



## Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: January 23, 2014

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Branch Report to the Legislature: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013	Action Required
	Effective Date
	January 23, 2014
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	January 13, 2014
Recommended by	Contact
Administrative Office of the Courts Steven Jahr Administrative Director of the Courts	Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397 <a href="mailto:zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov">zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Recommendation

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013*, and
2. Direct the AOC to submit the report to the Legislature.

### Previous Council Action

Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) to reflect the creation of a successor fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Previous reports on the Trial Court Improvement Fund have been required and submitted pursuant to Government Code section 77209 since fiscal year 2002–2003.

### **Rationale for Recommendation**

Government Code section 77209(i) requires that the Judicial Council annually report to the Legislature on use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

Since this report is required by the above referenced section of the Government Code, no alternatives were considered. This report is not required to circulate for public comment.

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

Submission of this mandated report to the Legislature does not involve any implementation requirements, costs, or operational impacts for the trial courts.

### **Attachments**

1. *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013*



## Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
Chief Justice of California  
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR  
Administrative Director of the Courts

CURT SODERLUND  
Chief Administrative Officer

ZLATKO THEODOROVIC  
Director, Fiscal Services Office

January 23, 2014

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine  
Legislative Counsel  
State Capitol, Room 3021  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt  
Secretary of the Senate  
California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson (*electronic copy*  
*amy.leach@asm.ca.gov*)  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 3197  
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for  
Fiscal Year 2012–2013, as required under Government Code section 77209(i)

Dear Senator Leno and Assembly Member Skinner:

The Judicial Council respectfully submits the attached *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013* under the reporting requirements stated in Government Code section 77209(i).

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an important component of the judicial branch budget, supporting statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine  
Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt  
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson  
January 23, 2014  
Page 2

initiatives detailed in this report highlight many of the judicial branch's efforts to ensure that all Californians are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Director Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Fiscal Services Office, at 916-263-1397.

Very truly yours,

Steven Jahr  
Administrative Director of the Courts

SJ/FT  
Attachments

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine  
Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt  
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson  
January 23, 2014  
Page 3

cc: Chair, Senate Appropriations Committee  
Vice-Chair, Senate Appropriations Committee  
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee  
Vice-Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee  
Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee  
Vice-Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee  
Chair, Assembly Committee on Budget  
Hon. Jeff Gorell, Vice-Chair, Assembly Committee on Budget  
Chair, Senate Budget Subcommittee #5  
Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee #5  
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
Vice-Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
Ms. Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell S. Steinberg  
Ms. Fredericka McGee, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez  
Ms. Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review  
Mr. Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office  
Mr. Marvin Deon II, Consultant, Assembly Committee on Budget  
Mr. Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office  
Mr. Drew Liebert, Chief Counsel, Assembly Committee on Judiciary  
Ms. Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
Ms. Anita Lee, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office  
Mr. Jay Sturges, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance  
Members of the Judicial Council  
Ms. Jody Patel, Chief of Staff, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)  
Mr. Curt Soderlund, AOC Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. Curtis L. Child, AOC Chief Operating Officer  
Mr. Cory T. Jaspersen, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs  
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office  
Mr. Peter Allen, Senior Manager, AOC Office of Communications  
Mr. Steven Chang, Manager, AOC Fiscal Services Office  
Ms. Andi Liebenbaum, Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs



## Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
Chief Justice of California  
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR  
Administrative Director of the Courts

CURT SODERLUND  
Chief Administrative Officer

ZLATKO THEODOROVIC  
Director, Fiscal Services Office

Report Title: *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013*

Statutory citation: Assem. Bill 1700 (Stats. 2001, ch. 824) Code section: Gov. Code, § 77209(i)

Date of Report: January 23, 2014

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Government Code section 77209(i) regarding the use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

The following summary of the report is provided per the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an important component of the judicial branch budget, supporting statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report highlight many of the judicial branch's efforts to ensure that all Californians are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts.

In fiscal year 2012–2013, as of June 30, 2013, \$64.8 million was expended or encumbered from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various programs and projects, including information technology services, legal services, education programs, and programs for families and children.

The full report is available at [www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm).

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-7955.

# Judicial Council Members

As of January 2, 2014

**Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye**

*Chief Justice of California and  
Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Second Appellate District, Division Two*

**Hon. Stephen H. Baker**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Shasta*

**Hon. Marvin R. Baxter**

*Associate Justice of the Supreme Court*

**Hon. Richard Bloom**

*Member of the California State Assembly*

**Mr. Mark Bonino**

*Attorney at Law*

**Hon. James R. Brandlin**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles*

**Ms. Angela J. Davis**

*Assistant United States Attorney  
for the Central District of California*

**Hon. David De Alba**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Sacramento*

**Hon. Emilie H. Elias**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles*

**Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Riverside*

**Hon. Noreen Evans**

*Member of the California State Senate*

**Mr. James P. Fox**

*Attorney at Law (Retired)*

**Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Third Appellate District*

**Hon. Teri L. Jackson**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Francisco*

**Hon. Douglas P. Miller**

*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two*

**Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Contra Costa*

**Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.**

*Attorney at Law*

**Hon. David Rosenberg**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Yolo*

**Hon. David Rubin**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego*

**Hon. Dean T. Stout**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Inyo*

## ADVISORY MEMBERS

**Hon. Sue Alexander**

*Commissioner of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda*

**Hon. Robert A. Glusman**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Butte*

**Hon. James E. Herman**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Santa Barbara*

**Hon. Morris D. Jacobson**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Alameda*

**Hon. Brian L. McCabe**

*Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Merced*

**Mr. Frank A. McGuire**

*Clerk of the California Supreme Court*

**Hon. Kenneth K. So**

*Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego*

**Ms. Mary Beth Todd**

*Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California,  
County of Sutter*

**Hon. Charles D. Wachob**

*Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of  
California, County of Placer*

**Hon. Brian C. Walsh**

*Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Santa Clara*

**Mr. David H. Yamasaki**

*Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California,  
County of Santa Clara*

## ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

**Hon. Steven Jahr**

*Administrative Director of the Courts  
and Secretary of the Judicial Council*

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

**Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye**  
*Chief Justice of California and  
Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Hon. Steven Jahr**  
*Administrative Director of the Courts*

**Mr. Curt Soderlund**  
*Chief Administrative Officer*

**JUDICIAL AND COURT  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION**

**FISCAL SERVICES OFFICE**  
**Zlatko Theodorovic**  
*Director*

**Steven Chang**  
*Manager*

**Frank Tang**  
*Senior Budget Analyst / Primary Author of Report*



# Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2012–2013

---

JANUARY 2014



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE COURTS

## Recommendations Regarding the IMF

Government Code section 77209(i) requires the Judicial Council to make “appropriate recommendations” to the Legislature concerning the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) in the annual report. The council does not have recommendations at this time, but in the near future will be considering recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the council’s Technology Committee. The council will submit any recommendations in the next expenditure report or, if they require more immediate attention by the Legislature, in a separate communication.

