

Realizing the Goals of Assembly Bill 233 (Stats. 1997, ch. 850)

A sampling of judicial branch accomplishments¹

In legislative findings and declarations, AB 233 asserts that state funding of trial courts is necessary to provide uniform standards and procedures, economies of scale, and structural efficiency and simplicity. The Legislature also found that structural improvement will provide for an improved court system, a uniform and equitable court system, and will, therefore, increase access to justice for the citizens of the State of California.

This document sets out a sampling of judicial branch accomplishments that realize those goals, organized into the following 8 subject matter areas:

- Administrative, Legal, and Human Resources
- Case Management
- Direct Public Services
- Education and Guidance
- Fiscal Management and Reporting
- Judges and Jury Practices
- Records and Technology
- Security

For each accomplishment, the document identifies the AB 233 goal realized by the accomplishment, (i.e., (1) uniform standards, (2) economies of scale, (3) efficiency and simplicity, or (4) structural improvement), whether it is mandatory or permissive, and whether the accomplishment is found in all trial courts.

¹ Note: the listing of achievements is *not* a comprehensive list of each and every judicial branch achievement in the respective categories, but is only a sampling.

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users		AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
I. Administrative, Legal, and Human Resources				
1.	Statewide Strategic and Operational Plans Promotes uniformity and provides direction.	Uniform Standards	M (CRC ² 10.1)	Y
2.	Litigation Management Program The Litigation Management Program annually manages approximately 500 claims and lawsuits against the courts without exceeding its 4.5 million budget. The Litigation Management Program fulfills the duty of the Judicial Council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of courts, judicial officers, and court employees with a small group of experienced attorneys who centrally manage the claims and outside counsel under the oversight of the Judicial Council in a way that promotes the cost-effective, prompt, and fair resolution of claims against the courts for a cost considerably lower than if managed individually.	Economies of Scale	M (Gov. Code, § 68119; CRC 10.202)	Y
3.	Regional collective bargaining for interpreters Leverages resources and expertise by reducing labor agreements from 58 to 4 statewide for court interpreters.	Economies of Scale	M (Gov. Code, §§ 71807 and 71808)	Y
4.	Workers' Compensation Program Streamlined workers' compensation administration for the trial courts.	Economies of Scale	P (CRC 10.350)	N
5.	Court construction program The judicial branch established a court construction program to identify, prioritize, and remedy courts that are in most need of structural improvements, designed to provide access and safety to the public and all court users. Providing access to justice through safe, secure, accessible, functional courthouses is a critical priority for the California judicial branch. The courthouse construction program focuses on the most immediate and critical needs in the branch. Many buildings that house California's courts are in a critical state of disrepair and antiquated design. Inadequate security	Structural Improvement	N/A	N/A

² Denotes the rule set forth in the California Rules of Court

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
has created dangerous conditions that place children, jurors, witnesses, litigants, visitors, and court employees at risk. Without the necessary improvements in physical infrastructure, the courts are in danger of losing their ability to safely and effectively carry out justice.			
6. Statewide services in areas of legal, human resources, and education Centralized services and support by the AOC provide greater access and enhanced services to courts. Includes training and education, legal opinions, litigation management, and labor and employee relations assistance. Expertise is leveraged and need for redundancy and duplicative efforts are eliminated.	Economies of Scale	P	N
7. Statewide manuals adopted Statewide manuals include Judicial Branch Contract Manual, Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures, Court Records Manual, and others. Goals are to ensure consistent practices, provide guidance, and promote best practices statewide.	Uniform Standards Structural Improvement	M/P (Varies depending on practice)	N
8. Statewide procurement strategies The judicial branch has established statewide procurement strategies to leverage economies of scale and minimize trial court costs by drawing on the purchasing power of the statewide judicial branch (by, among other things, the development of master service agreements for various products and services) These save court resources – both time and money.	Economies of Scale	P	N
9. Shared services When appropriate, courts develop shared administrative services such as the Shared Procurement Services provided by the Riverside County Superior Court where the Riverside Court performs the competitive bidding process for 18 other courts to provide economies of scale and ensure the process complies with legal requirements.	Economies of Scale	P	N
10. Comprehensive collections program guidelines and standards, performance measures, and best practices Encourage the optimal collection of criminal and traffic fines and fees and ensure the enforcement of court orders and respect for the rule of law.	Efficiency/Simplicity	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 3

