



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: January 22, 2015

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014	Action Required
	Date of Report
	January 9, 2015
Submitted by	Contact
Judicial Council Staff Zlatko Theodorovic, Director Finance	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195 <a href="mailto:steven.chang@jud.ca.gov">steven.chang@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

The Judicial Council staff recommends that the Judicial Council approve the *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*, as required by Government Code section 77209(i), to be sent to the Legislature.

### Recommendation

The Judicial Council staff recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*; and
2. Direct the Judicial Council staff to submit the report to the Legislature.

### Previous Council Action

Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) reflecting the creation of a successor fund—the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund—to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Previous reports on the Trial Court Improvement Fund have

been required and submitted pursuant to Government Code section 77209 since fiscal year (FY) 2002–2003.

### **Rationale for Recommendation**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Attachments**

1. *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
Tel 415-865-4200  
TDD 415-865-4272  
Fax 415-865-4205  
www.courts.ca.gov

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

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER  
*Chair, Executive and Planning Committee*

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN  
*Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. KENNETH K. SO  
*Chair, Policy Coordination and  
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.  
*Chair, Rules and Projects Committee*

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN  
*Chair, Technology Committee*

*Hon. Marla O. Anderson*  
*Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst*  
*Hon. Brian John Back*  
*Hon. Richard Bloom*  
*Mr. Mark G. Bonino*  
*Hon. James R. Brandlin*  
*Hon. Ming W. Chin*  
*Hon. David De Alba*  
*Hon. Emilie H. Elias*  
*Mr. James P. Fox*  
*Ms. Donna D. Melby*  
*Hon. Gary Nadler*  
*Ms. Debra Elaine Pole*  
*Hon. David Rosenberg*  
*Hon. Dean T. Stout*  
*Hon. Martin J. Tangeman*

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

*Hon. Daniel J. Buckley*  
*Mr. Richard D. Feldstein*  
*Hon. David E. Gunn*  
*Hon. Morris D. Jacobson*  
*Hon. Brian L. McCabe*  
*Mr. Frank A. McGuire*  
*Hon. Marsha G. Slough*  
*Ms. Mary Beth Todd*  
*Hon. Charles D. Wachob*  
*Hon. Joan P. Weber*

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO  
*Administrative Director,*  
*Judicial Council*

January 23, 2015

Hon. Mark Leno, Chair  
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee  
State Capitol, Room 5019  
Sacramento, California 95814

*and*

Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
1020 N Street, Room 553  
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Shirley N. Weber, Chair  
Assembly Committee on Budget  
State Capitol, Room 6026  
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization  
Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*, as required under  
Government Code section 77209(i)

Dear Senator Leno and Assembly Member Weber:

The Judicial Council respectfully submits the attached *Annual Report of  
State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for  
Fiscal Year 2013–2014* under the reporting requirements stated in  
Government Code section 77209(i).

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

Hon. Mark Leno  
Hon. Shirley N. Weber  
January 23, 2015  
Page 2

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Finance, at 916-263-1397.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino  
Administrative Director  
Judicial Council of California

MH/sc  
Attachments

cc: Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel

Danny Alvarez, Secretary of the Senate

E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León

Fredericka McGee, Special Assistant to Assembly Speaker Toni G. Atkins

Anita Lee, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office

Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office

Madelynn McClain, Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance

Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee

Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee

Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office

Marvin Deon, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee

Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office

Jolie Onodera, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee

Chuck Nicol, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee

Benjamin Palmer, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee

Mike Petersen, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office

Leora Gershenzon, Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee

Paul Dress, Consultant, Assembly Republican Policy Office

Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

Peter Allen, Senior Manager, Communications, Judicial Council

Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council

Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Finance, Judicial Council

Steven Chang, Manager, Finance, Judicial Council

Hon. Mark Leno  
Hon. Shirley N. Weber  
January 23, 2015  
Page 3

Andi Liebenbaum, Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst, Governmental Affairs, Judicial  
Council  
Yvette Casillas-Sarcos, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial  
Council



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
Tel 415-865-4200  
TDD 415-865-4272  
Fax 415-865-4205  
[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

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

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER  
*Chair, Executive and Planning Committee*

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN  
*Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. KENNETH K. SO  
*Chair, Policy Coordination and  
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.  
*Chair, Rules and Projects Committee*

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN  
*Chair, Technology Committee*

*Hon. Marla O. Anderson*  
*Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst*  
*Hon. Brian John Back*  
*Hon. Richard Bloom*  
*Mr. Mark G. Bonino*  
*Hon. James R. Brandlin*  
*Hon. Ming W. Chin*  
*Hon. David De Alba*  
*Hon. Emilie H. Elias*  
*Mr. James P. Fox*  
*Ms. Donna D. Melby*  
*Hon. Gary Nadler*  
*Ms. Debra Elaine Pole*  
*Hon. David Rosenberg*  
*Hon. Dean T. Stout*  
*Hon. Martin J. Tangeman*

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

*Hon. Daniel J. Buckley*  
*Mr. Richard D. Feldstein*  
*Hon. David E. Gunn*  
*Hon. Morris D. Jacobson*  
*Hon. Brian L. McCabe*  
*Mr. Frank A. McGuire*  
*Hon. Marsha G. Slough*  
*Ms. Mary Beth Todd*  
*Hon. Charles D. Wachob*  
*Hon. Joan P. Weber*

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO  
*Administrative Director,*  
*Judicial Council*

**Report Title:** *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*

**Statutory Citation:** Assembly Bill 1700 (Stats. 2001, ch. 824)  
**Code Section:** Gov. Code, § 77209(i)

**Date of Report:** January 23, 2015

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

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

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

In fiscal year 2013–2014, ending June 30, 2014, \$69.9 million was expended or encumbered from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various programs and projects, including information technology services, legal services, education programs, and families and children programs.

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

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

## **JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA**

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

**Mr. Martin Hoshino**  
*Administrative Director  
Judicial Council of California*

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

## **ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION**

### **FINANCE**

**Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic**  
*Director*

**Mr. Steven Chang**  
*Manager / Primary Author of Report*



# Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2013–2014

---

JANUARY 2015



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA



## **Recommendations Regarding the IMF**

Government Code section 77209 requires the Judicial Council to make “appropriate recommendations” to the Legislature concerning the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) in the annual report. The council does not have recommendations at this time.