## Resources, Expenditures, and Fund Balance Overview

In fiscal year (FY) 2012–2013, the IMF was supported by a variety of funding sources, including the 50/50 excess fees, fines, and forfeitures split revenue under Government Code<sup>1</sup> section 77205(a), the 2 percent automation fund under section 68090.8(b), interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund, royalties from publication of jury instructions under section 77209(h), and a transfer from the state General Fund. Including prior year adjustments and a transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund, the total available was \$109.8 million (see Attachment 1).

As of June 30, 2013, from allocations approved by the council for FY 2012–2013, \$64.8 million was expended and encumbered for various programs and projects, such as security grants, self-help centers, education programs for judicial officers and trial court personnel, the litigation management program, complex civil litigation program, enhanced collections, information technology, and Phoenix financial and human resources services, all of which were managed by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) (see Attachment 2). Of the \$64.8 million expended and encumbered, \$52.3 million was related to local assistance (distributions to trial courts or payments to vendors in support of trial courts), and \$12.5 million was related to administrative support provided by the AOC.

Given the resources that were available for the fiscal year and the resulting expenditures and encumbrances, the fund ended the year with a positive balance of \$44.8 million (see Attachment 3).

## Use of IMF Resources for Trial Courts during FY 2012–2013

For FY 2012–2013 the council approved allocations of funding from IMF resources for various programs and projects that seek to improve trial court administration, increase access to justice and the provision of justice throughout the state, and improve court management, efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. A description of how each project and program used its allocation of funding is included below.

---

<sup>1</sup> All future code references in this report are to the Government Code unless otherwise specified.

## **Trial Court Security**

### ***Security Grants***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$1.2 million. The allocation was used for trial court security enhancement projects. Statewide master agreements were used for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of video surveillance, access, and duress alarm systems in trial court facilities. Other security enhancement projects included upgrades to lighting and fencing for secured judicial officer parking. Funds were also used for a pilot project to determine the effectiveness of evacuation devices in high-rise facilities. Court and sheriff staff in the Los Angeles Superior Court conducted training and test exercises. As a result of the positive feedback, additional units will be purchased for the Los Angeles Superior Court in FY 2013–2014, and the possibility of making them available to other courts is under discussion. In addition, funds were used to provide training to trial courts on the preparation and maintenance of their continuity-of-operations plans.

## **Families and Children Programs**

### ***Self-Represented Litigants: Statewide Support***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$105,030. The allocation was used to support statewide services available to court self-help centers in all of California's 58 trial courts. The California Courts Online Self-Help Center has over 4,000 pages of content in English, also available in Spanish, as well as hundreds of links to other free legal resources. Over 4 million users view the self-help website annually. The self-help site also provides local courts with information that they can use to research, translate, and post local court information on their own. In a time when many courts have suffered staff reductions, the site enables California's courts to provide information and avoid duplicative work by making a wide range of resources available to them at one single location.

The allocation also supported updates to the California Courts Online Self-Help Center with instructional materials and forms to be used by self-help centers and the public, as well as translations for the self-help website and support staff that review Spanish-language translations for accuracy, and contributed to updating outdated content in videos, editing to make them more “web-friendly,” and adding local content to make that content available statewide.

The allocation supported professional educational content for self-help center staff on legal updates and contributed to the maintenance of an extensive bank of resources for self-help and legal services programs to share, such as sample instructions, translations, and other materials. The allocation also supported adapting websites created by the Justice Education Society in British Columbia, Canada, in order to provide extensive information to parents, teenagers, and children about parenting after separation. These websites will be linked closely to the self-help website and have extensive video and interactive content.

### ***Domestic Violence: Family Law Interpreter Program***

The allocated funds of \$1.75 million were expended in two areas. \$1.73 million was distributed directly to the courts, where it is used entirely for court interpreter staffing and service-related travel. The remaining \$20,000 was used to pay for the translation of domestic violence forms and instructions into Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese and to make these translations available to all courts. It is critical to keep these forms updated to reflect legislative changes.

There is strong demand for this funding. At the current level, the funding falls far short of court needs. Court requests typically total \$3.0 to \$3.5 million in each fiscal year—about twice the amount available from the allocation. Interpreter shortages adversely affect court proceedings. Attorneys report that when interpreters are not available, court proceedings, particularly those involving self-represented litigants, often result in continuances or very difficult, protracted hearings. Interpreter shortages also compromise public safety, resulting in delays in processing restraining orders, and potentially affect the quality and enforceability of orders, which in turn affect law enforcement, schools, and others who have to interpret orders in these cases.

### ***Self-Help Centers***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$5 million. The allocation was distributed directly to the courts for public self-help center programs and operations. All 58 trial courts receive funding for their self-help centers. The minimum allocation per court was \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population. Ninety-two percent of the funds distributed are used by the courts for staffing.

Reducing self-help services would increase courts' other costs. When self-help staff are decreased, the number and complexity of questions and issues at the public court counter increase substantially, thereby increasing line lengths and wait times. Likewise, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerks' offices.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short- and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent. Demand for self-help services is strong. Courts indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help. Currently, the judicial branch has been able to allocate roughly a quarter of that amount, \$11.2 million annually from this fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund, assisting over 450,000 persons.

### ***Interactive Software: Electronic Forms for Self-Represented Litigants***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$40,000. The allocation was used to develop document assembly software programs that simplify the process of completing Judicial Council forms and other pleadings. Using a “TurboTax” model, litigants enter information only once; the program automatically fills in the information on the rest of the form. This saves substantial time and assists self-represented litigants in preparing understandable and legible pleadings. Self-help centers report that these programs can significantly enhance their efficiency and effectiveness. The time of clerks and judicial officers is similarly saved by having legible and fully completed documents.

