updates to online course for new interpreter orientation.</p>	<p>Evaluate cost of dubbing existing video into additional languages and determine whether sufficient resources exist to proceed.</p> <p>Update existing online course (“Interpreter Orientation: Working in the California Courts”) for new and</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objective Supported: Objective 4		Prospective interpreters
17.	<p>NCSC to conduct a survey of the courts identifying different points of contact at their courts, and the level of service required, to help define language proficiency standards for bilingual staff.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>	1	<p>See LAP Recommendation #26 (Identification of critical points of contact).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: Task Force Consultant (NCSC).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	June 2017 for language proficiency standards regarding bilingual staff at different points of contact with the courts.	Evaluate recommendations for language proficiency standards regarding bilingual staff at different points of contact with the courts.
18.	<p>Define standards for bilingual staff; identify existing and develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #47 (Language proficiency standards for bilingual staff); #48 (Standards and online training for bilingual staff); #45 (Training for prospective interpreters); #46 (Training for interpreters on civil cases and remote interpreting).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/2015).</p> <p>Resources: CJER; Task Force Consultant (NCSC).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	June 2017 for identification of existing training programs and development needs for new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.	Based on points of contact and course needs identification, Judicial Council staff will develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters in FY 2017–2018.

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Develop and complete a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for 2017–2018 to increase trial court and Judicial Council funding to support LAP implementation.	Completed. The Task Force submitted a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for FY 2017–2018 to Department of Finance in September 2016.
2	Develop and complete a detailed work plan and cost estimates for full LAP implementation.	Ongoing. As of June 2016, the NCSC, in consultation with the subcommittee, developed rough cost estimates regarding implementation of the various LAP recommendations to assist with future BCPs and other funding requests.
3	Develop and complete a statewide complaint form and process, including interaction with local trial court complaint processes.	January 2018 for related rules of court. In September 2016, a model complaint form and procedures were distributed to courts and posted to the Language Access Toolkit. A draft Invitation to Comment (ITC) regarding related rules has been submitted to RUPRO for the January 2018 rules cycle. If approved by RUPRO, the ITC will go out for public comment between February 27 and April 28, 2017.
4	Adoption of LAP by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court.	June 2018. The Task Force approved a report with recommendations in October 2016. The Task Force plans to submit a report on these recommendations to the Judicial Council in 2017, with a supplemental report regarding implementation status to be presented to the council at a future meeting.
5	Work with courts, educational providers, community-based organizations, and interpreter organizations to develop and implement recruitment strategies, including consideration of market conditions, to encourage bilingual individuals to pursue the interpreting profession or employment opportunities in the courts as bilingual staff.	Ongoing. A BCP was submitted in 2016 to garner additional resources. Judicial Council staff is currently developing a statewide recruitment initiative. The NCSC is assisting the Court Interpreters Program (CIP) regarding affirmation and refinement of recruitment strategies, along with strategies to help near-passers of the bilingual interpreting exam.
6	Provide guidance to courts regarding review of data beyond the U.S. Census, such as school systems, health departments, county social services, and local community-based agencies, to help courts anticipate the numbers and languages of likely LEP court users.	Completed. In December 2016, the Task Force compiled a list of data resources for courts, which will be posted soon on the Judicial Resources Network. Judicial Council staff will periodically review and update the data resources document.

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
7	Sponsor legislation to amend Government Code section 68560.5(a) and Civil Code of Procedure section 116.550 dealing with court interpreters in small claims actions.	January 2019. The Task Force approved proposed statutory amendments at its October 2016 meeting. The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee requested that we delay this legislation for one year (to take effect in 2019, instead of 2018). The Task Force and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee plan to resubmit a joint proposal to PCLC in Fall 2017.
8	Develop a new Judicial Council policy stating that when and where appropriate, new or revised Judicial Council forms should include a data field regarding court user language access needs to (1) assist courts with early identification of LEP court users and (2) ensure that LEP court users receive appropriate language access services; also ensure that the proposed data fields would also be transferable to hot docs or perhaps case management systems.	December 2017.
9	Design, plan for and conduct a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot with spoken-language court interpreters in up to ten courts, and collect relevant data.	March 2018 for report on pilot progress, including data report. The VRI pilot will commence in three courts in 2017.
10	Develop and establish guidelines for VRI with spoken-language court interpreters, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements.	March 2018 for report on guidelines, including minimum technology requirements. The VRI pilot will commence in three courts in 2017.
11	Establish (1) guidelines for courts to early identify language access needs and document the needs in their case management system and/or case record or file; (2) guidelines to track provision or denial of language access services and document same in their case management system and/or case record or file; and (3) protocols for justice partners to early communicate LEP court user language needs to the court.	June 2018 for guidelines and protocols. This project is likely to require ongoing updates to case management systems including future upgrades.
12	Develop budget and cost estimates, including staffing needs, for maintaining and improving the Language Access Toolkit, which is hosted on the California Courts public web page.	Completed. On December 31, 2015, the Language Access Toolkit went live on the California Courts website ( <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/lap-toolkit-courts.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/lap-toolkit-courts.htm</a> ).
13	Develop and share translation protocols.	Completed June 2016.
14	Establish guidelines regarding use of bilingual volunteers.	Draft completed and circulated in June 2016. Currently awaiting bilingual employee guidelines to ensure concordance before finalizing.