## **Resources, Expenditures, and Fund Balance Overview**

In fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014, the IMF was supported by a variety of funding sources, including the 50/50 excess fees, fines, and forfeitures split revenue under Government Code section 77205(a); the 2 percent automation fund under Government Code section 68090.8(b); interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund; royalties from publication of jury instructions under Government Code section 77209(h); and a transfer from the State General Fund. Including prior year adjustments and a transfer to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the total available resources was \$96.7 million (see Attachment 1).

As of June 30, 2014, from allocations approved by the council for FY 2013–2014, \$69.9 million was expended and encumbered for various programs and projects, namely trial court security grants, self-help center funding, education programs for judicial officers and trial court personnel, the litigation management program, the complex civil litigation program, enhanced collections, information technology, and Phoenix financial and human resources services, all of which were managed by the Judicial Council staff (see Attachment 2). Of the \$69.9 million expended and encumbered, \$56.5 million was related to local assistance—distributions to trial courts or payments to vendors in support of trial courts—and \$13.4 million was for administrative support provided by Judicial Council staff.

Given the resources that were available for the fiscal year and the resulting expenditures and encumbrances, the fund ended the year with a positive balance of \$26.2 million (see Attachment 3).

## **Use of IMF Resources for Trial Courts during FY 2013–2014**

For FY 2013–2014, the council approved allocations of funding from IMF resources for various programs and projects that improve trial court administration, increase access to justice and the provision of justice throughout the state, and improve court management, efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. A description of how each project and program used its allocation of funding is included below.

## **Families and Children Programs**

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

\$99,999 was expended and/or encumbered to support statewide services available to court self-help centers in all of California's 58 trial courts. The California Online Self-Help Center has over 4,000 pages of content in English, also available in Spanish, as well as hundreds of links to other free legal resources. Over 4 million users view the self-help website annually. The self-help site provides local courts with information that they can use to research, translate, and post local court information on their own. In a time when many courts have suffered staff reductions, the site enables California's courts to provide information and avoid duplicative work by making a wide range of resources available to them at one single location.

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

The allocation supported professional educational content for self-help center staff on legal updates and contributed to the maintenance of an extensive bank of resources for self-help and legal services programs to share, such as sample instructions, translations, and other materials.

### **Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program (Translation)**

\$20,167 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the translation of domestic violence forms and instructions into Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese, and to make them available to all courts. It is critical to keep these forms updated to reflect legislative changes.

### **Self-Help Centers**

\$4,999,831 was distributed directly to the courts for public self-help center programs and operations. All 58 trial courts receive funding for their self-help centers. The minimum allocation per court was \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population. Ninety-two percent of the funds distributed are used by the courts for staffing.

Self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and cleanup work in the clerks' offices, which would increase courts' other costs.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short- and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from

expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent. Demand for self-help services is strong. Courts indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help. Currently, the judicial branch has been able to allocate roughly a quarter of that amount—a combined \$11.2 million annually from this fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund—assisting over 900,000 persons.

### **Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms**

\$60,069 was expended and/or encumbered to develop document assembly software programs that simplify the process of completing Judicial Council forms and other pleadings. Using a “Turbo-Tax” model, litigants enter information only once; the program automatically fills in the information on the rest of the form. This saves substantial time and assists self-represented litigants in preparing understandable and legible pleadings. Self-help centers report that these programs can significantly enhance their efficiency and effectiveness. The time of clerks and judicial officers is similarly saved by having legible and fully completed documents.

### **Educational Programs**

\$89,716 was expended and/or encumbered to support the biannual Beyond the Bench Conference, providing 70 educational workshops and 4 plenary sessions for 1,400 attendees: judicial officers, attorneys, law enforcements personnel, social workers, probation officers, and other professionals who deal with family and juvenile law proceedings. Conference content included legal updates, emerging issues, and best practices, and met continuing education requirements for attorneys, court administrators, mental health professionals, and probation officers.

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

The Youth Court Summit provided a statewide training program for approximately 150 youth court participants, judges and staff. The funding was used for youth scholarships, lodging/meal

costs and speakers. This event was also partially funded by other outside sources and was a collaborative effort between the California Association of Youth Courts and the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee.

## **Publications**

\$20,000 was expended and/or encumbered to support the California Dependency Online Guide (CalDOG). The number of court professionals using CalDOG continues to grow. The website currently has 4,165 subscribers, a 34 percent increase compared to this time last year. Subscribers encompass most of the categories of judicial branch dependency stakeholders, including 268 judicial officers, 2,329 attorneys, 702 child welfare agency social workers, and 852 other child welfare professionals including educators, probation officers, tribal representatives and psychologists. CalDOG provides subscribers with a bimonthly e-mail summary of new cases and other current information. Resources on the website include a comprehensive case law page with summaries and case text for California dependency and related state and federal cases; distance-learning courses including for-credit online courses that meet the eight-hour training requirement for new dependency attorneys; educational content, such as the curriculum and materials for Assembly Bill 12/212 training, and handouts from recent Beyond the Bench conferences and other events; and articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, and publications. CalDOG page views averaged 21,408 in June 2014.

## **Education Programs**

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

#### ***New Judge Education and Primary Assignment Orientation Courses***

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

All newly elected and appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers are required by California Rules of Court, rule 10.462 (c)(1) to complete new judge education offered by CJER by attending the NJO program within six months of taking the oath of office, attending an orientation course in their primary assignment within one year of taking the oath of office, and attending the B.E. Witkin Judicial College within two years of taking the oath of office. By rule of court, CJER is the sole provider for these audiences. These three programs which comprise the new judge education required under rule 10.162(c)(1) have been determined by the CJER Governing Committee to be essential for new judges and subordinate judicial officers, and are specifically designed for that audience. The content of each program has been developed by the various curriculum committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee.

1. New Judge Orientation Program

\$83,480 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the week-long New Judge Orientation (NJO) program that is designed to assist new judges and subordinate judicial officers in making the transition from attorney advocates to judicial officers, and includes the subject areas of judicial ethics, fairness, and trial management. There are four highly experienced faculty members for the entire week. Program participants focus on ethics, including demeanor (demeanor issues are the number one cause of discipline by the Commission on Judicial Performance), fairness, and courtroom control in this highly interactive program, as well as learning about the judicial branch, Judicial Council, and the courts. The concept at NJO is to give the new judges the opportunity, as they begin their careers, to focus on the core of what it means to be a judge and to come away with a commitment to maintaining high standards in their work. The number of programs offered depends on the number of judicial appointments in a given year.