### ***Educational Programs***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$92,563. The allocation was used to support local and statewide educational programs for professionals in court-based Family Dispute Resolution and Youth Court Summit programs.

The allocation further supported technical support to court-based Family Court Services programs as well as education for approximately 450 mediators, child custody recommending counselors, evaluators, and management staff to fulfill Family Code section 1850 and California rule of court mandates. Also funded were regional trainings, distance-learning webinars, and videoconference programs, as well as a statewide program held in conjunction with CJER’s Family Law Institute. The statewide program included joint educational sessions for judicial officers, child custody mediators, recommending counselors, evaluators, and management staff. The statewide program also provided mandated training specifically designed for child custody mediators and recommending counselors hired within six months of the program, and provided continuing education for Family Court Services management staff.

The Youth Court Summit provided a statewide training program for approximately 150 youth court participants, judges, and staff. The funding was used for youth scholarships, lodging/meal costs, and speakers. This event was also partially funded by other outside sources and was a collaborative effort between the California Association of Youth Courts and the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee.

### ***Publications***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$19,904. The allocation was used to support the California Dependency Online Guide (CalDOG). The number of court professionals using CalDOG continues to grow. The website currently has 3,096 subscribers, a 16 percent increase compared to this time last year. Subscribers encompass most of the categories of judicial branch dependency stakeholders, including 226 judicial officers, 1,961 attorneys, 621 child welfare agency social workers, and 756 other child welfare professionals such as educators, probation officers, tribal representatives, and psychologists. CalDOG began providing subscribers with a bimonthly e-mail summary of new cases and other current information. Resources on the website include a comprehensive case law page with summaries

and case text for California dependency and related state and federal cases; distance-learning courses, including for-credit online courses that meet the eight-hour training requirement for new dependency attorneys; educational content, such as the curriculum and materials for AB 12/212 training; handouts from the Beyond the Bench conference and other conferences; and articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, and other publications. CalDOG page views averaged 24,042 in June 2013, a 105 percent increase over June 2012.

## **Education Programs**

### ***Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers***

#### NEW JUDGE EDUCATION AND PRIMARY ASSIGNMENT ORIENTATION COURSES

The allocation was used to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual (AV) equipment and other program-related rentals, as well as production expenses for participant materials for the New Judge Orientation, B. E. Witkin Judicial College, and Primary Assignment and Overview Courses.

All newly elected and appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers are required by rule 10.462(c)(1) of the California Rules of Court to complete new judge education offered by CJER by attending the New Judge Orientation Program within six months of taking the oath of office, attending an orientation course in their primary assignment within one year of taking the oath of office, and attending the B. E. Witkin Judicial College within two years of taking the oath of office. By rule of court, CJER is the sole provider for these audiences.

The amount expended and/or encumbered for New Judge Orientation programs was \$67,251. The week-long New Judge Orientation (NJO) program is designed to assist new judges and subordinate judicial officers in making the transition from attorney advocates to judicial officers and includes the subject areas of judicial ethics, fairness, and trial management.

The amount expended and/or encumbered for the two-week Judicial College was \$103,851. The college offers new judges and subordinate judicial officers a broader educational experience than the orientation courses while still emphasizing their current position as new bench officers.

The amount expended and/or encumbered for the Primary Assignment Orientation and Overview Courses was \$191,236. The Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses provide new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion in their primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, traffic, probate) with a heavy emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, as well as classroom exercises designed to test their skills in the assignment.

CJER also offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments that are substantively more complex than those covered by the basic orientation programs described above (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, and capital cases).

All of this education programming ensures cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide. Educating judges to understand and act in accordance with the rules and issues of ethics and fairness enhances public confidence in the judiciary, and ensures access to justice.

#### CONTINUING JUDICIAL EDUCATION—LEADERSHIP TRAINING

The amount expended and/or encumbered for leadership training was \$40,061. The allocation was used to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and production expenses for participant materials for the Presiding Judge/Court Executive Officer Court Management Program and Supervising Judges Program that offered educational opportunities for trial court judicial leadership.

This leadership training provides participants with management techniques, strategies, and best practices designed for the unique environment of the courts. This training enables judges to fulfill continuing education hours and expectations under rules 10.462(c)(2) and 10.462(c)(2)(a)–(c).

#### CONTINUING JUDICIAL EDUCATION—STATEWIDE JUDICIAL INSTITUTES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for these institutes was \$126,756. The allocation was used to primarily cover lodging and group meals for judges and subordinate judicial officers participating in the Family Law, Juvenile Law, Cow County, and Civil Law Institutes. Additional costs covered include materials production, meeting room rental, and AV equipment rental. CJER offers these institutes to enable experienced justices and judges to remain current on the evolving issues in their specific bench assignments.

#### CONTINUING JUDICIAL EDUCATION—ADVANCED EDUCATION FOR EXPERIENCED JUDGES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$27,488. The allocation was used to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and production expenses for participant materials. These are continuing education courses designed to address advanced judging issues, and they include such topics as Advanced Capital Case Issues, Complex Civil Litigation, and Civil and Criminal Evidence.

#### CONTINUING JUDICIAL EDUCATION—REGIONAL AND LOCAL EDUCATION COURSES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$6,028. The allocation was used to primarily pay for trial court participant business meals and materials production expenses. These courses were developed because they offer a far less expensive alternative to statewide programming while preserving the quality of judicial education. Courts are also less taxed because the programming is usually much closer and therefore more convenient for them.

### ***Essential and Other Education for Court Executives, Managers, and Supervisors***

#### MANAGER AND SUPERVISOR TRAINING

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$18,770. The allocation was used to pay for business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other program-related rentals, as well as production expenses for participant materials and trial court participant lodging for the CORE 40 courses, except the Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses, for which the courts pick up the cost of participant lodging.

1. CORE 40

Each CORE 40 course is an intensive one-week program for new and experienced trial court supervisors and managers. It contains valuable and practical information that can be used to improve leadership skills that result in the overall improvement in performance of staff. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management; experienced court personnel serve as the faculty.