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
15	Research and recommend best practices for design of court facilities to ensure that any modification to existing court design, or any new plans for court design, includes, promotes and ensures language access for LEP court users.	Completed December 2016.
16	Develop a policy to promote sharing of bilingual staff among courts and written procedures for courts to follow when bilingual staff are not available.	Due June 2017.
17	Develop and enhance existing course content and develop new educational programs that will enhance judicial branch training regarding the Language Access Plan.	Completed. The Judicial Council, at its June 24, 2016, meeting, adopted a Bench Card: Working with Court Interpreters; a Resource Outline for judicial officers; and training curricula outlines for judicial officers and court staff. These materials expressly address LAP Recommendations # 22–24, 50, 52, and are available to judges, subordinate judicial officers and court staff on CJER Online. The Bench Card is also handed out at all of CJER’s live statewide judicial education programs. Judicial and court staff education in this area is ongoing.
18	Identify multilingual standardized videos to assist court users, and update existing online course (“Interpreter Orientation: Working in the California Courts”) for new and prospective interpreters.	June 2017 to evaluate cost of dubbing existing video into additional languages. December 2017 for updates to online course for new interpreter orientation.
19	NCSC to conduct a survey of the courts identifying different points of contact at their courts and the level of service required to help define language proficiency standards for bilingual staff.	June 2017 for language proficiency standards regarding bilingual staff at different points of contact with the courts.
20	Define standards for bilingual staff; identify existing and develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.	December 2017 for identification of existing training programs and development needs for new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.

## Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

*Subgroup or working group name:* Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding funding and monitoring.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 9

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

*Date formed:* May 2015

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 3–4 times per year

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* In 2017, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

*Subgroup or working group name:* Technological Solutions Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding technology.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 7

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

*Date formed:* May 2015

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 3–4 times per year

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* In 2017, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

*Subgroup or working group name:* Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding translation, signage and other tools to assist the trial courts and LEP court users.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 7

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 1 ad hoc member with expertise in developing recommendations and best practices relating to building design, signage and wayfinding strategies.

*Date formed:* May 2015

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 3–4 times per year

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* In 2017, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

*Subgroup or working group name:* Language Access Education and Standards

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding language access education and standards.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 7

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 2 ad hoc members with expertise in developing training for court interpreters and bilingual staff.

*Date formed:* May 2015

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* 3–4 times per year

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* In 2017, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

**Upcoming Meetings of the Task Force:** *To conduct its charge, including conduct of community outreach meetings regarding LAP implementation, the Task Force requests that the Council support its plan to hold the following in-person meetings in 2017:*

- *Community Outreach Meeting – March 14, 2017*
- *In-Person Meeting – June 13, 2017 (tentative)*
- *In-Person Meeting – TBD (September or October 2017)*

**Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**

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

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Earl Johnson, (Ret.)
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Bonnie Hough, Managing Attorney; Ms. Laural Ayala, Administrative Coordinator Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> This committee is required by Government Code section 68651(b)(5) in order to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Assem. Bill 590 [Feuer]; Stats. 2009 ch. 457). The act requires the Judicial Council to develop one or more model pilot projects in selected courts for three-year periods. The projects will provide legal representation to low-income parties on critical legal issues affecting basic human needs. At the direction of the Judicial Council, the implementation committee will make recommendations on which pilot projects will be selected and provide input into the design of the pilot projects evaluations, which are required by the authorizing legislation.	
<b>Advisory Body's Membership:</b> There are 14 members, including 1 appellate justice; 2 retired justices; 1 retired judge, 1 State Bar representative, 3 legal aid attorneys, 2 private attorneys; 2 academics, 1 representative to the Chamber of Commerce, and 1 former legislative staff member.	
<b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> None	
<b>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:</b> Continue to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel pilot project including final evaluation of first set of grants and make recommendations to the Judicial Council for next set of three year grants.	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Research and data collection</b> Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Supports Strategic Goal II and III, Independency and Accountability and Modernization of Management and Administration, as well as Operational Plan Object 4, “Measure and regularly report branch performance...” and Operational Plan Objective 2, “Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.”</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code section 68651 requirement that evaluation of the pilot projects must be submitted to Legislature on or before January 31, 2016.</p> <p>Resources: Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts Staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act</p>	Ongoing	Final report of first phase to be submitted to Judicial Council in July 2017. Continuing evaluation to be conducted for new set of grants.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sub>2</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p><b>Implementation of pilot projects</b>            Make grant recommendations to the Judicial Council for third round of grants.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:            Supports Strategic Goal I, Access, Fairness and Diversity: As well as Operational Plan Objective 4: Expand the Availability of Legal Assistance, Advice and Representation for Litigants with Limited Financial Means.</p> <p>Origin of Project:            Government Code section 68651 requirement to establish pilot projects.</p> <p>Resources:            Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts Staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:            Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.</p>	On-going	<p>Present recommendations to the Judicial Council for its July 2017 meeting. Continue monitoring grants awarded which provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.</p>

**III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:**

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<b>Research and data collection</b> Submit report to the Legislature on January 31, 2016, and continue evaluation of programs.	Initial report was submitted to the Legislature on January 31, 2016. Comprehensive evaluation was ongoing.
2	<b>Implementation of pilot projects</b> Continue monitoring grants awarded which provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.	Ongoing

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

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** None

**Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Glenn County
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
<b>Staff:</b>	Mr. Jagan Singh, Manager, Real Estate and Facilities Management
<p><b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> The committee makes recommendations to the council on facilities modifications, maintenance, and operations; environmental services; and utility management.</p> <p>In addition to this charge, the committee has the following duties (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.65(b)):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Makes recommendations to the council on policy issues, business practices, and budget monitoring and control for all facility-related matters in existing branch facilities.</li><li>(2) Makes recommendations to the council on funding and takes additional action in accordance with council policy, both for facility modifications and for operations and maintenance.</li><li>(3) Collaborates with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee in the development of the capital program, including providing input to design standards, prioritization of capital projects, and methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost.</li><li>(4) Provides quarterly and annual reports on the facilities modification program in accordance with the council policy. (The policy referred to is contained in the <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Policy</i> adopted by the council.)</li></ol>	

Advisory Body's Membership: The committee consists of members from the following categories: Trial court judges (5) and court executive officers (4). The committee includes the chair and the vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee as non-voting members.