2. B.E Witkin Judicial College

\$143,990 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the two-week Judicial College that offers new judges and subordinate judicial officers a broader educational experience than the orientation courses while still emphasizing their current position as new bench officers. Extensive courses in evidence and other basic civil and criminal courses are offered as well as a multitude of relevant elective courses, including mental health and the courts, self-represented litigants, and domestic violence. The college class is divided into seminar groups, which meet frequently during the college to provide participants an opportunity to discuss the courses and answer questions that arise during the program. The college design is premised on the belief that working professionals learn best from each other. The small group design of the college, as well as the presence of trained seminar leaders, is a means to encourage this type of learning. This also allows participants to bring sensitive issues with them that they might be reluctant to raise at their local courts. The statewide program provides an early opportunity for new judges to see a variety of approaches within different courts. The number of Judicial College participants varies based on the number of judicial appointments. In the past, participation has ranged from approximately 55 to 140 judges and subordinate judicial officers.

3. Primary Assignment Orientation and Overview Courses

\$256,686 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses that provide new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion in their primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, traffic, probate) with emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, as well as classroom exercises designed to test their skills in the assignment. The courses are typically offered at one of three venues throughout the year, but some of the courses are offered multiple times throughout the year. These courses are also available to experienced judges who are moving into a new assignment for the first time and to judges returning to an assignment after a period of time.

In addition to the PAO courses, CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments which are substantively more complex than those covered by the PAO above (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, and capital cases). These programs are designed for experienced judges who are expected by the education rule to take a course in their new primary assignment or to fulfill other statutory or case law-based education requirements. There are also a number of courses developed by the Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC)—dealing specifically with domestic violence issues—that CJER supports by augmenting the grant funds used for the programs and offering the programs at CJER venues. The funds are used to pay for participant meal costs that the grants cannot fund. By attending the domestic violence programming, judges and subordinate judicial officers also meet the provisions of California Rules of Court, rule 10.464 that sets forth the education requirements and expectations for judges and subordinate judicial officers on domestic violence issues. Planned courses can accommodate approximately 680 participants per year.

All of the PAO courses are taught by judicial faculty who are experts in these assignments and specifically trained for this education program. Because these programs focus deeply on all of the major bench assignments, the Assigned Judges Program relies heavily on the PAO to provide its judges with the education and training they need to be able to take on assignments which these retired judges may not have had during their active careers. These PAO courses are statewide programs, offered throughout the year, that provide judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state the opportunity to network with their colleagues and learn the ways various courts do the work of judging. This encourages cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide. Educating judges to understand the rules and issues of ethics and fairness enhances public confidence in the judiciary.

The structure of NJO as well as the college also provides two opportunities for new judges to develop relationships that last throughout their career. Bringing the newly assigned judges together allows them to ask the faculty questions and discuss issues with them as well as with their colleagues. Uniformity in judicial practice and procedure is promoted by the sharing of ideas and best practices. The benefits to the individual judge, who is able to feel confident in his or her practice on the bench, and to courts, most of whom are unable to provide a systematic training program for judges, are great. Moreover, providing a well educated judiciary enhances the administration of justice, increases the public's confidence in the judicial branch, and promotes support for the branch.

### ***Continuing Judicial Education—Leadership Training***

\$40,507 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Presiding Judge/Court Executive Officer Court Management Program and Supervising Judges Program that offered educational opportunities for trial court judicial leadership.

These programs offer court leaders a chance to learn management techniques, strategies, and best practices designed for the unique environment of the courts. The ability to bring presiding judges and court executive officers together to focus on the specific and special nature of their responsibilities is essential to the smooth, efficient, and fair operations of the court. These programs enable judges to fulfill continuing education hours and expectations under California Rules of Court, rules 10.462(c)(2) and 10.462(c)(2)(A–C).

***Continuing Judicial Education—Statewide Judicial Institutes***

\$95,919 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging and group meals for judges and subordinate judicial officers participating at the Criminal Law, Probate and Mental Health Law, and Cow County Institute programs. Additional costs covered include materials production, meeting room rental, and AV equipment rental.

CJER offers institutes in all of the major trial court bench assignments (civil, criminal, family, juvenile, probate) as well as specific programs for appellate justices, rural court judges, appellate court attorneys, and trial court attorneys. The bench assignment institutes are designed primarily for experienced judicial officers, but judges new to the assignment also benefit from attending. These two-day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and other current material. Participants frequently comment that the learning environment is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues, because it provides an opportunity to learn about different strategies for dealing with the many challenges faced by judges in the same assignment or by the specific audiences attending the institute. By attending these programs, judges and subordinate judicial officers achieve education hours towards the continuing education expectations and requirements of the California Rules of Court.

Attendance numbers at the institutes range from 70 to 140 attendees. Essential content is identified by Curriculum Committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee and then more specifically developed by workgroups. This content can include in-depth coverage of common, yet complex, issues which are not covered in sufficient detail at the Primary Assignment Orientations. In addition, there are many course offerings on advanced topics as well as courses on recent developments in the law. The primary benefit to the courts, and the branch as a whole, is that statewide programming for experienced judges encourages uniformity in the administration of justice and the opportunity for judicial officers to learn from more experienced colleagues. Additionally, some sessions may be videotaped and posted online, where they are available to all judicial officers. In FY 2012–2013, the Education Plan developed by the CJER Governing Committee included the institutes for Criminal Law, Probate & Mental Health Law, and Cow County Judges (judges in small, often rural courts who hear all assignments).

***Continuing Judicial Education—Advanced Education for Experienced Judges***

\$32,473 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production expenses.

CJER develops and provides a small number of advanced courses for experienced judges. These are continuing education courses designed to address advanced judging issues, and include such topics as Advanced Capital Case Issues, Complex Civil Litigation, and Civil and Criminal Evidence. CJER also supports the delivery of specialized courses in domestic violence and sexual assault offered by the CFCC. CJER funds participant meal costs that CFCC's grant money cannot fund. As with the New Judge Orientation and Primary Assignment Orientation courses, these are statewide programs providing judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state the opportunity to work with and learn from their colleagues, and exchange techniques and strategies. This enhances cohesiveness of the bench as well as the fair and consistent administration of justice statewide. Planned courses can typically accommodate approximately 210 participants per year.

