

**Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2019**

Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P): **[insert approval date]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Mr. Michael Roddy, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Diego County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Mr. Corey Rada, Senior Analyst, Trial Court Leadership
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> Under <a href="#">rule 10.48(a)</a> of the California Rules of Court, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) is charged with making recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, <a href="#">rule 10.48(b)</a> sets forth the additional duties of the committee.  <a href="#">Per rule 10.48(c)</a> , CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts. <a href="#">Rule 10.48(d)</a> establishes the Executive Committee of CEAC. The Executive Committee consists of 18 members.  The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.	

---

<sup>1</sup> The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and Judicial Council staff resources.

### **Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:**

1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee
4. CEAC Child Support Services Subcommittee
5. CEAC Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee
6. CEAC Nominations Subcommittee
7. CEAC Records Management Subcommittee
8. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Security Services for the Trial Courts
9. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Standards of Judicial Administration
10. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on the California Department of Justice Senate Bill (SB) 384 Implementation (*New*)
11. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Interpreter Payment Policy (*New*)
12. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities

---

<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.

## II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>3</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Security Services for the Trial Courts (One-Time)</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>4</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary</b><sup>5</sup>: CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will assess the statewide scope of a growing problem concerning inadequate sheriff staffing levels in the trial courts or potential reduction of current security staffing levels by the sheriff. This working group is also charged with analyzing solutions and developing recommendations, for CEAC’s approval, regarding court security services for the trial courts. In recent years, and in an increasing number of courts, county sheriff’s offices have provided fewer officers than set forth in the courts’ MOUs. In addition, courts that have opened new and large court facilities have experienced the same decline in court security services. Because these decreased levels of sheriffs services have significant implications for the safety of judicial officers, court employees, and the public, CEAC has determined that it is essential to begin assessing the statewide scope of this problem and to develop recommendations.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2019.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Budget Services, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services, and Security Operations.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> California State Association of Counties, California State Sheriffs' Association, and Department of Finance.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Court Security Advisory Committee, Judicial Branch Budget Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC).</p>		

<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.

<sup>5</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>3</sup>	
2.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Standards of Judicial Administration (One-Time)</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> CEAC, through an ad hoc working group and in consultation with TCPJAC (as needed), will review the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommend additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures to improve the branch’s ability to communicate the trial courts’ objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort seeks to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self-help center hours, clerks’ office hours, etc.). This project was conceived to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC.</p>	
3.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Interpreter Payment Policy (One-Time)</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will assess the existing “Payment Policies for Contract Court Interpreters” policy and develop recommendations for recent audit findings related to independent contractor interpreter reimbursement claims.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2019.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services, Human Resources, Language Access Services, and Audit Services.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Court Interpreters Advisory Panel.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>3</sup>	
4.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on the California Department of Justice Senate Bill (SB) 384 Implementation (One-Time)</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will consult with the California Department of Justice (DOJ) on the implementation of Senate Bill 384, <i>Sex offenders: registration: criminal offender record information systems</i>. The DOJ seeks to learn of courts' current processes and case management systems and receive input on matters of special concern to courts. The working group will share potential issues that should be considered when crafting this statewide process.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership and Legal Services.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> DOJ.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
1.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee</p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) is charged with developing, reviewing, commenting, and making recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new or amend existing laws. The subcommittee monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Governmental Affairs and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC.</p>	<b>Priority 1</b>
2.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee</p> <p><b>Project Summary:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) is charged with developing, reviewing, and providing input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Legal Services and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC and RUPRO.</p>	<b>Priority 1</b>

3. <b>Project Title: CEAC Child Support Services Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Through the Child Support Services Subcommittee, CEAC will work in consultation with the Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts (CFCC) and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to review and comment on future iterations of the model Plans of Cooperation (POCs) between the trial courts and DCSS. In response to issues that arose with the 2015 DCSS model POC, CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and CFCC staff to discuss and resolve concerns prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies. CEAC requested that this former ad hoc working group be converted to a subcommittee to review future model POCs. The subcommittee will meet annually in Spring on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>The additional work charged to the subcommittee includes providing input on the language in the agreements between DCSS and the Judicial Council that could have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee will develop comments and/or recommendations (for CEAC’s approval) concerning recommendations proposed by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee regarding the development of Assembly Bill (AB) 1058 data for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). The subcommittee will also convene to address any other critical issues related to the POCs and AB 1058 that might arise in the interim.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, and Research and Evaluation Unit.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> DCSS.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committee.</p>	
4. <b>Project Title: TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee (JTS) reviews and provides early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback</p>	