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

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** None

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:**

- Implement Rule 10.65 – Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC)
- Implement Policy – Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy;
- Implement Charge – Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge; and
- Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs.
- Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy
- Implementation and evaluation of an update to the Seismic data set developed during the Transfer Process
- Increase and implement water conservation and energy efficiency efforts and best practices

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) provides continuous review of proposed facility modification projects that have been identified as potential projects by judges, court staff, regional service providers, VFA, Inc. (an asset management software), and Judicial Council staff. These potential projects are evaluated by the Judicial Council’s Real Estate and Facilities Management staff and are evaluated using specific criteria pursuant to the Judicial Council policy and then presented for review to the advisory committee.</p> <p>Judicial Council staff and the TCFMAC meet in-person or via teleconference every 30 to 60 days to review the proposed projects. The advisory committee does not always agree with staff recommendations and does not always agree with staff application of specific criteria resulting in the prioritization. The proposed project list is reviewed and upon concurrence of the advisory</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 4.C and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM) and Capital Programs (CP)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> </ul>	Ongoing	<p>Facility modifications are reviewed and either accepted or denied by the advisory committee.</p> <p>Approved projects receive funding allocations and then staff executes the projects.</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	committee, projects are either approved or denied for execution by staff.				
2.	<p>TCFMAC provides ongoing oversight to judicial branch facilities operations and maintenance spending via annual budget allocation approval and re-evaluation as needed throughout the year.</p> <p>The committee also provides recommendations to the Judicial Council on facilities funding-related issues and policies.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM and Capital Programs CP</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>• Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs</li> </ul>	Ongoing	Justify the ongoing operations and maintenance expenditures and submit annual budget allocation proposal in addition to policy proposals as needed.
3.	As of December 14, 2012, the advisory committee is responsible for providing ongoing oversight of policy issues related to the operations and maintenance of existing facilities, noncapital-related real estate transactions, energy management, and	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM and CP</p>	Ongoing	Justify the ongoing operating expenses of the Judicial Council’s existing building portfolio and assist the Capital Programs with design input that will reduce the long-term

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>environmental management and sustainability. Typical duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the Judicial Council Preventive Maintenance Plan</li> <li>• Support the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) in the development of the capital program with an emphasis on design methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost.</li> <li>• Implement an energy management plan that will leverage utility rebates, energy saving materials, and other energy conservation tasks to make the California courts as sustainable as possible.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>• Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs</li> <li>• Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure</li> <li>• Implementation and evaluation of an update to the Seismic data set developed during the Transfer Process</li> <li>• Increase and implement water conservation and energy efficiency efforts and best practices</li> </ul>		<p>operating and maintenance cost of future facilities.</p>
4.	<p>The advisory committee will submit the following <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Reports</i> to the Judicial Council as information only items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2016–2017</i> in December 2016. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 4.F</i> and <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM</p>	<p>Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s December 2016 (Q1), March 2017 (Q2), May 2017 (Q3), and</p>	<p>Provide an information only report to the Judicial Council detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding in the specified quarter.</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>committee for the months of July 2016, August 2016, and September 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Quarter 2 of Fiscal Year 2016–2017</i> in March 2017. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of October 2016, November 2016, and December 2016.</li> <li>• <i>Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2016–2017</i> in May 2017. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of January 2017, February 2017, and March 2017.</li> <li>• <i>Quarter 4 of Fiscal Year 2016–2017</i> in September 2017. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of April 2017, May 2017, and June 2017.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> </ul>	September 2017 (Q4) meetings.	
5.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year 2017–2018</i> to the Judicial Council as an action item in July 2017.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 4.D and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM</p>	Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s July 2017 meeting	Request the Judicial Council review the facility modification and operations and maintenance budget report for fiscal year 2017–2018. If approved,

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>• Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs</li> </ul>		staff will implement the budget.
6.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2016–2017</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in December 2017.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 4.E and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Judicial Council direction</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> </ul>	Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council’s December 2017 meeting	Provide the Judicial Council a report detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding from the past fiscal year.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs</li> </ul>		
7.	<p>Develop and propose concepts for consideration for the branch Budget Change Proposals (BCPs). Submittal to the Judicial Council in July 2017.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Operational Plan Objective</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed by REFM management team</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM and Budget Services</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs</li> </ul>	Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council’s July 2017 meeting	Increase funding allocations for the facility modification and operations and maintenance programs.
8.	<p>Complete Energy Efficiency Requests for Proposal and initiate projects to utilize \$10 million allocation. Initiate 13 water conservation projects.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed by REFM management team</p>	To be completed by July 2017	Execute projects thereby reducing utility usage and costs.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Resources:</b> REFM and local energy and water purveyors</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>• Increase and implement water conservation and energy efficiency efforts and best practices</li> </ul>		
9.	Refine Judicial Council database of court building seismic risk assessments; and develop tools for identifying potential mitigation projects.	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 2.A and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Original study completed in 2003 as requirement for court facilities transfers</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM and CP</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>• Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> </ul>	Database report to be completed February 2017	Updated seismic risk assessment database.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation and evaluation of an update to the Seismic data set developed during the Transfer Process</li> </ul>		
10.	Finalize the Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy (formerly <i>Trial Court Methodology for Prioritizing and Ranking Facility Modifications</i> ).	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Operational Plan Objective</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> To be proposed REFM</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> REFM, and Legal Services</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i></li> <li>Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i></li> <li>Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i></li> <li>Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure</li> </ul>	To be completed before July 2017	Update guidelines to align with updated Facility Modification Policy.

