



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

Thursday, March 24, 2016

12:10 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Teleconference

Committee Members Present: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, David M. Rubin, and Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby

Committee Members Absent: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Committee Staff Present: Ms. Nancy Carlisle

Staff Present: Ms. Karene Alvarado, Mr. Steven Chang, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. Benita Downs, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Deborah Genzer, Ms. Bonnie Hough, Ms. Susan McMullan, Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Ms. Pam Reynolds, Ms. Anne Ronan, Mr. David Smith, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Mr. Corby Sturges, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, and Mr. Don Will

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. and committee staff took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The committee approved the minutes of the February 25, 2016, meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Agenda Setting for the April 15, 2016, Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)

Review draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in April.

Action: *The committee reviewed draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in April.*

Item 2

Subordinate Judicial Officer Conversions Update and Request (Action Required)

Update members on a committee review of legislation and policies adopted by the Judicial Council on the subject of court requests to defer Subordinate Judicial Officer conversions.

Action: *Hon. Marla O. Anderson, Vice-Chair, briefed the committee on requests from three courts to defer conversion of subordinate judicial officers to judgeships and the resulting review that a working group of E&P members is conducting to clarify Judicial Council policies. She indicated a timeline by the summer of 2016 for completing the review.*

Review a request from the Superior Court of California, County of Placer to temporarily defer conversion of one vacant Subordinate Judicial Officer position to a judgeship.

Action: *The committee voted to approve the request from the Superior Court of California, County of Placer to temporarily defer conversion of one vacant Subordinate Judicial Officer position to a judgeship.*

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Item 3

Annual Agenda Preparation (Information Only)

Discuss committee roles and preparation for reviewing advisory body annual agendas on April 14, 2016.

Action: *Hon. Marla O. Anderson, Vice-Chair, discussed the format for the upcoming meeting and preparations for E&P member participation in the discussion of the annual agendas.*

There being no further open meeting business, the open meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF CLOSED MEETING

Tuesday, March 29, 2016

11:30 to 1:30 p.m.

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson, (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, David M. Rubin and Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Committee Staff Present: Ms. Jody Patel

C L O S E D S E S S I O N

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and committee staff took roll call.

Item 1

Judicial Council Nominations

The committee reviewed nominations for vacancies on the Judicial Council.

Action: The committee formulated recommendations for submission to the Chief Justice.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (E&P)

MINUTES OF ACTION BY E-MAIL

Tuesday, April 5, 2016

Action by E-Mail

Advisory Body Members Who Participated: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson, (Vice Chair); Justice James M. Humes; Judges Daniel J. Buckley, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, David M. Rubin, Charles D. Wachob; Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Mr. Frank McGuire and Ms. Donna D. Melby

Committee Staff: Ms. Jody Patel and Ms. Nancy Carlisle

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

Proposals for Review

The committee reviewed and considered the following draft report as an Information Only Item on the agenda for the April 15, 2016, Judicial Council business meeting:

16-046 – Judicial Council: Implementation of Judicial Council Directives on Judicial Council Staff Restructuring (No Action Required)

The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) presents this informational report on the implementation of the Judicial Council Directives on Staff Restructuring, as approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012. The Judicial Council Staff Restructuring Directives specifically direct the Administrative Director to report to E&P before each council meeting on every directive. This informational report provides an update on the progress of implementation efforts.

Action: *The committee approved the report as an Information Only Item on the agenda for the April Judicial Council business meeting.*

CLOSURE OF ACTION

The action by e-mail concluded on April 5, 2016.

Approved by the advisory body on _____.

Court Facilities Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District
Staff:	Ms. Kelly Quinn, Principal Manager for Business and Planning, Capital Program, Judicial Council
Advisory Body's Charge: Per Rule 10.62 that was adopted by the Judicial Council on February 20, 2014, the committee makes recommendations to the Judicial Council concerning the judicial branch capital program for the trial and appellate courts.	
Advisory Body's Membership: Currently, there are a total of 21 members. Please see the attached Court Facilities Advisory Committee roster. Per Rule 10.62, the committee must include at least one member from each of the categories below. Presently, the composition of the committee is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appellate court justice – 2 members• Appellate court clerk/administrator – 1 member• Superior court judge – 8 members• Court executive officer – 3 members• Lawyer – 2 members• Local government official or administrator – 1 member• Public member with expertise in real estate acquisition, construction, architecture, or cost estimating, or facilities management and operations – 2 members• The chair and vice-chair of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, as non-voting members – 2 members	

Subcommittees:

Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS) – Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair

CCRS Workgroups (by topic): Courtroom Standards, First vs. Long-term O&M Costs, and Courthouse Security –

Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair

Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee – Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Chair

Subcommittee on Courthouse Names – Hon. Keith D. Davis, Chair

Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2016:

The key objectives are the projects listed below.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> All projects support 2006–2012 Strategic Plan Goal: Goal VI, A – Facilities Infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide and maintain safe, dignified, and fully functional facilities for conducting court business. 2. Provide judicial branch facilities that accommodate the needs of all court users, as well as those of justice system partners <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Coordination through Lead Staff to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Kelly Quinn, Judicial Council, Capital Program Contact: 818-558-3078; Kelly.Quinn@jud.ca.gov</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing, as needed	Reviews of courthouse projects in relation to budget. Submit recommendations for Judicial Council consideration on how projects should proceed with available budgets.
2.	Review and monitor implementation of recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant (IOC)	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Review and monitor implementation of IOC recommendations.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	Oversee Judicial Council’s process for and progress in reducing courthouse project costs	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Oversight of reductions to courthouse project costs. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.
4.	Coordinate with Executive and Planning Committee and the Judicial Council to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.
5.	Coordinate with the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council on the effort to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Facilities Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> Same as above</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> This project is a key objective.</p>	Ongoing	Additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications.

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	Review of Judicial Council-approved courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available budget and recommend how to proceed	Ongoing, as needed
2.	Review and monitor recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant	Ongoing
3.	Oversee Judicial Council’s process for and progress in reducing courthouse project costs	Ongoing
4.	Coordinate with Executive and Planning Committee and the Judicial Council to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program	Ongoing
5.	Coordinate with the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council on the effort to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications	Ongoing
6.	Review and approve a catalog of courtroom layouts for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the <i>Catalog of Courtroom Layouts for California Trial Courts</i> on June 26, 2015
7.	Review and approve a facilities water conservation policy for adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. The CFAC reviewed and approved the policy on May 15, 2015. Subsequently, and as recommended by the Facilities Policies Working Group, the Judicial Council adopted the <i>Water Conservation Policy</i> on June 26, 2015
8.	Review and approve a courthouse naming request for the new courthouse under construction in the City of Los Banos for the Superior Court of Merced County, for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the courthouse naming request on August 21, 2015

9.	Review and approve a courthouse naming request for the existing, unnamed courthouse in the City of Roseville for the Superior Court of Placer County, for recommendation of adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. Judicial Council adopted the courthouse naming request on October 27, 2015
10.	Review a policy for limiting the acceptance and purchasing of art for court facilities for adoption by the Judicial Council	Completed. The CFAC reviewed and approved the policy on July 16, 2015. Subsequently, and as recommended by the Facilities Policies Working Group, the Judicial Council adopted the <i>Judicial Council Policy Limiting the Acceptance and Purchasing of Art for Court Facilities</i> on December 11, 2015

IV. SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittees: Note: Each subcommittee is only composed of members of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee.

***Subcommittee name:* Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS)**

Purpose of subcommittee: The subcommittee was created with the purpose of proposing further cost reductions to the SB 1407 program. In October 2012, the Judicial Council directed that the subcommittee should oversee and have direct implementation authority to mandate project cost reductions for all capital-outlay projects in design managed by the judicial branch. The subcommittee is currently responsible for the review of the costs of all courthouse capital projects in design, in an effort to reduce expenditure of public funds without compromising safety, security, and functionality for the public and the courts.

Number of advisory committee members: 10

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Date formed: October 2011

Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets: This subcommittee meets approximately seven times per year.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

Workgroups of the Subcommittee: Courtroom Standards, First vs. Long-term O&M Costs, and Courthouse Security:

***CCRS Workgroup name/topic:* Courtroom Standards**

Purpose of workgroup: To update standards on courtroom design to apply to projects in design phase, to reduce construction costs.

Number of advisory committee members: 8

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Date formed: May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets: This workgroup has met a total of four times.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: A catalog of courtroom layouts was presented to the full advisory committee in March and December 2014 and in May 2015, prior to its adoption by the Judicial Council in June 2015.

CCRS Workgroup name/topic: First vs. Long-term O&M Costs

Purpose of workgroup: To compare costs of one-time or initial costs to ongoing operations and maintenance costs for informing choices on courthouse building materials and systems, to reduce construction costs.

Number of advisory committee members: 7

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Date formed: May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets: This workgroup has met a total of two times.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: A pamphlet, titled *First Cost and Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Costs*, was approved for production by the CCRS in January 2014.

CCRS Workgroup name/topic: Courthouse Security

Purpose of workgroup: To review security issues in the courthouse construction program, to reduce construction costs.

Number of advisory committee members: 5

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Date formed: May 2013. This workgroup was approved by the Executive and Planning Committee.

Number of meetings or how often the workgroup meets: This workgroup has met a total of two times.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: A metric for central holding capacity/cells in new courthouse capital projects was approved by the CCRS in December 2013.

Subcommittee name: Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee

Purpose of subcommittee: The subcommittee was created with the purpose of overseeing the procurement of the independent outside oversight consultant that would review and assess the judicial branch's courthouse construction program. The subcommittee has been responsible for all processes involved with the outside consultant's procurement, including the final selection, the review and endorsement of the report findings and recommendations, and the review of the policies, procedures, and guidelines created by the Judicial Council in response to the report findings and recommendations.

Number of advisory committee members: 5

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Subcommittee name: Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee, continued

Date formed: August 2011

Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets: This subcommittee meets approximately two times per year.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

Subcommittee name: Subcommittee on Courthouse Names

Purpose of subcommittee: The subcommittee was created to develop a recommended courthouse naming policy to the Judicial Council and implement the policy as it requires action by the subcommittee.

Number of advisory committee members: 7

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory committee): None.

Date formed: December 2012

Number of meetings or how often the subcommittee meets: This subcommittee meets as needed and usually between 1–3 times per year.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: The work of this subcommittee is ongoing.

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
Annual Agenda—2016 Draft Copy
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Steven K. Austin
Vice Chair:	Ms. Christina Volkers
Staff:	Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf; Ms. Catharine Price
<p>Advisory Body's Charge: Makes recommendations to the Judicial Council on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Interpreter use and need in court proceedings; and2. Certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters.3. Review and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the findings of the Language Need and Interpreter Use study in court proceedings, conducted by the Judicial Council every five years under Government Code section 68563. <i>(Sen. Bill 1304; Stats. 1992, ch.770, Rule 10.51 and GC §68561-68565)</i>	

Advisory Body’s Membership: 15 Member Panel – Rule of Court 10.51 provides that the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel will consist of 11 members, a majority of whom must be court interpreters. The panel must include representatives from the following categories:

- One appellate court justice;
- Two trial court judges;
- Two court administrators, including at least one trial court executive officer;
- Four certified or registered court interpreters working as employees in the trial courts, one from each of the four regions established by Government Code section 71807; and
- Two certified or registered court interpreters in a language other than Spanish, working in the trial courts as independent contractors or in an educational institution.

In addition CIAP membership includes four advisory non-voting positions, each offering a perspective not represented by the voting members. They currently are:

- A representative of the American Sign Language (ASL) community;
- A representative of court users of interpreter services, such as a public defender, legal aid attorney, or other public advocate;
- A representative familiar with the hands-on supervision of day-to-day court interpreter operations; and
- A representative with legal experience within the court (This position has also been filled by a representative in the field of interpreter education.)

