

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)

Annual Agenda—2015

Approved by E&P: 12-11-14

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

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

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
- TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Subcommittee
- New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee
- New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Subcommittee
- New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees
- New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group
- TCPJAC Legislative Outreach Subcommittee

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;
- Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice;
- Review, comment, and make recommendations on policies, standards, and actions related to the implementation of criminal justice realignment efforts;
- Review, comment, and recommend policies related to acquisition, design, and construction of new court facilities and renovation and maintenance of existing facilities;
- Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration; and
- Meet periodically with the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council's Administrative Director and 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
1.	<p>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS), monitor proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p> <p>The JLS will subsume the work of the Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Subcommittee (TCLES) in 2015.</p> <p>This includes reviewing proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommending proposals for the</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 2. Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety,</p>	Ongoing	<p>Comments on proposed legislation and recommendations to PCLC on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC.</p> <p>Identify high-priority legislative proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC’s consideration of these proposals</p>

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).		<p>and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Rule of Court 10.46(b)(2)</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
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 Subcommittee, monitor proposed and existing rules that have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure and Service Excellence</p> <p>Objective 4: Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing</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>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 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 Subcommittee (TCEIS) 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>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 2: Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of</p>	Ongoing	Provide assistance to requesting courts, hold business process reengineering (BPR) workshops, and maintain the online BPR resource page.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>This subcommittee 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 business process reengineering as well as maintain the online Trial Court Business Process Reengineering resource page now loaded onto the Innovation Knowledge Center.</p> <p>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 inviting Judicial Council recognition of efficient and effective programs. 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>effective management practices branchwide.</p> <p>Objective 4: Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Directive of the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office, Legal Services, Center for Judiciary Education and Research, and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs. • Identify efficient and effective trial court programs and practices that provide greater access to justice. 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p>Review and Make Recommendations on Court Facilities Proposals and Recommendations.</p> <p>A new TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee would provide an opportunity for PJs and CEOs to review and provide input into court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p> <p>This new subcommittee grows out of the ad hoc joint working group that TCPJAC and CEAC formed in 2014 to provide comprehensive and constructive feedback to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) on proposed court set templates that it had distributed to the judicial branch for comment.</p> <p>This subcommittee will continue to be involved and engaged in the court-set templates project; but TCPJAC and CEAC would like to broaden the scope to provide input and feedback on various facility issues being addressed by the CFAC and the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee. A recent</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for conducting court business. 2. Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners. <p>Origin of Project: In 2014, TCPJAC/CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to provide comprehensive and constructive feedback on the court set templates to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Resources: Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee, Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Capital Programs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, comment, and recommend policies related to acquisition, design, and construction of new court 	Ongoing	Input into the development and future adoption of court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>example is the repurposing of vacant facilities throughout the branch.</p> <p>The TCPJAC/CEAC committees propose a new joint subcommittee of presiding judges and court executive officers be formed to serve as a resource to these two committees and to provide input on the impact of proposed recommendations on trial court operations.</p>		<p>facilities and renovation and maintenance of existing facilities.</p>		
5.	<p>Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations.</p> <p>A new TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Subcommittee would provide an opportunity for PJs and CEOs to review and provide early input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p> <p>TCPJAC and CEAC seek an opportunity to provide comment and input on technology policy recommendations at a stage where input can be thoughtfully</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</p> <p>B. Technology Infrastructure</p> <p>Policy 1: Encourage and sustain innovation in the use of new information-sharing technologies.</p> <p>Policy 2: Establish a branchwide technology infrastructure that provides the hardware, software, telecommunications, and technology management systems necessary to meet the case management, information-sharing, financial, human resources, education, and administrative technology needs of the judicial branch and the public.</p> <p>Policy 3: Develop and maintain technology strategic plans for the</p>	Ongoing	<p>Input into the development and future adoption of court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>considered.</p> <p>The TCPJAC and CEAC would like to assist in providing input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) and the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC). They propose a new subcommittee group of presiding judges and court executive officers be formed to serve as a resource to these two technology committees and to provide input on the impact of proposed recommendations on trial court operations.</p>		<p>judicial branch that are coordinated with the branch's technology initiatives and address needs such as business continuity planning and meaningful performance standards.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office and Information Technology Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, comment, and make recommendations on policies, standards, and actions related to the development, maintenance, and enhancement of technological improvements for the trial courts; • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration. 		
6.	<p>Study Issues Related to Courts Charging Government Entities, Other Courts, and the Public for Services and Records</p> <p>On November 7, 2014, Justice</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of</p>	2016	Analysis of related issues and possible recommendations to the Judicial Council

