

**Executive Committee of the  
Court Executives Advisory Committee**

**Business Meeting  
November 6, 2014**

**Rule Proposals Sponsored by the  
TCPJAC and CEAC**

## Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm)

---

# DRAFT INVITATION TO COMMENT

## W15-\_\_

---

Title	Action Requested
Judicial Branch Education: Court Executive Officers Education	Review and submit comments by comments by January __, 2015
Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes	Proposed Effective Date
Amend rule 10.473	July 1, 2015
Proposed by	Contacts
Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee	Deirdre Benedict, 415- 865-8915 deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	Kathy Sher, 415-865-8031 katherine.sher@jud.ca.gov
Court Executives Advisory Committee	
Ms. Mary Beth Todd, Chair	

---

### Executive Summary and Origin

Rule 10.473 addresses education for trial court executive officers. Among other provisions, it requires that continuing education be completed every three years and that half of the required hours be live, face-to-face education.

In June 2012, the Judicial Council's Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) asked advisory committees to submit suggestions for changes to rules and forms that could result in cost savings or efficiencies for the courts. As part of that process, various trial court executive officers suggested that rule 10.473 be repealed or amended to reduce training costs to trial courts for required training for court executive officers. The Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) propose amending rule 10.473 to accomplish this goal. The TCPJAC and CEAC do not recommend repeal of the rule because of the value of education in the judicial branch.

### Background

Effective January 1, 2007, the council adopted rule 10.473 as part of a comprehensive set of rules addressing judicial branch education.

In June 2012, RUPRO asked advisory committees to submit suggestions for changes to rules and forms that could result in cost savings or efficiencies for the courts. Various court executive officers proposed rule changes that could lead to cost savings, including the repeal of rule

*The proposals have not been approved by the Judicial Council and are not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules and Projects Committee, or its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee. These proposals are circulated for comment purposes only.*

10.473. The submission stated that repeal of the rule would result in reduced training costs to trial courts for required training for court executive officers who have already had the training, or, based on prior education or experience, do not need the specific training required by the rule. In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC, the CEAC, and the Center for Judiciary Education and Research Governing Committee for future consideration and action.

### **The Proposal**

Rule 10.473 would be amended to provide that the presiding judge of each court has discretion to determine the number of hours, if any, of traditional (live, face-to-face) education that the court executive officer is required to complete to meet the continuing education requirement.

Amending the rule to enable the presiding judge to determine the number of in-person hours for continuing education under subdivision (c) would significantly reduce training costs to trial courts without necessitating the repeal of the entire rule. Currently, court executive officers must complete at least 50 percent of their required continuing education via live face-to-face education (15 hours over three years) and enabling presiding judges to alter this percentage will also give them flexibility in meeting the needs of their individual courts.

The proposed amendment of rule 10.473 parallels the changes in rules 10.491 and 10.474 to the in-person education requirement. Rule 10.491, which addresses judicial council employee education, was amended, effective January 1, 2014, to similarly provide that the council's Administrative Director has discretion to determine the number of hours, if any, of traditional (live, face-to-face) education that is required of council employees to meet the continuing education requirement.

Rule 10.474, which addresses trial court employee education, was amended, effective January 1, 2015, to provide that the court executive officer of each court has discretion to determine the number of hours, if any, of live, face-to-face education that is required of trial court managers, supervisors, and other personnel to meet the continuing education requirement.

### **Alternatives Considered**

#### **No change to rule 10.473**

No change to rule 10.473 would provide no cost relief to the trial courts, and, make education requirements for court executive officers inconsistent with those recently amended for trial court employees that provide greater local flexibility.

#### **Repeal of rule 10.473**

Repeal of the rule is not necessary to achieve the desired goal. Other modifications to the rule will be equally effective at providing the desired costs savings. The amendment of the court staff and council staff education rules allows more of the education to be obtained via distance education, which reduces the need for travel, and the associated costs.

In addition, repeal of the rule would eliminate an important education component of the rule ((10.473 (c)(1)), unique to court executive officers. Amended in 2013, this subdivision introduces an ethics component requiring three hours of ethics education for all court executive officers.

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

The proposal is expected to have positive operational impacts, giving a presiding judge the discretion to allow a court executive officer flexibility with respect to alternatives to live training.

### **Request for Specific Comments**

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committees are interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?
- Should relaxation of the face-to-face education requirement have a sunset date? If so, when should it end?
- Should the number of hours of education required in subdivision (c)(1) be reduced or otherwise changed?
- Should the length of the compliance period in subdivision (c)(1) be changed?
- Should the orientation required in subdivision (b)(1) count toward the total hours requirement?
- Should the education requirements in the rule be made nonbinding recommendations (“should”) rather than mandatory (“must”)?

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.473, at pages 4–5

Rule 10.473 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective January 1, 2015, to read:

1 **Rule 10.473. Minimum education requirements for trial court executive officers**

2  
3 **(a) Applicability**

4  
5 All California trial court executive officers must complete these minimum  
6 education requirements. All executive officers should participate in more education  
7 than is required, related to each individual's responsibilities and in accordance with  
8 the education recommendations set forth in rule 10.479.

9  
10 **(b) Content-based requirement**

- 11  
12 (1) Each new executive officer must complete the Presiding Judges Orientation  
13 and Court Management Program provided by the Administrative Office of  
14 the Courts' Education Division/Center for Judicial Education and Research  
15 (CJER) within one year of becoming an executive officer and should  
16 participate in additional education during the first year.  
17  
18 (2) Each executive officer should participate in CJER's Presiding Judges  
19 Orientation and Court Management Program each time a new presiding judge  
20 from his or her court participates in the course and each time the executive  
21 officer becomes the executive officer in a different court.  
22

23 **(c) Hours-based requirement**

- 24  
25 (1) Each executive officer must complete 30 hours of continuing education,  
26 including at least three hours of ethics education, every three years, ~~beginning~~  
27 ~~on the following date:~~  
28  
29 (A) For a new executive officer, the first three-year period begins on  
30 January 1 of the year following completion of the required education  
31 for new executive officers.  
32  
33 ~~(B) For all other executive officers, the first three-year period began on~~  
34 ~~January 1, 2007.~~  
35  
36 (2) The following education applies toward the required 30 hours of continuing  
37 education:  
38  
39 (A) Any education offered by an approved provider (see rule 10.481(a))  
40 and any other education, including education taken to satisfy a statutory  
41 or other education requirement, approved by the presiding judge as  
42 meeting the criteria listed in rule 10.481(b).  
43

1 (B) Each hour of participation in traditional (live, face-to-face) education;  
2 distance education such as broadcasts, videoconferences, and online  
3 coursework; self-directed study; and faculty service counts toward the  
4 requirement on an hour-for-hour basis. ~~Each court executive officer~~  
5 ~~must complete at least half of his or her continuing education hours~~  
6 ~~requirement as a participant in traditional (live, face-to-face) education.~~  
7 ~~The court executive officer may complete the balance of his or her~~  
8 ~~education hours requirement through any other means with no~~  
9 ~~limitation on any particular type of education.~~ The presiding judge has  
10 discretion to determine the number of hours, if any, of traditional (live,  
11 face-to-face) education required to meet the continuing education  
12 requirement.

13  
14 (C) A court executive officer who serves as faculty by teaching legal or  
15 judicial education to a legal or judicial audience may apply education  
16 hours as faculty service. Credit for faculty service counts toward the  
17 continuing education requirement in the same manner as all other types  
18 of education—on an hour-for-hour basis.