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users		AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
II. Case Management				
11.	Blue Ribbon Panel on the Fair and Efficient Administration of Civil Cases The panel recommended a series of practices to improve civil case processing, leading to rules of court and time standards to make the civil delay reduction program more flexible and practical for court users.	Efficiency/Simplicity Uniform Standards	P	N
12.	Streamline and simplify processes in civil cases These innovations include: expedited jury trials, modernized statutes and rules related to e-discovery, uniform standards for telephonic appearances. Expedited jury trials are an alternative, streamlined method for handling civil actions to promote the speedy and economic resolution of cases and to conserve judicial resources. An expedited jury trial is heard by a smaller jury, and the goal is to complete the trial in one day. Lawyers around the state raised concerns with the seeming inconsistent practice of allowing appearances by telephone in certain proceedings. The rules establish presumptions allowing for telephonic appearances in certain cases, eliminating time and cost for litigants, but providing the courts with necessary tools to require parties to appear in person when necessary.	Efficiency/Simplicity Uniform Standards	P	N
13.	Complex civil litigation program Provides judges training and resources to help manage complex civil cases efficiently and effectively.	Efficiency/Simplicity Economies of Scale	P	N
14.	Technical assistance to courts on criminal case flow management To ensure the most effective practices in criminal, dependency, and delinquency cases, identifies methods for improving efficiency in case processing, and identifies the major caseload management issues facing California judges and justice system partners. It is designed to familiarize judges and administrators with the underlying principles of effective caseload management and improve the delivery of justice to the public.	Efficiency/Simplicity Economies of Scale	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 4

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
<p>15. Task forces to conduct comprehensive studies of practices in family law, juvenile dependency, domestic violence cases, and probate conservatorships</p> <p>Resulted in the adoption of rules, procedures, standards and measures of case processing to improve offender accountability in domestic violence cases, ensure permanence and safety in dependency, and provide heightened oversight and protections of elder and dependent adults.</p>	Structural Improvement Efficiency/Simplicity	M/P (depending on rule or practices)	Y/N (depending on rule or practice)
<p>16. Technical assistance to courts, including a resource manual on effective practices in family law, to improve the efficiency of courts' family law operations</p> <p>A resource manual on caseflow management was developed based on best practices submitted by local courts. This manual was used for a series of workshops that enabled teams of court staff to develop plans for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of their family law processes. Based on the success of that project, the Judicial Council allocated funds to continue the work of developing best practices in other areas of family law. Teams of court staff, judges, self-help center attorneys and others from throughout the state discussed ways to improve family law court operations and agreed on a series of best practices. Those practices were studied to determine how they operated and to report on their costs and benefits. This information is being finalized to provide guidance to courts on how best to use limited resources.</p>	Efficiency/Simplicity Economies of Scale	P	N
<p>17. Dependency court-appointed counsel programs (DRAFT)</p> <p>The Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding and Training (DRAFT) program was established by the Judicial Council to improve dependency counsel on behalf of courts statewide. DRAFT is in 20 courts serving approximately 70 percent of the foster care population. Through DRAFT the state has made significant progress in reducing disparate caseloads statewide and managing contracts so that all participating courts will reach the Judicial Council caseload standard for dependency, and provide education to attorneys to ensure a high level of competence. Judges, parents and children can now count on representation from counsel who are</p>	Structural Improvement	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 5