2. Institute for Court Management (ICM)

ICM courses lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The courses serve a dual purpose: (a) to provide relevant education courses for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Management, and (b) to provide this education locally at a significantly reduced cost to courts and participants as compared to attending the national programs. This program grew out of a multistate consortium comprised of the California Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), ICM, and six other states interested in enhancing the existing ICM certification program and preparing court leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to effectively manage the courts. This effort resulted in the ability of CJER to provide education and certification for court managers and supervisors. In the past, the courts had to pay ICM to bring these courses to their location, or to send their staff to NCSC headquarters in Williamsburg, Virginia, the cost for which was prohibitive for most courts. CJER's ability to offer these courses in-state using California faculty has allowed all courts—small, medium, and large—to reap the benefits of this program.

The initial capital investment has yielded extremely positive results in advancing judicial branch education for court leaders. Since June 2009, over 90 court leaders have completed the full set of courses for certification and approximately 900 participants have taken one or more courses. The ICM courses are taught and held within California, making attendance affordable and convenient.

***Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel***

COURT PERSONNEL INSTITUTES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$69,515. The allocation was used to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and production expenses for participant materials for the Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI).

The week-long Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI) offers courtroom and court legal process clerks education in each substantive area of the court (civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, juvenile). The institute provides training in California Rules of Court, changes in the law, customer service, and other performance aspects that impact court operations “behind the scenes.”

Although all 58 trial courts have accessed this education for their staff, CCTI has a special relationship with the smaller courts. Smaller courts do not typically have training departments and rely on CJER to provide a statewide perspective on the duties and responsibilities of courtroom and counter staff. The larger courts often provide faculty for this program. CCTI has been an essential education program for courts for more than 25 years and continues to prepare court staff for the essential functions of their jobs consistent with the law and statewide practices. In addition to legal process and procedure, classes stress statewide consistency, ethical performance, and efficient use of public funds.

#### REGIONAL AND LOCAL COURT STAFF COURSES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for these courses was \$768. The allocation was used to pay for trial court participant business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and production expenses for participant materials for the regional and local court staff courses and Core Leadership and Training Skills course.

##### 1. Regional and Local Court Staff Courses

Regional and local court staff courses allow CJER to provide high-quality judicial education to the trial courts at a greatly reduced cost and with greatly enhanced convenience to the courts. Courses cover a wide array of topics, including human resources, traffic court, case processing in the major court assignments of civil, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile, as well as broad topics relevant to all court staff, such as preventing sexual harassment.

##### 2. Core Leadership and Training Skills Course

This course is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors and provides participants with skills that contribute to effective leadership, as well as identifying approaches to building successful and effective work relationships at all levels of the organization.

### ***Faculty and Curriculum Development***

#### TRIAL COURT FACULTY—STATEWIDE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The amount expended and/or encumbered for these programs was \$206,366. The allocation was used to cover lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty teaching at trial court courses and programs. The amount needed directly correlates with the amount of statewide, regional, and local trial court programs and products developed and provided. Faculty members who are asked to serve as volunteers are not likely to be able to offer their services if their expenses are not paid for by CJER.

#### FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$15,531. The allocation was used to cover the cost of lodging, group meals, and travel for trial court participants at train-the-trainer and faculty development programs, some of which are foundational for new faculty and some of which are designed to support specific courses or programs. It may also have been used for meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and production expenses for participant materials.

Current CJER faculty development programs include (a) critical course and/or program-specific faculty development (e.g., New Judge Orientation, the B. E. Witkin Judicial College, and the Institute for Court Management); (b) design workshops for new or updated courses in development such as regional one-day and orientation/institute courses; (c) advanced faculty development courses (offered this year as webinars), which allow faculty to work on more complex faculty skills; and (d) short lunchtime webinars for advanced faculty on discrete faculty development topics. As a result of the Faculty Development Fundamentals course provided in previous years, many new courses have been developed by the participants, and those courses are now offered statewide under the local court training initiative.

#### CURRICULUM COMMITTEES AND EDUCATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$1,320. The allocation was used to pay for business meal costs of judges and court staff that serve on the committees involved in curriculum development work.

#### *Distance Learning*

##### DISTANCE EDUCATION—SATELLITE BROADCAST

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$141,225. The allocation was used to pay for transmission of statewide educational satellite broadcasts for trial court audiences, new satellite downlink site installation work in trial court facilities, and maintenance and repair work and fees associated with existing trial court satellite downlink sites. It was also used to pay for lodging, business meals, and travel costs associated with faculty for trial court satellite broadcast education.

The development of alternative methods for delivery of education was established by the CJER Governing Committee as a strategic goal in the mid-1990s. The intent of the Governing Committee was to meet an increasing need for education by judges, managers, and staff by establishing cost-effective delivery mechanisms that were an alternative to traditional statewide programs and written publications. Staff was directed to identify or research new technologies to increase education for judges, enable new educational services for court staff and manager audiences, and provide mechanisms for continuing delivery of education even during tight budgetary times.

CJER has met the goal of providing distance education to all judicial branch audiences, and much of it is delivered via the educational satellite broadcast network. The satellite network serves as the core delivery method for staff and manager/supervisor education, providing a comprehensive and timely statewide mechanism for accessing high-quality staff education that is, for many courts, the only source of staff education. Many of the broadcasts are also recorded and available online or as DVDs to serve as resources for local training throughout the year. Training that is required statewide, including sexual harassment prevention training, is delivered regularly by satellite broadcast, and time-sensitive training has been provided for judges on a number of occasions in response to new legislation such as mental health records or criminal justice realignment legislation.

Education is delivered via satellite to court staff and includes such topics as:

- Updates to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- The jury process
- Felony and misdemeanor appeals
- Certifying copies
- Customer service

Education is delivered via satellite for court managers and supervisors on such topics as:

- Handling disasters
- Coaching and communication
- Technology management
- Change management
- Stress management
- Preventing and responding to sexual harassment

Education is delivered via satellite for presiding judges and court executive officers and includes such topics as:

- ADA issues for court leaders
- Court security
- Ethical excellence

Education delivered via satellite for trial court judicial officers includes such topics as:

- Assembly Bill 939 family law proceedings overview
- Judicial canons updates
- How a child enters the juvenile dependency system

DISTANCE EDUCATION—ONLINE VIDEO, WEBINARS, AND VIDEOCONFERENCES

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$6,112. The allocation was used to pay for storage, encoding, and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products

delivered online; for captioning of videos and broadcasts if needed and for some webinar-based education costs.