19  
20 **(d) Extension of time**

- 21  
22 (1) For good cause, a presiding judge may grant a one-year extension of time to  
23 complete the education requirements in (b) and (c).  
24  
25 (2) If the presiding judge grants a request for an extension of time, the executive  
26 officer, in consultation with the presiding judge, must also pursue interim  
27 means of obtaining relevant educational content.  
28  
29 (3) An extension of time to complete the hours-based requirement does not affect  
30 the timing of the executive officer's next three-year period.  
31

32 **(e) Record of participation; statement of completion**

33 Each executive officer is responsible for:

- 34  
35  
36 (1) Tracking his or her own participation in education and keeping a record of  
37 participation for three years after each course or activity that is applied  
38 toward the requirements;  
39  
40 (2) At the end of each year, giving the presiding judge a copy of his or her record  
41 of participation in education for that year; and  
42  
43 (3) At the end of each three-year period, giving the presiding judge a signed  
44 statement of completion for that three-year period.

## Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm)

---

### **DRAFT** INVITATION TO COMMENT

W15-\_\_

---

Title	Action Requested
Trial Court Management: Reporting of Reciprocal Assignment Orders	Review and submit comments by comments by January __, 2015
Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes	Proposed Effective Date
Amend rule 10.630	July 1, 2015
Proposed by	Contacts
Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee	Claudia Ortega, 415- 865-7623 claudia.ortega@jud.ca.gov
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	Katherine Sher, 415-865-8031 katherine.sher@jud.ca.gov
Court Executives Advisory Committee	
Ms. Mary Beth Todd, Chair	

---

#### **Executive Summary and Origin**

Rule 10.630 addresses the reporting of reciprocal assignment orders. It defines a reciprocal assignment order as “an order issued by the Chief Justice that permits judges in courts of different counties to serve in each other’s courts.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.630.) The rule also requires the trial courts to report to the Judicial Council on a monthly basis each assignment of a judge from another county to its court under a reciprocal assignment order.

At the August 30, 2013 Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) Business Meeting, the committee members discussed the monthly reporting requirements mandated by rule 10.630 and agreed that because this reporting requirement did not appear to serve any beneficial purpose and is unnecessarily burdensome to the courts, the rule should be reviewed for possible amendment or repeal. After careful review of this rule, the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and CEAC jointly propose amending rule 10.630 to achieve efficiencies and cost-savings.

#### **Background**

The Judicial Council adopted this rule as rule 813 effective July 1, 1990. The council subsequently amended and renumbered this rule effective January 1, 2007.

*The proposals have not been approved by the Judicial Council and are not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules and Projects Committee, or its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee. These proposals are circulated for comment purposes only.*

At the August 30, 2013 CEAC Business Meeting, the committee members discussed the monthly reporting requirements mandated by rule 10.630 and agreed that because this reporting requirement did not appear to serve any beneficial purpose and is unnecessarily burdensome to the courts, the rule should be reviewed for possible amendment or repeal. The former chairs of the TCPJAC and CEAC assigned this proposal to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group (JRWG) for its consideration and development. The members of the JRWG also agreed that this rule should be amended as the data addressed by the rule was no longer needed and the rule takes court staff resources from other critical tasks. On October 22, 2014 the Executive Committee of the TCPJAC reviewed and approved a draft of this proposal to amend rule 10.630. Subsequently, on November 6, 2014 the Executive Committee of CEAC also reviewed and approved the same draft proposal to amend rule 10.630. Therefore, after careful review of this rule, the TCPJAC and CEAC jointly propose amending rule 10.630 to achieve efficiencies and cost-savings.

### **The Proposal**

Rule 10.630 would be amended to remove the requirement that the trial courts report to the Judicial Council every month each assignment of a judge from another county to its court under a reciprocal assignment order. In addition to setting forth this reporting requirement, rule 10.630 defines a reciprocal assignment order as “an order issued by the Chief Justice that permits judges in courts of different counties to serve in each other’s courts.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.630.) Because rule 10.630 is the only rule that defines reciprocal assignment orders, the TCPJAC and CEAC recommend that this definition remain in the rules of court and that only the language regarding the reporting requirement be deleted.

Effective July 1, 1990, the council adopted this rule (then numbered as rule 8.13) to define “reciprocal agreement” and “exchange assignment” for purposes of waiving a certain reimbursement requirement that was previously required by Government Code section 68541.5. Government Code section 68541.5 provided an exception to what was then known as the 50/10 rule in several instances, including if a judge was serving pursuant to a reciprocal agreement or exchange order. The 50/10 rule served a particular purpose relating to how active assigned judges were funded. In short, the law required that the receiving county pay the state 50 percent of an assigned judge’s full salary for the time the judge serves in the receiving court. The state would then reimburse the “lending” county 10% of the judge’s salary. The council adopted rule 8.13, as directed by the statute, to define reciprocal or exchange order and to provide for the reporting requirement so that the waiver of the 50/10 rule could be applied. These legislative and rule actions took place pre-trial court funding and pre-the current funding structure for assigned judges. Government Code section 68541.5 was repealed in 1993 and it is likely that this funding approach was abandoned even before trial court funding.

The members of both the TCPJAC and CEAC have reviewed the reporting requirement of rule 10.630 and they do not find it to be of any use or benefit to their courts’ operations. Instead, it



requires the courts to direct critical staff resources to this endeavor when they could be used on more essential tasks.

The council's Office of Court Research has also verified that the information required in rule 10.630 is not of significant value. Reportedly the information has been used (along with AJ usage and pro tem usage) for calculating the Judicial Position Equivalents (JPE), which is used for the Court Statistics Reports. The JPE is used along with the Authorized Judicial Positions (AJPs) to obtain a clearer picture of actual judicial officer usage and need in a court. However, the data mandated by this rule has minor value as a small part of the JPE calculations. More importantly, JPE is not used in any of the Office of Court Research's workload models or in the new funding methodology (WAFM). Instead, AJPs are used and they are not affected by reciprocal assignments.

### **Alternatives Considered**

#### **No change to rule 10.630**

The committees considered not recommending the amendment of rule 10.630, but concluded that inaction would not provide any relief to the courts, and it would leave an outdated and unnecessary reporting requirement in the California Rules of Court.

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

The amendment of rule 10.630 would result in cost-savings to the courts as they would be able to direct staff resources to more necessary functions. Implementation requirements and negative operational impacts are not anticipated as a result of amending this rule.

### **Request for Specific Comments**

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committees are interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?

The advisory committees also seek comments from *courts* on the following cost and implementation matters:

- Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so please quantify.

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.630, at page 4

Draft: 10/21/14

Rule 10.630 of the California Rules of Court would be repealed effective July 1, 2015:

1 **Rule 10.630. ~~Reporting of~~ Reciprocal assignment orders**

2  
3 A “reciprocal assignment order” is an order issued by the Chief Justice that permits  
4 judges in courts of different counties to serve in each other’s courts. ~~A court must report~~  
5 ~~to the Administrative Office of the Courts, on a monthly basis, each assignment of a~~  
6 ~~judge from another county to its court under a reciprocal assignment order.~~

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

DRAFT

## Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm)

---

# DRAFT INVITATION TO COMMENT

## W15-\_\_

---

Title	Action Requested
Temporary Judges: Use of Attorneys as Court-Appointed Temporary Judges	Review and submit comments by comments by January __, 2015
Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes	Proposed Effective Date
Amend rule 10.742	July 1, 2015
Proposed by	Contacts
Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee	Claudia Ortega, 415- 865-7623 claudia.ortega@jud.ca.gov
Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair	Susan R. McMullan, 415-865-7990 susan.mcmullan@jud.ca.gov
Court Executives Advisory Committee	
Ms. Mary Beth Todd, Chair	

---

### Executive Summary and Origin

Rule 10.742 addresses the use of attorneys as court-appointed temporary judges. It sets forth the conditions for the use of court-appointed temporary judges and requires the trial courts to report to the Judicial Council information concerning the use of these temporary judges. A court-appointed temporary judge is an attorney who has satisfied the requirements for appointment under rule 2.812 and has been appointed by the court to serve as a temporary judge in that court. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.810(b).)

In June 2012, the council's Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) asked advisory committees to propose changes to rules and forms that could result in cost-savings or efficiencies for the courts. As part of that process, a trial court executive officer suggested that the reporting requirements in subsection (c) of rule 10.742 be repealed as neither the council nor the trial courts utilize the data required by this rule. In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) for future consideration and action. The TCPJAC and CEAC jointly propose repealing subsection (c) of rule 10.742 to achieve efficiencies and cost-savings.