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Douglas Miller (on behalf of the Executive and Planning Committee) authorized the creation of the new TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees. The new working group will provide an opportunity for presiding judges and court executive officers to examine the many complex issues associated with courts' practices relating to charging government entities, other courts, and the public for various services and records. Because of the possibility of related legislation being introduced in January 2015, it was necessary to form this working group on an expedited basis so that it could immediately assess any new legislation.</p> <p>The following is the proposed charge of this working group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess and evaluate issues raised by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and other governmental entities about fees that courts charge to the DOJ, other governmental entities, and to other courts; • Identify and address issues among courts concerning fees 		<p>court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC and CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Trial Court Liaison office, Governmental Affairs, Finance, and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>charged to the public;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider clarification of current statutes that address court service fees and fees related to electronic court records; identify any potential barriers, ambiguous language or gaps in the law that should be addressed; Consider how, when, and if fees should be charged to justice system partners, other courts, and the public. 		improving court administration.		
7.	<p>Enhanced Access to the Criminal Law Enforcement Technology System (CLETS)</p> <p>Through a new TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, the TCPJAC and CEAC would like to work to develop proposed legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship and to seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to information from the Criminal Law Enforcement Technology System (CLETS) for purposes of conducting their investigations for adoption, guardianship, and child custody/visitation cases.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services: support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide. Objective 5. Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Origin of Project: CEAC (November 6, 2014 business meeting)</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office</p>	2016	Enhanced access to CLETS for probate investigators and child custody mediators

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>The Department of Justice (DOJ) maintains CLETS. It has denied access to CLETS for family court mediators. It has granted access for probate investigators in guardianship cases only where it is an emergency placement case, under Welfare and Institutions code section 16504.5.</p> <p>The inability of probate investigators to access other needed information from CLETS, despite statutory authorization for them to obtain criminal history information, poses enormous practical problems for the courts. The investigators responsible for determining whether a prospective adopting parent or prospective guardian is an appropriate placement have no ready means of accessing the criminal history information they need to make their investigations. Similarly, child custody mediators are unable to obtain information about parents' criminal backgrounds that may be critical to a custody recommendation.</p> <p>Any change to the policies</p>		<p>(TCLO), Governmental Affairs, and possibly Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>regarding access to CLETS will require two steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statutory changes that will specifically grant CLETS access to probate investigators for use in adoption and guardianship cases generally, and to child custody mediators for investigations in child custody and visitation matters. 2. Changes in FBI policy to allow such access. <p>Advocacy for both of these changes will require working closely with the DOJ, which is responsible for implementing both state law regarding CLETS access and FBI policy (Penal Code section 11077).</p>				
8.	<p>Review Rule 10.620 (Public access to administrative decisions of trial courts)</p> <p>Rule 10.620 addresses public access to certain administrative decisions made by trial courts. It sets forth requirements for trial courts to provide public notice, and seek public input, regarding budget recommendations made</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p>Origin of Project: Legal Services</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office and Legal Services.</p>	2016	Amendments to rule 10.620

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>by trial courts to the Judicial Council and specified administrative decisions. The decisions subject to public notice and comment requirements include any decision to close or reduce the hours of a court location. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.620(d)(3).) When notice is required, the rule specifies the ways in which it must be given, including a requirement that notice be posted at all court locations that accept papers for filing. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.620(g)(3).)</p> <p>Amendments to Government Code section 68106, which took effect on January 1, 2012, created new requirements for public notice and comment when trial courts decide to close court facilities or reduce hours. These requirements are inconsistent with the requirements of rule 10.620, and trial courts have faced confusion in determining how notice is to be provided. The TCPJAC and CEAC will jointly propose amending the rule to repeal those provisions that are inconsistent with Gov. Code section 68106, leaving the statute as the sole governing</p>		<p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts. 		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	authority regarding notice where it is applicable, and to make the language of the rule regarding posting of notice at court facilities consistent with section 68106.				
9.	<p>Revise Procedure for Presiding Judges’ Review and Investigation of 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>	2(b)	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p>Objective 4: 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(s): Effort originated from 2010 Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) letter to AOC proposing amendments to rule 10.703. A working group was appointed to explore the issue and consider support of amendments. (See TCPJAC 2012 Annual Agenda, Project # 9).</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office and Legal Services.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California 	2016	Possible amendments to rule 10.703