### ***Continuing Judicial Education—Regional and Local Education Courses***

\$3,150 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant business meals and materials production expenses.

Statewide budget reductions over the past few years have necessitated that CJER develop and expand both local and regional programs because they offer a far less expensive alternative to statewide programming while preserving the quality of education. The content and courses that lend themselves to both regional and local programming are considered and identified by the CJER Governing Committee's curriculum committees and are taught by experienced CJER judicial faculty.

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

#### ***Manager and Supervisor Training***

\$26,551 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other program-related rentals, as well as participant materials production expenses and trial court participant lodging for the Core 40 Courses—but not the Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses—for which the courts pick up the cost of participant lodging.

#### **1. CORE 40**

The CORE 40 course is an intensive one-week program for new and experienced trial court supervisors and managers. It contains valuable and practical information that can be used to improve leadership skills that result in the overall improvement in performance of staff. Classes are limited to 28 participants who are selected from applications received online. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management. Experienced court personnel serve as the faculty.

#### **2. Institute for Court Management (ICM)**

ICM courses lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in a number of national curriculum areas related to court management. The courses serve a dual



purpose: a) to provide relevant education courses for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Managers, and b) to provide this education locally at a significantly reduced cost to courts and participants as compared to the national programs. This program grew out of a multistate consortium formed in 2008 between the California Judicial Council ICM, and six other states interested in enhancing the existing ICM certification program and preparing court leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to effectively manage the courts. This effort resulted in the ability of CJER to provide education and certification for court managers and supervisors. In the past, the courts had to pay ICM to bring these courses to their location, or to send their staff to NCSC headquarters in Williamsburg, Virginia, the cost of which was prohibitive for most courts. CJER's ability to offer these courses at the regional offices using California faculty has allowed all courts—small, medium, and large—to reap the benefits of this program.

The initial capital investment has yielded extremely positive results in advancing judicial branch education for court leaders. Since June 2009, over 90 court leaders have achieved the Certified Court Manager or Certified Court Executive certification from ICM, and there have been approximately 900 course participants who have taken one or more courses. The ICM courses are taught and held within California, making attendance affordable and convenient.

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

### ***Court Personnel Institutes***

\$122,895 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI) and Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute (TCJAI).

### ***Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI)***

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

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

### ***Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute (TCJAI)***

This multiday, biennial statewide education program is designed to meet the educational needs of trial court judicial attorneys. This program includes education in dealing with the issues currently dominating in the trial courts, such as criminal realignment, anti-SLAPP litigation, and elder abuse, in addition to the traditional areas of civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate. Courses dealing with ethics and related topics are also included. Trial court attorneys from across the state attend this program. This institute provides much needed education, especially for the smaller courts that do not have local education for this critical audience. This program typically serves nearly 200 trial court attorneys. It should also be noted that trial court attorneys, unlike other government-employed attorneys, are **not** exempt from the Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirements of the California State Bar and, as such, this education program provides an essential education venue for them.

### ***Regional and Local Court Staff Courses***

\$8,258 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Regional and Local Court Staff Courses and the Core Leadership and Training Skills Course.

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

Regional and local court staff courses allow CJER to provide high-quality education to trial court personnel at a significantly reduced cost and with greatly enhanced convenience to the courts. The courses and programs included in both the regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees, and are taught by experienced CJER faculty. Courses cover a wide array of topics including human resources; traffic court; case processing in the major court assignments of civil, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile; as well as broad topics relevant to all court staff, such as preventing sexual harassment.

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

This course is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this two-day course teaches participants skills that contribute to effective leadership, discusses challenges to leading friends and former peers, identifies strategies to meet those challenges, and identifies approaches to building successful and effective work relationships at all levels of the organization.

## **Faculty and Curriculum Development**

### ***Trial Court Faculty Expenses—Statewide Education Programs***

\$231,803 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty teaching at trial court courses and programs. The amount needed directly correlates with the amount of statewide, regional, and local trial court programs and products developed and provided. Enabling expert judges, court executives, managers, and staff to share their

knowledge and experience by teaching their peers is the core mechanism by which CJER leverages resources for the good of all California courts and by extension, for the good of Californians who rely on the courts benefit of an educated judiciary. Faculty members who are asked to serve as volunteers are less likely to offer their services for statewide benefit if their expenses are not paid by CJER.

### ***Faculty Development Expenses***

\$41,806 was expended and/or encumbered to cover the cost of lodging, group meals, and travel for trial court participants at “train-the-trainer” and faculty development programs, some of which are foundational for new faculty and some of which are designed to support specific courses or programs. As necessary, the funds were also used for meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production expenses.

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

### ***Curriculum Committees and Education Plan Development Expenses***

\$435 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meal costs of judges and court staff that serve on the committees involved in curriculum development work.

## **Distance Learning**

### ***Distance Education—Satellite Broadcast***

\$137,560 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for transmission of statewide educational satellite broadcasts for trial court audiences, new satellite downlink site installation work in trial court facilities, and maintenance and repair work and fees associated with existing trial court satellite downlink sites.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- ADA issues for court leaders;
- Court security; and
- Ethical excellence.

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

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

### ***Distance Education—Online Video, Webinars, and Videoconferences***

\$7,448 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for storage, encoding, and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products delivered online, for captioning of videos and broadcasts as needed, and for some Webinar-based education costs.

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

### **Special Services for Court Operations**

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

\$9,124 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for meeting expenses of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC), a standing Judicial Council advisory committee consisting of court administrators and judges from 15 courts, which is charged with, among other things, updating the court staff and judicial workload models. In FY 2013–2014, WAAC members oversaw updates to the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model, updates to the methodology used to prioritize new judgeships that may be authorized and funded by the Legislature, updates to subordinate judicial officer conversions using more recent workload data, and the submission of two mandated legislative reports.

The allocation was used to reimburse travel expenses for WAAC members. Additionally, funds were used to reimburse travel expenses for the WAAC chair to present a report from WAAC to the Judicial Council in December 2013. The funds were also used to provide a phone line for meetings held via conference call.