### Background

Effective January 1, 2007, the council amended subsection (c) of rule 10.742.

*The proposals have not been approved by the Judicial Council and are not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules and Projects Committee, or its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee. These proposals are circulated for comment purposes only.*

In June 2012, RUPRO asked advisory committees to suggest changes to rules and forms that could result in cost-savings or efficiencies for the courts. As part of that process, a trial court executive officer suggested that the reporting requirements in subsection (c) of rule 10.742 be repealed as neither the council nor trial courts utilize the data collected under this rule. In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC and CEAC for future consideration and action. The TCPJAC and CEAC jointly propose repealing subsection (c) of rule 10.742 to achieve efficiencies and cost-savings.

### **The Proposal**

Subsection (c) of rule 10.742 would be repealed to eliminate all reporting requirements concerning the use of court-appointed temporary judges. Currently, subsection (c) requires each trial court that uses attorneys as temporary judges to record and report to council staff the following information on a quarterly basis:

1. The number of attorneys used as temporary judges by that court each month;
2. The number and types of cases, and the amount of time, on which the temporary judges were used each month; and
3. Whether any of the appointments of temporary judges were made under the exception in rule 2.810(d) and, if so, the number and reasons for these appointments. Rule 2.810(d) addresses appointments made under an exception for extraordinary circumstances.

The advisory committee comment for subsection (c) states that the regular reporting of the above-mentioned information assists the courts in monitoring and managing their use of temporary judges and that the information is important for establishing the need for additional judicial positions.

The members of both the TCPJAC and CEAC have reviewed the requirements of subsection (c) and no court has found that the quarterly reporting requirements of this rule have assisted them with monitoring and managing their use of temporary judges. In contrast, trial court leadership has conveyed that these reporting requirements do not assist the courts in any way and, instead, require the courts to direct critical staff resources to this endeavor when they could be used on more essential tasks. Specifically, repeal of these reporting requirements would eliminate the courts' need to dedicate court staff to track information for each courtroom, compile that information, and prepare the mandated reports.

The council's Office of Court Research has also verified that the information required in subsection (c) is not used to establish the need for additional judicial positions. In fact, the Office of Court Research no longer collects this data from the trial courts.

## Alternatives Considered

### No change to rule 10.742(c)

The committees considered not recommending the repeal of subsection (c), but concluded that inaction would not provide any relief to the courts, and it would leave an outdated and unnecessary reporting requirement in the California Rules of Court.

### Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

The repeal of subsection (c) would result in cost-savings to the courts as they would be able to direct staff resources to more necessary functions. Implementation requirements and negative operational impacts are not anticipated as a result of repealing subsection (c).

## Request for Specific Comments

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committees are interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?
- [Include any other specific issues for which the proponent seeks comments.]

The advisory committees also seek comments from *courts* on the following cost and implementation matters:

- Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so please quantify.
- ~~What would the implementation requirements be for courts? For example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems.~~
- ~~Would  months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation?~~
- ~~How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?~~

## Attachments and Links

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.742, at pages 4–5

Rule 10.742 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2015, to read:

1 **Rule 10.742. Use of attorneys as court-appointed temporary judges**

2  
3 **(a) Responsibility of the presiding judge**

4  
5 The presiding judge of the trial court is responsible for determining whether that  
6 court needs to use attorneys as temporary judges and, if so, the specific purposes for  
7 which attorneys are to be appointed as temporary judges.  
8

9 **(b) Conditions for the use of court-appointed temporary judges**

10 The presiding judge may appoint an attorney as a court-appointed temporary judge  
11 only if all the following circumstances apply:  
12

- 13 (1) The appointment of an attorney to serve as a temporary judge is necessary to  
14 fill a judicial need in that court;  
15  
16 (2) The attorney serving as a temporary judge has been approved by the court  
17 where the attorney will serve under rule 2.810 et seq.;  
18  
19 (3) The appointment of the attorney as a temporary judge does not result in any  
20 conflict of interest; and  
21  
22 (4) There is no appearance of impropriety resulting from the appointment of the  
23 attorney to serve as a temporary judge.  
24

25 *(Subd (b) amended effective January 1, 2007.)*  
26

27 **(c) ~~Record and report of uses~~**

28  
29 ~~Each trial court that uses attorneys as temporary judges must record and report to~~  
30 ~~the Administrative Office of the Courts on a quarterly basis information concerning~~  
31 ~~its use of them. The report must state:~~  
32

- 33 ~~(1) The number of attorneys used as temporary judges by that court each month;~~  
34  
35 ~~(2) The number and types of cases, and the amount of time, on which the~~  
36 ~~temporary judges were used each month; and~~  
37  
38 ~~(3) Whether any of the appointments of temporary judges were made under the~~  
39 ~~exception in rule 2.810(d) and, if so, the number of and reasons for these~~  
40 ~~appointments.~~  
41  
42  
43

Rule 10.742 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2015, to read:

**Advisory Committee Comment**

**Subdivisions (a)–(b).** These subdivisions provide that the presiding judge in each court is responsible for determining whether court-appointed temporary judges need to be used in that court, and these subdivisions furnish the criteria for determining when their use is proper. Under (b)(1), the use and appointment of court-appointed temporary judges must be based on judicial needs. Under (b)(3), an attorney serving as a temporary judge would have a conflict of interest if the disqualifying factors in the Code of Judicial Ethics exist. Under (b)(4), the test for the appearance of impropriety is whether a person aware of the facts might entertain a doubt that the judge would be able to act with integrity, impartiality, and competence. In addition to the disqualifying factors listed in the Code of Judicial Ethics, an appearance of impropriety would be generated if any of the limitations in family law, unlawful detainer, and other cases identified in the Code of Judicial Ethics are present.

~~**Subdivision (c).** Regular recording and reporting of information concerning each court’s use of temporary judges assists the courts in monitoring and managing their use of temporary judges. This information is also important for establishing the need for additional judicial positions.~~

**Executive Committee of the  
Court Executives Advisory Committee**

**Business Meeting  
November 6, 2014**

**2015 CEAC Annual Agenda Review**



**Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)**

**Annual Agenda—2015**

**Approved by E&P:**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	<a href="#">Ms. Mary Beth Todd</a> <del>Mr. David H. Yamasaki</del> , Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of <del>Sutter</del> <a href="#">Santa Clara</a> County
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. Marlene Hagman-Smith and Ms. Claudia Ortega, <del>Judicial Council and Court</del> Leadership Services Division
<b>Advisory Body's Charge:</b> <i>[Insert charge from Cal. Rules of Court, or the specific charge to the Task Force.]</i>  The Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) makes recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.48(a)). <sup>†</sup>  In addition to this charge, the committee has the following additional duties (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.48(b)): <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Recommend methods and policies to improve trial court administrators' access to and participation in council decision making;</li><li>2) Review and comment on legislation, rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations concerning court administration proposed to the council;</li><li>3) Review and make proposals concerning the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System or other large-scope data collection efforts;</li><li>4) Suggest methods and policies to increase communication between the council and the trial courts; and</li><li>5) Meet periodically with the Administrative Office of the Courts' executive team to enhance branch communications.</li></ol>	

<sup>†</sup> ~~All citations to rule 10.48 in this document are to the amended version of this rule, which will be effective February 2014.~~

**Advisory Body's Membership:** *[Insert total number of members and number of members by category.]*

- **CEAC:** Per rule 10.48(c), CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts.
- **Executive Committee of CEAC:** 18 members. Per rule 10.48(d), the Executive Committee consists of the following members:
  - Nine executive officers from trial courts that have 48 or more judges;
  - Four executive officers from trial courts that have 16 to 47 judges;
  - Two executive officers from trial courts that have 6 to 15 judges;
  - Two executive officers from trial courts that have 2 to 5 judges; and
  - One at-large member appointed from the trial courts by the committee chair to a one-year term.

