

Advisory Body Name
Annual Agenda—2015

Approved by E&P/RUPRO: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

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

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group
- TCPJAC/CEAC Proposed Court-Set Templates Working Group
- TCPJAC Legislative Outreach Working Group

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:

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

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
I.	<p>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group, monitor proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council strategic plan goal and operational plan objective:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p>	Ongoing	Comments on proposed legislation and recommendations to PCLC on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.46(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</p>		
2.	<p>Provide Review and Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process, and on Proposed and Existing Rules of Court</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group, monitor proposed and existing rules that have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council strategic plan goal and operational plan objective:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide</p>	Ongoing	Comments on rule proposals and recommendations to RUPRO on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure and Service Excellence</p> <p>Objective 4: Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.46(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Governmental Affairs (OGA). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms.		
3.	<p>Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group, continue efforts and activities that support sharing information on efficient and effective trial court programs through the Innovation Knowledge Center on Serranus and the Branch Efficiencies section of the www.courts.ca.gov public website.</p> <p>This working group subsumes the activities of the former TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group that will continue to provide training to interested courts in implementing BPR as well as maintain the online Trial Court Business Process Reengineering resource page now loaded onto the Innovation Knowledge Center.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council strategic plan goal and operational plan objective:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 2: Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and</p>	<p><u>TCEIWG</u> Ongoing</p> <p><u>TCLEWG</u> Ongoing</p>	<p>Assistance to requesting courts; TCBPR workshops and online TCBPR resource page. Projects planned for 2015 include: focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; ongoing marketing and encouraging the use of the Knowledge Center; and a presentation to the Judicial Council on the one-year anniversary launch of the Innovation Knowledge Center, highlighting previous accomplishments and an example of an efficient and effective program. In February 2015, one, two-day Business Process Reengineering workshop will be held in Contra Costa Superior Court for approximately 30-40 participants.</p> <p>Identify high-priority</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group, review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p>		<p>appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group—TCPJAC/CEAC</p> <p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group —Directive of the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison (TCL), Trial Court Leadership Services (TCLS), Legal Services (LS), Center for Judicial Education and of Governmental Affairs (OGA). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs. • Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms. • Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on 		<p>proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC’s consideration of these proposals</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration. • Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice. • Develop and promote a web-based Innovation Knowledge Center as a means of highlighting and sharing innovative, efficient and effective trial programs with the goal of encouraging the replication of these programs in courts across the state. 		
4.	<p>Proposed Court-Set Templates Working Group The working group met in-person in July and several times via phone with the goal of producing a comprehensive set of comments and proposed changes for the Court</p>		<p>Judicial Council strategic plan goal and operational plan objective: Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence.....</p> <p>1. Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for</p>	2015	<p>Input into the development and future adoption of court-set templates.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Facilities Advisory Committee’s future consideration. These comments and proposed changes were presented to TCPJAC and CEAC at the August 7th Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Business Meeting in Sacramento.</p>		<p>conducting court business.</p> <p>2. Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC/CEAC formed the working group to provide comprehensive and constructive feedback on the court set templates to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Capital Programs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p>		
5.	<p>Strengthen Role of Presiding Judges in Legislative Outreach</p> <p>The Presiding Judges Legislative Outreach Working Group works with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Fiscal Services, to develop strategy and discussion points for conversations with key members of the legislative and executive branches regarding trial court funding.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council strategic plan goal and operational plan objective:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC/CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO), Governmental Affairs and Fiscal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Develop legislative strategy.</p> <p>Strengthen relationships with legislative leaders.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs 		
6.	<p>Serve as a Resource</p> <p>Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Rule 10.46(b)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies</p> <p>Resources: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: All</p>	Ongoing	Input, feedback, data, and/or recommendations to requesting Judicial Council division or council advisory body