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

\$331,000 was expended and/or encumbered to support the California JusticeCorps program, an AmeriCorps national service program now in its 10th year. JusticeCorps operated in seven superior courts throughout the state. In FY 2013–2014, JusticeCorps was funded with an AmeriCorps grant (federal funding administered through a California Executive Branch agency) of \$850,000. Required matching funds for the grant are provided by the participating courts and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

The JusticeCorps program trains and places college students at court-based self-help centers to assist self-represented litigants. Working under the supervision of attorneys or other court staff, JusticeCorps members help litigants by identifying appropriate forms, helping litigants complete and file the forms properly, and providing information and referrals to related services. In this past program year, the program recruited, trained, and placed 238 undergraduate university students (each completing 300 hours of service) and 24 postgraduate members (each completing 1,700 hours of service) in court-based, legal access self-help centers in 7 courts throughout the state; the JusticeCorps members were placed at Superior Courts of Alameda, Los Angeles, San Diego, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties. The JusticeCorps' 262 members provided assistance to more than 100,000 litigants at these court sites.

All of the funding was distributed via intrabranch agreements directly to JusticeCorps lead courts—Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego—to ensure their established, successful program operations could continue and grow. Allocations were as follows:

- Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles: \$169,000
- Superior Court of California, County of Alameda: \$122,000
- Superior Court of California, County of San Diego: \$ 40,000

The allocation was used by these courts to support program operating expenses—including staff salaries, training expenses, and other member support costs—all of which count toward the grant “match” required by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) through our state funder, CaliforniaVolunteers (CV). (CNCS oversees federal AmeriCorps grant funding, and CV administers AmeriCorps programs in California.) Final invoices on IMF funding are not due from the courts until January 31, 2015, but projections indicate that the allocation will be fully spent down.

The JusticeCorps program has a proven track record of measurable results. Quantifiable data on instances of, and quality of, assistance is collected and analyzed daily during the program year. Program impacts are detailed in semiannual progress reports to the funder (CV) which also regularly monitors fiscal and administrative operations to ensure the program is in compliance. In addition to serving nearly 700,000 people since the program began in 2005, the program has been through numerous program audits which yielded only minor findings—often none at all. The history, scope, and impact of the JusticeCorps program can be found at the [California Courts website](#) and about AmeriCorps at the [CNCS website](#).

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

\$118,797 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for: the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters and interpreter candidates; providing ethics training for newly enrolled interpreters; and statewide expansion of technological solutions for American Sign Language interpretation. Funds were also expended for activities and resources required for the Judicial Council-approved Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan, which includes

all members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel, to develop a comprehensive statewide language access plan. The allocation was specifically used for the following:

- Contractual administration of court interpreter certification and registration exams (written and oral exams administered to approximately 2,100 candidates per year), including a portion of the contractual cost for test administration provided by our test administrator, Prometric, Inc.
- The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) formula-based fee assessment that supports and provides funding for the state court interpreter testing program. Cost effective benefits of participating in this program include access to NCSC court interpreter test instruments, which are shared by other member states, and provide consistency in testing standards nationwide. Other benefits include certification test rater training and development, and upgrades of test instruments.
- Outreach and recruitment of potential future certified and registered court interpreters. Funds expended include registration and sponsorship fees for events and conferences offered by the following organizations: California Healthcare Interpreters Association; National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators; and Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Region V.
- Three ethics workshops for all newly certified and registered interpreters. Ethics workshops are mandatory for all newly certified or registered interpreters, and meet educational and compliance requirements established by the Judicial Council. The funds expended include the contractual cost of the educators/trainers, and the cost of producing and shipping materials.
- Further expansion of the use of video remote technology resources to leverage interpreter resources where American Sign Language interpreters are needed throughout the state, including the cost of purchasing video remote equipment, training on the use of equipment, and service/maintenance support for direct use by 14 courts.
- Court interpreter badges for approximately 300 interpreters.
- Costs associated with the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (JWG). In line with the Judicial Council-approved Court Interpreters Advisory Panel Annual Agenda, the JWG engaged in substantive work during fiscal year 2013–2014. The goal of the JWG is to develop a statewide language access plan that includes recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access throughout the courts. Funds were used to support committee member participation in three public hearings throughout the state and two in-person meetings of the JWG.

## **2015 Language Needs Study**

\$293,347 was expended and/or encumbered to conduct the 2015 Language Use and Need Study as required every five years under Government Code section 68563, which reads:

*The Judicial Council shall conduct a study of language and Interpreter use and need in court proceedings, with commentary, and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and to the Legislature not later than July 1, 1995, and every five years thereafter. The study shall serve as a basis for (1) determining the need to establish interpreter programs and certification examinations, and (2) establishing these programs and examinations through the normal budgetary process. The study shall also serve as a basis for (1) determining ways in which the Judicial Council can make available to the public, through public service announcements and otherwise, information relating to opportunities, requirements, testing, application procedures, and employment opportunities for interpreters, and (2) establishing and evaluating these programs through the normal budgetary process.*

## **California Language Access Plan**

\$65,000 was expended and/or encumbered to retain the services of a consultant/attorney with considerable expertise on language access issues, to research, assess, and assist with the development of the Language Access Plan. The final plan is anticipated to be presented to the Judicial Council for review and approval in early 2015.

## **Trial Court Security Grants**

\$1,198,904 was expended and/or encumbered to use for trial court security enhancement projects. Statewide master agreements were used for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of video surveillance, access, and duress alarm systems in trial court facilities. Other security enhancement projects included ballistic window glazing and tinting for judges' chambers, and fencing for secured judicial officer parking. Funds were also used for the purchase of evacuation devices for the Los Angeles Court. The first group of devices was purchased in FY 2012–2013 as a pilot project to determine the effectiveness of evacuation devices in high-rise facilities. Positive feedback from both court and sheriff staff in the Los Angeles Court supported the purchase of additional equipment. This was the second of three purchases, the last of which will be funded in FY 2014–2015. In addition, funds were used to provide training to trial courts on the preparation and maintenance of their continuity of operations plans.



## **Legal Services**

### **Litigation Management Program**

\$3,442,205 was expended and/or encumbered to pay the costs of defense—including fees for private counsel—and to pay settlements of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals. Government Code section 811.9 requires the Judicial Council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state’s trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and court employees.