**Subgroups/Working Groups:** *[List the names of each subgroup/ working group, including groups made up exclusively of advisory body members and joint groups with other advisory bodies, and provide additional information about the subgroups/ working groups in Section IV below. To request approval for the creation of a new subgroup/working group, include "new" before the name of the proposed subgroup/working group and describe its purpose and membership in Section IV below.<sup>2</sup>]*

*Subcommittee or working group name:*

1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Legislation
2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group
3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court [Legislative Efficiencies Working Group](#)
- ~~3.4. New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group~~
4. ~~TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group~~
5. New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Facilities Working Group
6. New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Court Technology Working Group
7. New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Consistent Statewide Fees Charged to Governmental Entities, Other Courts, and the Public
- ~~5.8. Nominations Subcommittee~~
- ~~6.9. Records Management Working Group~~
- 7.10. JBSIS Working Group

---

<sup>2</sup> California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

### **Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:**

*[An objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or "end of action" to be achieved. Enter as bullet points the advisory body's objectives for the coming year.]*

1. Address the unprecedented impact of past and possible future budget reductions to court operations by working with the Judicial Council to secure equitable, adequate, and sustainable funding for the trial courts that provides resources necessary to fully fund essential court operations without the need for court closures, reductions in compensation, or other service reductions;
2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature;
3. Develop programs to assist trial courts with the review and reengineering of court processes to gain greater efficiency;
4. Increase the legislative branch's and executive branch's understanding of trial court operations and funding needs.
5. As an integral part of the success of the branch, advocate for the role of the administrator on key branch committees and projects, and advance the profession of court administration by demonstrating the value of the principles of court administration to the branch;
6. Recommend, review and comment on policies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues;
7. Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts;
8. Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration;
9. Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration; and
10. Meet periodically with the Judicial Council's Administrative Director ~~of the Courts~~ and ~~the~~ three division chiefs ~~of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)~~ regarding matters affecting the operation of trial courts.

## II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws</b></p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group, monitor proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</b>  <b>Objective 2.</b> Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.  <b>Objective 3.</b> Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p><b>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</b>  <b>Objective 4.</b> Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.  <b>Objective 5.</b> Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p>	Ongoing	Comments on proposed legislation and recommendations to PCLC on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC

<sup>3</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>4</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> California Rule of Court 10.48-(b)(2)</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO) and <del>Office of</del> Governmental Affairs (<del>OGA</del>). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> 7. Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</p>		
2.	<p><b>Provide Review and Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process, and on Proposed and Existing Rules of Court</b></p> <p>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group, monitor proposed and existing rules that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>Goal II:</b> Independence and Accountability  <b>Objective 3.</b> Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p><b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration  <b>Objective 4.</b> Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.  <b>Objective 5.</b> Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques,</p>	Ongoing	Comments on rule proposals and recommendations to RUPRO on behalf of TCPJAC and CEAC

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p><b>Goal VI:</b> Branchwide Infrastructure and Service Excellence  <b>Objective 4.</b> Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> California Rule of Court 10.48-(b)(2)</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO) and <del>Office of</del> Governmental Affairs (<del>OGA</del>). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b>  6. Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts.</p>		
3	<p><u><a href="#">Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group (TCEIWG), continue efforts and activities that support sharing information on efficient and effective trial</a></u></p>	1	<p><u><a href="#">Judicial Council Direction:</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Goal II: Independence and Accountability</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Objective 3: Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Objective 2: Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and</a></u></p>	<u><a href="#">TCEIWG - Ongoing</a></u>	<u><a href="#">TCEIWG - Assistance to requesting courts; TCBPR workshops and online TCBPR resource page. Projects planned for 2015 include:</a></u>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><a href="#">court programs through the Innovation Knowledge Center on Serranus and the Branch Efficiencies section of the <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov">www.courts.ca.gov</a> public website.</a></p> <p><a href="#">This working group subsumes the activities of the former TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group that will continue to provide training to interested courts in implementing BPR as well as maintain the online Trial Court Business Process Reengineering resource page now loaded onto the Innovation Knowledge Center.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group (TCLEWG), review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy</a></p>		<p><a href="#">services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Objective 4. Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Objective 5. Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</a></p> <p><b><a href="#">Origin of Project:</a></b>  <a href="#">TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group—TCPJAC/CEAC</a></p> <p><a href="#">TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group —Directive of the Judicial Council.</a></p> <p><b><a href="#">Resources:</a></b> <a href="#">Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO), Legal Services, Center for Judiciary Education, and Governmental Affairs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working groups.</a></p> <p><b><a href="#">Key Objectives Supported:</a></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">● Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court operations and funding needs.</a></li> <li><a href="#">● Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms.</a></li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">TCLEWG - Ongoing</a></p>	<p><a href="#">focused outreach targeting case types/programs of interest to the branch and the legislature; ongoing marketing and encouraging the use of the Knowledge Center; and a presentation to the Judicial Council on the one-year anniversary launch of the Innovation Knowledge Center, highlighting previous accomplishments and inviting Judicial Council recognition of</a></p>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<a href="#">Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</a>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Develop, review, comment, and make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration.</a></li> </ul>		<p><a href="#">efficient and effective program. In February 2015, one, two-day Business Process Reengineering workshop will be held in Contra Costa Superior Court for approximately 30-40 participants.</a></p> <p><a href="#">TCLEWG - Identify high-priority proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC's consideration of these proposals</a></p>



#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p><b><u>Review and Make Recommendations on Court Facilities Proposals and Recommendations.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>A new Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Court Facilities Working Group</u></b> would provide an opportunity for PJs and CEOs to review and provide input into court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p> <p><u>This new working group grows out of the ad hoc joint working group that TCPJAC and CEAC formed in 2014 to provide comprehensive and constructive feedback to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) on proposed court set templates that it had distributed to the judicial branch for comment.</u></p> <p><u>The TCPJAC and CEAC would like to track various facilities issues being addressed by the Court</u></p>	2	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b>  <b><u>Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</u></b>  <u>A. Facilities Infrastructure</u>  <b><u>Policy 1: Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for conducting court business.</u></b>  <b><u>Policy 2: Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project: In 2014, TCPJAC/CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to provide comprehensive and constructive feedback on the court set templates to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Resources: Trial Court Liaison office (TCLO) and Capital Programs. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</u></b></p>	Ongoing	<p><u>Input into the development and future adoption of court facilities proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations</u></p>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><a href="#">Facilities Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee. They propose a new joint working group of presiding judges and court executive officers be formed to serve as a resource to these two committees and to provide input on the impact of proposed recommendations on trial court operations.</a></p>				
5.	<p><b><a href="#">Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations</a></b></p> <p><a href="#">A new Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Court Technology Working Group</a> would provide an opportunity for PJs and CEOs to review and provide early input into court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations.</p> <p><a href="#">TCPJAC and CEAC seek an</a></p>	2	<p><b><a href="#">Judicial Council Direction:</a></b></p> <p><b><a href="#">Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence</a></b></p> <p><b><a href="#">B. Technology Infrastructure</a></b></p> <p><b><a href="#">Policy 1:</a></b> Encourage and sustain innovation in the use of new information-sharing technologies.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Policy 2:</a></b> Establish a branchwide technology infrastructure that provides the hardware, software, telecommunications, and technology management systems necessary to meet the case management, information-sharing, financial, human resources, education, and administrative technology needs of the judicial branch and the public.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Policy 3:</a></b> Develop and maintain technology strategic plans for the judicial branch that are coordinated with the branch’s technology initiatives and address needs such as business continuity planning and meaningful performance standards.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Origin of Project:</a></b> TCPJAC and CEAC</p>	Ongoing	<p><a href="#">Input into the development and future adoption of court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations</a></p>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u>opportunity to provide comment and input on technology policy recommendations at a stage where input can be thoughtfully considered.</u></p> <p><u>The TCPJAC and CEAC would like to track various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JTC) and the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC). They propose a new joint working group of presiding judges and court executive officers be formed to serve as a resource to these two committees and to provide input on the impact of proposed recommendations on trial court operations.</u></p>		<p><u><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison office and Information Technology Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</u></p> <p><u><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Recommend, review and comment on policies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues</u></li> <li><u>• Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration</u></li> </ul>		
6.	<p><u><b>Study Issues Related to Courts Charging Government Entities, Other Courts, and the Public for Services and Records</b></u></p> <p><u>A new joint TCPJAC/CEAC Working Group on</u></p>	<u>2</u>	<p><u><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></u></p> <p><u><b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration</u></p> <p><u><b>Objective 4.</b> Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</u></p>	<u>2015</u>	<p><u>Analysis of related issues and possible recommendations to the Judicial Council</u></p>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u><b>Consistent Statewide Fees Charged to Governmental Entities, Other Courts, and the Public</b></u> would provide an opportunity for PJs and CEOs to examine the many complex issues associated with courts charging the above-mentioned groups for various services and records.</p> <p>The following is the proposed charge of this working group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Assess and consider the possible need for consistency among courts with respect to fees charged to the Department of Justice, other governmental entities, and other courts;</u></li> <li>• <u>Assess and consider the possible need for consistency among courts concerning fees charged to the public;</u></li> <li>• <u>Consider clarification of current statutes that address court service fees and fees related to electronic court records; identify any</u></li> </ul>		<p><u><b>Origin of Project:</b> TCPJAC and CEAC</u></p> <p><u><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison office, Governmental Affairs, Finance, and Legal Services. Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</u></p> <p><u><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration</u></li> <li>• <u>Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration</u></li> </ul>		