**III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:**

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Advisory Committee Meetings	Ongoing
2.	Operations and Maintenance Oversight	Ongoing
3.	REFM Program Oversight	Ongoing
4.	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarters 1–4 of Fiscal Year 2015–2016	Reports submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on December 11, 2015 (Q1); February 26, 2016 (Q2); June 24, 2016 (Q3); and August 26, 2016 (Q4)
5.	Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year 2016–2017	Judicial Council reviewed and approved the budget report on August 26, 2016
6.	Court Facilities: Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2015–2016	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on December 16, 2016
7.	Budget: Fiscal Year 2017–2018 Budget Requests for Trial Court Facilities Operations Needs	Completed August 26, 2016. BCPs were denied by Department of Finance
8.	Finalization of the Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure	Continued review; project completion extended to April 2017
9.	Revision to the Court-Funded Facilities Request (CFR) procedure/policy	Policy approved by Judicial Council on August 26, 2016

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

<p><b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> None</p>
--

**Tribal Court–State Court Forum (forum)**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

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

**Advisory Body's Membership:**

Twenty-nine positions—29 members representing the following categories:

- Thirteen tribal court judges (nominated by their tribal leadership, representing 13 of the 23 tribal courts currently operating in California; these courts serve approximately 39 tribes)
- Director of the California Attorney General's Office of Native American Affairs (ex officio)
- Tribal Advisor to the California Governor (ex officio)
- One appellate justice
- Seven chairs or their designees of the following Judicial Council advisory committees:
  - Access and Fairness Advisory Committee
  - Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER)
  - Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
  - Criminal Law Advisory Committee
  - Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
  - Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee
  - Traffic Advisory Committee
- Five trial court judicial officers (selected from local courts in counties where tribal courts are situated and one from Los Angeles\*)
- One retired judge (advisory)

\*Judge D. Zeke Zeidler, who was originally appointed as the designee of the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, is finishing out his term, which expires on September 14, 2017.

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** None

**Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2017:**

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

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>A. Legislation</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA): Review newly adopted <i>Regulations for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings</i> (as published in the Federal Register on March 20, 2015 (Vol. 80 FR No. 54 14880) approved Bureau of Indian Affairs Guidelines (as published in the Federal Register on December, 30, 2016 (Vol. 81 FR No. 251 96476), and statewide Indian Child Welfare Task Force Report on the Indian Child Welfare for possible recommendations to the Judicial Council for sponsored legislation or legislative positions on bills</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability. Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Operational Plan Objective 5</p>	January 1, 2019	Recommendations submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration by the Legislature and the Governor.