### **Judicial Performance Defense Insurance**

\$919,892 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the portion of the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) defense master insurance policy that covers claims by superior court judges and subordinate judicial officers. The CJP Defense Insurance program was approved by the council as a comprehensive loss-prevention program in 1999. The program (1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints, (2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties, and (3) lowers the risk of conduct that could lead to complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.

### **Subscription Costs—*Judicial Conduct Reporter***

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

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

\$457,118 was expended and/or encumbered to pay attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas, including business transactions, labor and employment negotiations, finance and taxation matters, and real estate. The additional area in which legal assistance was provided reflects council actions to expand the scope of the program. The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program in July 2001 as a means by which the Office of the General Counsel (now Legal Services) could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed by Legal Services.

### **Jury System Improvement Projects**

\$13,410 was expended and/or encumbered to: (1) support the meeting expenses of the Judicial Council's Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions, and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official CACI and CALCRIM publications. The Jury System Improvement Projects are supported by royalty revenue from the publication of the Judicial Council's civil (CACI) and criminal (CALCRIM) jury instructions. The Judicial Council's Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions prepare new and revised instructions and propose their adoption to the council. On approval, the instructions are then copyrighted and licensed to commercial publishers. The publishers pay royalties to the council based on sales of the instructions.

### **Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers**

\$59,478 was expended and/or encumbered to support a contract for the development of a distance-learning course to help mediators in court-connected mediation programs for civil cases more effectively mediate cases with one or more self-represented litigants. This program helps courts meet the goal of standard 10.70(a) of the California Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations. The Alternative Dispute Resolution program also continued to implement the council's February 2004 directive that Judicial Council staff work with the trial courts to (1) assess their needs and available resources for developing, implementing, maintaining, and improving mediation and other settlement programs for civil cases; and (2) where existing resources are insufficient, develop plans for obtaining the necessary resources.

### **Complex Civil Litigation Program**

\$4,001,074 was expended and/or encumbered to provide support for the Complex Civil Litigation Program, which began as a pilot program in January 2000 to improve the management of complex civil cases. In August 2003, the council made the program permanent. During this reporting period, all funds went directly to courts to support the operation of 17 courtrooms or departments exclusively handling complex cases in the Superior Courts of California, Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

### **Regional Office Assistance Group**

\$1,218,654 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for six attorneys, one administrative coordinator, and one secretary working primarily at three locations to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial courts and serve as liaisons, consultants, clearinghouses, advocates, and direct legal services providers to the trial courts in the areas of transactions, legal opinions, and labor and employment.

## **Audit Services**

\$628,068 was expended and/or encumbered for five staff auditor positions in the Audit Services unit, which conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts once every three to four years encompassing these primary areas, and focusing on court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations.

## **Fiscal Services**

### **Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report**

\$600,079 was expended and/or encumbered to retain an actuarial firm to assist trial courts in meeting the requirements established in Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements 43 and 45, which require government entities to disclose their accrued liability for OPEB and related information at least once every other year.

Postemployment benefits may be provided through a county retirement system, CalPERS, or directly through benefit providers. Each trial court offers its own benefits package, and some may offer more than one package depending on the provisions of their collective bargaining agreements. Due to the specialized terminology associated with the complex rules and regulations for collecting the required information, as well as the specialized calculations involved in determining the valuations of these postemployment plans, these reports must be developed by a licensed actuary. Completed valuation reports are submitted to the State Controller's Office so that the required data can be included in the state's comprehensive annual financial report. In FY 2013–2014, this reporting process included secondary reviews and subsequent revisions of completed valuations due to the establishment of OPEB trusts by numerous courts. These contributions often affect the liability obligations, thereby reducing future liabilities in certain instances and requiring revised valuations.

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

\$45,527 was expended and/or encumbered to support meetings of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and associated subcommittees that deal with trial court funding policies and issues. The allocation was also used to support budget-related meetings and conference calls in support of branch budget advocacy efforts, as well as to support budget training for trial court staff, including annual training on various fiscal-related schedules.

### **Treasury Services—Cash Management**

\$160,649 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the compensation, operating expenses, and equipment costs for two accounting staff. Staff are engaged in the accounting and distribution of all uniform civil fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts. Responsibilities include receiving cash deposits and monthly collection reporting of UCF for all 58 trial courts, entering

UCF reporting into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions when due to state and local agency recipients, and completing the financial accounting for the function. Staff performed other cash management and treasury duties as needed for the trial courts.

### **Trial Court Procurement**

\$25,812 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for phone services and rent allocation for one position in Business Services that provided procurement and contract-related services at a statewide level to save trial courts resources by not having to perform the same services.

### **Enhanced Collections**

\$595,699 was expended and/or encumbered to support four positions—three court services analysts and one administrative coordinator—working for the Enhanced Collections Unit. The unit provides professional support and technical assistance to court and county collections programs to improve collections of court-ordered debt statewide. The unit assists programs with the development and modification of operations to help meet the performance measures, benchmarks, and best practices established and adopted by the Judicial Council. In collaboration with the California State Association of Counties, California Revenue Officers Association, Probation Business Managers Association, Victims Compensation and Government Claims Board, and other stakeholders, the unit also identifies statutory changes needed to improve the collection of delinquent fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments.

The unit provides regular professional and technical support to justice partners to improve the effectiveness of the statewide collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. Enhancement activities include collaboration with the Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt and Interagency Intercept programs, assistance with the implementation of memoranda of understanding between the collaborative court and county collection programs, and the development of statewide master agreements with collections vendors. Staff also provide annual training on collections data reporting requirements set forth in statute and council policy.

### **Human Resources Services**

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

\$29,158 was expended and/or encumbered to maintain mental health referral services for judges throughout the judicial branch for the period January 2014 through June 2014. These services were made available to the 1,579 superior court judges in California, as well as assigned judges and subordinate judicial officers. Utilization rates remained relatively low, consistent with industry standards.

The Judicial Council, at the recommendation of the Revenue and Expenditure Review Subcommittee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, approved the elimination of the Judicial Officers Assistance Program due to low utilization. As a result, the program was discontinued July 1, 2014.