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u>potential barriers, ambiguous language or gaps in the law that should be addressed;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Consider how, when, and if fees should be charged to justice system partners, other courts, and the public.</u></li> </ul>				
7.	<p><b><u>Review Rule 10.620 (Public access to administrative decisions of trial courts)</u></b></p> <p><u>Rule 10.620 addresses public access to certain administrative decisions made by trial courts. It sets forth requirements for trial courts to provide public notice, and seek public input, regarding budget recommendations made by trial courts to Judicial Council and specified administrative decisions. The decisions subject to public notice and comment requirements include any decision to close or reduce the hours of a court location. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.620(d)(3).) When notice is</u></p>	2	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b>  <u>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</u>  <u>(Additional text pending.)</u></p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> <u>Legal Services</u></p> <p><b><u>Resources:</u></b> <u>Trial Court Liaison office and Legal Services</u></p> <p><b><u>Key Objective Supported:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts</u></li> </ul>	2016	<u>Amendments to rule 10.620</u>

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u>required, the rule specifies the ways in which it must be given, including a requirement that notice be posted at all court locations that accept papers for filing. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.620(g)(3).)</u></p> <p><u>Amendments to Government Code section 68106, which took effect on January 1, 2012, created new requirements for public notice and comment when trial courts decide to close court facilities or reduce hours. These requirements are inconsistent with the requirements of rule 10.620, and trial courts have faced confusion in determining how notice is to be provided. The TCPJAC and CEAC will jointly propose amending the rule to repeal those provisions that are inconsistent with Gov. Code section 68106, leaving the statute as the sole governing authority regarding notice where it is applicable, and to make the language of the rule regarding posting of</u></p>				

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<a href="#">notice at court facilities consistent with section 68106.</a>				
8.	<u><a href="#">CEO Outreach to Legislative Staff</a></u> (Text pending)	2	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b>  <b><u>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</u></b>  <b><u>Objective 2.</u></b> Partner with other branches and the public to secure constitutional and statutory amendments that will strengthen the Judicial Council’s authority to lead the judicial branch.  <b><u>Objective 3.</u></b> Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of justice.</p> <p><b><u>Origin of Project:</u></b> CEAC</p> <p><b><u>Resources:</u></b> Trial Court Liaison office and Governmental Affairs</p> <p><b><u>Key Objective Supported:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the legislative branch’s and executive branch’s understanding of trial court operations and funding needs.</li> </ul>	Ongoing	(Text pending)
	<p><b><u>Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts</u></b></p> <p><i>NOTE:</i> In December 2013, the</p>	1	<p><b><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></b>  <b><u>Goal II: Independence and Accountability</u></b>  <b><u>Objective 3.</u></b> Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of</p>	TCEWG— Ongoing	Identify high-priority proposals for the trial courts and request PCLC’s

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><del>Executive and Planning Committee and the Rules and Projects Committee directed TCPJAC and CEAC to begin a conversation with the leadership of the Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability, the Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group (TCEWG), and the Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Program and Working Group (TCBPR) about the oversight of TCEWG and TCBPR. If a decision is made to transition oversight of the working groups from TCPJAC and CEAC to the Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability, a timeline will be developed for implementation of this change.</del></p> <p><del>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group (TCEWG), review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for</del></p>		<p><del>justice.</del></p> <p><del><b>Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</b></del></p> <p><del><b>Objective 2.</b> Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.</del></p> <p><del><b>Objective 4.</b> Uphold the integrity of court orders, protect court user safety, and improve public understanding of compliance requirements; improve the collection of fines, fees, and forfeitures statewide.</del></p> <p><del><b>Objective 5.</b> Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</del></p> <p><del><b>Origin of Project:</b></del></p> <p><del>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group—TCPJAC/CEAC</del></p> <p><del>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering (TCBPR) Program—Directive of the Chief Justice</del></p> <p><del><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO), Special Projects Office, Legal Services Office (LSO), and Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group</del></p>	<p><del>TCBPR—2015</del></p>	<p><del>consideration of these proposals</del></p> <p><del>Assistance to requesting courts; online TCBPR resource page</del></p>



#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><del>the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</del></p> <p><del>Through the TCPJAC/CEAC <b>Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering (TCBPR) Program and Working Group</b> continue to publicize and raise awareness of Business Process Reengineering's (BPR's) potential to improve operational performance of the trial courts. Provide assistance to interested courts in implementing BPR. Create an online TCBPR resource page that will include a central repository of court reengineering improvement processes, BPR resource information, templates, and toolkits.</del></p>		<p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <p><del>1. Address the unprecedented impact of current and future budget reductions to court operations by working with the Judicial Council to secure equitable, adequate, and sustainable funding for the trial courts that provides resources necessary to fully fund essential court operations without the need for court closures, reductions in compensation, or other service reductions.</del></p> <p><del>2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.</del></p> <p><del>3. Develop programs to assist trial courts with the review and reengineering of court processes to gain greater efficiency.</del></p>		
4.	<p><b>Criminal Justice Realignment – Data and Funding</b></p> <p><u>(Updated text pending.)</u></p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p><b>Goal II:</b> Independence and Accountability</p> <p><b>Objective 3.</b> Improve communication within the judicial branch, with other branches of government, with members of the bar, and with the public to achieve better understanding of statewide issues that impact the delivery of</p>	2015	Collection of necessary data and requests for additional funding

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>CEAC will participate in the compilation of data and provide support for requests for additional funding to address the full costs of realignment. SB 1021 included language requiring the AOC to collect data from the trial courts related to the public safety realignment, specifically sentencing and disposition data. The Criminal Justice Realignment Data Working Group has identified the data that should be collected and helped guide the data collection effort. The group will continue to monitor the data collection process and will provide guidance to the trial courts in their efforts. This mandate represents an opportunity for the branch to show what it has done as well as report on the additional workload and costs created by the realignment. Although this working group will be staffed by the Criminal Justice Court Services Office, CEAC would like to provide input to</p>		<p>justice.</p> <p><b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration  <b>Policy A.2.</b> Ensure that data collected by the judicial branch are complete, accurate, and current and provide a sound basis for policy decisions, resource allocations, and reports to other branches of government, law and justice system partners, and the public.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> SB 1021</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <del>Trial Court</del> Leadership Services <del>(TCLS)</del> and Criminal Justice Court Services Office (CJCSO). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address the unprecedented impact of current and future budget reductions to court operations by working with the Judicial Council to secure equitable, adequate, and sustainable funding for the trial courts that provides resources necessary to fully fund essential court operations without the need for court closures, reductions in compensation, or other service reductions.</li> <li>2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.</li> </ol>		