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>that will be introduced to comply with the federal law.</p> <p>(ii) Judge-to-Judge Communications: Develop legislative proposal modeled after California Code of Civil Procedure section 1740, which authorizes a state court, after notice to all parties, to attempt to resolve any issues raised regarding a tribal court judgment by contacting the tribal court judge who issued the judgment. The proposal would also require a court to permit the parties to participate in the judge-to-judge communication and to prepare a record of any communication with the tribal court.</p> <p>(iii) Make recommendation to implement a streamlined process to recognize and enforce non-money judgments issued by a tribal court (incremental strategy building on the success of council-sponsored legislation, SB 406, see page 16 for status of project).</p> <p>(iv) Explore use of state funding in connection with the service of process or notices for state court domestic violence restraining</p>	2	<p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence Operational Plan Objective 4</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum</p> <p>Resources: Forum and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC)</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts (CFCC) and Governmental Affairs</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	orders to pay for service of tribal protection orders.				
2.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation: B. Rules and Forms – ICWA</b></p> <p>Review newly adopted <i>Regulations for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings</i> (as published in the Federal Register on March 20, 2015, (Vol. 80 FR No. 54 14880) and approved Bureau of Indian Affairs Guidelines (as published in the Federal Register on December, 30, 2016, (Vol. 81 FR No. 251 96476) for possible amendments to Title 5. Family and Juvenile rules relating to the ICWA.</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Operational Plan Objective 5</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Operational Plan Objective 4</p> <p>Origin of Project: Federal Law</p> <p>Resources: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC and Legal Services (LS)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	January 1, 2018	Rule and form recommendations that comply with federal rules and guidelines implementing ICWA
3.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation: C. Rule and Forms – Juvenile Records</b></p> <p>Revise California Rules of Court, rule 5.552 to conform to the requirements of subdivision (f) of section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, which was added effective January 1, 2015, to clarify the right of an Indian child’s tribe to have access to the</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Operational Plan Objective 5</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Operational Plan Objective 4</p> <p>Origin of Project: Justice partners have commented that the rule is</p>	January 1, 2018	Rule recommendations that comply with statute.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	juvenile court file of a case involving that child. At that time, no changes were made to California Rules of Court, rule 5.552, which implements section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. Contrary to section 827 as amended, rule 5.552, continues to require that representatives of an Indian child's tribe petition the juvenile court if the tribe wants access to the juvenile court file. This inconsistency has created confusion.		<p>contrary to statute and has created confusion.</p> <p>Resources: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC and LS</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>		
4.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation: D. Rule and Forms – Child Support</b></p> <p>Revise California Rule of Court, rule 5.372 in response to the need for consistent procedures for determining the orderly transfer of title IV-D child support cases from the state court to the tribal court when there is concurrent subject matter jurisdiction. Since implementation of the rule of court, over 40 cases have been considered for transfer between the state courts in Humboldt and Del Norte counties and the Yurok Tribal Court. The Yurok Tribe intends to seek transfer of cases currently under the jurisdiction of state court in the</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Operational Plan Objective 5</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Operational Plan Objective 4</p> <p>Origin of Project: This proposal grew out of the cross-court educational exchange convened by Judge Abinanti and Judge Wilson. Representatives of the State Department of Child Support Services, local county child support agencies, the tribal child support program, the tribal court, the state</p>	January 1, 2018	Rule recommendations that implement federal law.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>following counties: Lake, Mendocino, Shasta, Siskiyou, and Trinity. In addition, at least one other tribe located in Southern California is expected to soon begin handling title IV-D child support cases. Based on the experience with the transfers that have taken place so far, the participants of a cross-court educational exchange have suggested amendments to rule 5.732 to streamline the process, reduce confusion, and ensure consistency and efficient use of court resources.</p>		<p>courts, and Judicial Council staff met to review the case transfer procedures; and justice partners proposed a number of revisions to improve the transfer process.</p> <p>Resources: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC and LS</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>		
5.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation: E. Tribal Access to the Child Abuse Central Index (Index)</b></p> <p>The Index is used to aid law enforcement investigations and prosecutions, and to provide notification of new child abuse investigation reports involving the same suspects and/or victims. Information is also used to help screen applicants for licensing or employment in child care facilities, foster homes, and adoptive homes. The purpose of allowing access to this information on a statewide basis is to quickly provide authorized agencies, including tribal agencies, with relevant information</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Operational Plan Objective 5</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Operational Plan Objective 4</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Indian Legal Services brought this topic of mutual concern to tribal and state courts to the forum's attention at one of its meetings. Resources: Forum and California Department of Justice</p>	2017	California Department of Justice to give tribal access to the Index and local tribal and county child welfare agencies to share relevant information from the Index.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>regarding individuals with a known or suspected history of abuse or neglect. While tribal agencies can obtain information from the Index, they cannot readily submit information to the Index.</p> <p>This practice poses several problems: (1) suspected or known abusers may remain in the home of a child posing safety risks; (2) unnecessary duplication of effort by agencies; (3) delays in entry into the Index due to double investigations; and (4) barriers to sharing information among tribal and nontribal agencies that should be working together to protect children. The forum recommends exploring executive branch action to permit tribal access to the Index.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>		
6.	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b>  <b>F. Technological Initiatives</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Recommend Judicial Council continue giving tribal courts access to the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR).</li> <li>(ii) Explore development of an electronic application to improve inquiry and notice under ICWA.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:  Strategic Plan Goal II:  Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III:  Operational Plan Objective 5:  Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p>	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) State and tribal courts will be able to see each other's protective orders, to avoid conflicting orders, and to promote enforcement of these orders.</li> <li>(ii) Application will be developed and will improve inquiry and notice practices under ICWA.</li> </ul>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Strategic Plan Goal VI:</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 4: Implement new tools to support the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC and Information Technology</p> <p>Collaborations: Stanford Design Center</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>		
7.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation:</b> <b>G. Other</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i> (i) Prepare a request to the California Supreme Court’s Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics to amend the canons to permit with appropriate safeguards a judge who sits concurrently on a tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum cochair</p> <p>Resources: Forum and California Supreme Court’s Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p>	2017	<p>Request prepared and submitted.</p> <p>Amended canon permitting judges who sit concurrently on tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	(ii) Make recommendation to the California State Bar Association to waive pro hac vice fees for out-of-state counsel representing tribes in ICWA cases.		Collaborations:  Key Objective Supported: 2 Increase Tribal/State partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.		
8.	<b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:            A. Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</b>  <i>Major Tasks:</i> (i) Identify Judicial Council and other resources that may be appropriate to share with tribal courts. (ii) Identify tribal justice resources that may be appropriate to share with state courts. (iii) Identify grants for tribal/state court collaboration. (iv) Share resources and information about partnerships through Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter. (v) Publicize these partnerships at conferences, on the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), and at other in-person or online venues.	2	Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, and Diversity  Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect, and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given an opportunity to be heard.</li> <li>• Expand the availability of legal assistance, advice and representation for litigants with limited financial resources.</li> </ul> Strategic Plan Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.  Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</li> </ul>	Ongoing	Increased Tribal/State partnerships for sharing resources and communicating information.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices to leverage and share resources and to create tools to educate court stakeholders and the public.</li> </ul> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>		
9.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>B. Education and technical assistance to promote partnerships and understanding of tribal justice systems</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to continue providing educational and technical assistance to local tribal and state courts to address</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal I Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal IV Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p>	Ongoing	Increased Tribal/State partnerships for educational and technical assistance.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>domestic violence and child custody issues in Indian country.</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to provide technical assistance to evaluate the joint jurisdictional court and to courts wishing to replicate the model.</p> <p>(iii) Make recommendation to the Judicial Council staff to continue developing civic learning opportunities for youth that exposes them to opportunities and careers in tribal and state courts.</p> <p>(iv) Make recommendation to explore, at the option of tribes, opportunities for state and federal court judges to serve as a tribal court judge.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>		
10.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>C. Tribal/State collaborations that increase resources for courts</b></p> <p>Develop and implement strategy to seek resources for tribal/state collaborations.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal IV Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>	Ongoing	Tribal/State collaborations that increase resources for courts.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
11.	<p><b>Education:</b>  <b>A. Judicial Education</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) In collaboration with the CJER Curriculum Committees, consult on and participate in making recommendations to revise the CJER online toolkits so that they integrate resources and educational materials from the forum’s online federal Indian law toolkit. Forum judges are working together with committee representatives from the following curriculum committees: (1) Access, Ethics, and Fairness, (2) Civil, (3) Criminal, (4) Family, (5) Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency, and (6) Probate.</p> <p>(ii) Develop a ten-minute mentor video on the Information Bulletin relating to the recognition and enforcement of tribal protection orders, issued by the California Office of the Attorney General. This Information Bulletin was the culmination of work by the forum in partnership with the California Department of Justice (DOJ), the California State Sheriffs’ Association, the U.S. Attorney</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V  Operational Plan Objective 1: Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012)</p> <p>Resources: CJER, Forum, and DOJ</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC and CJER</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 3</p>	Ongoing, completion date depends on funding.	CJER toolkits, located on the Judicial Resources Network, will be updated to include federal Indian law. Ten-minute educational video to be posted online and shared statewide with justice partners.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	General's Office, and other justice partners.				
12.	<p><b>Education:</b> <b>B. Education–Documentary</b></p> <p>Having consulted on and participated in the production of a documentary about tribal justice systems in California, the forum will be exploring ways to use the film to educate judges and justice partners on tribal justice systems. The forum will consider consulting on the development of online curriculum to complement the film.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V Operational Plan Objective 1</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012)</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 3</p>	2017	Wide distribution of the film and use of training materials that complement the film.
13.	<p><b>Education</b> <b>C. Truth and Reconciliation</b></p> <p>Consider collaboration among the three branches of state government in partnership with tribal governments to promote a truth and reconciliation project that acknowledges California's history, as described in Professor Benjamin Madley's book, An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, with respect to indigenous peoples, fosters an understanding of our shared history, and lays a foundation</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal I Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal IV Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3</p> <p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V Operational Plan Objective 1</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: CFCC</p>		