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
not carrying caseloads of 200 or more clients and who are specialists in dependency law.			
<p>18. Collaborative justice courts</p> <p>Developed principles for collaborative justice courts. Over 400 hundred collaborative justice courts statewide serve approximately 40,000 high risk/high need participants annually in all jurisdictions and every case type, including emerging areas such as veterans' courts, elder courts, and reentry courts. The Judicial Council's Drug Court Cost Study showed that approximately \$90,000 is saved annually through drug courts.</p> <p>Identified effective practices and funding opportunities to support effective, efficient case processing for cases involving mental health issues, including a study of mental health courts, survey of judicial needs in processing mental health cases, and tools to assist judges in adjudicating cases involving elders.</p> <p>Collaborative courts show a reduction in recidivism, and county jail populations, and increase in family reunification. Research shows that litigants involved in their own treatment and outcome are more likely to comply with judicial orders and are satisfied with the court system.</p> <p>Treatment courts (family, juvenile, drug) provide greater access to justice for not only litigants, but everyone involved. Courts focus on outcomes increase access to services and gain higher level of public trust and confidence.</p>	Structural Improvement	P	N
<p>19. Appellate division project in Lassen, Plumas, Sierra, and Modoc</p> <p>Merged appellate divisions from these 4 courts into a single appellate division serving these courts. A cost efficient and effective approach to maximize the use of limited resources while not impacting public access to justice.</p>	Economies of Scale Efficiency/Simplicity	P	N
III. Direct Public Services			
<p>20. Mandatory Judicial Council rules and forms</p> <p>Eliminated, for the most part, widely divergent practices dealing with,</p>	Uniform Standards	M (Gov. Code, §)	Y

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 6

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
		68115; CRC 1.31)	
21. Adoption of plain language, easy to read court forms These make the court system more accessible for unrepresented litigants. Forms also translated into Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese, allowing limited English proficient litigants to secure restraining orders or otherwise protect themselves and their children.	Uniform Standards Efficiency/Simplicity	M/P (depending on the form)	Y
22. Rules eliminate limitations on submission of handwritten forms imposed by some courts These rules have been a significant benefit to low income, self-represented litigants, especially in family law matters, who in the past, found themselves turned away from some courts because they had prepared all of their forms by hand, and not with the assistance of a computer or typewriter.	Uniform Standards	M (CRC 2.118, 2.135, 5.330.)	Y
23. Statewide rules on fee waiver petitions Litigants were faced with inconsistent local rules and denied the ability to proceed with critical custody, support, or other family law matters when courts required some to provide additional documentation to demonstrate eligibility for a fee waiver. Litigants often were not prepared with, or unable to access such documentation, delaying their ability to get critical problems resolved, when courts in other parts of the state would not require the same proof of eligibility.	Uniform Standards Efficiency/Simplicity	M (Gov. Code, § 68630, et seq.; CRC 3.50, et seq.)	Y
24. Self-help centers and family law facilitators Self-help centers and family law facilitators are now found in every court in the state, serving nearly 1 million litigants each year. Educates litigants, improves the flow of cases for everyone because pro pers are prepared. JC allocates more than \$10 million in ongoing funding for courts to start or expand self-help centers. Services provided by court self-help centers facilitate the timely and cost-effective processing of cases involving self-	Structural Improvement	M (Fam. Code, § 10002; CRC 10.960)	Y