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	the working group as this project progresses.				
5.	<p><b>Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) and Consider Revisions to Rule 10.855 (Superior Court Records Sampling Program)</b></p> <p>Through the Records Management Working Group, CEAC will continue to develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices.</p> <p>It will also review and consider amendments to rule 10.855 (superior court records sampling program). In the Fall of 2012, various CEOs proposed rule changes that could possibly lead to cost savings. The review and repeal of rule 10.855(f) was one of these proposals.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration  <b>Objective 2.</b> Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services: support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.  <b>Objective 5.</b> Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Regarding the working group - California Rule of Court 10.854; regarding review of rule 10.855 - Proposal by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to CEAC and other advisory committees.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO), Center for Judiciary Education and Research (CJER), and Legal Services Office (LSO). Subject matter presentation and expertise. Staffing of working group.</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b>  2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial</p>	<p><a href="#">TCRM Updates – Ongoing</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.855 Amendments – 2016</a></p>	Updated Trial Court Records Manual and possible amendments to rule 10.855

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Rule 10.855(f) requires three courts assigned in rotation by the Judicial Council to preserve 100 percent of their court records for a calendar year. All other courts must preserve a systematic sample of 10 percent or more of each year's court records and a 2 percent subjective sample of the court records scheduled to be destroyed.</p> <p>In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to CEAC's Records Management Working Group and the following committees for future consideration and action: Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee; Criminal Law Advisory Committee; Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee. The proponent of this proposal stated that these records take up space and cost money to store. There are many case</p>		<p>Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.</p> <p>5. Recommend, review and comment on policies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues.</p> <p>6. Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts.</p>		

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	types that already require permanent retention of the case files. Therefore, without a sampling program, courts are already retaining a high percentage of unlimited civil case files in probate, family law and civil case types where statutes require permanent retention (e.g. eminent domain, quiet title, CEQA, etc.).				
6.	<p><b>Review rule 10.473 (Minimum Education Requirements for Trial Court Executive Officers)</b></p> <p>In the Fall of 2012, various CEOs proposed rule changes that could possibly lead to cost savings. The review and repeal of rule 10.473 was one of these proposals.</p> <p>Rule 10.473 requires all California trial court executive officers to complete specific trainings in addition to 30 hours of continuing education within three-year reporting cycles.</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <del>RUPRO: Request by RUPRO Chair for rule proposals to achieve cost savings.</del></p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Proposal by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to the TCPJAC and CEAC.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO), Legal Services Office (LSO), and Center for Judiciary Education &amp; Research (CJER)</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b>  2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.  6. Develop, review, and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court,</p>	2015	Possible amendments to rule 10.473

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC, CEAC, and the CJER Governing Committee for future consideration and action. The proponent of this proposal stated that repeal of the rule would result in reduced training costs to trial courts for required training for CEOs who have already had the training, or, based on prior education or experience, do not need the specific training required by the rule.</p>		<p><del>Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms.</del></p>		
7.	<p><b>Review rule 10.742(e) (Judicial Administration – Use of Attorneys as Court-appointed Temporary Judges)</b></p> <p>In the Fall of 2012, various CEOs proposed rule changes that could possibly lead to cost savings. The review and repeal of rule 10.742(e) was one of these proposals.</p> <p>Rule 10.742(e) requires each trial court that uses attorneys as temporary judges to record</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>RUPRO:</b> Request by RUPRO Chair for rule proposals to achieve cost savings.  <b>In the same spirit of Judicial Council Directive 23:</b> E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the courts and the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.  <b>Origin of Project:</b> Proposal by CEO at the request of Justice Hull (Chair, RUPRO). Subsequently referred by RUPRO to the TCPJAC and CEAC.  <b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO), Legal Services Office (LSO), and Office of Court Research</p>	2015	Possible amendments to rule 10.742(e)

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>and report to the AOC on a quarterly basis information concerning its use of temporary judges.</p> <p>In November 2012, RUPRO referred this proposal to the TCPJAC and CEAC for future consideration and action. The proponent of this proposal stated that his/her court does not use the report for monitoring or managing volunteer attorneys. Repealing this requirement would eliminate the need to dedicate court staff to track information for each courtroom, compile that information, and prepare the report. Also, due to a lack of staff resources, the AOC is currently not collecting this data.</p>		<p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <p>2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.</p> <p>6. Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts.</p>		
8.	<p><b>Provide Input Regarding the Amendment of Rule 10.48 (CEAC) and Repeal of Rule 10.49 (COCE)</b></p> <p>At the request of the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO), Executive and Planning</p>	1(e)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> In 2013, the council charged RUPRO, E&amp;P, and the Technology Committee with the responsibility for making recommendations to improve the governance, structure, and organization of advisory groups.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Governance recommendations regarding CEAC and COCE.</p>	2014	Amendment of rule 10.48 and repeal of rule 10.49

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><del>Committee (E&amp;P), and the Technology Committee, provide input regarding amendment of rule 10.48 (CEAC) and rule 10.49 (COCE). In 2013, the council charged these internal committees with the responsibility for making recommendations to improve the governance, structure, and organization of advisory groups. One of the recommendations concerned CEAC and asked the council to implement the following:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. Merge COCE into CEAC;</del></li> <li><del>2. Create an Executive Committee of CEAC; and;</del></li> <li><del>3. Eliminate the appellate court clerk membership position on CEAC.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>In 2013, the CEAC chair and staff worked with RUPRO staff to draft the necessary rule changes. In August 2013, CEAC approved these proposed revisions for submission to the council's</del></p>		<p><del><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO) and Legal Services Office (LSO)</del></p> <p><del><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b> N/A</del></p>		



#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><del>internal committees for their consideration. Among other proposed revisions, CEAC proposed that rule 10.48 be amended to allow <i>incoming</i> members of CEAC's Executive Committee to be eligible for appointment as chair or vice chair. The rule proposals were circulated for public comment from October 25—December 20, 2013. If requested by the internal committees, CEAC will provide any additional input that is needed regarding the proposed rule changes. It is expected that the updated rule proposals will be considered by the Judicial Council on February 21, 2014 and become effective on that date if approved.</del></p>				
9.	<p><b>Review Rule 10.630 (Reporting of Reciprocal Assignment Orders)</b></p> <p>At the August 2013 CEAC Business Meeting, the members discussed the monthly reporting</p>	2(b)	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>In the same spirit of Judicial Council Directive 23:</b> E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the courts and the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.</p>	2015	Possible repeal of or amendments to rule 10.630

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>requirements of rule 10.630 and agreed that because this mandated reporting did not appear to serve any beneficial purpose and is unnecessarily burdensome to the courts, the rule should be reviewed for possible amendment or repeal. Staff from the Assigned Judges Program will inform the Chief Justice of CEAC's concerns with this rule. Pending the Chief Justice's approval, CEAC will consider amending or repealing this rule.</p>		<p><b>Origin of Project:</b> CEAC</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO), Legal Services Office (LSO), Assigned Judges Program, and Office of Court Research</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b>  2. Identify strategies that will assist courts in mitigating multi-year budget reductions and partner with the Judicial Council to develop those strategies and address them within the branch and with the Legislature.  6. Develop, review, and/or provide input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the courts.</p>		
14	<p><b>Update CEAC Bylaws</b></p> <p>CEAC will update its bylaws to address outdated language and to ensure that they conform to the proposed revisions to rule 10.48 (CEAC) that will be in effect February 2014. In August 2013, CEAC approved preliminary revisions to the committee's bylaws. After the council approves the amendment of rule 10.48 in February 2014, CEAC will revisit the proposed bylaws</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> In 2013, the council charged RUPRO, E&amp;P, and the Technology Committee with the responsibility for making recommendations to improve the governance, structure, and organization of advisory groups.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> This project stems from the governance recommendations regarding CEAC and COCE.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO)</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b> N/A</p>	2014	Updated CEAC bylaws that conform to amended rule 10.48