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	for reconciliation, which promotes a call to action.		Collaborations: Tribal Governments and State Government  Key Objective Supported: 2		

DRAFT

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>A. Legislative Study</b>  <a href="#">SB 406</a>, Judicial Council-sponsored legislation, included a “sunset” provision (Code of Civ. Proc. § 1742) providing that the legislation will expire on January 1, 2018, unless legislative action is taken to extend it.</p> <p><b>B. Promote Policy</b>            The California Department of Public Health would not issue a birth certificate based on a tribal parentage order. The forum worked with the executive branch to issue an agency directive that would recognize tribal parentage orders.</p>	<p>A. October 6, 2016/Study completed and upon recommendation by the California Law Review Commission, Legislature is likely to remove the sunset provision.</p> <p>B. February 9, 2016/California Department of Public Health – Vital Records (CDPH-VR) issued an All County Letter clarifying its policy regarding the acceptance of Tribal Court Orders relating to adjudications of facts of parentage.</p>
2.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>C. Rules and Forms–Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)</b></p> <p>1. In response to the California Supreme Court decision in <i>In re Abbigail A.</i> (2016) (Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 83), the forum recommend amending California Rules of Court, rule 5.482, by deleting subdivision (c) of that rule, which the Supreme Court held is invalid. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee joined in this recommendation, and on July 29, 2016, the Judicial Council adopted this recommendation.</p> <p>2. Forum reviewed pending <i>Regulations for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings</i> (as published in the Federal Register on March 20, 2015, (Vol. 80 FR No. 54 14880) and approved <a href="#">Bureau of Indian Affairs Guidelines</a> (as published in the Federal Register on December 30, 2016, (Vol. 81 FR No. 251 96476) for possible amendments to Title 5. Family and Juvenile rules relating to ICWA.</p>	<p>1. July 29, 2016/Effective date of August 15, 2016</p> <p>2. Ongoing</p>
3.	<p><b>Policy Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>D. Technological Initiatives</b></p> <p>1. Consulted with the California Attorney General’s Office regarding access to California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) by tribal courts. This consultation, which included federal and other state justice partners, resulted in an Informational Bulletin</p>	<p>1. November 29, 2016/Information Bulletin issued by the California Department of Justice.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
	<p>issued by the California Department of Justice. This Information Bulletin clarifies that verification of a tribal protection order in any statewide database (e.g., CLETS) is not a precondition to recognition and enforcement of these orders.</p> <p>2. Recommended Judicial Council staff continue giving tribal courts access to the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR).</p> <p>3. Due to lack of staffing resources, the forum did not explore the development of an electronic application to improve inquiry and notice under ICWA.</p>	<p>2. Ongoing</p> <p>3. Project will be undertaken next year if prioritized by the forum.</p>
4.	<p><b>Policy Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>E. Other</b></p> <p>Due to lack of staffing resources and competing priorities, the forum did not prepare a request to the California Supreme Court’s Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics to amend the canons to permit a judge who sits concurrently on a tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.</p>	<p>Project will be undertaken next year if prioritized by the forum.</p>
5.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>A. Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</b></p> <p>1. Disseminated information to tribal court judges and state court judges on a monthly basis through the Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter with information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant opportunities;</li> <li>• Publications;</li> <li>• News stories; and</li> <li>• Educational events.</li> </ul> <p>2. Fostered tribal court/state court partnerships, such as the Superior Court of Los Angeles County’s Indian Child Welfare Act Roundtable and the Bay Area Collaborative of American Indian Resources—court-coordinated community response to ICWA cases in urban areas.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
6.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>B. Education and Technical Assistance to Promote Partnerships and Understanding of Tribal Justice Systems</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue to provide the <a href="#">State/Tribal Education, Partnerships, and Services (S.T.E.P.S.) to Justice—Domestic Violence</a> and <a href="#">Child Welfare</a> programs and provide local educational and technical assistance services.</li> <li>2. Continue the first joint jurisdictional court in California. The Superior Court of El Dorado County, in partnership with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, is operating a family wellness court. Next year, will provide technical assistance to evaluate the joint jurisdictional court. (See <a href="#">Court Manual</a>).</li> <li>3. Establish partnership between the Superior Court of Humboldt County and the Yurok Tribal Court to develop a civics learning opportunity for youth in the region.</li> </ol>	Ongoing
7.	<p><b>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>C. Tribal/State Collaborations that Increase Resources for Courts</b></p> <p>Obtained funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, which is administered through the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES). This funding pays for the <a href="#">S.T.E.P.S. to Justice—Domestic Violence</a> and associated travel expenses for judges to participate in cross-court educational exchanges. These exchanges are judicially led and shaped by the host judges (one tribal court judge and one state court judge) and enable the judges to continue the dialogue on domestic violence and elder abuse in tribal communities, which began as part of a statewide needs assessment. At these exchanges, judges utilize a checklist of problems and solutions identified through the needs assessment to determine how they can work together to address these issues locally.</p> <p>Obtained funding from the California Department of Social Services. This funding pays for the associated travel expenses for forum members to improve compliance with ICWA.</p>	Ongoing