III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

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

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Strengthen Role of Presiding Judges in Legislative Outreach</p> <p>The Presiding Judges Legislative Outreach Working Group works with the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Office of Governmental Affairs, and the Fiscal Services Office, to develop strategy and discussion points for conversations with key members of the legislative and executive branches regarding trial court funding.</p>	<p>In 2014, the Legislative Outreach Committee continued to focus on presiding judge communication and interaction with the legislature.</p> <p>They conducted a survey to gather information from the trial courts on the impacts of budget cuts, and played a pivotal role in the successful restoration of \$100 million for the trial courts and in opposition of AB 2332, the public contracting bill</p> <p>The Legislative Outreach Committee will continue its efforts in 2015.</p>
2	<p>Jury Reform</p> <p>In 2014, TCPJAC and its Jury Working Group will focus its advocacy efforts on supporting the California Judges Association (CJA)-sponsored legislation (SB 794). SB 794, as currently proposed, would decrease the number of preemptory challenges allowed in criminal cases if the offense charged is punishable with a maximum term of imprisonment of one year or less. It would also lower the number of additional challenges which may be exercised separately, when two or more defendants are jointly tried.</p> <p>The Jury Working Group will delay any proposal for Judicial Council-sponsored jury reform legislation until 2015, or when efforts with SB 794 are concluded.</p>	<p>The TCPJAC Jury Working Group presented a recommendation to the full TCPJAC Committee at the January 24, 2013 business meeting. The recommendation proposed to (1) reduce the number of statutorily allocated preemptory challenges as well as (2) reduce the size of juries in selected types of cases. (see “Reducing Preemptory Challenges and Reducing Jury Size”)</p> <p>Concurrent to the working group’s efforts, the California Judges Association (CJA) sponsored legislation (SB 794) that proposed a very modest reduction in jury size. The Judicial Council had a support position on SB 794 and participated with CJA on their advocacy efforts. SB 794 died in 2014.</p>
3	<p>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group, monitor proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>	<p>The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Legislation remained active throughout 2014 providing review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>
4	<p>Create a TCPJAC Working Group on Trial Court Leadership Education</p> <p>Convene a group of recently or soon to be past-Presiding Judges to provide input on judicial branch educational opportunities for judicial branch leadership and to review and revise the 2006 TCPJAC publication on judicial assignments <i>Making Judicial Assignments</i>”</p>	<p>Provide input on judicial branch leadership educational opportunities to CJER Governing Committee</p> <p>Revised <i>Making Judicial Assignments</i> and provided to attendees at CJER’s Supervising Judges Institute in March, 2014 and the PJ/CEO Court Management Program in November, 2014.</p>

5	<p>Provide Review and Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process, and on Proposed and Existing Rules of Court</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group, monitor proposed and existing rules that have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts.</p>	<p>Provided review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing rules that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>
6	<p>Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</p> <p><i>NOTE:</i> In December 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee and the Rules and Projects Committee directed TCPJAC and CEAC to begin a conversation with the leadership of the Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability, the Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group (TCEWG), and the Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Program and Working Group (TCBPR) about the oversight of TCEWG and TCBPR. If a decision is made to transition oversight of the working groups from TCPJAC and CEAC to the Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability, a timeline will be developed for implementation of this change.</p> <hr/> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group, review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering (TCBPR) Program and Working Group continue to publicize and raise awareness of business process reengineering's (BPR) potential to improve operational performance of the trial courts. Provide assistance to interested courts in implement BPR. Create an online TCBPR resource page that will include a central repository of court reengineering improvement processes, BPR resource information, templates, and toolkits.</p>	<p><u><i>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group (TCLEWG)</i></u></p> <p>In October and November 2012, the TCLEWG reconvened to take a fresh look at the efficiency and cost-savings proposals that were not adopted for Judicial Council sponsorship in previous years.</p> <p>In December 2012, the council approved seventeen of the proposals for council-sponsored legislation. Many of the efficiency proposals endorsed for council sponsorship as legislation were included in early versions of the Governor's FY 12-13 budget, but were removed during budget negotiations with the Legislature.</p> <p>In 2013, one of the seventeen efficiency proposals approved for council-sponsorship in December 2012 was ultimately signed into law. AB 1293 (Bloom - Santa Monica) adds a probate fee of \$40 for the filing of a request for special notice in decedents' estate, guardianship, conservatorship, and trust proceedings. Other proposals were included in this bill and in other bills, but most of those efforts failed in the Legislature.</p> <p>The TCLEWG will reconvene in 2014 to consider suggested statutory changes that were previously submitted by court leaders that had been identified by TCEWG as medium to long-term projects. The TCLEWG will also ask the courts to identify any new statutory changes that could result in additional revenue or cost savings.</p> <p><u><i>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group (TCBPR)</i></u></p> <p>In April and November 2014 two day-long workshops for approximately 100 court employees were conducted. The workshops provided participants with instruction in BPR, applicable tools, information on available resources, and the opportunity to develop a reengineering plan. The working group continues to maintain the</p>