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><del>changes to ensure they conform to the approved version of rule 10.48.</del></p>				
+	<p><b>Provide Input on Potential Audit Program for Filings Data</b></p> <p><u>(Updated text pending)</u></p> <p>In 2014, the SB 56 Working Group will consider development of an audit program for filings data. Given CEAC's charge per rule 10.48(b)(3), CEAC would like to assist with the planning for this program and provide input on it if it is approved by the council in 2014.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration  <b>Recommended Policy A2:</b> Ensure that data collected by the judicial branch are complete, accurate, and current and provide a sound basis for policy decisions, resource allocations, and reports to other branches of government, law and justice system partners, and the public.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> CEAC</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO) and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b>  5. Recommend, review and comment on policies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues.  8. Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration.</p>	2015	Provide input to SB 56 Working Group
+	<p><b>Provide Input to Update the JBSIS Filings Information Definitions</b></p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b>  <b>Goal III:</b> Modernization of Management and Administration</p>	2015	Updated JBSIS filings information

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sup>4</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><u>(Updated text pending)</u></p> <p>CEAC will provide input to a new working group (staffed by the Office of Court Research) that will be convened in 2014 to review and update the JBSIS filings information definitions. The working group will focus on these higher priority definitions, rather than reviewing and updating all definitions in the JBSIS manual.</p>		<p><b>Recommended Policy A2:</b> Ensure that data collected by the judicial branch are complete, accurate, and current and provide a sound basis for policy decisions, resource allocations, and reports to other branches of government, law and justice system partners, and the public.</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> CEAC (November 2013 business meeting)</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO) and Office of Court Research (OCR)</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b></p> <p>5. Recommend, review and comment on policies that address data and record information storage, retrieval, reporting and sharing; information ownership; and information access control issues.</p> <p>8. Develop, review, comment, and/or make recommendations on various Judicial Council task force reports, other studies, and other recommendations aimed at improving court administration.</p>		definitions
4	<p><b>Review and Recommend Court Administrator Candidates for Membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and Other Advisory Groups</b></p> <p>Pursuant to rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Rule 10.48(e)(2)</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Trial Court Liaison Office (TCLO)</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b></p> <p>4. As an integral part of the success of the branch, advocate for the role of the administrator on key branch committees and projects, and advance the profession of court</p>	Ongoing	Recommendations to the Executive and Planning Committee

#	Project <sup>3</sup>	Priority <sub>4</sub>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>recommend to the council’s Executive and Planning Committee candidates for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of CEAC’s Executive Committee;</li> <li>• Nonvoting court administrator members of the council; and</li> <li>• Members of other advisory committees who are court executives or judicial administrators.</li> </ul>		<p>administration by demonstrating the value of the principles of court administration to the branch.</p>		
4	<p><b>Serve as a Resource</b></p> <p>Serve as a subject matter resource for <a href="#">Judicial Council AOC</a> divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Rule 10.48(b)</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Respective <a href="#">Judicial Council AOC</a> divisions and <del>council</del> advisory bodies</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Respective <a href="#">Judicial Council AOC</a> divisions and <del>council</del> advisory bodies</p> <p><b>Key Objectives Supported:</b> All</p>	Ongoing	<p>Input, feedback, data, and/or recommendations to requesting <a href="#">Judicial Council AOC</a> division or <del>council</del> advisory body</p>

### III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

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

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group – The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Working Group remained active throughout 2014 <sup>43</sup> providing review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.	Ongoing
2	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group – Provided review and, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, made recommendations on proposed and existing rules that have a significant operational and/or administrative impact on the trial courts.	Ongoing
3	<p><u>(Updated text pending)</u>  Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts –</p> <p><i>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies Working Group (TCEWG)</i>  In October and November 2012, the TCEWG reconvened to take a fresh look at the efficiency and cost-savings proposals that were not adopted for Judicial Council sponsorship in previous years.</p> <p>In December 2012, the council approved seventeen of the proposals for council-sponsored legislation. Many of the efficiency proposals endorsed for council sponsorship as legislation were included in early versions of the Governor’s FY 12-13 budget, but were removed during budget negotiations with the Legislature.</p> <p>In 2013, one of the seventeen efficiency proposals approved for council-sponsorship in December 2012 was ultimately signed into law. AB 1293 (Bloom - Santa Monica) adds a probate fee of \$40 for the filing of a request for special notice in decedents’ estate, guardianship, conservatorship, and trust proceedings. Other proposals were included in this bill and in other bills, but most of those efforts failed in the Legislature.</p> <p>The TCEWG will reconvene in 2014 to consider suggested statutory changes that were previously submitted by court leaders that had been identified by TCEWG as medium to long-term projects. The TCEWG will also ask the courts to identify any new statutory changes that could result in additional revenue or cost savings.</p> <p><i>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group (TCBPR)</i>  In May and September 2013, the TCBPR, in collaboration with the AOC, offered six day-long workshops for</p>	Ongoing

	approximately 160 court employees from 26 courts to share the benefits of BPR. The workshop provided participants with instruction in BPR, applicable tools, information on available resources, and the opportunity to develop a reengineering plan. The working group continues to develop the online TCBPR resource page that will include a central repository of court reengineering improvement processes, BPR resource information, templates, and toolkits.	
4	Assist with Criminal Justice Realignment Data Collection – SB 1021 included language requiring the AOC to collect data from the trial courts related to the public safety realignment, specifically sentencing and disposition data. The Criminal Justice Realignment Data Working Group has identified the data that should be collected and helped guide the data collection effort.	Ongoing
5	Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) and Support Related <del>Rule</del> Statutory Changes – <del>The Records Management Working Group continued to review changes and improvements to the Trial Court Records Manual and began to consider amendments to rule 10.855 to achieve greater efficiencies and cost savings. The Records Management Working Group successfully amended Government Code section 68152, which defines the minimum retention and destruction periods for trial court records. AB 1352 (the bill sponsored by the council concerning the retention and destruction of court records) becomes effective January 1, 2014. The legislation updates many records retention practices and timelines, and also addresses various types of case related records that were not included in the previous sections of the Government Code. The Trial Court Records Manual will also be updated to reflect these changes.</del>	<u>TCRM Updates – Ongoing</u>  <u>Rule 10.855 Amendments – 2016</u> <u>Ongoing</u>
6	Review rule 10.473 (Minimum Education Requirements for Trial Court Executive Officers) – The proposed rule change <del>washas been</del> referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014-2015. <u>In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</u>	<u>July 2015</u>
	<u>Review Rule 10.630 (Reporting of Reciprocal Assignment Orders) – The proposed rule change was referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014. In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</u>	<u>July 2015</u>
7	Review rule 10.742(c) (Judicial Administration - Use of Attorneys as Court-appointed Temporary Judges) – The proposed rule change <del>washas been</del> referred to the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group for review and vetting in 2014-2015. <u>In October and November 2014, the TCPJAC and CEAC reviewed and approved the proposed amendments to this rule as developed by the Joint Rules Working Group. It is anticipated that this rule proposal will be included in the Winter rule proposal cycle and the amendments will become effective on July 1, 2015.</u>	<u>July 2015</u>