Subcommittees/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.¹]*

1. Professional Standards and Ethics (Established 1999 under name of *Interpreter Standards and Procedures*)
2. Language Access Subcommittee (approved 2013)

In addition, CIAP is collaborating with the following subcommittees of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force:

3. The Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee (Collaboration on Project #1)
4. The Technological Solutions Subcommittee (Consultative basis Project # 4)

¹ 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 2016: (Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 5 are continuations of projects from the 2015 Annual Agenda)

1. Continue to review performance standards of current interpreters by developing a means of fairly and consistently assessing court interpreter knowledge, skills and abilities. Establish a comprehensive complaint based review process and procedures through which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter's skills and adherence to ethical requirements are fairly reviewed and assessed and through which sanctions may be imposed, up to, and including revocation of an interpreter's certified or registered status and removal from the Master List. Will include a corresponding revision of Rule of Court 2.891 and legislation as appropriate.
2. Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing Rule of Court 2.893 and corresponding Judicial Council INT forms. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms.
3. Develop policy and process for LEP litigant right to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter.
4. Consult with the Court Technology Advisory Committee on Video Remote Technology.
5. Develop and recommend the Judicial Council adopt a policy on the de-designation of previously designated languages whose use in the courts has declined.

Objectives 1-2 were identified in 2015 as anticipated to take no less two years to complete as they may require a review of and possible amendments to existing rules of court and Judicial Council forms.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
1	<p>Continue to research, develop and recommend method and means by which a biennial periodic review on court interpreter skills can be fairly and consistently assessed throughout the courts. (Rule of Court 2.891)</p> <p>Consideration will be given to include in the rule that courts may still recommend and initiate a review process of performance skills and abilities.</p> <p>Funding: An analysis of costs will need to be undertaken, as well as determining additional staffing needs necessary to implement revised and or new rule(s) of court, remedial action</p>	1	<p><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u> <u>GC §68562 (d)</u> The Judicial Council shall adopt standards and requirements for interpreter proficiency, continuing education, certification renewal, and discipline. The Judicial Council shall adopt standards of professional conduct for court interpreters.</p> <p><u>GC§68564 (f)</u> A procedure for Judicial Council and local court review of each court interpreter's skills and for reporting to the certification entity the results of the review.</p> <p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal IV:</u> Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p>	<p><u>2015 Annual Agenda:</u> CIAP anticipated no less than a two year timeline due to the complexity of issues involved.</p> <p><u>In 2016:</u> Continue identifying the components and develop a draft of a complaint based review process specific to court interpreters.</p> <p>Determined that Rule of Court 2.891 will need amendment as courts do not have adequate financial</p>	<p>End product will result in a comprehensive complaint based review process, and a corresponding Rule of Court(s) and legislation as appropriate.</p>

² 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.

³ 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 ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<p>procedures, including proposed legislation costs.</p> <p><i>Note: This project takes into account the requirements established by GC§71811 Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, and regional Memoranda of Understanding.</i></p>		<p><u>Supports Operational Objective 2:</u> Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p> <p><u>Origin of Project:</u> LAP recommendation #64: Complaints regarding court interpreters: The Judicial Council, together with stakeholders, will develop a process by which the quality and accuracy of an interpreter’s skills and adherence to ethical requirements can be reviewed. This process will allow for appropriate remedial action, where required, to ensure certified and registered interpreters meet all qualification standards. Development of the process should include determination of whether California Rule of Court 2.891 (regarding periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct) should be amended, repealed, or remain in place. Once the review process is created, information regarding how it can be initiated must be clearly communicated to court staff, judicial</p>	<p>resources or required linguistic expertise to conduct biennial reviews on employee and independent contractors. Includes collaboration with the Language Access Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee, who is currently developing a statewide complaint form and process applicable to all court personnel.</p> <p>Work to not only include drafting of recommended policy and procedures, but anticipated draft recommendations for rule and statutory amendments, as appropriate.</p> <p>Development and draft anticipated to be</p>	

<p>Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process to include remedial actions up to and including the permanent revocation of an interpreters' certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure, as per LAP Recommendation #64.</p> <p><i>Rule 2.891 Periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct</i> Each trial court must establish a procedure for biennial, or more frequent, review of the performance and skills of each court interpreter certified under Government Code section 68560 et seq. The court may designate a review panel, which must include at least one person qualified in the interpreter's language. The review procedure may include interviews, observations of courtroom performance, rating forms, and other evaluation techniques.</p> <p><i>Rule 2.891 amended and renumbered effective January 1,</i></p>		<p>officers, attorneys, and in plain language to court users (e.g., LEP persons and justice partners).</p> <p>Resources: Close collaboration with Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee, which is developing a statewide complaint form and process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate with and seek input from the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) regarding the development of appropriate review processes, procedures and tools. • Legal review and input will be required at juncture points to ensure compliance with applicable laws and statutes. <p>Other Resources: Regional Bargaining Unit Chairs, Court Human Resources, Language Access Plan Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee, and other stakeholders as needed for consultative purposes.</p>	<p>completed by June/July 2017.</p>	
--	--	---	-------------------------------------	--

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	2007; adopted as rule 984 effective July 1, 1979; previously amended effective January 1, 1996.				
2	<p>A comprehensive evaluation of existing Rule of Court 2.893, <i>Appointment of noncertified interpreters in criminal cases and juvenile delinquency proceedings</i>, and other rules related to court interpreters and Judicial Council INT forms and instructions, and recommend any appropriate revisions to the current forms and Rule of Court. Determine if Rule of Court 2.893 requires amendments, and consider the possible scope of amendments, and make recommendations accordingly.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u></p>	1(c)	<p><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u> GC §68561 requires the use of certified and registered interpreters and outlines the process for provisional qualification of a non-certified /non-registered interpreter. Effective January 1, 2015, legislative changes expanded the information required on the record and expanded court’s authority to provide court interpreters in civil proceedings.</p> <p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan Goal I:</u> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><u>Operational Objective 5:</u> Increase qualified interpreter services in mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court venues; increase the availability of language-assistance services to all court users.</p>	<p>Work is underway, however, a thorough review and subsequent recommended changes to applicable rules and forms may not be completed by the end of 2016. Work will continue into 2017.</p> <p>Anticipated completion date: August 2017.</p>	<p>Provide the Judicial Council with recommendations on amendments to Rule of Court 2.893 and corresponding Judicial Council INT forms and instructions.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ₃	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p><u>Origin of Project:</u></p> <p>AB 1657: Interpreters in Civil Proceedings (Stats. 2014, ch.721; effective January 1, 2015)</p> <p>Authorizes courts to provide interpreters to all parties in civil matters, regardless of income, and sets forth a priority order when courts do not have sufficient resources to provide interpreters for all LEP court users. The bill also resulted in adding section 68092.1 to the Government Code, which allows for courts to provide interpreters in accordance with the priorities set forth until such time that sufficient funds are appropriated.</p> <p>AB 2370 (Stats. 2014, ch. 424; effective January 1, 2015) expanded upon the previous GC 68561 by requiring that certain statements be made on the record whenever an interpreter interprets in a court proceeding, including statements that confirm that the court is following the procedures for provisional qualification.</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ₃	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			<p><u>LAP Recommendations:</u> #9: Provisional qualification requirements; #19: Verifying credentials of interpreters; #69 Procedures and guidelines for good cause, and #70 Amend rule of court for appointment of interpreters in civil proceedings. (Refers to Rule of Court 2.893)</p> <p><u>Resources:</u> TCPJAC, CEAC, Regional Bargaining Unit Chairs, Court Subject Matter Experts, Legal Services, Human Resources Labor Relations Unit, Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force.</p>		
3	Develop a policy and process, per LAP recommendation #75, for an LEP litigant’s right to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter; including whether a corresponding Rule of Court is needed in order to implement the recommended policy.	1(c)	<p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan</u> <u>Goal I:</u> Access, Fairness, and Diversity <u>Operational Objective 1:</u> Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given the opportunity to be heard.</p>	<p>Anticipate completion: January 1, 2018.</p> <p>Work will commence late 2016 or early 2017, contingent upon the completion of review of Rule 2.893 and corresponding INT forms.</p>	<p>Policy and process as specified in LAP recommendation #75, with a corresponding standardized form, and a Rule of Court, if required to implement the policy and process.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
	<u>Subcommittee: Language Access</u>		<p><u>Origin of Project: LAP Recommendation #75:</u></p> <p>Policy regarding waiver of interpreter. The Implementation Task Force will develop a policy addressing an LEP court user's request of a waiver of the services of an interpreter. The policy will identify standards to ensure that any waiver is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; is made after the person has consulted with counsel; and is approved by the appropriate judicial officer, exercising his or her discretion. The policy will address any other factors necessary to ensure the waiver is appropriate, including: determining whether an interpreter is necessary to ensure the waiver is made knowingly; ensuring that the waiver is entered on the record, or in writing if there is no official record of the proceedings; and requiring that a party may request at any time, or the court may make on its own motion, an order vacating the waiver and appointing an interpreter for all further proceedings. The policy shall reflect the expectation that waivers will rarely be invoked in</p>		<p>Completion date estimate: End of 2017/early 2018.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ₃	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			light of access to free interpreter services and the Implementation Task Force will track waiver usage to assist in identifying any necessary changes to policy.		
4	<p><u>Consultative Only- from 2015 Annual Agenda:</u></p> <p>Consult with Information Technology Advisory Committee, the Language Access Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee and/or Judicial Council Technology Committee in the execution of a Video Remote Interpreting pilot project for spoken languages.</p>	1	<p><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u></p> <p>Component of the Chief Justice’s “Access 3D” initiative that highlights physical, remote, and equal access to the justice system.</p> <p><u>Judicial Branch Strategic Plan</u></p> <p><u>Goal I:</u> Access, Fairness, and Diversity</p> <p><u>Origin of Project:</u></p> <p><u>LAP recommendation #16:</u></p> <p>The Judicial Council should conduct a pilot project, in alignment with the Judicial Branch’s Tactical Plan for Technology 2014-2016. This pilot should, to the extent possible, collect relevant data on: due process issues, participant satisfaction, whether remote interpreting increases the use of certified and registered interpreters as opposed to provisionally qualified interpreters, the effectiveness of a</p>	<p>A Request For Proposal to acquire vendor(s) in order to conduct a VRI pilot program is being developed under the auspices of the Language Access Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee. The proposal is anticipated to go before the Judicial Council during the April 2016 meeting.</p>	<p>Implementation of VRI pilot program and an evaluation and validation of guidelines developed.</p> <p>CIAP staff provides consultation on the project.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/Outcome of Activity
			variety of available technologies (for both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation), and a cost-benefit analysis.		
5	<p>Re-consider development and recommend the Judicial Council adopt a policy on the de-designation of previously designated languages whose use in the courts has declined.</p> <p><u>Sub-group:</u> Ad-Hoc group to be assigned</p>	2	<p><u>Judicial Council Direction:</u> Strategic Plan Goal: Goal I – Access, Fairness & Diversity</p> <p><u>Operational Plan Objective 2:</u> Identify and eliminate barrier to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient and perceived as fair.</p> <p><u>Origin of Project:</u> A result of the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study.</p>	<p>April 2015: CIAP concurred to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-consider recommending a de-designation policy for adoption by the Judicial Council in 2016. 	<p>Recommend to the Judicial Council a comprehensive policy for de-designation of a language, and delegate future authority to the Administrative Director to de-designate a language. (Administrative Director currently has delegation of authority to designate a language.)</p>

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Research, develop and recommend method and means by which a biennial periodic review on court interpreter skills can be fairly and consistently assessed throughout the courts. (Rule of Court 2.891)</p> <p>Determine whether California Rule of Court 2.891 should be amended, repealed, or remain in place.</p> <p>Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process to include remedial actions up to and including the permanent revocation of an interpreter's certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure.</p>	<p>Completed objective of conducting review of other state AOC practices, professional organizations and agency procedures, including the California State Bar and Court Reporters Board of California. Found that other agencies utilize a complaint based process, including violations of applicable Professional Code of Ethics, and on the grounds of conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of said profession.</p> <p>Subcommittee is in agreement that process, guidelines and corresponding Rule of Court will consist of a complaint based process, initiated at the court level, and if applicable; resolved at the state credentialing level.</p> <p>Determined that Rule of Court 2.891 will need amendment, as courts do not have adequate financial resources or required linguistic expertise to conduct biennial reviews on employee and independent contractors (1,835 currently on Master List) representing over 200 languages</p> <p>2016 Will commence drafting of recommended policy and procedures, anticipated draft recommendations for rule and statutory amendments, as appropriate. Development to be completed by June/July 2017.</p>
2.	<p>Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing Rule of Court 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms.</p>	<p>Following completion of Request for Interpreter in Civil Action form, this work will commence in Spring 2016. Anticipated completion date: August 2017.</p>
3.	<p>Consult with Civil and Small Claims Committee on Request for Interpreter in Civil Action forms.</p>	<p>Project was transferred to CIAP from the Civil and Small Claims Committee in 2015. The proposed final form and instructions were reviewed by CIAP on February 17, 2016. CIAP acted to recommend that the Request for Court Interpreter (Civil Actions)</p>

		form and corresponding Rule of Court 2.895 go to RUPRO and the Judicial Council for consideration. Pending RUPRO review, anticipated effective date for the new rule and form is July 1, 2016.
4.	Review and address public comment to proposed changes for Evidence Code 754.	The proposed changes were reviewed by PCLC for recommended sponsorship and the recommendation was approved by the Judicial Council at its December 11, 2015 meeting. The proposed bill, AB 1709 (Act to Amend Evidence Code 754), was introduced in late January 2016 and, if enacted, will be effective January 1, 2017.
5.	Consult with Information Technology Advisory Committee and Implementation Task Force and Judicial Council Technology Committee in the execution of a Video Remote Interpreting pilot project for spoken languages.	A Request for Proposal for selection of vendor(s) to provide equipment for the VRI pilot is being drafted. The proposed RFP will go before the Judicial Council in April 2016 for approval. Anticipate the VRI pilot will commence before the end of 2016.
6.	Develop and recommend a policy on the de-designation of previously designated languages whose use in the courts has declined.	CIAP moved not to de-designate Portuguese (Bilingual Interpreting Exam available) or to de-designate Japanese as per the recommendations made in <i>the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study</i> . CIAP also moved to not to adopt a de-designation policy at the current time. CIAP concurred that a policy regarding de-designation of a previously designated language will be re-visited in 2016 for consideration.