A natural evolution of the Satellite Broadcast Initiative has been the development of online instructional videos, videoconferences, and webinars. These three lines of educational products leverage the distance-learning technologies employed by the Judicial Council over the past 10 years, enabling CJER to develop multiple product lines to meet the educational needs of virtually every judicial branch audience it serves. The broadcast video production studio, which was originally created for developing and transmitting broadcasts, is now used frequently to create instructional videos that are immediately uploaded to the judicial and administrative websites. Funding was needed to enable streaming of judicial education videos to mobile devices like iPads as well as to desktop computers, and to improve video quality to a standard that users have come to expect.

## **Special Services for Court Operations**

### ***Trial Court Performance and Accountability***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$6,946. The allocation was used to reimburse expenses related to the January 16, 2013, meeting of the SB 56 Working Group. The SB 56 Working Group consists of court administrators and judges from 15 courts and is charged with, among other things, updating the court staff and judicial workload models. Working group members met to review and finalize the updated Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model. The funds were used to provide a phone line for SB 56 Working Group members and staff participants to join the meeting remotely and also to reimburse SB 56 Working Group members' travel to the meeting venue in San Francisco. In addition, the funds were used to pay for travel expenses for one member of the Executive and Planning Committee who was there to make a presentation to the working group. Funds from this account were also used to pay for travel expenses for the SB 56 Working Group chair, Judge Lorna Alksne, of the Superior Court of San Diego County, to travel to San Francisco to present the final report on the RAS model to the Judicial Council in February 2013.

### ***JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$277,000. The allocation was used to support the California JusticeCorps program, an AmeriCorps program, and the pilot of the Access to Justice Internship program at the Superior Court of Placer County. JusticeCorps operated in six superior courts throughout the state. In FY 2012–2013, JusticeCorps was funded with a \$1 million AmeriCorps grant, with matching funds provided by the participating courts and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF). The JusticeCorps program trains and places college students at court-based self-help centers to assist self-represented litigants, usually by serving in the courts' self-help centers. Working under the supervision of attorneys or other court staff, JusticeCorps members help litigants by identifying appropriate forms, helping litigants complete and file the forms properly, and providing

information and referrals to related services. The program recruited, trained, and placed 273 undergraduate university students in court-based legal access self-help centers, with the majority completing 300 hours of service during an academic year.

The allocation supported the ninth year of JusticeCorps program operations at a total of six partnering courts (Superior Courts of Alameda, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties). Almost all of the funding was distributed directly via intrabranch agreements to the JusticeCorps designated lead courts—Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego—to continue their efforts, as follows:

- Superior Court of Los Angeles County: \$140,000
- Superior Court of Alameda County: \$110,000
- Superior Court of San Diego County: \$ 22,500

The allocation was used by these courts to support program operating expenses—including staff salaries, training expenses, and other member support costs—all of which count toward the grant “match” required to fully leverage the \$1 million AmeriCorps grant. In the FY 2012–2013 program year, JusticeCorps’ 273 members provided assistance to more than 100,000 litigants.

In addition, \$4,500 of the allocation was distributed to the Superior Court of Placer County to support its new effort, the Access to Justice Internship (A2J). Designed to leverage the best practices and resources of the JusticeCorps program, but operating on a smaller scale, this more flexible, internship-type program also supports the court’s self-help centers. The internship was designed to help the centers serve the public better, while providing a high-quality learning opportunity for students. Utilizing the best practices of the JusticeCorps program, the A2J Internship works with local universities and junior colleges to recruit students. The allocated funds made it possible for the court to support its planning period prior to launching the program and put resources toward a number of operational needs, including technology, outreach materials, and member support costs during the first academic year of operation.

### ***Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$132,837. The allocation was used for the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters and interpreter candidates, as well as for monitoring necessary continuing education activities for the over 1,800 certified and registered California court interpreters throughout the courts statewide and for expanding technological solutions for American Sign Language interpretation. The allocation was used specifically for the following:

- Contractual administration of court interpreter certification and registration exams (written and oral exams administered to approximately 2,100 candidates per year), including a portion of the contractual cost for test administration provided by Prometric (educational test administrator).

- Outreach and recruitment of potential qualified candidates, including registration cost and sponsorship fees associated with conferences of the following organizations: Monterey Institute for International Studies, California Healthcare Interpreters Association, National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators, and American Translators Association.
- Four ethics workshops for all newly certified and registered interpreters. These workshops are mandatory and meet educational and compliance requirements established by the Judicial Council; expenditures included the contractual cost of the educators/trainers and the cost of producing and shipping materials.
- Further expansion of the use of video remote technology resources to leverage interpreter resources where American Sign Language interpreters are needed throughout the state, including the cost of purchasing video remote equipment, training on the use of equipment, and service/maintenance support for direct use by 14 courts.
- Production of court interpreter badges (for approximately 250–300 interpreters per year), including the contractual production cost for the badges.

California is mandated to provide certified and registered interpreters for litigants with limited English proficiency in all mandated cases. Effective January 1, 1993, the Judicial Council assumed responsibility for the certification and registration of court interpreters and for developing a comprehensive program to ensure an available, competent pool of qualified interpreters. The services provided by the Judicial Council’s Court Language Access Support Program (CLASP) include interpreter recruitment, certification, education, and professional development in order to ensure an available, competent pool of qualified interpreters.

## **Legal Services**

### ***Litigation Management Program***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$3.4 million. The allocation was used to pay the costs of defense—including fees for attorneys from the Office of the Attorney General and private counsel—and to pay settlements of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals. Government Code section 811.9 requires the Judicial Council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state’s trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and court employees.

### ***Judicial Performance Defense Insurance***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$875,966. The allocation was used to pay for the portion of the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) defense master insurance policy that covers claims by superior court judges and subordinate judicial officers. The CJP Defense Insurance program was approved by the Judicial Council as a comprehensive loss-prevention program in 1999. The program (1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints, (2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk

for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties, and (3) lowers the risk of conduct that could lead to complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.