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
8.	<p><b>Education</b></p> <p><b>A. Judicial Education</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Made recommendations to CJER to incorporate federal Indian law into all appropriate educational publications and programming for state court judges and advise on content; revisions to include federal Indian law; and the inter-jurisdictional issues that face tribal and state courts.</li> <li>2. Convened a cross-court educational exchange at Hopland for over 60 participants on behalf of the Superior Court of Mendocino County and the Northern California Intertribal Court System. The focus was domestic violence prevention and child welfare.</li> <li>3. Participated in a meeting convened by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to develop resources to address ICWA and domestic violence cross-over issues in Indian country.</li> <li>4. Hosted a national gathering of tribal/state court forums at the Second Appellate District of the Court of Appeal in Los Angeles.</li> <li>5. Held annual in-person meeting, which also serves as an educational program.</li> <li>6. Presented to the California Commission on Access to Justice.</li> <li>7. Convened a cross-court educational exchange in Klamath on child support.</li> <li>8. Prepared a judicial job aid on the new federal regulations and guidelines on ICWA.</li> <li>9. Sponsored two judicial educational programs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Pre-Institute ICWA Roundtable This roundtable brought together California tribal and state court judges as well as nationally known experts to explore, through interactive case scenarios, legal topics such as new federal mandates under ICWA, recent case law developments, and how to avoid reversals in these cases. The focus was on practical implications of recent development to juvenile child welfare courts in California. The roundtable complemented the Juvenile Law Institute workshop on ICWA</li> <li>(2) Juvenile Law Institute Workshop on ICWA</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ongoing, completion date depends on resources to incorporate recommendations.</li> <li>2. December 2016</li> <li>3. April 2016</li> <li>4. June 2016</li> <li>5. June 2016</li> <li>6. September 2016</li> <li>7. October 2016</li> <li>8. November 2016</li> <li>9. December 5, 2016</li> </ol>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
	<p>This workshop covered the new comprehensive federal ICWA regulations, which became effective December 12, 2016. In addition, the workshop discussed significant recent cases, including two important California Supreme Court cases, and highlighted important practice changes as a result of the new federal requirements.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Education</b>  <b>D. Documentary</b>            Consult on and participate in the production of a documentary describing tribal justice systems and highlighting collaboration between these systems and the state justice system.</p>	<p>February 2017/Documentary is completed. Accepted for distribution through Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Point of View series. Submission to film festivals pending.</p>
10.	<p><b>Education</b>  <b>E. ICWA Roundtable</b>            Cosponsored the Pre-Institute ICWA Roundtable (see item 8 above) in collaboration with CASEY Family Programs and the National American Indian Judges Association.</p>	<p>December 5, 2016</p>

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

<p>Subgroups/Working Groups: None</p>
---------------------------------------

**Workload Assessment Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by E&P: \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Lorna Alksne, Superior Court of San Diego County
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Court Operations Services, Office of Court Research
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Charge:</b> The committee makes recommendations to the council on judicial administration standards and measures that provide for the equitable allocation of resources across courts to promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. The committee must recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Improvements to performance measures and implementation plans and any modifications to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study Model;</li> <li>(2) Processes, study design, and methodologies that should be used to measure and report on court administration; and</li> <li>(3) Studies and analyses to update and amend case weights through time studies, focus groups, or other methods.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Membership:</b> 17 members: 9 judicial officers, 8 court executives</p>	
<p><b>Subgroups/Working Groups:</b> AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee (with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee)</p>	
<p><b>Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2017:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete the update of the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model and seek Judicial Council approval of revised caseweights and other model parameters for use in FY 2017–2018 budget allocations.</li> <li>2. Begin the update of the judicial workload study.</li> <li>3. Complete and submit a mandated report to the Legislature on standards and measures of judicial administration.</li> </ol>	

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model: update to caseweights (i.e., time per filing) and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload-based need. The committee's work in 2017 will include reviewing the proposed new caseweights and other model parameters, convening technical subcommittees as needed to address specific areas identified in the review, finalizing the caseweights and other model parameters, and taking the results to the Judicial Council for approval.	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> In February 2013, the Judicial Council approved the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by council staff as the data become available. The need for regular updates to the workload model has become more urgent now that RAS is used as the foundation piece of the model used to allocate trial court funding.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The SB 56 Working Group was formed in 2009 at the direction of the Administrative Director to provide trial court input and oversight to the Office of Court Research in its ongoing work to revise and improve the workload estimates for judges and court staff. In October</p>	Updated RAS Model to be presented to the Judicial Council for approval at its May 2017 meeting	Updated caseweights and other model parameters to estimate trial court staff need, which is then used in the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM).