IV. Subcommittees/Working Groups – Detail

Subcommittees/Working Groups:

Subcommittee or working group name: Professional Standards and Ethics

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Determine criteria and clear standards that establish grounds for a disciplinary process to include remedial actions up to and including the permanent revocation of an interpreter's certified or registered status, warranting removal from the Master List; and including a comprehensive review and appeal procedure.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 8 members (includes 1 advisory member)

Number and description of additional members: One non-CIAP member approved by E&P: Steve Cascioppo; Assistant Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Diego County.

Date formed: 1999

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Every four to six weeks (once in person with entire CIAP Body)

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: June/July 2017.

Subcommittee or working group name: Language Access

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Conduct comprehensive evaluation of existing Rules of Court 2.893, and Judicial Council INT forms, and continue development of form(s), rule and process for requesting interpreters in civil actions. Recommend appropriate revisions to the current rules and forms. Develop form and rule, if required, for litigants to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 7 member (includes 3 advisory members)

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): N/A

Date formed: 2013

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: 4-6 times per year (once in person with entire CIAP Body)

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: EC754 work December 2015; remainder of projects, August 2017

Note: CIAP will provide consultation as required:

Consult with the Information Technology Advisory Committee and Technological Solutions Subcommittee (subcommittee of LAP Implementation Task Force) on Video Remote Technology.

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee

Annual Agenda—2016

Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Richard Vlavianos (chair), Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin Hon. Rogelio Flores (vice-chair), Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara
Staff:	Ms. Nancy Taylor, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and Ms. Francine Byrne, Criminal Justice Services
<p>Advisory Body’s Charge: Rule 10.56 of the California Rules of Court charges the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee to “make recommendations to the Judicial Council on criteria for identifying and evaluating collaborative justice courts and for improving the processing of cases in these courts, which include drug courts, domestic violence courts, youth courts, and other collaborative justice courts. Those recommendations include ‘best practices’ guidelines and methods for collecting data to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of collaborative justice courts.”</p> <p>Additional Duties included under Rule 10.56:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Assess and measure success and effectiveness of local collaborative justice courts;2. Identify and disseminate to trial courts locally generated best practices;3. Recommend minimum judicial education standards and educational activities to support those standards to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research;4. Advise the council of potential funding sources;5. Make recommendations regarding grant funding programs that are administered by the Administrative Office of the Courts for drug courts and other treatment courts; and6. Recommend appropriate outreach activities needed to support collaborative justice courts.	
<p>Advisory Body’s Membership:</p> <p>The committee currently has 23 members (eight judicial officers, two court administrators, one district attorney, one criminal defense attorney, one law enforcement officer, one treatment court coordinator, one probation officer, one treatment provider, one treatment court graduate, one representative from the mental health field, one social services representative, one non-profit community organization representative, and three public members).</p>	

Subgroups/Working Groups:¹

Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee

Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee

Policy Subcommittee

Mental Health Subcommittee*

*Indicates new subcommittee.

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016:

1. Support local court efforts to increase effectiveness and efficiency of case processing for high risk/high needs cases by identifying and disseminating local court practices that apply collaborative justice to a broad range of high risk/high needs case types in both criminal and noncriminal cases;
2. Support local court efforts to assess evidence based practices in local collaborative justice courts as core functions in court operations that address high risk/high needs cases through statewide evaluations of mental health courts, youth courts, and reentry courts;
3. Provide collaborative justice related expertise and support collaboration among justice system partners at the state and local levels through inter-branch efforts in areas such as parolee reentry courts, veterans courts and military families, and juvenile collaborative justice courts;
4. Identify potential funding and advise the Judicial Council regarding funding to sustain local collaborative justice courts during challenging times, including funding for juvenile and family collaborative courts, funding for family reunification in collaborative courts, realigned drug court funding, recidivism reduction funding, fiscal impacts of Proposition 47, federal funding for collaborative courts, and funding through the Mental Health Services Act;
5. Identify non-criminal issues that impact case outcomes in criminal and other collaborative courts, such as child support, child custody, juvenile court issues, and access to treatment and rehabilitative services through the Affordable Care Act and realigned treatment programs; and
6. Recommend and provide multi-disciplinary education that addresses the changing role of collaborative justice and application of collaborative justice principles across a broad range of case types, including elder law, family law, and mental health law.
7. Support efforts to address expungement of records, release of DMV holds resulting from outstanding fines/fees or child support cases, implementation of 1170.9, and other relief granted through collaborative courts.

¹ 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 PROJECTS

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects and are available to support local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California, as well as supplementing dependency drug courts with federal funding from the Court Improvement Project.</p> <p>a. Report to the Judicial Council on grant activities from fiscal year 2015-16.</p> <p>b. Recommend to the Judicial Council grant</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Legislative mandate reviewed annually by Judicial Council. The Substance Abuse Focus Grant was initiated in FY 2000-01. Current year funding has been established through the Budget Act of 2014 (Stats. 2014, ch. 21; § 45.55.020, item 0250-101-0001).</p> <p>Resources: External legislatively earmarked funding for drug court implementation provides needed resources for committee activities for this project.</p>	<p>On-going/ annual dates below:</p> <p>1 a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>1b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>1c. <i>Completion Date:</i> October 31, 2016</p> <p>1d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p>	Allocation of grant funds to local courts

² 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.

³ 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 ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>allocations to local courts based on allocation method approved by the Judicial Council in FY14-15.</p> <p>c. Review biannual reports regarding funding distribution, invoicing, and deliverables reports from local courts.</p> <p>d. Recommend methods of allocation and grants administration for next annual funding cycle using Judicial Council approved allocation methodology</p>		<p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Fiscal Services Office, Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 4</p>		
2.	<p>Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance such as developing intern and mentor programs for local collaborative court projects.</p> <p>a. Identifying funding in collaboration with the</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices</p>	<p>On-going/annual dates below:</p> <p>2a. <i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2016</p> <p>2b. <i>Completion Date:</i> September 30, 2016</p>	<p>Local courts will be provided access to a variety of funding sources, such as reentry and recidivism reduction grants that are allocated through the Judicial Council, and assistance from Judicial Council staff,</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, California Office of Traffic Safety, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Improvement Program, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance to support existing and planned collaborative courts.</p> <p>b. Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle.</p> <p>c. Share findings from collaborative court outcome and cost studies as well as compiled reports and studies from local collaborative courts with collaborative court coordinators in quarterly</p>		<p>branch wide.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal I: Access, Fairness, & Diversity</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i></p> <p>Objective 2. Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Requested by local courts and justice system partners, including</p>	<p>2c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>2d. <i>Completion date:</i> December 31, 2016</p>	<p>national technical assistance providers, and mentor courts to implement mentor and intern programs.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>meetings to assist local courts in seeking local, federal, and private funding.</p> <p>d. Share effective practices, at the request of local courts, among courts that use intern programs involving law schools or graduate schools for human services professionals or mentor programs involving program graduates or support persons, such as veterans, to improve outcomes for collaborative court participants.</p>		<p>the California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, and Homeless Court Network; approved by the Executive & Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: SB 318; AB109, the Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act, President's Office of National Drug Control Policy reporting duties; California Endowment and Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance funding.</p> <p>Resources: External funding for projects through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources required for committee activities.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1 and 2</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	Continue to collaborate with Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees; to provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of management and administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive & Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act, and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides needed resources for these committee activities.</p>	<p>On-going/annual dates below: 3a. <i>Completion Date:</i> June 30, 2016 3b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p>	<p>Summary of recommendations, multidisciplinary education programs, and educational materials will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>justice models for high risk/high needs cases, focusing on cases involving mental health, veterans and military families, truancy, reentry, and human trafficking, as well as the impact on collaborative courts of policy changes such as expungement and release of DMV holds, resolution of child support issues, family reunification, Proposition 47, Diversion options, the Affordable Care Act and realignment of funding for treatment and services.</p> <p>a. Continue to confer with relevant CJER judicial education planning committees in criminal law and mental health, and juvenile and family law to address mental health, reentry, human trafficking, veterans' issues, and truancy.</p>		<p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Center for Judicial Education and Research, Office of Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>b. Continue to confer with the CJER Governing Committee and relevant judicial education planning committees, and provide guidance to committee staff regarding training activities developed in collaboration with justice system partners, including but not limited to the California Association of Collaborative Courts (CACC), National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), the California Association of Youth Courts (CAYC), the California Department of Corrections (CDCR) and Rehabilitation, the Department of Veterans Affairs, California Judges Association (CJA), and the American Bar Association (ABA) for training programs offered at quarterly or annual meetings and trainings for members of</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>the judiciary, collaborative court coordinators and court teams that identify emerging models, such as veterans and military families, trauma informed services, effective and evidenced-based practice, practice standards and peer review, reunification courts, elder courts, reentry courts, truancy courts, and collaborative courts that address human trafficking, such as girls' courts.</p>				
4	<p>Upon request, identify methods to assist local courts in improving case outcomes and implementing policy changes including juvenile and adult mental health, Proposition 47, diversion, pretrial supervision, reentry, family reunification, juvenile competency, child support, veterans issues, sealing of</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive &</p>	<p>On-going/ annual dates below:</p> <p>4a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>4b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p>	<p>Summary of programs and activities to identify case outcomes and evidence based approaches to be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>records, and human trafficking through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, courts that address human trafficking, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts.</p> <p>a. Provide guidance and act as subject matter experts for the dissemination of resources for judicial officers and court staff in the area of mental health, veterans and military families, human trafficking, and collaborative courts addressing adult, juvenile, probate, and family cases.</p> <p>b. Provide guidance and</p>		<p>Planning Committee for the committee’s 2014 Annual Agenda; recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: SB318; AB109, the Budget Act; Proposition 47; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding from the California Endowment and Mental Health Services Act was obtained to support all committee activities for these projects.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Office of Communications, Center for Judicial Education Research, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force.</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>act as subject matter experts to advise committee staff regarding a youth court study, studies of adult and juvenile mental health courts, a girls' court study, veterans court studies, and reentry court studies including approaches for improving outcomes, by addressing family reunification, child support, housing, trauma, and mental health.</p>		<p>Key Objective Supported: 1, 2, 3, 5</p>		
5	<p>Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such as Proposition 47, recidivism reduction, realigned funding and services, veterans and military families, DUI, and the Affordable Care Act that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate,</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal III: Modernization of management and administration</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 2. Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branch</p>	<p>On-going through December 31, 2016</p>	<p>Summary of identified policies, assistance provided and recommendations to help local courts provided to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>mental health, and drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities.</p>		<p>wide.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: Mental Health Services Act; Proposition 47; and the Budget Act.</p> <p>Resources: External funding through the Mental Health Services Act, the California Endowment, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation provides all resources needed by the committee for these activities.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Center for Judicial Education and Research, Office of Governmental Affairs, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Executives Advisory Committees.</p> <p>Key Objectives Supported: 1, 5</p>		
6	<p>Continue to consult with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education curriculum committees, and make recommendations for judicial education and court assistance materials in the areas of court-involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, and veterans courts, including implementation of the optional Judicial Council form to identify military status effective as of January 1, 2014; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education planning committees, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public <i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1. Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Project originated at the request of an Appellate Court Justice who served on the Judicial Council Task Force for Criminal Justice Collaboration on Mental Health Issues and members of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force, and local courts. Project was recommended by committee members to assist courts in responding to mandates of PC 1170.9.</p> <p>Resources: Federal Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Assistance</p>	<p>Ongoing/annual dates below:</p> <p>6a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>6b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>6c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>6d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p>	<p>Summary of recommendations and activities will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>content development, dissemination, and review.</p> <p>a. Make recommendations regarding use of judicial education job aids in judicial education programs, including “Veterans in Criminal Court: A decision map of Penal Code 1170.9” to assist veterans courts, homeless courts, and others in the court system to implement PC1170.9.</p> <p>b. Make recommendations for implementing broad use of the form MIL-100, <i>Notification of Military Status</i>, to assist the courts in the identification of veterans involved in cases within the court system, with modifications developed in accord</p>		<p>funding was obtained to support all committee activities related to the project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 3, 5</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>with policy changes.</p> <p>c. Identify educational materials and, at the request of relevant committees, serve as subject matter experts for preparation of toolkit for areas pertaining to military families and veterans courts, such as implementation of PC 1170.9, PC1001.3, PC1001.8, military sexual trauma, family reunification issues, trauma informed services and court programs, and reentry issues for incarcerated veterans by providing guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p> <p>d. At the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>committees, serve as subject matter experts and provide guidance in the development of educational programs, identification of faculty, and review of content linked with CJER functions, such as Military Families and Veterans Court programs at the Juvenile Law Institute and Family Law Institute by providing guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
7	<p>Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as juvenile mental health courts, truancy, youth courts, trafficking, girls' court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; continue to assist in effort to address juvenile competency through legislation and implementation of policy changes in this area.</p> <p>a. To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the committee will collaborate with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, to consider developing recommendations to the Judicial Council to committee staff to develop content, and follow up activities for the Youth</p>		<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Approved by the Executive & Planning Committee for the committee's 2014 Annual Agenda; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013-14 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory</p>	<p>June 30, 2017/ in process/ project dates below</p> <p>7a. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>7b. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>7c. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016</p> <p>7d. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017.</p> <p>7e. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2017.</p> <p>7f. <i>Completion Date:</i> December 31, 2016.</p>	<p>Summary of identified policy issues and best practices will be submitted to the Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Summit in partnership with the California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p>b. Provide subject matter expertise and guidance to committee staff in development and maintain updates of briefing papers on evidence based practices on assessments, girls' court, and human trafficking for inclusion in and distribution of a judicial officer toolkit.</p> <p>c. Provide subject matter expertise and guidance, and coordinate with staff to other groups, in the area of human trafficking, which will include the development of briefing papers on evidence based practices, bench cards for judicial officers, sample scripts, a description of validated assessment and screening tools for</p>		<p>Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>trafficking victims, a discussion of girls' courts and specialized human trafficking courts, and the creation of a judicial officer toolkit.</p> <p>d. Assist in the Branch coordination of efforts to support work done by the Child Welfare Council's Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team and other Branch entities, including the CJER Governing Committee and the Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP) Planning Committee, in the area of human trafficking</p> <p>The Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative, funded by the State Justice Institute, has agreed to provide technical support for these projects and to the Judicial Branch in the area of human trafficking.</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, through the Juvenile Subcommittee, will oversee follow-up work from the Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative Summit and Technical Assistance Project, including holding a Human Trafficking Summit in 2017.</p> <p>e. Assist in Branch coordination efforts to address permanency for children in foster care by providing subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with the Permanency Committee of the Child Welfare Council to promote and expand the use of Dependency Drug Courts as a best practice model. The work will include developing literature and data, improving data collection efforts, and increasing outreach efforts</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>to courts that do not currently use Dependency Drug Courts. Continue to coordinate efforts with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the CJER Governing Committees, as well as relevant education and curriculum committees and to partner with Children and Family Futures, the federal technical assistance provider in this subject area, which has agreed to provide technical support for this project.</p> <p>f. Support completion of the legislative proposal process for proposed juvenile competency legislation, in coordination with the Office of Governmental Affairs, and assist in implementation of any legislative changes, as well as assisting courts in identifying and implementing effective practices in juvenile</p>				