### ***Subscription Costs – Judicial Conduct Reporter***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$15,535. The allocation was used to cover the annual subscription cost for this publication. The *Judicial Conduct Reporter* is a quarterly newsletter published by the American Judicature Society. It reports on recent opinions and other issues involving judicial ethics and discipline. It is provided to all judicial officers as part of the Judicial Council ethics education program, which was implemented as a means of risk management when the council initiated the Commission on Judicial Performance Defense Insurance program.

### ***Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$450,906. The allocation was used to pay attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas, including business transactions, labor and employment negotiations, finance and taxation matters, and real estate. The additional area in which legal assistance was provided reflects council actions to expand the scope of the program. The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program in July 2001 as a means by which the Office of the General Counsel (now the Legal Services Office) could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed by the LSO.

### ***Jury System Improvement Projects***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$15,653. The allocation was used to (1) support the meeting expenses of the Judicial Council's Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions, and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official CACI and CALCRIM publications. The Jury System Improvement Projects are supported by royalty revenue from the publication of the Judicial Council's civil (CACI) and criminal (CALCRIM) jury instructions. The Judicial Council's Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions prepare new and revised instructions and propose their adoption to the council. On approval, the instructions are then copyrighted and licensed to commercial publishers. The publishers pay royalties to the council based on sales of the instructions.

### ***Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$74,808. The allocation was used to support a contract for the development of a distance-learning course to help mediators in court-connected mediation programs for civil cases more effectively mediate cases with one or more self-represented litigants. This program helps courts meet the goal of standard 10.70(a) of the California Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations. The Alternative Dispute Resolution program also continued to implement the council's February 2004 directive that AOC staff work with the trial courts to (1) assess their needs and available resources for developing, implementing, maintaining, and improving mediation and other settlement programs

for civil cases; and (2) where existing resources are insufficient, develop plans for obtaining the necessary resources.

### ***Complex Civil Litigation Program***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$4 million. The allocation was used to provide support for the Complex Civil Litigation Program, which began as a pilot program in January 2000 to improve the management of complex civil cases. In August 2003, the council made the program permanent. During this reporting period, all funds went directly to courts to support the operation of 17 courtrooms or departments exclusively handling complex cases in the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties.

### ***Regional Office Assistance Group***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$1.3 million. The allocation was used for seven attorneys, one administrative coordinator, and one secretary working primarily at three locations to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial courts and serve as liaisons, consultants, clearinghouses, advocates, and direct legal services providers to the trial courts in the areas of transactions, legal opinions, and labor and employment.

## **Audit Services**

### ***Audit Contract***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$100,000. The allocation was used to supplement the Judicial Council's Internal Audit Services (IAS) staff through the assistance of outside auditing and consulting firms. IAS conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts once every three or four years encompassing areas such as court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations.

### ***Audit Services***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$628,068. The allocation was used for five staff auditor positions in IAS, which conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts once every three or four years encompassing these primary areas, such as court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations .

## **Fiscal Services**

### ***Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$14,827. The allocation was used to retain an actuarial firm to assist trial courts in meeting the requirements established in Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements 43 and 45, which require

government entities to disclose their accrued liability for OPEB and related information at least once every other year.

Post-employment benefits may be provided through a county retirement system, CalPERS, or directly through benefit providers. Each trial court offers its own benefits package, and some may offer more than one package depending on the provisions of their collective bargaining agreements. Due to the specialized terminology associated with the complex rules and regulations for collecting the required information, as well as the specialized calculations involved in determining the valuations of these post-employment plans, these reports must be certified by a licensed actuary. Copies of the completed valuation reports will be provided to the State Controller's Office so that this mandatory information can be included in the state's comprehensive annual financial report.

### ***Budget-Focused Training and Meetings***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$31,879. The allocation was used to support meetings of the Trial Court Budget Working Group (now the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee) and associated subcommittees that deal with trial court funding issues. The allocation was also used to support other budget-related meetings and conference calls in support of branch budget advocacy efforts, as well as to support budget training for trial court staff, such as recurrent training on annual fiscal reporting requirements.

### ***Treasury Services: Cash Management***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$235,804. The allocation was used for the compensation, operating expenses, and equipment costs for one senior accountant and one staff accountant. Staff are engaged in the accounting and distribution of all uniform civil fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts. Responsibilities include receiving cash deposits and monthly collection reporting of UCF for all 58 trial courts, entering UCF reporting into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions when due to state and local agency recipients, and completing the financial accounting for the function. Staff performed other cash management and treasury duties as needed for the trial courts.

### ***Trial Court Procurement***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$128,037. The allocation was used for two positions, a senior procurement specialist and a contract specialist, who performed solicitations and entered into master agreements on behalf of the trial courts. By having these services provide at a statewide level, trial courts save resources by not having to perform these solicitations themselves.

### ***Enhanced Collections***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$751,599. The allocation was used for five positions—one assistant director, three court services analysts, and one administrative coordinator—working for the Enhanced Collections Unit (ECU). The ECU

provides professional support and technical assistance to court and county collections programs to improve collections of court-ordered debt statewide. The ECU assists programs with the development and modification of operations to help meet the performance measures, benchmarks, and best practices established and adopted by the Judicial Council. In collaboration with the California State Association of Counties as well as court and county subject-matter experts, the ECU identifies statutory changes needed to improve the collection of delinquent fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments.

The ECU also provides ongoing professional and technical support to justice partners to improve the effectiveness of the statewide collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. Enhancement activities include participation in the Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt program, implementation of memoranda of understanding between the collaborative court and county collection programs, and statewide master agreements with collections vendors.

## **Human Resources Services**

### ***Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$85,000. The allocation was used to maintain mental health referral services for judges throughout the judicial branch. These services were made available to the 1,570 superior court judges in California, as well as assigned judges and subordinate judicial officers. Utilization rates remained relatively low, consistent with industry standards.

On April 2013, the AOC conducted a request for proposals and selected a new vendor, CONCERN, to manage both the Employee Assistance Program and the Judicial Officers Assistance Program. To reduce costs, the new agreement with CONCERN focused only on providing referral services to mental health professionals; quality-of-life referral services and the provision of "off-the-shelf" training were removed from the overall scope of work.