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 7

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
<p>represented litigants and improve the delivery of justice to the public. The Judicial Council provides \$11.2 million in funding for self-help centers. Self-help centers assist individuals to complete legal forms, explaining the court process and legal issues, and provide referrals for additional assistance. Self-help services save time for clerks and judicial officers. 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 \$.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 \$.36 to \$.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 \$.45 spent.</p>			
<p>25. Nationally recognized self-help website provides tools to unrepresented litigants to help them manage their own cases</p> <p>This enables litigants to gain answers to basic questions 24/7, to complete their forms online to increase legibility and accuracy, and to enable clerks and other court staff to make referrals to accurate and helpful information that is applicable statewide.</p> <p>There are over 4,000 pages of legal and procedural information about cases in which many people represent themselves - family law, domestic violence, small claims, child support, landlord/tenant, consumer issues, traffic, guardianships and conservatorships. The site links to thousands of free, credible resources for additional online information, legal assistance and other help. The entire site is translated into Spanish and there are some materials in other languages as well. The site receives over 3 million views each year.</p>	Structural Improvement	N/A	N/A
<p>26. Children's waiting rooms</p> <p>The number of children's waiting rooms has increased. As of 2009, there were 70 staffed children's waiting rooms in 17 different counties. When</p>	Structural Improvement	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 8

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
new facilities are planned, the need for children's waiting rooms, by law, must be considered and generally is always included in the plan. Funds are collected and maintained statewide for staffing of those waiting rooms, but most courts must augment those funds with other trial court funds. The waiting rooms that are in place provide greater access for adults needing to visit a court for a hearing or to file papers, attend mandatory services such as mediation, or benefit from visiting a self-help center or parent education, and increases the likelihood that they will be able to comply with requirements. It is also provides a child-friendly place for families accessing the courts when children need to testify or otherwise participate in court processes.			
27. Expanded availability of interpreters There is no access to justice if litigants cannot understand the basic processes, understand what is occurring in the courtroom, or even find their way around the courthouse. These services have provided incredible advances in the ability of courts to serve limited English proficient individuals so they can have access to the courts for basic services or the most complex or sensitive issues. Bilingual staff has been expanded at self help centers; forms translated into several languages; dedicated funds for interpreters in domestic violence cases; testing and qualification standards that ensure access to qualified interpreters; a master agreement to enable courts to easily purchase competent translation services; a master agreement to allow testing of bilingual staff and volunteers to determine their language proficiency; sample instructional materials in a wide variety of languages; trainings provided for judges, court staff and self-help center personnel in assisting litigants with limited English proficiency, assistance for courts in developing plans for serving litigants with limited English proficiency as required by the federal Department of Justice; multilingual signage provided to courts regarding holiday closures and other signs that are needed statewide.	Structural Improvement Efficiency/Simplicity	M/P (depending on item)	Y/N (depending on item)

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 9

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users		AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
28.	Expanded ADR and other conflict resolution programs Courts offer a variety of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and other conflict resolution programs to help people resolve disputes without a trial and as early in the process as possible. Offering ADR programs saves litigants time, money, and increases control over the process and outcome.	Structural Improvement Efficiency/Simplicity	P	N
29.	Uniform Fee Schedule Created consistency within the branch on fees assessed to file documents regardless of jurisdiction.	Uniform Standards	M (Gov. Code, §§ 70600, 70603)	Y
IV. Education and Guidance				
30.	CJER – provides uniform training for judicial officers and court staff CJER is acknowledged nationwide as a model in judicial branch education. CJER's offerings include educational programs and services for justices, judges, and subordinate judicial officers, including orientation programs for new judges, continuing education programs, judge's benchbooks, benchguides, videotapes, and other educational aids. Its mission is to enhance the quality of justice by providing a comprehensive program of educational services that reinforce the unique roles of justices, judges, subordinate judicial officers, and court personnel; enhance decision making skills; encourage uniformity in judicial procedures; and promote fairness, access, and equal justice for all. By providing judges and court staff recent updates on changes in the law, it helps ensure equal justice throughout the state. Provides standards of uniformity in qualifications, training, and expectations for temporary judges who serve throughout the state.	Structural Improvement Economies of Scale	M/P (A certain amount and certain types of training are mandated, but what provider is used is optional.)	Y
31.	Benchguides The California Judges Benchguides are a series of reference guides detailing specific court proceedings and procedures. Written from the judge's point of view, the benchguides are designed for use on and off the bench. The benchguides include procedural checklists, discussion of the applicable law, scripts, and written forms. Benchguides covering civil, criminal, family law, juvenile court, probate and conservatorship, special proceedings, and many	Structural Improvement Uniform Standards	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 10