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	competency and juvenile mental health courts.				
8	<p>Review the following recommendations from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force, that were identified as within Judicial Council purview and in need of continuing work for implementation and develop a project plan of next steps in implementation as regards collaborative justice:</p> <p>1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62,</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council meeting- December 2015, at which the final report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force</p>	Project plan developed by June 30, 2017.	Project plan to be developed and implementation initiated with summary provided to Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>64, 66, 67, 84, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 124, 128, 130, 131, 132, 134</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendations may be found at the following link: http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/MHIITF-Final-Report.pdf Continue the work of the MHIITF to assist staff in the Office of Governmental Affairs by weighing in on legislative proposals involving mental health issues 		<p>was submitted and Council indicated that Advisory committees would implement follow-up work; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013-14 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p> <p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p>		

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9	Develop a plan to identify and address mental health issues through application of collaborative court principles in noncriminal case types, including civil, probate, family, and juvenile.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> <i>Strategic Plan:</i> Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public</p> <p><i>Operational Plan:</i> Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p> <p>Origin of Project: December 2015 Judicial Council meeting at which the final report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force was submitted and the council indicated that advisory committees would implement follow-up work and identified noncriminal case types as part of the ongoing work regarding cases involving mental health issues; Recommended by committee members to fulfill the following mandates: 2013-14 Budget Act; and Mental Health Services Act.</p> <p>Resources: Funding from the Mental Health Services Act will be used to support committee activities related to this project.</p>	Initial plan developed: June 30, 2017	Initial plan to be developed with summary provided to Judicial Council by June 30, 2017.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>To ensure that there is no duplication of effort and no new workload or fiscal burdens placed on trial courts or the Branch by these projects, the following offices and advisory bodies will be consulted: Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee; Office of Communications, and CJER.</p>		

II. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of, the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant, a legislatively mandated grant, distributing funds from the State budget that are earmarked for collaborative and drug court projects, and are available to local collaborative justice and drug courts throughout California.</p>	<p>Status: Complete, December 31, 2015. On recommendation of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, the Judicial Council allocated funding to local collaborative courts located in 50 jurisdictions. Courts received \$1.16 million of Substance Abuse Focus Grants with an additional \$75,000 in supplemental grants to 17 Dependency Drug Courts allocated through federal Court Improvement Plan funding.</p>
2	<p>Assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance such as developing intern and mentor programs for local collaborative court projects.</p>	<p>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2015. Courts are informed of funding opportunities and provided assistance with applications on request. Information about funding is provided at all education programs, as well as through meetings with collaborative court coordinators and email notices to courts. Currently there are two students involved in projects in the areas of youth courts and Keeping Kids in School project. Visits to mentor courts and education programs that concern the use of mentors, especially in veterans' courts were provided through Beyond the Bench programming and at the veterans' court education program.</p>

3	<p>Collaborate with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee to make recommendations for judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice; to assist in implementing the recommendations, at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant education curriculum committees, provide guidance to committee staff about preparation of educational toolkits and job aids, development and review of content, and identification of faculty for delivery of multidisciplinary programs for local collaborative court teams that address effective practices and cost efficient collaborative justice as the impact of policy changes such as the Affordable Care Act and realignment of funding for treatment and services on collaborative courts.</p>	<p>Status: Substantially complete and ongoing, December 31, 2015. Multidisciplinary education programs were held in the areas of community justice and reentry, human trafficking, youth courts, veterans’ courts, and mental health with toolkits prepared and posted on veterans issues, mental health issues, and human trafficking.</p>
4	<p>Identify methods to assist local courts, at their request, in improving case outcomes through the broad application of evidence-based collaborative justice principles and practices across a variety of case types including local adult and juvenile reentry courts, homeless and veterans courts, elder courts, adult and juvenile mental health courts, dependency and delinquency drug courts, youth and truancy courts, and DUI courts in order to develop recommendations to the Judicial Council.</p>	<p>Status: Completed, December 31, 2015. Provided guidance and acted as subject matter experts for the youth court roundtables, veterans’ court summit, and best practices education program at the California Association of Collaborative Courts statewide conference.</p>
5	<p>Identify policy changes and inform courts and judicial officers of the impacts of changing policies in areas such as realigned funding and services and the Affordable Care Act, Proposition 47, and recidivism reduction that impact core collaborative justice areas of criminal, juvenile, family and probate, mental health, and drug and alcohol related cases and provide new treatment services and funding opportunities</p>	<p>Status: Substantially Complete and ongoing, December 31, 2015. Multidisciplinary education was provided in these areas at the statewide California Association of Collaborative Courts program, the statewide Veterans Court training, the Youth Court Summit, and meetings of the Child Welfare Council that concerned Dependency Drug Courts.</p>

6	<p>Continue to consult with CJER and the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education curriculum committees, and make recommendations for judicial education and court assistance materials in the areas of court- involved military personnel and veterans, the needs of military families, and veterans courts, including implementation of the optional Judicial Council form to identify military status effective as of January 1, 2014; at the request of the CJER Governing Committee or relevant judicial education planning committees, provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review.</p>	<p>Status: Substantially Complete and ongoing, December 31, 2015. The revised MIL100 form was adopted to identify military status for use in all case types, with consideration of use in cases subject to PC1170.9. Educational programs were prepared in conjunction with the Family Law Institute, Juvenile Law Institute, and programs addressing collaborative courts in the criminal justice system, including veterans, homeless, and reentry courts. A veterans’ court summit was held to assist in developing local veterans’ courts.</p>
7	<p>Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding juvenile collaborative justice courts in areas such as truancy, youth courts, trafficking, girls’ court, and delinquency and dependency drug court; propose to the Executive and Planning Committee and the Rules and Projects Committee that a joint working group be established with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force to address juvenile competency.</p>	<p>Status: Substantially Complete and ongoing, December 31, 2015. California sent a team to the Human Trafficking and State Court Collaborative in October 2015 for a summit on human trafficking that was led by Judge Stacy Boulware Eurie, which resulted in efforts to develop a summit in California in 2017. The committee participated in development of a legislative proposal regarding juvenile competency that is currently in review for Judicial Council sponsorship; and the Child Welfare Council endorsed Dependency Drug Courts.</p>

III. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

Subgroup or working group name: Policy Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding legislation and other policy matters, including rules and forms.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*10

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

Date formed: June 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Quarterly conference calls

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: On-going

Subgroup or working group name: Veterans' Court and Military Families Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding veterans and military families in the courts. To identify and disseminate best practices regarding court responses to veterans and military families in the court system primarily focused on high risk/high needs cases, including veterans' courts, child support and family safety/reunification issues, and responses to legislative changes and mandates.

*Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group:*4

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

Date formed: November 2013

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Quarterly conference calls

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: On-going

Subgroup or working group name: Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To provide recommendations to the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee regarding collaborative justice courts that address the needs of children and families, with a focus on juvenile collaborative justice courts addressing high risk/high needs cases.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 6

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):*n/a

Date formed: March 2012

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: One annual in-person meeting held in conjunction with either the Youth Court Summit or the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee's in person meeting. Bimonthly conference calls.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: On-going

Subgroup or working group name: Mental Health Subcommittee (New)

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To respond to the directive of the Judicial Council to ensure that the recommendations for on-going work related to the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force is addressed.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: approximately 6

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):n/a

Date formed: March 2016

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: The work of this task force will be conducted via conference calls or in conjunction with meetings of the CJCAC.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: On-going

CJER Governing Committee
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Theodore Weathers, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego
Staff:	Bob Lowney, Principal Manager, Center for Judicial Education and Research
Committee's Charge: California Rules of Court, rule 10.50 The committee makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through comprehensive and quality education and training for judicial officers and other judicial branch personnel. The committee must: <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Recommend rules, standards, policies, and procedures for judicial branch education;(2) Recommend a strategic long-range plan for judicial branch education (last submitted in 2000-01; since then the committee has been required to submit a work plan/annual agenda);(3) Evaluate the effectiveness of judicial branch education, the quality of participation, the efficiency of delivery, and the impact on service to the public;(4) Review and comment on proposals from other advisory committees and task forces that include education and training of judicial officers or court staff in order to ensure coordination, consistency, and collaboration in educational services;(5) Establish educational priorities for implementation of curricula, programs, publications, and delivery systems;(6) Identify the need for and appoint education committees to implement the priorities, long-range plan, and programs and products of judicial branch education; create and adopt procedures for their operation; and review and approve their projects and products;(7) Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with courts to promote and assure the availability of training at the local court level;(8) Identify, analyze, and implement systems to enhance the delivery of education and training statewide; and Identify and foster collaborative opportunities with internal and external partners to maximize the resources dedicated to education and training.	