### **Workers' Compensation Reserve**

\$719,749 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for a tail claim that was settled with a county. Senate Bill 2140 established the courts as separate employers effective January 1, 2001, whereby court staff went from being county employees to court employees. However, since the state-administered Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (JBWCP) only came into existence as of January 1, 2003, this created a "runoff" or "tail claim" situation for the files with dates of injury occurring from January 1, 2001, to the date the files were transferred from the counties to the JBWCP. The Judicial Council has been resolving the monies owed to the counties for claims payment and administration for those losses with dates of injury occurring between January 1, 2001, and the date the files were transferred to the JBWCP in addition to transferring those tail claims to the JBWCP.

### **Human Resources—Court Investigation**

\$100,000 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for invoices related to court investigations stemming from courts' personnel issues. The firms investigated ten matters at nine courts. Due to the sensitive and often complex nature of these investigations, some matters took a number of months to complete.

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

\$34,127 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for conference room and lodging costs associated with the Labor Relations Academies and Forums. Participation figures are as follows:

	# of Participants	# of Courts Represented
<b>Labor Relations Forum</b>		
Northern California	56	28
Southern California	33	10
<b>Labor Relations Academy I</b>		
Northern California	12	10
Southern California	30	11
<b>Labor Relations Academy II</b>		
Northern California	54	27
Southern California	24	10

The Academies and Forums are offered to court professionals who support or directly participate in labor relations and negotiations. Academy I is a two-day program, which includes a basic introduction to labor relations and provides participants with the experience of engaging with others in a bargaining role-playing exercise. Academy II is a two-day program, where participants discuss current topics and trends, and strategies for resolving complex labor issues and best practice recommendations from subject matter experts in labor relations. The one-day forum serves as an interactive platform for problem solving, information sharing, education, and discussion of issues.

## **Information Technology Services**

### **Telecommunication Support**

\$15,579,291 was expended and/or encumbered to provide a program for the trial courts to develop and support a standardized level of local network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local court systems and enterprise applications such as Phoenix, and hosted case management systems via shared services at the California Courts Technology Center, which eases deployment, provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources. Activities that were funded included network maintenance, which provides the trial courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure; and network security services, which maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three managed security services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention, vulnerability scanning, and web browser security and network technology training for court IT staff.

## **Statewide Planning and Development Support**

\$5,091,094 was expended and/or encumbered to support delivery of a number of technology initiatives. These initiatives include the Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy budget, which funds the Oracle Branchwide License Agreement (BWLA) and the Enterprise Architecture (EA) program. The Oracle BWLA frees up local courts from having to manage complex software asset management and costly annual maintenance renewals. Local courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment. Enterprise architects provide support to guide the development and implementation of statewide applications and ensure compatibility with California Court Technology Center (CCTC) infrastructure, communications, and security protocols.

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

\$1,052,564 was expended and/or encumbered to provide program management support to 15 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Nine of the 15 SJE courts are hosted and supported from the CCTC. The allocation also was used to provide maintenance and operations support, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management. Six locally hosted SJE courts use ICMS program resources for legislative updates and SJE support as needed. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Justice, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information System, as well as custom interfaces with Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collections program, interactive voice/interactive web response processing, issuance of warrants, traffic collections, failure-to-appear/failure-to-pay collections, and web portal interfaces.

## **Data Integration**

\$3,314,047 was expended and/or encumbered to continue work with trial courts to develop and implement a statewide approach to data exchange standards and the integrated service backbone: a leveraged, enterprise-class platform for exchanging information within the judicial branch and between the judicial branch and its integration partners. The Data Integration program worked with California Department of Justice (CA DOJ) and the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara on a grant-funded California Disposition Reporting Improvement Project to exchange data between the trial courts and the CA DOJ. Work was also done developing a successful proof-of-concept for a cost-saving, web service-based alternative means of accessing California Department of Motor Vehicles data for the courts.

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

\$9,453,348 was expended and/or encumbered to provide ongoing technology center hosting or shared services to the trial courts, as well as a comprehensive disaster recovery program.

Applications hosted at the CCTC include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Computer-Aided Facilities Management, Integration Services Backbone, and local court desktop/remote server support. The CCTC continued to host the Phoenix Financial System (serving all 58 courts) and the Phoenix Human Resources/Payroll System (serving nine courts). Three case management systems (CMSs) operate out of CCTC: Sustain (SJE); the criminal and traffic CMS (V2); and civil, small claims, mental health, and probate CMS (V3). Some courts leverage the third party contract to also receive full IT services for their local court including desktop support, helpdesk, file server management, and e-mail.

### **Jury Management System**

\$600,000 was expended and/or encumbered to provide grant funding to the trial courts. In FY 2013–2014, all 22 courts that submitted jury grant funding requests received some level of funding for their jury management system projects. All courts are eligible to apply for jury funding. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to number and size of grant requests submitted, as well as the available funding. All 58 trial courts have an opportunity to participate and take advantage of this program. To date, 55 of 58 courts have received some level of funding.

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

\$470,718 was expended and/or encumbered to provide support for the program and ongoing maintenance to refresh servers, and upgrade software applications. Eight superior courts use the CLETS access program, with one additional court in the deployment phase and a second court in the process of applying to the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ) for access. CLETS access, as provided by the CA DOJ, was enabled during FY 2006–2007 via the CCTC, with the implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services.

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

\$444,559 was expended and/or encumbered to provide a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders to the 37 counties currently participating (40 as of December 31, 2014). The allocation was used to cover the hosting costs of the CCPOR application at the California Courts Technology Center, maintain the application code, and provide user support to the court and local law enforcement agency users of the system. CCPOR was also provided to 13 tribal courts and 35 Superior Court of Orange County judicial officers and their clerks with read-only access.

### **Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)**

\$437,586 was expended and/or encumbered to support the use of ETMS (IBM Rational testing suite) for applications, including maintenance for the civil, small claims, mental health, and probate case management system (V3) and the California Courts Protective Order Registry



(CCPOR). The ETMS records and tracks progress for software enhancement requests and defects, and is used to improve the quality of management of the applications. These tools ensure that mission-critical applications are delivered with a consistent high quality, maximizing function and minimizing defects.