8	<p>Review rules 10.48 and 10.49 (CEAC and COCE) – In December 2012, E&amp;P and RUPRO developed preliminary recommendations regarding the governance, structure, and organization of the council’s advisory groups and their subgroups. One of the recommendations asked the council to implement the following: (1) merge COCE into CEAC; (2) create an Executive Committee of CEAC; and (3) eliminate the appellate court clerk membership position on CEAC. In 2013, the CEAC chair and staff worked with staff to RUPRO to draft the necessary <u>proposed</u> rule changes. In August 2013, CEAC approved these proposed revisions for submission to the council’s internal committees for their consideration. The rule proposals were circulated for public comment from October 25 – December 20, 2013. <del>If requested by the internal committees, CEAC will provide any additional input that is needed regarding the proposed rule changes. It is expected that the updated</del> <u>The final rule proposals were approved will be considered</u> by the Judicial Council on February 20, 2014 and become effective on that date. <del>if approved.</del> <u>In summary, rule 10.48 was amended to merge the Conference of Court Executives and the Court Executives Advisory Committee into one advisory body with an executive committee. Rule 10.49, concerning the Conference of Court Executives, was repealed.</u></p>	<u>Completed 2014</u>
	<p><u>Update CEAC Bylaws – It was necessary for CEAC to update its bylaws to address outdated language and to ensure that they conformed to the proposed amendments to rule 10.48 (CEAC) that went into effect on February 20, 2014. In August 2013, CEAC approved preliminary revisions to the committee’s bylaws, which also went into effect on the same date that the amendments to rule 10.48 went into effect (February 20, 2014).</u></p>	<u>Completed</u>
	<p><del>Consider Revisions to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual—In 2013, the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual Working Group reviewed proposed revisions to the manual, including those based on an initial audit report issued by the California State Auditor. These proposed revisions are now out for public comment. Responsibility for ongoing updates and revisions is being proposed (www.courts.ca.gov/documents/SP13-10.pdf) to fall under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch. Accordingly, updates regarding this project will not appear on future CEAC annual agendas.</del></p>	<u>Completed</u>
	<p><del>Assist with Implementation of Assembly Bill 2073 (Silva)—The AB 2073 Mandatory E-Filing Working Group was established to implement Assembly Bill 2073 (Silva). That legislation states that the Judicial Council “shall, on or before July 1, 2014, adopt uniform rules to permit the mandatory electronic filing and service of documents for specified civil actions in the trial courts of the state . . . .” (See Assem. Bill 2073 [amended Code Civ. Proc., § 1010.6(f)].) The legislation also requires the Judicial Council to provide a report to the Legislature regarding an evaluation of the Orange County pilot project on or before December 31, 2013. The working group was charged with assisting the advisory committees in developing the uniform rules required by AB 2073. It was also charged with assisting in the review of the report on the pilot project. The working group has completed its work.</del></p>	<u>Completed</u>
	<p><del>Consider Concerns Re Deposits for Court Reporters’ Transcripts—Through the Appellate Advisory Committee (AAC)/CEAC Joint Working Group on Reporter’s Transcript Issues, CEAC collaborated with the AAC to review concerns relating to deposits for the costs of court reporters transcripts in civil cases, including when</del></p>	<u>Completed</u>



<p><del>certified transcripts of some proceedings have previously been prepared, and recommended amending rules 8.130 and 8.835 to address these concerns. The recommended amendments are intended to generate revenue for trial courts and provide costs savings and efficiencies for trial courts and for litigants by making several changes to the rules relating to reporter's transcripts in civil appeals. The working group's recommendations to amend rules 8.130 and 8.835 were approved by CEAC in August 2013. The council approved these proposed revisions at its October 25, 2013 business meeting. The revisions will be effective January 1, 2014.</del></p>	
---	--

DRAFT

## IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

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

### TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group on Legislation

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This standing working group meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review, comment, and make recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new and/or amend existing laws including: 1) draft proposals for council-sponsored legislation; 2) draft proposals from other advisory committees for legislation; and 3) review and comment on bills sponsored by other parties that may impact court administration. As necessary, the working group will refer matters to the TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members feel need broader consideration. The working group convenes throughout the year by conference call.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 9 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 10 PJs and 1 Assistant CEO
- *Date formed:* 2001
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The working group meets via conference call every three –four weeks about a week prior to each PCLC meeting, and as issues arise.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

### TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Working Group

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This standing working group meets on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC to review and provide input on proposals to establish, amend, and/or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms. As necessary, the working group will refer matters to the TCPJAC and/or CEAC that the members feel need broader consideration. The working group convenes throughout the year by conference call to review proposals and evaluate the operational and/or administrative impact of proposals on the trial courts.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 6 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* ~~63 PJs and 1 Chief Operations Officer~~
- *Date formed:* 2001
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The working group meets by conference call

approximately 7 times a year.

- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

### **TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Legislative Efficiencies Working Group**

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This working group meets to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts. It was formed in 2012 and has continued to meet throughout the year to recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 5 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 7 PJs
- *Date formed:* 2012
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* It is estimated that the working group will meet by conference call approximately 4-7 times a year.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

### **~~TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Business Process Reengineering Working Group~~**

- ~~*Purpose of subcommittee or working group:* Continue to publicize and raise awareness of BPR's potential to improve operational performance of the trial courts. Develop training programs and materials to assist interested courts in implementing BPR. Create a central online repository of BPR ideas and toolkits.~~
- ~~*Number of advisory group members:* 4 CEOs~~
- ~~*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group):* 5 PJs and 1 Chief Operations Officer~~
- ~~*Date formed:* The creation of the working group was approved by the Judicial Council on February 28, 2012. The working group was formed in May 2012.~~
- ~~*Number of meetings or how often the group meets:* The full working group will meet approximately twice this year in person. Its sub-working groups will meet approximately 12 times this year by conference call.~~
- ~~*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* 2015~~

### **New TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Trial Court Efficiencies and Innovations Working Group**

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* This group promotes efforts and activities that support sharing information on efficient and effective trial court programs through the Innovation Knowledge Center on Serranus and the Branch Efficiencies section of the [www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov) public website.

- Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 6
- Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 6 PJs
- Date formed: 2014
- Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: The full working group will meet approximately 4 times per year by phone. Its sub-working groups will meet approximately 15 times this year by conference call.
- Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: Ongoing

### **New Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Court Facilities Working Group**

(Text pending)

- Purpose of subgroup or working group:
- Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:
- Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):
- Date formed:
- Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:
- Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:

### **New Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Court Technology Working Group**

(Text pending)

- Purpose of subgroup or working group:
- Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:
- Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):
- Date formed:
- Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:
- Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:

### **New Joint TCPJAC/CEAC Working Group on Consistent Statewide Fees Charged to Governmental Entities, Other Courts, and the Public**

- Purpose of subgroup or working group: The following is the proposed charge of this working group:
  - Assess and consider the possible need for consistency among courts with respect to fees charged to the Department of Justice, other governmental entities, and other courts;
  - Assess and consider the possible need for consistency among courts concerning fees charged to the public;

- Consider clarification of current statutes that address court service fees and fees related to electronic court records; identify any potential barriers, ambiguous language or gaps in the law that should be addressed;
- Consider how, when, and if fees should be charged to justice system partners, other courts, and the public.
- Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 4 PJs and 4 CEOs
- Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): N/A
- Date formed: TBD
- Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Approximately 5 conference calls and perhaps one in-person meeting that might be scheduled to coincide with the TCPJAC/CEAC Statewide Meetings in January 2015
- Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: 2015

### **Records Management Working Group**

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. Continue to monitor support the Judicial Council-sponsored legislative proposal to amend Government Code section 68152 that defines minimum retention periods for certain trial court case records.
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* 5 CEOs
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 2 Chief Information Officers, 1 Appellate Assistant Clerk/Administrator, and 1 Deputy Executive Officer
- *Date formed:* The working group was originally formed on June 19, 2006. The working group changed its name on January 8, 2010.
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* The working group meets 3 to 5 times a year.
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

### **Nominations Subcommittee**

- *Purpose of subgroup or working group:* Review and recommend court administrator candidates for membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and other advisory [bodiesgroups](#).
- *Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:* Approximately [76](#) (CEAC chair, CEAC vice-chair, and [54](#) previous CEAC chairs if possible)
- *Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* N/A
- *Date formed:* Approximately 2004
- *Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Approximately 6 times a year by conference call
- *Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* Ongoing

Date: [11/03/14](#)~~12/11/13~~

DRAFT