Advisory Body Membership:

15 Voting Members

- 10 sitting judicial officers;
- 1 appellate court justice; and
- 4 judicial administrators.

Advisory Members:

- California Judges Association (CJA) President or designee
- Court Technology Advisory Committee designee
- Administrative Director or designee
- Dean, B.E. Witkin Judicial College or designee

Subcommittees/Working Groups:

Subcommittee or working group name:

1. Appellate Practice Curriculum Committee
2. Civil Law Curriculum Committee
3. Criminal Law Curriculum Committee
4. Family Law Curriculum Committee
5. Judicial Branch Access, Ethics & Fairness Curriculum Committee
6. Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee
7. Juvenile Law Curriculum Committee
8. Probate Law Curriculum Committee
9. Trial and Appellate Court Operations Curriculum Committee
10. B.E. Witkin Judicial College Steering Committee

Committee's Key Objectives for 2016:

1. Ensure that the 2016 – 2018 Education Plan is submitted to and approved by the Judicial Council and launched on July 1, 2016.
2. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.
3. Ensure that judicial branch members have appropriate and convenient access to relevant educational resources.
4. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.

ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Education Plans</p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee will continue to successfully execute the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan and conclude it on June 30, 2016.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i> Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER Contact: Bob Lowney</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i> #1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER</p>	June 30, 2016	<p>The 2014 – 2016 Education Plan will be complete on June 30, 2016 and a report will be submitted to the Judicial Council on the execution and completion of this education plan at a later date.</p>

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner.		
2.	Launch the 2016 – 2018 Education Plan.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project</i> Required pursuant to the CJER Governing Committee’s education development model.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER Contact: Bob Lowney</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i> # 1.Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being</p>	July 1, 2016	<p>A draft 2 year education plan ready to submit to the Judicial Council for review and approval in June 2016. This education plan is dependent upon the availability of requisite staff and funding.</p> <p>The Governing Committee will ensure that the recommendations from the Mental Health Implementation Task Force as well as the Language Access Implementation Task Force will be implemented, as appropriate.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			met in a timely and effective manner.		
3.	Enhance education for experienced judges through an Advanced Judicial College, which will contain education on electronic evidence, neuroscience, and other topics of interest to experienced judges.	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; Objective 3 – Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices.....</p> <p>Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Three factors contributed to the establishment of this effort. First, reductions to CJER’s budget and staffing levels over the past several years has had a disproportionate impact on the education dedicated to experienced judges. For example, the phasing out of CJER’s four CJSP programs as well as shifting most of the subject matter annual judicial Institutes to a biennial schedule.</p>	This program will be launched in calendar year 2016 depending upon the availability of staff and funding resources.	<p>A new multi-day stand-alone program in family law which will be hosted at the Advanced Judicial College.</p> <p>Roundtable sessions will also be included.</p> <p>But because of limited funding, participants will be required to pay for lodging and other costs without reimbursement.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Second, results from a completed statewide survey to the judiciary on education indicated that there is a patent desire for expanding education for experienced judges.</p> <p>And third, a report from a workgroup appointed by the CJER Governing Committee to examine education provided to experienced judges concluded that a program dedicated to this audience needed to be developed and offered.</p> <p>CJER contacts: Karene Alvarado</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1. Ensure that the educational needs of the judicial branch audiences served by the CJER Governing Committee are being met in a timely and effective manner. #3. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	Develop and launch new distance mediated education products, such as podcasts and use technology to more effectively enable judges to access and use CJER Online.	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1 – Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development for all judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>Origin: The Director and a member of the Governing Committee proposed developing a new podcast series for judicial education. This came about from a recommendation from the judicial education technology workgroup that was formed in late 2015.</p> <p>CJER Contacts: Gavin Lane, Gene Kim</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i> 1. Ensure that judicial branch members have appropriate and convenient access to relevant educational resources..</p>	On or before July 1, 2016	<p>A series of podcasts will be launched and available to judges via CJER Online.</p> <p>Explore creating a listserve for judges in specific assignments.</p>
5.	Conduct needs assessments for local courts in the area of court staff education, to determine what CJER can directly provide, as well as	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction</i> Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 1</p>	Ongoing. CJER has contacted one court, Stanislaus Superior Court, and has begun this process.	Suggested language for outcome: Determine what assistance CJER can

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	determining how CJER can assist courts in establishing their own local administrative education.		<p><i>Origin of Project</i> This effort grows out of a need to find new ways to provide trial courts with administrative education opportunities, given budget reductions and the increasing challenges of attending live statewide and regional education events.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> CJER – Mary Ann Koory, Rhonda Sharbono</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported</i></p> <p>#6 - Continue to enrich the regional and local judicial education initiatives. #7. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>	A second court, Santa Clara Superior Court, is under consideration.	provide to courts in establishing their own local administrative education.
6.	Expand judicial branch education in the area of unconscious bias.	1	Judicial Council Direction: Goal V-Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; Objective 2 – Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.	Implementation effective July 1, 2016 and ongoing thereafter	Teach this topic at CJER institutes such as the PJ CEO Institute, Criminal Law Institute, as well as more fully incorporated into court staff education.

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Objective 1 – ensure that all court users are treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p>Objective 2 – Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure that interactions with the courts are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair.</p> <p>Origin of Project: During the development of the 2016 – 2018 education plan the Judicial Branch Access, Ethics, and Fairness Curriculum Committee recommended that the topic of unconscious bias be included in judicial education programs.</p> <p>Resources: CJER – Karene Alvarado, Rhonda Sharbono</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #4. Promote public trust and confidence by establishing and maintaining high standards of professionalism and ethics.</p>		

II. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	<p>Education Plans</p> <p>The CJER Governing Committee continues to oversee the successful execution of the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan.</p> <p>CJER staff has reported to the Governing Committee on the progress on and changes to the Education Plan.</p> <p>It is expected that the 2014 – 2016 education plan will be successfully concluded on June 30, 2016.</p>	<p><u>February 3, 2015</u> Six month update on the 2014 – 2016 Education Plan submitted to the CJER Governing Committee.</p> <p><u>May 5, 2015</u> Review and approval of changes to the 2014 – 2016 education plan.</p> <p><u>August 25, 2015</u> Six month review and approval of the 2014 – 2016 education plan.</p> <p>Initial discussions on developing the 2016 – 2018 education plan.</p> <p><u>November 3, 2015</u> Review and approval of 2014 – 2016 education plan changes</p>
2	<p>Begin developing the 2016 – 2018 Education Plan.</p>	<p>The 2016 – 2018 education plan is currently under review by the CJER Governing Committee and it is expected to be finally reviewed and approved in April and submitted to the Judicial Council in June.</p>
3	<p>Enhance education for experienced judges.</p>	<p>An Advanced Judicial College is currently being planned. This program, subject to adequate funding, will contain education of particular interest to experienced judges, including topics on neuroscience, electronic evidence, and advanced family law topics.</p>
4	<p>Increase collaboration between CJER and the California Judges Association</p>	<p>The proposed Advanced Judicial College is being done in collaboration with the CJA. In addition, CJER is</p>

		collaborating with CJA to launch a multi-day course in the area of domestic violence at the CJA annual program.
5	Conclude item 2 from the 2014 Annual Agenda concerning court staff education in the area of processing cases for appeal by consulting with the trial court executive officers to ensure that the education developed will meet the educational needs for this area.	<p>This agenda item was presented at a CEAC meeting in 2015 and there were no issues or concerns expressed regarding direction CJER took with respect to ameliorating this issue educationally.</p> <p>Programmatically, CJER launched a new one week course at the Court Clerk Training Institute on Appellate Procedures and has revised its course work on preparing the abstract of judgment for processing cases for appeal.</p>
5	Ensure that CJER continues to meet the educational needs of the judiciary, both in terms of accessing traditional education using distance technologies as well as providing education on emerging technologies which will impact the work of the judiciary.	The Judicial Technology workgroup is making recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee. Most immediately, CJER is in the process of developing judicial education podcasts and plans to launch this product on or before July 1, 2016.
6	Conduct needs assessments for local courts in the area of administrative education, to determine what CJER can directly provide, as well as determining how CJER can assist courts in establishing their own local administrative education.	A local court has been identified and CJER is currently working with that court to determine what its needs are and how best CJER can assist in meeting them.

Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subcommittees/Working Groups:

Subcommittee or working group name: CJER Curriculum Committees, Judicial College Steering Committee

Purpose of subcommittee or working group: The curriculum committees all have the same broad responsibility to provide the Governing Committee with draft education recommendations for their target audiences in the development of the Education Plan. In addition, the Curriculum committees serve on various program and education product workgroups and

are consulted on a regular basis regarding any changes or revisions to the education plan that impacts their audiences. The Steering Committee develops the courses and curriculum for the B.E Witkin Judicial College.

Number of members: Ranging from 7 to 11

Date formed: The curriculum committees were initially formed in 2010 and are standing with rotating membership every year.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: Ongoing

Court Security Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
Staff:	Ed Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Advisory Body's Charge: The Court Security Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.	
<p>Advisory Body's Membership: The committee must include at least one member from each of the following categories: Appellate court justice; Appellate court administrator; Trial court judge; Trial court judicial administrator; Member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee; and Member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.</p> <p>At least one member of the committee should be from a trial court that uses a marshal for court security services; this is not, however, a separate category of membership.</p> <p>The committee currently has 10 members, including one appellate justice, four trial court judges, one appellate court administrator, and four trial court administrators, one of whom is a member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, and one of whom is a member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.</p>	
Subgroups/Working Groups: None (Ad Hoc Short Term Subcommittee on Office of Security Functions and Duties finished its work).	
<p>Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch. • Assign Chair and Lead Staff to liaise with Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee. • Advocate for funding to support emergency and security projects identified in this Annual Agenda. 	

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, and make additional recommendations as needed.	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Rules of Court, rule 10.61(a), Area of Focus • Goal III. Modernization of Management and Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Objective 3. Improve safety, security—including disaster preparedness—at all court locations for all court users, judicial officers, and staff. <p><u>Outcome a.</u> Emergency preparedness and continuity of operations plans and programs in all courts.</p> • Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part A: Facilities Infrastructure, Objective 2. Facilitate the acquisition of sites for, and the construction, renovation, maintenance, and expeditious transfer of, court facilities. <p><u>Outcome b.</u> Models and guidelines for acquiring sites for new facilities and maintaining facilities and for transferring existing facilities.</p> <u>Outcome c.</u> Shared practices in place for 	Ongoing	Reports to Judicial Council as needed

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>building courthouses to better meet the needs of all court users and judicial branch staff.</p> <p><u>Outcome d.</u> Funding and operational standards for small construction and renovation projects for the courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 3. Ensure that all technology decisions are compatible with the judicial branch enterprise technology master plan. <p><u>Outcome a.</u> New technologies compatible with and integrated into branchwide infrastructure, including the California Courts Technology Center, telecommunications, security systems, and educational technology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 4. Implement new tools to facilitate the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security. <p><u>Outcome c.</u> A single point of Internet access to the Judicial Council for the California courts, justice partners, and the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part B: Technology Infrastructure, Objective 7. Develop, support, and implement a statewide business continuity and emergency preparedness technology infrastructure—with emphasis on key system features. <p><u>Outcome a.</u> Threat and vulnerability assessment systems/technology funded and in place.</p> <p><u>Outcome b.</u> Funding structure for actual disaster recovery/continuity of operations.</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction, rule 10.61.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch.</p>		
2.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority. • Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made. • If no funding is made available, direct staff to 	1(f)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Same as Project 1.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Lack of dedicated funding.</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff support from Legal Services, Real Estate and Facilities Management, and Security Operations.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch.</p>	End of 2016	Recommendations to Judicial Council.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.				
3.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Trial Court Security Grant Program for trial courts, which provides and maintains systems such as access, camera, duress, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority. • Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made. • If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts. 	1(f)	<p>Same as Project 1. Additional Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign Chair and Lead Staff to liaise with Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee. • Advocate for funding to support emergency and security projects identified in this Annual Agenda. 	End of 2016	Recommendations to Judicial Council.
4.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers.</p>	1(f)	<p>Same as Project 1. Additional Key Objectives Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign Chair and Lead Staff to liaise with Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee. 	End of 2016	Recommendations to Judicial Council.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority. • Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made. • If no funding is made available, direct staff to communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for funding to support emergency and security projects identified in this Annual Agenda. 		
5.	<p>Recommendations to Judicial Council for Continuation of Security Operations unit's Court Security Plans services, which involve the online planning module in Project 2, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise budget committees and decision-makers of this priority. • Advise budget committees to allow us to review and comment on security-related agenda items before decisions are made. • If no funding is made available, direct staff to 	1(f)	<p>See 2. Additional Judicial Council Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Rules of Court, rule 10.172, Court Security Plans 	Ongoing	Recommendations to Judicial Council.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	communicate the resulting direct cost to the courts.				
6.	Court Security Advisory Committee survey to obtain information about the trial courts' security needs and priorities.	2(b)	Same as Project 1.	End of 2016	Information needed to support key objectives such as advocacy for BCPs for funding of security programs.