### ***Trial Court Benefits Program: Legal Advice***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$40,000. The allocation was used to solicit the services of an outside law firm to provide legal advice and counsel on various benefits issues affecting the trial courts. The Human Resources Services Office contracted with two law firms to support all trial courts on matters pertaining to benefits questions arising in the courts. Court usage of this program has been low. While all 58 trial courts were eligible to use these funds to assist in answering benefits-related inquiries, usage in fiscal year 2012–2013 was limited to only one or two courts.

### ***Human Resources: Court Investigation***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$107,702. The allocation was used to pay for invoices related to court investigations stemming from courts' personnel issues.

The firms investigated a total of nine matters at eight courts. Due to the sensitive and often complex nature of these investigations, some matters took a number of months to complete.

### ***Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$31,214. The allocation was used to pay for conference room and lodging costs associated the Labor Relations Academies and Forums. During this reporting period, 87 participants, representing 41 trial courts, attended the Labor Relations Forums (two forums were held, one in Sacramento and one in Burbank), and 111 participants, representing 37 trial courts, attended the Labor Relations Academies (two academies were held, one in Sacramento and one in Ontario).

New challenges created the need for an increased allocation. First, meeting space in the Burbank offices of the Judicial Council is not large enough to accommodate these events, resulting in the need to have the academies at a Southern California hotel. Second, the Southern California courts expressed the need for a Labor Relations Academy I, which has been eliminated due to budget reductions. Staff from the Human Resources Services Office met the needs of the Southern California courts and offered the Labor Academy I in Ontario.

## **Information Technology Services**

### ***Telecommunication Support***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$8.7 million. The allocation was used to provide a program for the trial courts to develop and support a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local court systems and enterprise applications such as Phoenix, as well as hosted case management systems via shared services at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), which eases deployment, provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources. The program received an augmentation in FY 2012–2013 of \$1.58 million after taking a reduction of \$6.6 million in FY 2011–2012. This eliminated funding for the network technology refresh and ad hoc network consulting to the superior courts. Activities that were funded included network maintenance, which provides the trial courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure; and network security services, which maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three managed security services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention; vulnerability scanning; and web browser security and network technology training for court IT staff.

### ***Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Planning and Development Support)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$5.1 million. The allocation was used to support delivery of a number of technology initiatives. These initiatives include the Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy budget, which funds the Oracle Branchwide License Agreement (BWL A), Enterprise Architecture (EA) program, and Enterprise Methodology and Process (EMP) program. The Oracle BWL A frees up local courts from having

to manage complex software asset management and costly annual maintenance renewals. Local courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment. Enterprise architects provide support to guide the development and implementation of statewide applications and ensure compatibility with California Courts Technology Center infrastructure, communications, and security protocols. The EMP program develops and promotes standardized, repeatable processes to reduce complexity and increase efficiencies throughout the Solution Development Lifecycle.

### ***Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$1.2 million. The allocation was used to provide program management support to 16 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Ten of the 16 SJE courts are hosted and supported from the CCTC. The allocation also was used to provide maintenance and operations support, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management. Six locally hosted SJE courts use ICMS program resources for legislative updates and SJE support as needed. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Justice, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information System, as well as custom interfaces with the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collections program, interactive voice/interactive web response processing, issuance of warrants, traffic collections, failure-to-appear/failure-to-pay collections, and web portal interfaces.

### ***Data Integration***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$3.9 million. The allocation was used to continue work with trial courts to develop a statewide approach to data exchange standards and the Integrated Services Backbone—a leveraged, enterprise-class platform for exchanging information within the judicial branch and between the judicial branch and its integration partners. The Data Integration program worked with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and three pilot courts on the grant-funded e-Citations project to exchange data with law enforcement and trial courts.

### ***California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$8.8 million. The allocation was used to provide ongoing technology center hosting/shared services to the trial courts, as well as a full disaster recovery program. Applications hosted at the CCTC include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Computer-Aided Facilities Management, Integrated Services Backbone, and local court desktop/remote server support. The CCTC continued to host the Phoenix Financial System (serving all 58 trial courts) and the Phoenix Human Resources/Payroll System (serving 8 trial courts). Three case management systems (CMSs) operate out of CCTC: Sustain (SJE); the criminal and traffic CMS (V2); and civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3). Some courts leverage the third party contract to also receive full IT services for their local court: desktop, helpdesk, file server management, and e-mail.

### ***Jury Management System***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$600,000. The allocation was used to provide grant funding to the trial courts. In FY 2012–2013, 20 of 26 courts that submitted jury grant funding requests received some level of funding for their jury management system projects. All courts are eligible to apply for jury funding. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the number and size of grant requests submitted, as well as the available funding. The council has provided funding since FY 2000–2001 for trial courts to improve their jury management systems. The impetus for providing technology funding was implementation of “one-day or one-trial” juror service in all superior courts, which required courts to summons and process many more jurors than previously done. When the program began, courts were working with outdated DOS versions of jury management systems. These systems had reached the end of their useful life and required upgrading as they could not adequately support the new requirements of “one-day or one-trial.” All 58 trial courts have an opportunity to participate and take advantage of this program. To date, 55 of 58 courts have received some level of funding.

### ***California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$469,857. The allocation was used to maintain staffing for the program. Eight superior courts used the CLETS access program, with one additional court in the process for approval and deployment. CLETS access, as provided by the California Department of Justice, was enabled during FY 2006–2007 through the California Courts Technology Center, with implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services.

### ***California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR): ROM***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$654,498. The allocation was used to provide a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders to the 32 counties currently participating. The allocation was used to cover the hosting costs of the CCPOR application at the California Courts Technology Center, maintain the application code, and provide user support to the court and local law enforcement agency users of the system. CCPOR was also provided with read-only access to 11 tribal courts and 35 judicial officers of the Superior Court of Orange County and their clerks.

### ***Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$591,274. The allocation was used to support deployment of ETMS (IBM Rational testing suite) to additional applications, including maintenance for the civil, small claims, mental health, and probate case management system (V3). The ETMS provides application enhancement for the software testing process and improves quality management of those applications. These tools help ensure that mission-critical applications are delivered with a consistently high quality, maximizing function and minimizing defects.

### ***Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$385,602. The allocation was used to support the UCFS that automates centralized reporting and distribution of Uniform Civil Fee cash collections. Funding supported two contractors to provide the ongoing maintenance and support of UCFS. Work in FY 2012–2013 included support for legislated and mandated changes to distribution rules to ensure accurate and timely civil fee distributions to appropriate entities within the mandated time frames. Support allowed processing of prior period reporting of collected fees in response to trial court audits. Major enhancements included developing additional utilities and reporting, which were used to analyze and verify the integrity of the distribution rules.