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms.		
10	<p>Continue to Strengthen Role of Presiding Judges in Legislative and Executive 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. TCPJAC will also provide outreach to the Executive Branch, specifically the Department of Finance, regarding trial court funding.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</p> <p>Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p>Origin of Project: TCPJAC/CEAC</p> <p>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO), Governmental Affairs and Finance. 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. 	Ongoing	<p>Develop legislative strategy.</p> <p>Strengthen relationships with legislative leaders.</p>
11	<p>Serve as a Resource</p> <p>Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Rule 10.46(b)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Input, feedback, data, and/or recommendations to requesting Judicial Council division or</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action.		Resources: Respective Judicial Council divisions and council advisory bodies. Key Objectives Supported: All		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 the defeat 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 focused 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 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> <p>The Jury Working Group will delay any proposal for Judicial Council-sponsored jury reform legislation until CJA jury efforts are concluded.</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</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>

	<p>operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p> <p>The working group will 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><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 JLWG will subsume the work of the TCLEWG in 2015 and will consider suggested statutory changes that were previously submitted by court leaders that had been identified by TCEWG as medium to long-term projects. The JLWG will also ask the courts to identify any new statutory changes that could result in additional revenue or cost savings.</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 <u><i>Making Judicial Assignments</i></u>”</p>	<p>Provide input on judicial branch leadership educational opportunities to CJER Governing Committee</p> <p>Revised <u><i>Making Judicial Assignments</i></u> 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><u><i>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group (TCBPR)</i></u></p> <p>In April and November 2014, three 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 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 2015 Annual Agenda.</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>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group (TCBPR)</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 online TCBPR resource page that will include a central repository of court reengineering improvement processes, BPR resource information, templates, and toolkits. 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 2015 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 a 2015 Judicial Council meeting.</p>
8	<p>Review rule 10.742(c) (Judicial Administration - Use of Attorneys as Court-appointed Temporary Judges) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</p>	<p>July 2015</p>

9	<p>Review rule 10.473 (Minimum Education Requirements for Trial Court Executive Officers) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</p>	July 2015
N/A	<p>Review Rule 10.630 (Reporting of Reciprocal Assignment Orders) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</p>	July 2015

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee

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

Number of members: 12

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

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

Date formed: 2001

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

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee

This standing subcommittee meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) review and comment on bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. As necessary, the subcommittee will refer matters to TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members determine need broader consideration. The subcommittee convenes throughout the year by conference call. In 2015, this subcommittee will also meet as needed to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).

Number of members: 20

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

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

Date formed: 2001

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

Ongoing

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Subcommittee

This subcommittee 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 TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Efficiencies and Innovations Subcommittee.

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

Date formed: 2014

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

Ongoing

New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee

This new standing joint subcommittee would review and make recommendations on court facilities proposals and recommendations, and serve as a resource to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee. This subcommittee will continue to be involved and engaged in the court-set templates project; but TCPJAC and CEAC would like to broaden the scope to review and provide input on various facilities issues being addressed by the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.

Number of members: 8

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC would have four (4) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee.

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 Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee 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 4-5 times a year.

Ongoing

New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Subcommittee

This new standing TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Subcommittee would be formed to serve as a resource to the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JTC) and the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC). TCPJAC and CEAC seek an opportunity to provide comment and input on technology policy recommendations at a stage where input can be thoughtfully considered.

Number of members: 4

Number of advisory group members: The TCPJAC has four (4) members participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Subcommittee.

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

Date formed: 2015

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the subcommittee will meet by conference call approximately 4-5 times a year.

Ongoing

New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Court Fees

On November 7, 2014, Justice Douglas Miller (on behalf of the Executive and Planning Committee) authorized the creation of this working group to evaluate and make recommendations to the TCPJAC and CEAC regarding, but not limited to, the following issues relating to court fees: 1) Assess and evaluate issues raised by the Department of Justice and other governmental entities about fees that courts charge to the DOJ, other governmental entities, and to other courts; 2) Identify and address issues among courts concerning fees charged to the public; 3) Consider clarification of current statutes that address court service fees and fees related to electronic court records; identify any potential barriers, ambiguous language or gaps in the law that should be addressed; and 4) Consider how, when, and if fees should be charged to justice system partners, other courts, and the public. Because of the possibility of related legislation being introduced in January 2015, it was necessary to form this working group on an expedited basis so that it could immediately assess any new legislation.

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

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

Date formed: 2015

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

2016

New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Through a new TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group, the TCPJAC and CEAC would like to work to develop proposed legislation for Judicial Council sponsorship and to seek related regulatory changes to allow court probate investigators and child custody mediators access to information from the Criminal Law Enforcement Technology System (CLETS) for purposes of conducting their investigations for adoption, guardianship, and child custody/visitation cases.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: The TCPJAC will have four (4) members (estimated) participating in the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint CLETS Working Group.

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

Date formed: 2015

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

2016

TCPJAC Legislative Outreach Subcommittee

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

Number of members:3

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

Date formed: 2013

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: It is estimated that the subcommittee 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

Final Version: 12-19-14