	<p>on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Project Title: Strengthen the Role of Court Executive Officers in Outreach to the Legislative and Executive Branches</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> CEAC will conduct outreach with the legislature with a focus on legislative staff in both the local districts and in the Capitol. This effort will entail the development of outreach materials for court executive officers and perhaps educational sessions with legislative staff to educate them on the judicial branch budget and the fiscal/operational needs of the trial courts. CEAC will also seek to strengthen communication with the executive branch and with the Department of Finance in particular. It will do so in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Budget Services.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Budget Services, and Governmental Affairs.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	



6. <b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Through the Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities, CEAC will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and provide, on an as needed basis, early court executive officer input on facility related proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations; and</li> <li>• Discuss strategies and best practices for courts facing delayed court construction projects and provide input, as appropriate, to the Court Facility Advisory Committee (CFAC) on advocacy efforts.</li> </ul> <p>The working group will also provide input and feedback on various facility issues being addressed by the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) and CFAC. The working group is charged with providing preliminary feedback on facility proposals on behalf of CEAC. Input on more substantive facility policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented CEAC for final review.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2019.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Facilities Services, and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Possible consultation with CFAC and TCFMAC.</p>	
7. <b>Project Title: CEAC Records Management Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Through the Records Management Subcommittee, CEAC will continue to develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. It will also continue to review and make recommendations on various statutes and rules governing trial court records management.</p> <p>The subcommittee identified the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and publish subsequent updates to the TCRM with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices</li> </ul>	

- Review and develop standards and best practices for electronic court records maintained as data in case management systems. Determine whether statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of court records in the form of data.
- Review and develop additional guidelines on the contents of indexes and electronic registers of action remotely accessible by the public for inclusion in the TCRM to provide clarity and consistency among courts statewide. Currently, courts from different jurisdictions have varying practices on what to include in the electronic registers of action that are remotely accessible by the public.
- Determine the need to propose amendments to Government Code section 68152 to clean up the records retention statutes. The technical amendments will include fixing statutory conflicts regarding the retention of original wills and codicils, retention of Prop 47 petitions, retention of criminal realignment filings, and retention periods for family and juvenile cases.
- Develop best practices in maintaining original paper court records. Provide guidance on whether certain court records should be maintained in paper form. Several courts have approached Legal Services office with questions about specific types of court records that the original paper document need to be retained for policy reasons.
- Develop additional guidelines for exhibits management.
- Monitor the progress of proposed 2019 Judicial Council-sponsored legislations.

*Status/Timeline:* TCRM Updates – Ongoing. Government Code sections 68152(a)(6) and 68153 – 2019.

*Fiscal Impact/Resources:* Information Technology, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, and Legal Services.

*Internal/External Stakeholders:* None.

*AC Collaboration:* Possible consultation with Information Technology Advisory Committee; and Probate Mental Health Advisory Committee.

8. **Project Title: Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee**

**Priority 2**

**Project Summary:** CEAC will continue to provide oversight responsibility over JBSIS through the JBSIS Subcommittee. JBSIS is authorized through California Rules of Court, rule 10.400, and CEAC has oversight responsibility of JBSIS as defined in rule 10.48, which governs CEAC.

The subcommittee identified the following projects:

**Ongoing Review and Revisions of JBSIS Reporting Standards**

The CEAC JBSIS Subcommittee recently updated the filing definitions in JBSIS in order to ensure that consistent, comparable, and accurate JBSIS data is being reported from all courts. CEAC decided to focus first on the filing definitions in JBSIS because of their use in the Resource Assessment Study model and, by extension, the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology. These revised JBSIS filing definitions were approved by the Judicial Council in January 2018 and have an effective date of July 1, 2018.

CEAC will continue to review and seek input from courts on the recent revisions to the filing definitions and recommend additional revisions as needed. CEAC will also identify additional areas in JBSIS for review that will be important for branchwide budget advocacy efforts, monitoring court operations, and workload analysis. This work would include an evaluation of the appropriate types and amount of data that should be collected in JBSIS.

The following are areas of ongoing work or planned for the upcoming year:

- Disposition definitions and categories; and
- Case aging definitions and categories.

#### **Strengthening Data Governance Principles for JBSIS Reporting**

The *JBSIS Implementation Manual* currently contains the data standards, definitions, reporting rules, and technical specifications for JBSIS reporting. The CEAC JBSIS Subcommittee will work on adding new components to the JBSIS manual that will document some of these new data governance principles for JBSIS to provide greater transparency and confidence in JBSIS data. The JBSIS Subcommittee will also provide input to the Judicial Council's Research and Evaluation Unit as they develop additional procedures and guidance for courts as part of their regular JBSIS reporting.

The following are areas of ongoing work or planned for the upcoming year:

- Recommend data validation procedures for courts in JBSIS reporting;
- Provide guidelines to courts for how/when to report and amend JBSIS data;
- Implement a new JBSIS Dispute Resolution Process;
- Create a public database with ongoing JBSIS Q&A and technical assistance provided by the Judicial Council's Court Research for greater transparency and consistency in guidance provided to courts; and
- Provide ongoing input to Judicial Council's Audit Services on JBSIS filing audit.