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Develop recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch and organization of the Office of Security (aka Final Report on Directive 125).	July 28, 2015 – Report accepted by Judicial Council
2	Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, develop annual agenda for March 2016, and make additional recommendations as needed.	In progress and ongoing

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups: N/A.

Tribal Court–State Court Forum
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Judge Abby Abinanti and Justice Dennis M. Perluss
Staff:	Ms. Jennifer Walter, Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<p>Advisory Body’s Charge: The forum makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving the administration of justice in all proceedings in which the authority to exercise jurisdiction by the state judicial branch and the tribal justice systems overlaps.</p> <p>In addition to the general duties and responsibilities applicable to all advisory committees as described in rule 10.34, the forum must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Identify issues of mutual importance to tribal and state justice systems, including those concerning the working relationship between tribal and state courts in California;2. Make recommendations relating to the recognition and enforcement of court orders that cross jurisdictional lines, the determination of jurisdiction for cases, and the sharing of services among jurisdictions;3. Identify, develop, and share with tribal and state courts local rules of court, protocols, standing orders, and other agreements that promote tribal court–state court coordination and cooperation, the use of concurrent jurisdiction, and the transfer of cases between jurisdictions;4. Recommend appropriate activities needed to support local tribal court–state court collaborations; and5. Make proposals to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research on educational publications and programming for judges and judicial support staff. <p>[Excerpted from California Rules of Court, Rule 10.60]</p>	

Advisory Body’s Membership: Twenty-nine positions—29 members representing the following categories:

- 13 Tribal Court Judges (nominated by their tribal leadership, representing 13 of the 23 tribal courts currently operating in California; these courts serve approximately 39 tribes)
- Director of the California Attorney General’s Office of Native American Affairs (ex officio)
- Tribal Advisor to the California Governor (ex officio)
- 1 Appellate Justice
- 7 Chairs or their Designees of the following California Judicial Council advisory committees:
 - Access and Fairness Advisory Committee
 - Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee
 - Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
 - Criminal Law Advisory Committee
 - Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
 - Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee
 - Traffic Advisory Committee
- 5 Trial Court Judicial Officers (selected from local courts in counties where tribal courts are situated and one from Los Angeles*)
- 1 Retired Judge (advisory)

* Judge D. Zeke Zeidler, who was originally appointed as a member of the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, is finishing out his term, which expires on September 14, 2017.

Subgroups/Working Groups: None

Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2016:

1. Make policy recommendations that enable tribal and state courts to improve access to justice, to issue orders, and to enforce orders to the fullest extent allowed by law.
2. Increase Tribal/State Partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.
3. Make recommendations to committees developing judicial education institutes, multi-disciplinary symposia, distance learning, and other educational materials to include content on federal Indian law and its impact on state courts, including interjurisdictional issues.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Policy Recommendations: A. Legislative Study</p> <p>SB 406, Judicial Council-sponsored legislation, included both a “sunset” provision (Code of Civ. Proc. § 1742) providing that the legislation will expire on January 1, 2018 unless legislative action is taken to extend it, and a requirement that the California Law Revision Commission “conduct a study of the standards for recognition of a tribal court or a foreign court judgment under the Tribal Court Civil Money Judgment Act and the Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act, and submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Independence and Accountability. Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration. Operational Plan Objective 5.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. Operational Plan Objective 4.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum</p> <p>Resources: Forum and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC)</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	January 1, 2018	Study completed; findings and recommendations submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration by the Legislature and the Governor.

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>no later than January 1, 2017.” (Stats. 2014, ch. 243, § 1.)</p> <p>In light of the Judicial Council’s interest in the subject matter, the forum proposes researching the effects, if any, of SB 406—specifically, how it has been used, whether it has achieved its goal of simplifying the recognition and entry of tribal court civil money judgments, and whether there are any issues or concerns with lifting the sunset and expanding the legislation’s scope to non-money judgements.</p> <p>To undertake this research, the forum is collaborating with Professor Katherine Florey at the U.C. Davis School of Law.</p> <p>B. Promote Policy The California Department of Public Health will not issue a birth certificate based on a tribal parentage order. Tribes retain inherent authority over domestic relations matters involving their members.</p>		<p>Make policy recommendations that enable tribal and state courts to improve access to justice, to issue orders, and to enforce orders to the fullest extent allowed by law.</p>	<p>2016</p>	<p>Local agencies to recognize and enforce tribal parentage orders.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>California law recognizes the authority of tribes and tribal courts to make child custody and support determinations, but not parentage determinations. The forum recommends exploring an executive agency directive that would recognize tribal parentage orders.</p>				
2.	<p>Policy Recommendation: C. Rules and Forms-Indian Child Welfare Act</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Monitor pending California Supreme Court case <i>In re Abbigail (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1450 [173 Cal.Rptr.3d 191]</i>, review granted Sept. 10, 2014, S220187 for possible amendments to rules 5.482(c) and 5.484(c)(2) and</p> <p>(ii) Review pending <i>Regulations for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings</i> (as published in the Federal Register on March 20, 2015 (Vol. 80 FR No. 54 14880) and approved Bureau of Indian Affairs Guidelines (as</p>	1(a)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III: Operational Plan Objective 5.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI: Operational Plan Objective 4.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Department of Social Services and Statewide Workgroup on the Indian Child Welfare Act</p> <p>Resources: Appellate Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: LSO</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	2017	<p>Rule and form recommendations that comply with case law and federal rules and guidelines implementing the Indian Child Welfare Act.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2015 (Vol. 80 FR No. 37 10146) for possible amendments to Title 5. Family and Juvenile Rules relating to the Indian Child Welfare Act.</p>				
3.	<p>Policy Recommendations: D. Technological Initiatives</p> <p><i>Major Tasks</i></p> <p>(i) Consult with the California Attorney General’s Office regarding access to California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) by tribal courts.</p> <p>(ii) Recommend Judicial Council staff continue giving tribal courts access to the California Courts Protective Order (CCPOR) Registry.</p> <p>(iii) Consult with the Stanford Design Center regarding the development of an electronic application to</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II: Operational Plan Objective 3</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal III:</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 5: Develop and implement effective trial and appellate case management rules, procedures, techniques, and practices to promote the fair, timely, consistent, and efficient processing of all types of cases.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal VI:</p> <p>Operational Plan Objective 4: Implement new tools to support the electronic exchange of court information while balancing privacy and security.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Forum</p>	Ongoing	<p>(i) Tribal court judges will be able to enter their protective orders into CLETS and enforcement will be improved</p> <p>(ii) State and tribal courts will be able to see each other’s protective orders, to avoid conflicting orders, and to promote enforcement of these orders.</p> <p>(iii) Application will be developed and will improve inquiry and</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	improve inquiry and notice under the Indian Child Welfare Act.		Resources: Forum Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology Collaborations: California Attorney General's Office Key Objective Supported: 1		notice practices under the Indian Child Welfare Act.
4.	Policy Recommendation: F. Other Prepare a request to the California Supreme Court's Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics to amend the canons to permit a judge who sits concurrently on a tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.	2	Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal II Operational Plan Objective 3 Strategic Plan Goal III Operational Plan Objective 5 Strategic Plan Goal VI Operational Plan Objective 4 Origin of Project: Forum and legislative study by CLRC Resources: Forum Judicial Council Staffing: Collaborations: CLRC Key Objective supported: 1	2016/Conducting research	Request prepared and submitted. Amended canon permitting judges who sit concurrently on tribal court and a state court to fundraise on behalf of a tribal court.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
5.	<p>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: A. Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(i) Identify Judicial Council and other resources that may be appropriate to share with tribal courts.</p> <p>(ii) Identify tribal justice resources that may be appropriate to share with state courts.</p> <p>(iii) Identify grants for tribal/state court collaboration</p> <p>(iv) Share resources and information about partnerships through Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter</p> <p>(v) Publicize these partnerships at conferences, on the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), and at other in-person or online venues.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, & Diversity.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all court users are treated with dignity, respect, and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, without bias or appearance of bias, and are given an opportunity to be heard. • Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair. • Expand the availability of legal assistance, advice and representation for litigants with limited financial resources. <p>Strategic Plan Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p>Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes. • Develop and support collaborations to improve court practices to leverage and share resources and to create tools to 	Ongoing	Increased Tribal/State partnerships for sharing resources and communicating information.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>educate court stakeholders and the public.</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p>Resources: Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), Forum, and Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: Court Operations Special Services Office, and Leadership Services Division</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2 Increase Tribal/State Partnerships that identify issues of mutual concern and proposed solutions.</p>		
6.	<p>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships:</p> <p>B. Education and technical assistance to promote partnerships and understanding of tribal justice systems</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal I Operational Plan Objectives 1, 2, 4</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal IV Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3</p>	Ongoing	Increased Tribal/State partnerships for educational and technical assistance.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>(i) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to continue providing educational and technical assistance to local tribal and state courts to address domestic violence and child custody issues in Indian Country</p> <p>(ii) Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to continue giving technical assistance to tribal and state courts interested in establishing a joint jurisdictional court.</p> <p>(iii) Make recommendation to the Judicial Council staff to develop civics learning opportunities for youth that exposes them to opportunities and careers in tribal and state courts.</p> <p>(iv) Make recommendation for a voluntary tribal/state program that gives state and federal court judges the opportunity to serve as a tribal court judge.</p>		<p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council</p> <p>Resources: Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), Forum, and Task Force on Trial Court Fiscal Accountability</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing: Court Operations Special Services Office, and Leadership Services Division</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
7.	<p>C. Tribal/State collaborations that increase resources for courts Develop and implement strategy to seek resources</p>	2	<p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p> <p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal IV Operational Plan Objectives 1, 3</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum</p> <p>Resources: Forum</p> <p>Judicial Council Staffing:</p> <p>Collaborations: Local tribal and state courts</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>	Ongoing	Tribal/State collaborations that increase resources for courts.
8.	<p>Education: A. Judicial Education In collaboration with the CJER Curriculum Committees, consult on and participate in making recommendations to revise the CJER online toolkits so that they integrate resources and educational materials from the forum's online federal Indian law toolkit. Forum judges are working together with committee representatives from the following</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V Operational Plan Objective 1: Provide relevant and accessible education and professional development opportunities for all judicial officers (including court-appointed temporary judges) and court staff.</p> <p>Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012).</p>	Ongoing, completion date depends on funding.	CJER toolkits, located on the Judicial Resources Network, will be updated to include federal Indian law.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	curriculum committees: (1) Access, Ethics, and Fairness; (2) Civil; (3) Criminal; (4) Family; (5) Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency; and (6) Probate.		Resources: Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee and forum Judicial Council Staffing: Key Objective Supported: 3		
9.	Education: B. Education- Documentary Consult on and participate in the production of a documentary describing tribal justice systems and highlighting collaboration between these systems and the state justice system in California.	2	Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V Operational Plan Objective 1 Origin of Projects: Forum and California State-Federal Judicial Council Resolution (June 1, 2012). Resources: Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Governing Committee and forum Judicial Council Staffing: Key Objective Supported: 3	Ongoing, completion date depends on funding.	Educational documentary describing tribal justice systems and collaborations with state justice system in California.
10.	Education: C. Education- Indian Child Welfare Act Roundtables In collaboration with CASEY Family Programs and Native American Indian Judges Association (NAIJA), conduct two roundtables statewide on ICWA.	2	Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan Goal V Operational Plan Objective 1 Origin of Projects: CASEY and NAIJA Resources: Forum Judicial Council Staffing:	Ongoing, completion date depends on funding.	ICWA Roundtables are held.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objective Supported: 3		