<sup>1</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

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

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>2013, the advisory committee voted to update the studies every 5 years, as resources permit. In December 2013, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to establish the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee to succeed the SB 56 Working Group and to continue its work. In April 2014, the committee was renamed to the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC).</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.25 FTE Manager, 0.75 FTE Supervising Analyst, 1.5 FTE Senior Analyst, 1.0 FTE Analyst, 0.5 FTE Associate Analyst (Supervising Analyst position vacant effective 2/1/17; others are existing staff); subject matter expert consultants from the Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts and Criminal Justice Services (existing staff).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported: #1</b></p>		
2.	Judicial Workload Study update: update to caseweights (i.e., time per filing) and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload-based need for judicial officers. The committee's work in 2017 will	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> The methodology for determining the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts was approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001 and modified and approved by the council in August 2004 and December 2011.</p>	Ongoing through 2018	Updated caseweights and other model parameters to estimate trial court judicial officer need.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>consist of establishing the overall project plan and timeline, modifying data collection instruments to reflect needed changes since the last study in 2010, and recruiting courts to participate in the study.</p>		<p>The methodology was incorporated into statute in 2006 (Stats. 2006, ch. 390).</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Government Code section 61614(c)(1) requires the Judicial Council to prepare biennial updates of the Judicial Needs Assessment in even-numbered years. In October 2013, the advisory committee voted to conduct a study every five years, as resources permit, to update the judicial caseweights that are used in the Judicial Needs Assessment.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.25 FTE Manager, 0.75 FTE Supervising Analyst, 1.5 FTE Senior Analyst, 1.0 FTE Analyst, 0.5 FTE Associate Analyst (Supervising Analyst position vacant effective 2/1/17; others are existing staff); subject matter expert consultants from the Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts and Criminal Justice Services (existing staff).</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> #2</p>		
3.	<p>Prepare report to Legislature on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> The Judicial Council must approve this statutorily mandated report before it is transmitted to the Legislature.</p>	Fall 2017	<p>Judicial Council report (September or November 2017) and Report to Legislature</p>

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	administration of justice. Annual reports are required pursuant to Government Code section 77001.5.		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Government Code Section 77001.5 requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature annually on judicial administration standards and measures.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.10 Supervising Analyst; 0.25 FTE Associate Analyst (Supervising Analyst position vacant effective 2/1/17; other is existing staff)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> #3</p>		
4.	To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will collaborate with members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to reconsider the AB 1058 funding allocation methodology developed in 1997. The subcommittee will coordinate with DCSS on its program review and develop a	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> At its April 17, 2015 meeting, the Judicial Council received and approved a recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Advisory Committee to form a joint subcommittee to study the AB 1058 funding methodology. The Judicial Council received a report from the joint subcommittee at its February 26, 2016, meeting and approved a recommendation to reconstitute the joint subcommittee to allow for more time to consider different funding methodology options and coordinate with DCSS on its program review.</p>	Ongoing through December 2017	The subcommittee will provide recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding updating the AB 1058 funding methodology.

#	Project <sup>1</sup>	Priority <sup>2</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	workload-based funding methodology for implementation no later than fiscal year 2018–2019.		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> The AB 1058 funding methodology was first established in 1997 and has not since been updated. In reviewing the proposed midyear funding reallocations, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee acknowledge the need to reexamine the funding methodology to account for “the myriad of factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year.”</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> 0.25 FTE Supervising Analyst (position will be vacant effective 2/1/17); CFCC staff (existing resources); Budget Services staff (existing resources)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> N/A (WAAC is acting in a consulting role and the key objective rests with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.)</p>		

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Staff workload study update. The update will consist of a time study of a sample of trial courts and is intended to update the caseweights and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload need. The committee’s work in 2016 will consist of training participating courts on data collection, fielding the staff time study, preliminary data analysis, review and validation of data with study courts, supplemental data collection, and holding Delphi sessions to make adjustments to draft caseweights.</p>	<p>Data collection, preliminary analysis, review and validation of preliminary data with study courts, and Delphi sessions to make adjustments to the draft caseweights were completed. Remaining steps for WAAC to close out the project in 2017 include reviewing the proposed post-Delphi caseweights and other RAS Model parameters, convening technical subcommittees as needed to examine and refine particular components of the model, and seeking approval of the final model parameters at the May 2017 Judicial Council meeting.</p>
2	<p>To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will collaborate with members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997. The subcommittee will coordinate with the DCSS on its program review and develop a workload-based funding methodology for implementation no later than fiscal year 2018–2019.</p>	<p>Membership was identified for the newly reconstituted subcommittee and an initial meeting was held on June 30, 2016, to discuss the subcommittee’s work to date and next steps. Several subsequent meetings were scheduled for members to be briefed on the RAS Model, DCSS efforts to develop its own allocation methodology, and other information pertinent to the allocation process. Subject matter expert groups of child support commissioners and family law facilitators were assembled to provide input to the subcommittee and have been meeting to discuss and gather information on key factors to be considered in the allocation methodology. There was also a plenary session on the subcommittee’s efforts at the annual AB 1058 conference in August 2016.</p>
3	<p>Update the Judicial Needs Assessment: this project involves using updated filings data to project the need for judicial officers. Biennial updates in even-numbered years are required by Government Code section 61614(c)(1).</p>	<p>The report was completed and approved for transmission to the Legislature by the Judicial Council at its October 27, 2016 meeting.</p>
4	<p>Prepare report to Legislature on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. Annual reports are required pursuant to Government Code section 77001.5.</p>	<p>The report was completed and approved for transmission to the Legislature by the Judicial Council at its October 27, 2016 meeting.</p>

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

*Subgroup or working group name:* AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To reconsider the AB 1058 allocation methodology developed in 1997, with an eye to the myriad of factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year.

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

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 6 members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, 6 members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, 1 representative of the Department of Child Support Services

*Date formed:* initially formed June 2015; reconstituted May 2016

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* On an as-needed basis

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* A workload-based funding methodology is to be developed for implementation no later than fiscal year 2018–2019.