**Status/Timeline:** Ongoing.

**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** Audit Services, Information Technology, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, and Court Research.

**Internal/External Stakeholders:** Superior courts and case management system vendors.

	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.	
9.	<b>Project Title: Review and Recommend Court Administrator Candidates for Membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and Other Advisory Bodies</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Executive and Planning Committee and advisory bodies receiving nominations.</p>		
10.	<b>Project Title: Serve as a Resource</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Respective Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Respective advisory bodies.</p>		

### III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p><b>Educational Opportunities.</b> TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to provide 24 educational breakout sessions on 12 key areas of court operations as part of the January and August 2018 TCPJAC/CEAC Statewide Business Meetings. The topics of the educational breakout sessions included: Pretrial Detention and Release Reform: Report and Recommendations to the Chief Justice; Budget Advocacy; Overview of Court Budgeting; WAFM – Current and Future Status; Court/County Funding Responsibilities Regarding Court Security Court Technology Trends; Court Financial Reporting; Pre-Trial Services: Best Practices; Facilities: How to Make a Successful Maintenance or Modification Request; Audits: Survival Guide; and Innovations in Specialty and Collaborative Courts. Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers.</p>
2.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2018, holding 13 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations to PCLC on 27 different bills identified by Governmental Affairs as having significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2018, the subcommittee meeting schedule will be set according to the PCLC’s 2019 meeting schedule. The subcommittee will continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts, and to recommend proposals for the future consideration.</p>
3.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2018 to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and input on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and submit comments on rules, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2019 and meet as needed.</p>
4.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee has reviewed and provided formal comments on rule proposal SPR18-37, related to remote access of court records. The subcommittee will continue to meet and be active in 2019.</p>
5.	<p><b>Law Enforcement Body Cameras: New Judicial Resource Network (JRN) Reference Page.</b> In July 2018, the TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to the Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement completed its charge by establishing a <u>new resource page</u> on JRN related to local court policies governing body cameras worn by law enforcement while at the court. This page is linked in the <u>News &amp; Reference section</u> under “California Trial Court Administration and Planning.” The direct link to the new page is <a href="http://jrn.courts.ca.gov/reference/body-worn-camera-policies.htm">http://jrn.courts.ca.gov/reference/body-worn-camera-policies.htm</a>. The joint working group was charged to 1) assess issues relating to the presence of body-worn cameras brought into the court by officers appearing on legal matters; 2) review and recommend policies and procedures for trial courts; and 3) determine other related issues that may arise as the working group delves into this subject. During March 2018, the court executive officers were asked to provide local policies that their courts may have and were willing to share. These policies are now available on JRN as resources for courts that have not yet established local policies. As these courts establish local policies, they are asked to contact TCPJAC lead staff if they would like their court’s policies added to the resource page.</p>
6.	<p><b>Child Support Services Subcommittee.</b> The Judicial Council is in the second year of this two-year contract with DCSS and reviewed proposed changes to the Plans of Cooperation between the trial courts and DCSS. The subcommittee reviewed draft contracts for the AB1058 Child Support Commissioners and Family Law Facilitators for fiscal year 2018–19. The subcommittee will continue to meet and be active in 2019 in regard to annual review of proposed contract changes.</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
7.	<b>JBSIS Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee drafted a new JBSIS Dispute Resolution Process to standardize any responses to disagreements on JBSIS filings definitions. This proposal received CEAC approval at the August 2018 Statewide TCPJAC/CEAC meeting, which will be submitted for the council’s consideration during the November 30, 2018 meeting, with the understanding that additional technical updates may be added before the report is submitted to the council.
8.	<b>Nominations Subcommittee.</b> During the 2018 nominations cycle, the subcommittee identified, assessed, and recommended court executive/judicial administrator candidates for membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and other advisory committees.
9.	<b>Records Management Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee is working on updates to the TCRM; reviewing statutes and rules pertaining to the content of registers of action and indexes to determine whether amendments are necessary; and developing guidelines on the content of indexes and electronic registers to ensure clarity and consistency. Additionally, the subcommittee is reviewing proposed legislation on the handling of original wills as court records, in collaboration with the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee.
10.	<b>CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on DOJ SB 384 Implementation.</b> The CA DOJ is requesting input from the superior courts’ in establishing statewide policies and developing the technology infrastructure needed to meet the various components of SB 384 via ongoing statewide stakeholder meetings.
11.	<b>Resource for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers for Responding to Emergency Situations</b> <i>Staff Comment: Summary TBD. Project is estimated to be completed by December 2018.</i>