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

\$350,858 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for staffing and operating expenses to support the UCFS that automates centralized reporting and distribution of UCFS cash collections. Funding supported the refresh and upgrade of the technical infrastructure on which UCFS operates in order to keep the system secure, technically viable, and vendor supportable.

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

\$234,637 was expended and/or encumbered to maintain staffing for the program. This program promotes the Judicial Council's objectives for court e-services and e-filing initiatives by supporting the planning and implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all 58 California superior courts and local and state justice/integration partners. This program also provides representation for the judicial branch at key partner justice forums. Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services continues to participate in local, state, and national task forces and committees regarding information sharing, disposition reporting, and e-filing standards and systems, including e-filing document management and self-represented litigant access to electronic filing.

### **Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension**

\$129,780 was expended and/or encumbered to continue the ongoing software maintenance for Adobe Forms. There are nearly 1,000 statewide forms and over 2,000 local forms that are used in the trial courts. A PDF form can be "fillable," but it can also be savable for later updates with this Adobe license agreement. In addition to ability to save the form for later updates, the other innovations include data validation, auto-population of data fields, XML tagging of data fields, file embedding, and e-filing.

### **Trial Court Administrative Services**

#### **Phoenix Program—Financial Management Systems**

\$11,074,899 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the program. Of this amount, \$3.3 million was used for required licensing, hardware, maintenance and operations (M&O), technology center support costs, and end-user training in direct support of the trial courts. Staff in the Phoenix Program's Enterprise Resource Planning Unit and Shared Services Center was supported by the remaining \$7.8 million.

The Phoenix Program was established in response to the Judicial Council's directive for statewide fiscal accountability and human resources support as part of the council's strategic plan. The program's purpose is to provide daily centralized administrative services to the trial courts including accounting and financial services, trust accounting services, purchasing services, a centralized treasury system, human capital management services, and core business analysis, training, and support. Program staff design, test, deploy, maintain, and manage the Phoenix System, which enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations.

The branch benefits from an integrated, state-administered program promoting statewide consistency in court administrative practices. The financial component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in all 58 courts and allows for uniform process, accounting, and reporting. The human capital management component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in 9 courts to date, providing human resources management and payroll services.

### **Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force**

\$1,440 was expended and/or encumbered to cover the travel and meal expenses associated with the activities of the Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force members, as well as the costs associated with the biannual, statewide revenue distribution training conducted in partnership with the State Controller's Office. The task force was established in conjunction with Penal Code section 1463.02, and its composition requires inclusion of state, county, and city representatives. The task force's objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of the criminal and traffic-related fine/fee distribution structure and attempt to simplify the administration of this system for the benefit of the citizens and the criminal justice participants.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2013-14**

**Resources**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 44,827,741</b>
Prior Year Adjustments <sup>1</sup>	4,410,172
<b>Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>49,237,913</b>
<b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	
50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Split	26,873,351
2% Automation Fund	15,242,700
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	124,878
Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	445,365
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	24,476
Transfer from State General Fund	38,709,000
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund	(33,991,000)
<b>Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>47,428,770</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 96,666,683</b>

<sup>1</sup> Adjustments include under-accrued revenues and liquidation of prior years' encumbrances.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund  
FY 2013-14 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project**

Description	Amount
<b><i>Families and Children Programs</i></b>	
Self-Represented Litigants - Statewide Support	99,999
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,167
Self-Help Centers	4,999,831
Interactive Software - Self-Reprinted Electronic Forms	60,009
Educational Programs	89,716
Publications	20,000
<b><i>Education Programs</i></b>	
Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	83,480
B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	143,990
Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	256,686
Leadership Training	40,507
Judicial Institutes	95,919
Advance Education for Experienced Judges	32,473
Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	3,150
Manager and Supervisor Training	26,551
Court Personnel Institutes	122,895
Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	8,258
Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	231,803
Faculty Development	41,806
Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	435
Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	137,560
Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars and Videoconferences	7,448
<b><i>Special Services for Court Operations</i></b>	
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	9,124
JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	331,000
Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education)	118,797
2015 Language Needs Study	293,347
California Language Access Plan	65,000
Trial Court Security Grants	1,198,904
<b><i>Legal Services</i></b>	
Litigation Management Program	3,442,205
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	919,892
Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	15,535
Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	457,118
Jury System Improvement Projects	13,410
Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	59,478
Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,074
Regional Office Assistance Group <sup>1</sup>	1,218,654

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund  
FY 2013-14 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b><i>Audit Services</i></b>	
Audit Services <sup>1</sup>	666,857
<b><i>Fiscal Services</i></b>	
Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report	600,079
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	45,527
Treasury Services - Cash Management <sup>1</sup>	160,649
Trial Court Procurement <sup>1</sup>	25,812
Enhanced Collections <sup>1</sup>	595,699
<b><i>Human Resources Services</i></b>	
Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	29,158
Workers' Compensation Reserve	719,749
Human Resources - Court Investigation	100,000
Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	34,127
<b><i>Information Technology Services</i></b>	
Telecommunications Support	15,579,291
Statewide Planning and Development Support <sup>2</sup>	5,091,094
Interim Case Management Systems	1,052,564
Data Integration <sup>2</sup>	3,314,047
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) <sup>2</sup>	9,453,348
Jury Management System	600,000
California Law Enforcement Telecomm System (CLETS) Services <sup>2</sup>	470,718
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) - ROM <sup>2</sup>	444,559
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	437,586
Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) <sup>2</sup>	350,858
Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services <sup>2</sup>	234,637
Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	129,780
<b><i>Trial Court Administrative Services</i></b>	
Phoenix Program - Financial Management System <sup>2</sup>	11,074,899
Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	1,440
<b>Total Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>\$ 69,878,695</b>

<sup>1</sup> All expenditure is for administrative support services provided by Judicial Council staff.

<sup>2</sup> Expenditures include the costs for local assistance and administrative support services provided by Judicial Council staff.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2013-14**  
**Fund Condition Summary**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 96,666,683</b>
<b>Program/Project Area</b>	
Families and Children	5,289,722
Education	1,232,958
Court Operations Services	2,016,172
Legal Services	10,127,365
Audit Services	666,857
Finance	1,427,767
Human Resources	883,034
Information Technology	37,158,482
Trial Court Administrative Services	11,076,339
<b>Subtotal, Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>69,878,695</b>
Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services	580,982
<b>Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata</b>	<b>70,459,677</b>
<b>Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 26,207,006</b>