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

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

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Legislation A.1. Made recommendations to support amendment to Family Code to expressly authorize tribal court judges to solemnize marriages. AB 445 was identified as the vehicle for this policy recommendation; the Legislature made it a two-year bill.</p>	February 19, 2015
2.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Legislation A.2. Prepared Comment, which was approved by the Judicial Council and submitted to the to the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement on the <i>Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM): Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs</i> (as published in the Federal Register on November, 17, 2014 (Vol. 79 FR No. 221 68548)</p>	January 15, 2015
3.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Rules and Forms- Indian Child Welfare Act and Inter-Court Transfer of Cases B. Prepared Rule and Form Proposal, which was approved by the Judicial Council, concerning the transfer of court proceedings involving an Indian child from the jurisdiction of the state court to a tribal court. This proposal was in response to provisions of Senate Bill 1460 (Stats. 2014, ch. 772) (SB 1460) and the Court of Appeal decision in <i>In re. M.M. (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 897</i>. SB 1460 requires the state juvenile court to give the tribal court specific information and documentation when a case governed by the Indian Child Welfare Act is transferred. The <i>In re M.M.</i> decision implicates an objecting party’s right to appeal a decision granting a transfer to a tribal court. (proposal amended Cal. Rules of Court, rules 5.483 and 5.590, and revised forms ICWA-060 and JV-800)</p>	October 27, 2015

4.	<p>Policy Recommendations: Technological Initiative</p> <p>C.3. Recommend a pilot project that would provide electronic notice to tribes in Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases.</p>	Completed/Recommendation made, but due to lack of funding, unable to implement
5.	<p>Policy Recommendations: Technological Initiative</p> <p>C.4. Recommend continuation of tribal Domestic Assistance Self Help (DASH) Tribal/State Program.</p>	Completed/Recommendation made, but due to lack of funding, unable to implement
6.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Other</p> <p>D.2. Work with the <u>California Law Review Commission (CLRC)</u> on its study of the enforcement of tribal civil money judgments (see <u>SB 406</u>, Stats. 2014, Ch. 243, effective January 1, 2015).</p>	Ongoing/Collaboration with U.C. Davis School of Law established, surveys for presiding judges, tribal court judges, and tribal practitioners drafted, approved by Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee and TCPJ/CEAC, and two of the three surveys have been distributed.
7.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Other</p> <p>D. 3. Developed a proposal to promote the education of federal Indian law in California law schools. Made presentation to the deans of California law schools and wrote letter requesting that the California State Bar Examination (Bar) include American Indian law as either one of the topics on the essay and/or the multistate bar exam (MSBE), or as part of the civil procedure topic of the Bar.</p>	June 8, 2015
8.	<p>Increase Tribal/State Partnerships</p> <p>A. Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</p> <p>1. Disseminated information to tribal court judges and state court judges on a monthly basis through the Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter with information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant opportunities; • Publications; • News stories; and • Educational events. <p>2. Fostered tribal court/state court partnerships, such as the Los Angeles Superior Court’s Indian Child Welfare Act</p>	Ongoing

	<p>Roundtable, a court-coordinated community response to Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases in Los Angeles County.</p> <p>3. Developed a Federal/State/Tribal Court Administrator Toolkit. This toolkit was endorsed by the California Court Clerks Association, the California Tribal Court Clerks Association, the California Federal/State Judicial Council, the Judicial Council’s Court Executives Advisory Committee, and the National Judicial College.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>B. Education and Technical Assistance to Promote Partnerships and Understanding of Tribal Justice Systems</p> <p>1. Launched the State/Tribal Education, Partnerships, and Services (S.T.E.P.S) to Justice—Domestic Violence and Child Welfare programs and provided local educational and technical assistance services.</p> <p>2. Established the first joint jurisdictional court in California. The El Dorado Superior Court, in partnership with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, is operating a Family Wellness Court. The two judges hear cases together. (See links for press on this innovative court: http://www.marketwired.com/press-release/shingle-springs-tribal-court-superior-court-el-dorado-countycollaborate-on-tribal-juvenile-1879359.htm and http://www.casaforchildren.org/site/c.mtJSJ7MPIsE/b.9300709/k.2758/Article_8D_Kingsbury_Williams.htm.)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>D. Tribal/State Collaborations that Increase Resources for Courts</p> <p>Obtained funding from the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice that is administered through the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES). This funding pays for the associated travel expenses for judges to participate in cross-court educational exchanges. These exchanges are judicially led and shaped by the host judges (one tribal court judge and one state court judge) and enable the judges to continue the dialogue on</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

	<p>domestic violence and elder abuse in tribal communities, which began as part of a statewide needs assessment. At these exchanges, judges utilize a checklist of problems and solutions identified through the needs assessment to determine how they can work together to address these issues locally.</p> <p>Obtained funding from the California Department of Social Services. This funding pays for the associated travel expenses for forum members to improve compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act.</p>	
11.	<p>Education A. Judicial Education Made recommendations to the Judicial Council’s CJER Governing Committee to incorporate federal Indian law into all appropriate educational publications and programming for state court judges and advise on content; revisions to include federal Indian law and the interjurisdictional issues that face tribal and state courts.</p>	Ongoing, completion date depends on resources to incorporate recommendations.
12.	<p>Education B. Documentary Consult on and participate in the production of a documentary describing tribal justice systems and highlighting collaboration between these systems and the state justice system.</p>	Ongoing
13.	<p>Education C. Education- Court Extranet Name Change Recommend to the judicial council staff that it change the name of the court extranet.</p>	Completed/Judicial Resources Network is the new name of the court extranet.

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups – No subgroups/working groups

Subgroups/Working Groups: None

Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force
Annual Agenda—2016 (Draft 3/11/2016)
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar		
Staff:	Donna Hershkowitz, Olivia Lawrence, Douglas G. Denton, Elizabeth Tam-Helmuth		
<p>Advisory Body’s Charge: The Judicial Council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force advises the Chief Justice and Judicial Council on implementation of the recommendations, issued by the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (2013–2015), in the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i> (adopted by the Judicial Council on January 22, 2015). The Task Force includes representatives of key stakeholders in the provision of language access services in the courts, including, but not limited to, judicial officers, court administrators, court interpreters, legal services providers, and community representatives. The Task Force's charge is to turn the Language Access Plan into a practical roadmap for courts by creating an implementation plan for full implementation in all 58 superior courts. Additional responsibilities of the task force include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an implementation plan for the Language Access Plan to present to the Judicial Council and to guide the work of the Task force and the courts to make the strategic plan a reality; • Develop estimates of the costs of implementing the recommendations; • Assess the feasibility of the phasing process outlined in the plan based upon resources available and adjust where necessary based on operational feasibility and resource availability; • Propose rules of court, forms, and Judicial Council–sponsored legislation for the council and its internal committees to consider; • Create and distribute work products (including bench guides, tool kits, and others); • Coordinate with related advisory groups on implementation efforts where appropriate; and • Develop mechanisms to oversee and monitor the implementation of the plan. 			
<p>Advisory Body’s Membership: There are a total of 26 current Task Force members, representing the following categories:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Supreme Court Justice • 4 Appellate Court Justices • 7 Trial Court Judicial Officers • 5 Court Administrators¹ </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Court Interpreters • 3 Legal Services Representatives • 3 Community Representatives </td> </tr> </table>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Supreme Court Justice • 4 Appellate Court Justices • 7 Trial Court Judicial Officers • 5 Court Administrators¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Court Interpreters • 3 Legal Services Representatives • 3 Community Representatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Supreme Court Justice • 4 Appellate Court Justices • 7 Trial Court Judicial Officers • 5 Court Administrators¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Court Interpreters • 3 Legal Services Representatives • 3 Community Representatives 		
<p>Subgroups/Working Groups: The Task Force has established four ad hoc subcommittees: Budget and LAP Monitoring; Technological Solutions; Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts; and Language Access Education and Standards.</p>			

¹ Ms. Leah Wilson, Chief Operations Officer, State Bar of California (former CEO of Alameda Superior Court) recently resigned from the Task Force.

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016:

The [*Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*](#) (hereafter “Language Access Plan” or “LAP”) contains 75 recommendations that enumerate the policies and operational changes that will need to take place to make comprehensive language access a reality in the California courts. Forty-seven (47) of the LAP recommendations are designated as Phase 1 recommendations (meaning that the recommendation should already be in place or work to implement it should have commenced in 2015). An additional 23 of the LAP recommendations are designated as Phase 2 recommendations (meaning that work to implement these recommendations should begin no later than 2016 or 2017). The Task Force is coordinating its work with related advisory groups and Judicial Council staff on implementation efforts. In addition to developing and providing cost estimates for the council regarding LAP implementation, the implementation process also includes the monitoring and updating of the plan, as the trial courts and other stakeholders provide information, feedback, suggestions and innovative solutions.

To support implementation of LAP recommendations as quickly and effectively as possible, the Task Force assigned each of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations to one of four Task Force Ad Hoc Subcommittees (additionally, the Task Force has assigned certain Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations regarding court interpreter issues [#9, #43, #64, #69, #70, #73 and #75] to the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel and/or the Court Interpreters Program for implementation). The Task Force last met in person on January 27, 2016. During that meeting, the Subcommittees discussed progress and presented their initial plans for 2016 priority projects (described in Section II below) drawn from among the Phase 1 and Phase 2 LAP recommendations. The following are the Task Force's major objectives for 2016, organized by Task Force Subcommittee:

- 1. Budget and LAP Monitoring** (Chaired by Judge Steve Austin): This Subcommittee is charged with supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding funding and monitoring. A major priority among these is securing adequate funding for expanded use of court interpreters in civil cases and for all court-ordered, court-operated programs, services and events. Other key objectives of the subcommittee include developing a statewide complaint process, and working with courts and language access stakeholders to develop and implement recruitment strategies that will help expand the pool of qualified bilingual staff and court interpreters. Objectives for 2016 also include developing recommendations for a 2017–18 Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for presentation to the council that would increase court and Judicial Council funding in the upcoming fiscal year (2017–18) in order to help support ongoing LAP implementation.
- 2. Technological Solutions** (Chaired by Justice Terrence Bruiniers): This Subcommittee is responsible for supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding technology, including 1) data collection to identify language access needs, and 2) appropriate use of video-remote technology. Major objectives for 2016 include a review of case information systems for language service tracking, and the launch of a Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) pilot program for use with spoken-language court interpreters. This pilot will help the branch gather data regarding successful VRI court practices (including due process issues, participant satisfaction, and effectiveness of available technologies) and establish minimum technical guidelines for appropriate use of VRI with spoken-language court interpreters.
- 3. Translation, Signage, and Tools for Courts*** (Chaired by Justice Laurie Zelon and Mr. Jose Varela): This Subcommittee will support implementation of LAP recommendations regarding translation, signage and other tools to assist the trial courts and limited English proficient (LEP) court users, including development of templates for multilingual signs and notices, benchcards for judicial officers, and translation protocols. Major objectives for 2016 include continuing refinement of the Language Access

Toolkit hosted on the California Courts public web page, which includes resources for courts such as I-Speak cards and multilingual signs and templates. The Subcommittee will also be researching and recommending best practices for translation protocols and the use of bilingual volunteers.

- 4. Language Access Education and Standards** (Chaired by Judge Janet Gaard and Ms. Ana Maria Garcia): This Subcommittee is charged with supporting implementation of LAP recommendations regarding language access education and standards, including education and standards to assist judges, court staff and court interpreters with successful implementation of LAP policies and procedures, and creation of multilingual videos to assist LEP court users with navigating the court system. Major objectives for 2016 include development and enhancement of existing course content and development of new educational programs and products that will enhance judicial branch training regarding the Language Access Plan.