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
<p>more are currently available. All benchguides are available on line for ease of access by judicial officers.</p>			
<p>32. Bench Handbook-Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants Most judges spend a significant portion of their judicial career handling cases in which at least one party is self-represented. Self-represented litigants often have difficulty preparing complete pleadings, meeting procedural requirements, and articulating their cases clearly to a judicial officer. This bench handbook is designed to help judicial officers handle the growing self-represented litigant portion of their caseload. Based on the experiences of hundreds of judicial officers who have shared their perspectives, ideas, and suggestions, this handbook includes tools and techniques to help judges run their courtrooms effectively, comply with the law, maintain neutrality, and increase access to justice. The bench handbook starts with a general discussion of the characteristics and needs of the self-represented and offers guidance on how to handle cases with self-represented litigants, including a review. It discusses caseload and calendar management and provides scripts and suggestions on managing a courtroom with self-represented litigants to ensure that it runs smoothly. The bench handbook provides specific information and tools on enhancing communication skills and on recognizing and dealing with potential unintended bias.</p> <p>The handbook is available on line for ease of access by all judicial officers.</p>	Uniform Standards	P	N
<p>33. New laws workshops and materials Annual trainings and/or materials provided to court staff to ensure consistent understanding of new legislation enacted during that year that will affect court operations commencing January 1 (or earlier). Ensures courts can implement necessary changes and strategies in a timely manner.</p>	Structural Improvement Economies of Scale	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 11

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users		AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
34.	Outreach efforts Expand courtrooms beyond courthouse; mock trials, court visits, iCivics, courts in the schools, Law Day, etc. Increase public trust and confidence through education about judicial system.	Structural Improvement	P	N
	V. Fiscal Management and Reporting			
35.	Phoenix Financial System standardizes all accounting functions The Phoenix Financial System provides a diverse range of services, including accounting and financial services, a centralized treasury system, trust accounting services, and core business analysis and support. Implementation of the statewide trial court financial system and centralized treasury enables 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: a) standardize the accounting and business functions; b) maximize investment opportunities and timely use and disbursement of cash; c) ensure uniformity of financial record keeping and maintenance; d) provide consistency of data and quality of management information; and e) provide judicial partners with comprehensive financial information on a regular and timely basis. Automation provides tool to enhance court's ability to not only fiscally manage the court, but also maximize personnel resources.	Efficiency/Simplicity Economies of Scale Uniform Standards	M (Gov. Code, § 68505)	Y
36.	Treasury function for the judicial branch The treasury function allows for the statewide management of court funds in a pooled operating bank account under a Master Banking Agreement, and maintenance of pooled bank accounts for civil filing fees, criminal fines and fees, and trust deposits. The use of pooled bank accounts alone saves the state just under \$1 million each year in banking service fees.	Economies of Scale Structural Improvement	M (Gov. Code, § 77009)	Y

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 12

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users		AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
37.	Internal audit function The internal audit services office of the AOC improves accountability for the use of public resources and adherence to statutory and constitutional mandates.	Structural Improvement	M (Gov. Code, §§ 77009 and 77206; Internal Audit Services Charter ³)	Y
VI. Judges and Juries				
38.	Assigned judges program Streamlined, statewide administration of assigned judges to provide assistance to courts with judicial shortages for long or short term periods.	Economies of Scale	P (Cal. Const., Art. VI, § 6)	N
39.	Effective methodology for determining judgeship needs Ensured that judgeships, when authorized and funded, are provided to the courts most in need.	Structural Improvement	N/A, but applies statewide, to all courts	N/A, but applies statewide, to all courts
40.	One-day one-trial jury management While jury service is required by state law, it nonetheless impacts businesses and employees. The one-day or one-trial system is designed to reduce unproductive waiting time of jurors as well as the potential for lost income, and it reduces the uncertainty of when and for how long employees will be unavailable for work.	Uniform Standards Efficiency/Simplicity Structural Improvement	M (Gov. Code, § 68550; CRC 2.1002)	Y
41.	Statewide juror orientation video Ensures consistent information to jurors about the importance and value of jury duty and their role as jurors.	Uniform Standards	P	N (courts that do not use the statewide video use their own or in person information)
42.	Uniform rules and standards for jury management Task Force on Jury System Improvements (1998–2002) oversaw implementation of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on	Uniform Standards	M/P (Depends on practice)	Y/N