		<p>online TCBPR resource page that will include a central repository of court reengineering improvement processes, BPR resource information, templates, and toolkits.</p> <p>Note: Effective May 2014, the TCBPR Working Group was subsumed into the newly established TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations (TCEI) Working Group and further information regarding BPR activities will be included as part of the TCEI activities in the 2014 Annual Agenda.</p>
7	<p>Revise Procedure of Presiding Judges Reviewing and Investigating Complaints Against Subordinate Judicial Officers (SJOs)</p> <p>Proposed revisions to California Rules of Court rule 10.703 (Subordinate judicial officers: complaints and notice requirements) that would (1) simplify the procedures a presiding judge must follow while reviewing and investigating complaints against subordinate judicial officers, and (2) afford a presiding judge greater discretion in conducting an investigation and determining appropriate action.</p>	<p>Possible amendments to rule 10.703 - TCPJAC's proposal to be considered at the Judicial Council's December, 2014 meeting</p>
8	<p>Review rule 10.742(c) (Judicial Administration - Use of Attorneys as Court-appointed Temporary Judges)</p> <p>In the Fall of 2012, various CEOs proposed rule changes that could possibly lead to cost savings. The review and repeal of rule 10.742(c) was one of these proposals.</p> <p>Rule 10.742(c) requires each trial court that uses attorneys as temporary judges to record and report to the AOC on quarterly basis information concerning its use of temporary judges.</p> <p>In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC and CEAC for future consideration and action. The proponent of this proposal stated that his/her court does not use the report for monitoring or managing volunteer attorneys. Repealing this requirement would eliminate the need to dedicate court staff to track information for each courtroom, compile that information, and prepare the report. Also, due to a lack of staff resources, the AOC is currently not collecting this data.</p>	<p>Possible amendments to rule 10.742(c)</p>

<p>9 Review rule 10.473 (Minimum Education Requirements for Trial Court Executive Officers)</p> <p>In the Fall of 2012, various CEOs proposed rule changes that could possibly lead to cost savings. The review and repeal of rule 10.473 was one of these proposals.</p> <p>Rule 10.473 requires all California trial court executive officers to complete specific trainings in addition to 30 hours of continuing education within three-year reporting cycles.</p> <p>In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC and CEAC for future consideration and action. The proponent of this proposal stated that repeal of the rule would result in reduced training costs to trial courts for required training for CEOs who have already had the training, or, based on prior education or experience, do not need the specific training required by the rule.</p>	<p>Possible amendments to rule 10.473</p>
--	---

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

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

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group

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

Number of members: 10

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has three (3) members participating in the TCPJCA/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): In addition to the members from TCPJAC, there are seven (7) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)/Conference of Court Executives (COCE).

Date formed: 2001

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

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group

This standing working group meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) review and comment on bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. As necessary, the working group will refer matters to TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members feel need broader consideration. The working group convenes throughout the year by conference call

Number of members: 20

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

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

Date formed: 2001

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

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group

This group promotes efforts and activities that support sharing information on efficient and effective trial court programs through the Innovation Knowledge Center on Serranus and the Branch Efficiencies section of the www.courts.ca.gov public website.

Number of members: 12

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has six (6) members participating in the TCPJCA/CEAC Joint Trial Business Process Reengineering (TCBPR) Program and Working Group.

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

Date formed: 2014

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: The full working group will meet approximately four times per year by phone. Its sub-working groups will meet approximately 15 times this year by conference call.

Date work is expected to be completed: ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group

This working group meets as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts. It was formed in 2012 and has continued to meet throughout the years to recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).

Number of members: 12

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has seven (7) members participating in the TCPJCA/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): In addition to the members from TCPJAC, there are five (5) other members of the TCPJAC/CEAC Efficiencies Working Group from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)/Conference of Court Executives (COCE).

Date formed: 2012

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 4-7 times a year.

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Proposed Court-Set Templates Working Group

This group was formed in 2014 to review the Trial Court Facilities Advisory Committee's Proposed Court Set Templates report. TCPJAC and CEAC members voiced concerns with the report and its recommendations ranging from the overall process, the review period of the project, the size of the courtroom, and the flexibility of the templates. The working group's was appointed to review the report in detail, propose alternative solutions, and, if necessary, to meet with the Trial Court Facilities Advisory Committee to resolve differences.

Number of members 8

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has four (4) members participating in the TCPJCA/CEAC Proposed Court-Set Templates Working Group.

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): In addition to the members from TCPJAC, there are four (4) other members of the TCPJCA/CEAC Proposed Court-Set Templates Working Group from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC).

Date formed: 2014

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 1-2 times a year.

2015

TCPJAC Legislative Outreach Working Group

The Presiding Judges Legislative Outreach Working Group works with the Administrative Director of the Judicial Council, the Office of Governmental Affairs, and the Finance Office, to develop strategy and discussion points for conversations with key members of the legislative and executive branches regarding trial court funding.

Number of members: 3

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has 3 members participating in the Legislative Outreach Working Group.

Date formed: 2013

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 2-4 times a year. Individual members will meet with legislators in their district and/or the Capitol on an as-needed basis.

Ongoing

DRAFT