### ***Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$424,711. The allocation was used to maintain staffing for the program. This program promotes the Judicial Council's objectives for court e-services and e-filing initiatives by supporting the planning and implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all 58 California superior courts and local and state justice/integration partners. This program also provides representation for the judicial branch at key justice partner forums. Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services continues to participate in local, state, and national task forces and committees regarding information sharing, disposition reporting, and e-filing standards and systems, including e-filing document management and self-represented litigant access to electronic filing.

## **Trial Court Administrative Services**

### ***Phoenix Program: Financial and Human Resources Services***

The amount expended and/or encumbered for this program was \$11.9 million. The allocation was primarily used for required licensing, hardware, maintenance and operations (M&O), technology center support costs, and end-user training in direct support of the trial courts. In addition, the funds supported staff in the Phoenix Program's Enterprise Resource Planning Unit and Shared Services Center.

The purpose of the Phoenix Program is to provide daily centralized administrative services to the trial courts, including accounting and financial services, trust accounting services, purchasing services, a centralized treasury system, human capital management services, and core business analysis, training and support. Program staff design, test, deploy, maintain, and manage the Phoenix System, which enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations. The objectives of the system are to:

- Standardize accounting and business functions;
- Ensure uniformity of financial record keeping and maintenance;

- Provide consistency of data and quality of management information;
- Provide judicial and sister branch partners with timely and comprehensive financial information on a regular and timely basis;
- Maximize investment opportunities and timely use and disbursement of cash; and
- Provide comprehensive payroll services and solutions to trial courts.

The branch benefits from an integrated, state-administered program promoting statewide consistency in court administrative practices. The Phoenix Program was established in response to the Judicial Council's directive for statewide fiscal accountability and human resources support as part of the council's strategic plan, specifically, then-Goal IV: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence.

The financial component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in all 58 trial courts and allows for uniform process, accounting, and reporting. The human capital management component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in eight trial courts to date, providing human resources management and payroll services.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2012-2013**

**Resources**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 48,128,575</b>
Prior Year Adjustments <sup>1</sup>	15,188,338
<b>Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>63,316,913</b>
<b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	
50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Split	31,920,133
2% Automation Fund	15,753,200
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	201,201
Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	518,617
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	(8,495)
Transfer from State General Fund	38,709,000
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund	(40,620,000)
<b>Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>46,473,656</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 109,790,569</b>

<sup>1</sup> Adjustments include under-accrued revenues, liquidation of prior years' encumbrances, refund from Deloitte Consulting related to prior year contracts, and loan repayment from San Francisco Superior Court.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund  
FY 2012-13 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Project or Program**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b><i>Trial Court Security</i></b>	
Security Grants	\$ 1,199,994
<b><i>Families and Children Programs</i></b>	
Self-Represented Litigants - Statewide Support	105,030
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	1,750,000
Self-Help Centers	4,999,829
Interactive Software - Self-Reprinted Electronic Forms	40,000
Educational Programs	92,563
Publications	19,904
<b><i>Education Programs</i></b>	
<i>Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	
Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	67,251
B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	103,851
Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	191,236
Continuing Judicial Education - Leadership Training	40,061
Continuing Judicial Education - Statewide Judicial Institutes	126,756
Continuing Judicial Education - Advance Education for Experienced Judges	27,488
Continuing Judicial Education - Regional and Local Education Courses	6,028
<i>Essential and Other Education for CEOs, Managers and Supervisors</i>	
Manager and Supervisor Training	18,770
<i>Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel</i>	
Court Personnel Institutes	69,515
Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	768
<i>Faculty and Curriculum Development</i>	
Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	206,366
Faculty Development	15,531
Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	1,320
<i>Distance Learning</i>	
Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	141,225
Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars and Videoconferences	6,112
<b><i>Special Services for Court Operations</i></b>	
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	6,946
JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	277,000
Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education)	132,837
<b><i>Legal Services</i></b>	
Litigation Management Program	3,423,282
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	875,966
Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	15,535
Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	450,906
Jury System Improvement Projects	15,653
Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	74,808
Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,010
Regional Office Assistance Group <sup>1</sup>	1,348,050

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2012-13 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Project or Program**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<i><b>Audit Services</b></i>	
Audit Contract	100,000
Audit Services <sup>1</sup>	628,068
<i><b>Fiscal Services</b></i>	
Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report	14,827
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	31,879
Treasury Services - Cash Management <sup>1</sup>	235,804
Trial Court Procurement <sup>1</sup>	128,037
Enhanced Collections <sup>1</sup>	751,599
<i><b>Human Resources Services</b></i>	
Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	85,000
Trial Court Benefits Program - Legal Advice	40,000
Human Resources - Court Investigation	107,702
Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	31,214
<i><b>Information Technology Services</b></i>	
Telecommunications Support	8,722,102
Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Planning and Development Support)	5,102,258
Interim Case Management Systems	1,237,450
Data Integration <sup>2</sup>	3,906,374
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) <sup>2</sup>	8,762,431
Jury Management System	600,000
California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services <sup>2</sup>	469,857
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) - ROM	654,498
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	591,274
Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	385,602
Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services <sup>2</sup>	424,711
<i><b>Trial Court Administrative Services</b></i>	
Phoenix Program - Financial and Human Resources Services <sup>2</sup>	11,937,657
<b>Total Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>\$ 64,799,934</b>

<sup>1</sup> Administrative support provided by AOC staff.

<sup>2</sup> Administrative support provided by AOC staff as well as local assistance costs.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2012-2013**  
**Fund Condition Summary**

Description	Amount
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 109,790,569</b>
<b>Program/Project Area</b>	
Trial Court Security	1,199,994
Families and Children Programs	7,007,326
Education Programs	1,022,278
Special Services for Court Operations	416,783
Legal Services	10,205,210
Audit Services	728,068
Fiscal Services	1,162,146
Human Resources Services	263,916
Information Technology Services	30,856,556
Trial Court Administrative Services	11,937,657
<b>Subtotal, Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>64,799,934</b>
Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services	162,894
<b>Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata</b>	<b>64,962,828</b>
<b>Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 44,827,741</b>