³ Approved by Judicial Council February 2004

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 13

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
<p>Jury System Improvement. The Judicial Council has adopted California Rules of Court and Standards of Judicial Administration to improve jury service and experiences, including: Rule 2.1004, accommodation of jurors' schedules by granting one-time deferral of jury service; Rule 2.1006, mothers who breastfeed a child may request that jury service be deferred for up to one year and may renew that request as long as breastfeeding continues; Rule 2.1008, jury commissioners are required to apply standards for hardship excuses determined by the Judicial Council and set forth in the rule; Rule 2.1031, jurors must be permitted to take written notes during civil and criminal trials; Rule 2.1033, encourages trial judges to allow jurors to submit written questions directed to witnesses during trials; Standard 10.51, recommends that each court establish a reasonable mechanism for receiving and responding to juror complaints.</p>			
<p>43. Adoption of model jury summons At least 16 courts have implemented the standardized, statewide summons for jury service. The model summons has a simple and open layout; improves the appearance and readability of the summons; lowers the costs of a two-step process through use of a one-step summons; has consumer appeal; and improves juror comprehension of the summons and knowledge about jury service with the goal of increasing juror compliance and decreasing consumer confusion and frustration.</p>	Uniform Standards	P (Code of Civ. Proc., § 210.5)	Y/N
<p>44. Plain language civil and criminal jury instructions The California jury instructions approved by the Judicial Council are the official instructions for use in the state of California. The goal of these instructions is to improve the quality of jury decision making by providing standardized instructions that accurately state the law in a way that is understandable to the average juror. Use of the Judicial Council instructions is strongly encouraged.</p>	Efficiency/Simplicity	P (CRC 2.1050(e) strongly recommends their use)	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 14

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
VII. Records and Technology			
45. Judicial Branch Statistical Information Systems data standards Standards provide for uniform reporting of court data and uniform measurement of some performance indicators such as caseload clearance, time to disposition, and age of active, pending caseload. Such measures are critical to the evaluation of court operations and reflect directly on the quality of justice. Combined, these three measures help evaluate the timeliness of case processing and the extent to which delay is a problem in the courts. The benefit to courts and the public is the transparency that these measures provide in looking at court operations and holding the courts accountable.	Uniform Standards	M (Gov. Code, § 68505; CRC 10.400, contingent upon funding)	N
46. Management of court records using modern technologies The Judicial Council sponsored legislation to amend Government Code sections 68150 and 68151 and adopted new California Rules of Court pertaining to the creation, maintenance, retention, and destruction of trial court records to authorize trial courts to manage and retain court records using modern technologies and to transfer the oversight of such activities to the Judicial Council and the trial courts. These rules facilitate the transition from paper records to records that are created and may exist only in electronic form. Standards and guidelines for managing trial court records are now published in the Trial Court Records Manual.	Uniform Standards Efficiency/Simplicity	P (CRC 10.850, et seq.)	N
47. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) CCPOR is a statewide repository of protective orders containing both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement. CCPOR provides statewide court access to images at other courts within the county and across the state. Access to this information allows judges to make more informed decisions and avoid issuing multiple protective orders with conflicting terms and conditions. Law enforcement officers can also view the complete images of orders, including notes, special conditions, and warnings. It also provides a gateway	Efficiency/Simplicity Structural Improvement	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 15

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
48. Smart Judicial Council Forms Building on the fillable, savable Judicial Council forms, three superior courts have joined to add intelligence to the forms to assist litigants in preparing them. When completing a form, the ‘intelligence’ assists by making sure that all required fields have information entered, that the information entered is proper, and that all associated forms in a packet are completed. The results are legible, complete forms and form packets submitted to the court. This significantly reduces the number of hearings that must be continued for lack of forms or information, and reduces unproductive appearances by litigants and attorneys.	Efficiency/Simplicity	P	Will be available to all courts (currently 3 courts are developing the system)
49. Certifying E-Filing Service Providers (EFSP) Spearheaded by one superior court, a process has been developed to certify vendors who want to provide e-filing services to lawyers and litigants. The process uses a single statewide standard for the format and transmission of information and documents directly into a court’s case management system (CMS) and document management system. E-filing avoids data entry and scanning by court staff, and eliminates trips to the court house to file documents. Once certified, an EFSP vendor can e-file documents to any superior court using the V3 CMS that is ready to accept e-filing. Currently there are 5 courts using the V3 CMS, representing 25% of the total state filings for case types managed by the V3 CMS. Courts using other CMSs can also take advantage of the certification when their CMS is modified to accept the standard information and documents.	Efficiency/Simplicity	P	N
50. Telecommunications program Provides a uniform set of standards for the trial courts and establishes a basic framework to manage and upgrade the networks of participating courts. The Telecommunications program offers a yearly technical refresh,	Economies of Scale	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 16

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
the Managed Intrusion Prevention Service, a suite of security tools, and free maintenance on eligible equipment for participating courts. Benefits include: a network that is compliant with regulatory requirements for data protection, confidentiality, integrity and availability; a maintained and/or updated network improving the user experience for all courts and the public; a network infrastructure ready to support new technologies and enterprise system applications.			
51. Web page templates and web design assistance for the courts Results in a uniform look and leads to maintaining of consistent online information, improving access to court users.	Structural Improvement	P	N
52. Sharing of Information Services resources by Butte and Glenn Courts Cost efficient approach to secure and maintain technology and assist the courts to stabilize their IT infrastructure and manage IT problems.	Efficiency/Simplicity	P	N
VIII. Security			
53. Established guidelines for security plans Uniform subject areas for court security practices. Improves safety for all court users.	Uniform Standards Structural Improvement	M (Gov. Code, § 69925; CRC 10.172)	Y
54. Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) Statewide web-based planning tools and training provided to ensure minimum disruption in the case of disaster.	Structural Improvement	P	N
55. Fund security screening equipment Screening and perimeter security provide a safer environment for all court users.	Structural Improvement	P	N
56. Emergency and security services consultation and specific services and assistance for judges and court facilities AOC security staff offer the courts centralized guidance, templates, tools, and staff assistance for the creation of comprehensive court security plans; administer all aspects of entrance security screening equipment program for the trial courts, surveying, assessing, tracking, and evaluating hundreds of	Economies of Scale	P	N

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 17

Accomplishments Implications or Benefits to Courts and Users	AB 233 Goals	Mandatory / Permissive	All Courts?
pieces of screening equipment and facilitating replacement; assist trial courts with critical security enhancements by purchasing, installing, and maintaining systems and equipment for needs such as access control, video surveillance, duress alarms, ballistic glass, and perimeter fencing; facilitate access to high-quality, reasonably-priced security equipment that is vetted by specialists by managing statewide master agreements; runs privacy protection program to assist judicial officers with online privacy; and provide assistance in creating emergency plans and continuity of operations plans.			

Prepared by AOC staff for the Trial Court Funding Workgroup

Ver. 1 - January 7, 2013

Revised February 8, 2013

Page 18