* The Language Access Plan recommended that the Judicial Council create a translation committee to develop and formalize a translation protocol for Judicial Council translation of forms, written materials, and audiovisual tools (See LAP Recommendation #36). The Task Force's Translation, Signage, and Tools for Courts Subcommittee is serving in and fulfilling that function for Phase 1 of LAP implementation, and the Subcommittee and Task Force Chairs will recommend to the council at a future date whether an ongoing and separate translation committee should be established.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	Develop and complete a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for 2017–18 to increase trial court and Judicial Council funding to support LAP implementation. <i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i>	1	Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations # 8 (Expansion of court interpreters to all civil proceedings); #56 (Advocacy for sufficient funding). Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15). Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Finance; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts). Key Objective Supported: Objective 1	September 2016 for 2017–18 BCP; ongoing for future BCPs	Budget Change Proposal for 2017–18.
2.	Develop and complete a detailed work plan and cost estimates for full LAP implementation.	1	Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations # 8 (Expansion of court interpreters to all civil proceedings); #10 (Provision of qualified interpreters in all court-ordered/court-operated proceedings);	June 2016 for draft of detailed work plan including costs for full LAP implementation.	Detailed work plan and cost estimates for full LAP implementation to assist with future funding requests.

² 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.

³ 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 ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i>		<p>#28 (Recruitment of bilingual staff); #56 (Advocacy for sufficient funding); #58 (Pursuit by the Judicial Council of other funding opportunities); #59 (Pursuit by courts of other funding opportunities); #60 (Language Access Implementation Task Force).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Finance; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>		
3.	<p>Develop and complete a statewide complaint form and process, including interaction with local trial court complaint processes.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #62 (Single complaint form); #63 (Complaints at local level regarding language access services).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15)</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services; Rules and Projects Committee; Task Force</p>	June 2016 for development of statewide form.	Statewide complaint process regarding language access services provided in courts.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>		
4.	<p>Adoption of relevant portions of the LAP by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring; Appellate Courts Working Group</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #67 (Adoption of Language Access Plan by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services; California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	December 2016	Adoption of relevant portions of the LAP by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court.
5.	<p>Work with courts, educational providers, community-based organizations, and interpreter organizations to develop and implement recruitment strategies, including consideration of market conditions, to encourage bilingual individuals to pursue the interpreting profession or</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #49 (Recruitment strategies for language access providers).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services</p>	December 2016	Development and implementation of recruitment strategies to increase the pool of qualified bilingual staff and court interpreters.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>employment opportunities in the courts as bilingual staff.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>		<p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>		
6.	<p>Provide guidance to courts regarding review of data beyond the U.S. Census, such as school systems, health departments, county social services, and local community-based agencies, to help courts anticipate the numbers and languages of likely LEP court users.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #7 (Review of other data beyond the U.S. Census).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 1</p>	December 2016	<p>Guidance to courts regarding review of data to help anticipate the numbers and languages of likely LEP court users.</p>
7.	<p>Sponsor legislation to amend California Government Code §68560.5(a) and Civil Code of Procedure §116.550 dealing with court interpreters in small claims actions.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Budget and LAP Monitoring</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #71 (Legislation to delete exception for small claims proceedings); #72 (Legislation to require credentialed interpreters for small claims).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p>	December 2016	<p>Revised statutes for 2017.</p>

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services and Governmental Affairs Key Objective Supported: Objective 1		
8.	Develop a new Judicial Council policy stating that when and where appropriate, new or revised Judicial Council forms should include a data field regarding court user language access needs to (1) assist courts with early identification of LEP court users and (2) ensure that LEP court users receive appropriate language access services; also ensure that the proposed data fields would also be transferable to hot docs or perhaps case management systems. <i>Subcommittees: Budget and LAP Monitoring and Technological Solutions</i>	2b	Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #68 (Implementation Task Force to evaluate need for updates to rules and statutes). Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15). Resources: Judicial Council staff in Court Operations Services, Information Technology, and Legal Services; Rules and Projects Committee Key Objective Supported: Objectives 1 and 2	June 2017	New Judicial Council policy regarding need for Judicial Council forms to identify language access needs to help courts with early identification of LEP court users.
9.	Design and conduct a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot with spoken-language court interpreters in up to ten courts, and collect relevant data.	1	Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendation #16 (Pilot for video remote interpreting).	December 2016 for report on pilot progress, including data report.	VRI pilot and report on data collected.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i>		<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT, Human Resources Office (Labor and Employee Relations Unit) and other offices, as appropriate, with expertise in technology, interpreting (including remote interpreting) and court-wide operations; members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel as needed for additional input and consultation.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>		
10.	<p>Develop and establish guidelines for VRI with spoken-language court interpreters, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i></p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations #12 (Preference for in-person interpreters); #13 (Remote interpreting in the courtroom); #14 (Remote interpreting minimum technology requirements); and #15 (Use of video for remote interpreting).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT, Human Resources Office (Labor and Employee Relations Unit) and other offices, as appropriate, with</p>	December 2016	VRI for spoken language guidelines, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>expertise in technology, interpreting (including remote interpreting) and court-wide operations; members of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel as needed for additional input and consultation.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>		
11.	<p>Establish (1) guidelines for courts to early identify language access needs and document the needs in their case management system and/or case record or file; (2) guidelines to track provision or denial of language access services and document same in their case management system and/or case record or file; and (3) protocols for justice partners to early communicate LEP court user language needs to the court.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Technological Solutions</i></p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations #1 (Language access needs identification); #2 (Requests for language services); #3 (Protocol for justice partners to communicate language needs); and #4 (Mechanisms for LEP court users to self-identify).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in IT; as appropriate, staff in Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) to help and consult regarding preliminary guidelines or protocols.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 2</p>	December 2016 (guidelines and protocols); likely to require ongoing updates to case management systems including future upgrades.	Guidelines regarding documenting language access needs identification and requests for language services; protocols for justice partners to communicate LEP court user language needs to the court.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
12.	<p>Develop budget and cost estimates, including staffing needs, for maintaining and improving the Language Access Toolkit, which is hosted on the California Courts public web page.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: LAP Recommendations #4 (Mechanisms for LEP court users to self-identify); #5 (Information for court users about availability of language access services); #27 (Provide language assistance tools to court staff); #37 (Statewide multilingual samples and templates); #52 (Benchcards on language access); and #66 (Statewide repository of language access resources).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC; collaborate with Language Access Education and Standards Subcommittee regarding development of benchcards; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>	September 2016	Budget and work plan for Language Access Toolkit.
13.	<p>Develop and share translation protocols.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #36 (Establishment of translation committee); #38 (Posting of translations on web); and #40 (Translation of court orders).</p>	June 2016	Translation protocols.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>		
14.	<p>Establish guidelines regarding use of bilingual volunteers.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendation #34 (Use of bilingual volunteers).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>	June 2016	Guidelines and recommendations regarding use of bilingual volunteers.
15.	<p>Research and recommend best practices for design of court facilities to ensure that any modification to existing court design, or any new plans for court design, includes, promotes and ensures language access for LEP court users.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #39 (Provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized symbols to limit need for text); #41 (Ensure that new courthouses and redesigned courthouse are accessible to LEP persons); and #42 (Provide information to courts on wayfinding strategies, signage and other design strategies).</p>	December 2016	Guidelines and recommendations regarding accessible courthouses.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC and Facilities.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>		
16.	<p>Develop a policy to promote sharing of bilingual staff among courts and written procedures for courts to follow when bilingual staff are not available.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #29 (Develop written procedures to help LEP court users when bilingual staff not available) and #30 (Adopt policies to promote sharing of bilingual staff and interpreters among courts).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CFCC; Task Force Consultant</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 3</p>	June 2017	Model procedures for courts to follow in the absence of bilingual staff and a policy for the sharing of bilingual staff and interpreter resources among courts.
17.	<p>Develop and enhance existing course content and develop new educational programs that will enhance judicial branch training regarding the Language Access Plan.</p>	1	<p>See LAP Recommendations #19 (Verifying credentials of interpreters); #22 (Avoiding conflicts of interest); # 23 (Appointment of minors to interpret); #50 (Judicial branch training regarding LAP); and #25 (Avoid appointment of bilingual court staff to interpret in courtroom</p>	June 2016 for existing course updates and any new educational programs and or products for court staff and judicial officers to enhance their knowledge, skills, and	Identification of learning needs of judges and court staff; develop training to address those needs; identify preferred delivery methods (e.g., updates to existing

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i>		<p>proceedings unless they meet all the provisional qualification requirements).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER); Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	abilities in the area of language access.	online education; adapt the curriculum for the judicial college course and put that online.)
18.	<p>Identify multilingual standardized videos to assist court users, and update existing online course (“Interpreter Orientation: Working in the California Courts”) for new and prospective interpreters.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #44 (Online orientation for new interpreters); #18 (Creation of multilingual standardized videos).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Judicial Council staff in CJER; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	June 2016 for updates to online course for new interpreter orientation and to identify existing video inventory; June 2017 for creation of new multilingual standardized videos.	Identify the existing inventory of the videos throughout the courts and at non-court organizations, and make all of them available to all court users, if possible.
19.	NCSC to conduct a survey of the courts identifying different points of contact at their courts,	1	See LAP Recommendation #26 (Identification of critical points of contact).	June 2016 for survey results and language proficiency standards	Survey results and standards of language proficiency for specific

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>and the level of service required, to help define language proficiency standards for bilingual staff.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>		<p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	<p>regarding bilingual staff at different points of contact with the courts.</p>	<p>points of contact within the courthouse.</p>
20.	<p>Define standards for bilingual staff; identify existing and develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee: Language Access Education and Standards</i></p>	2	<p>See LAP Recommendations #47 (Language proficiency standards for bilingual staff); #48 (Standards and online training for bilingual staff); #45 (Training for prospective interpreters); #46 (Training for interpreters on civil cases and remote interpreting).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Adoption of Language Access Plan (1/22/15).</p> <p>Resources: CJER; Task Force Consultant (National Center for State Courts).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Objective 4</p>	<p>June 2016 for identification of existing training programs and development needs for new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.</p>	<p>Based on points of contact and course needs identification, Judicial Council staff to develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters in FY 2016-17.</p>

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Develop and complete a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for 2016–17 to increase trial court and Judicial Council funding to support LAP implementation.	Completed. Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for FY 2016–17 was completed and submitted to Department of Finance in September 2015.
2	The court in each county to designate a language access office or representative.	Completed. The Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee developed and distributed written guidance for trial court leadership in December 2015, and requested that each court designate a language access office or representative. As of 2/23/16, 44 of 58 courts have responded. Requests are pending for the requested information for remaining courts.
3	Develop and complete a detailed work plan and cost estimates for full LAP implementation.	June 2016. The National Center for State Courts (NCSC), in consultation with the Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee, is developing a comprehensive LAP work plan, including a cost analysis, budget and estimates re full LAP implementation.
4	Develop and complete a template to assist trial courts with collection of language access data including cost reporting to assist with development of funding requests.	Not necessary. The Budget and LAP Monitoring subcommittee determined that existing trial court data collection systems can be modified to capture the additional information that is identified in LAP Recommendation No. 6.
5	Develop and complete a statewide complaint form and process, including interaction with local trial court complaint processes.	June 2016 (development of complaint form). NCSC is assisting the Budget and LAP Monitoring subcommittee with producing a single complaint form and complaint processes.
6	Adoption of LAP by the California Courts of Appeal and California Supreme Court.	December 2016. The Chief Justice and the Administrative Presiding Justices of the Courts of Appeal will be designating representatives from each courthouse to work with members of the Budget and LAP Monitoring subcommittee to review the LAP in its entirety and discuss the applicability of each of the recommendations to the appellate courts, and, where appropriate, how they could implement them.
7	Develop and launch a LAP monitoring database to allow public reporting regarding LAP implementation progress.	Completed. The Judicial Council has developed a LAP Monitoring Database, which provides quarterly progress reports regarding the implementation status of the LAP recommendations. The progress reports are available on the Task Force's web page (http://www.courts.ca.gov/LAP.htm).

8	Design, plan for and conduct a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot with spoken-language court interpreters in up to ten courts, and collect relevant data.	December 2016. The subcommittee proposes to pilot technology solutions for VRI for the trial courts to validate and finalize technical and programmatic guidelines. The pilot project will provide important foundational building blocks in developing a long term VRI strategy for the California judicial branch.
9	Develop and establish guidelines for VRI with spoken-language court interpreters, including remote interpreting minimum technology requirements.	December 2016. Following the video remote interpreting pilot project, guidelines for VRI will be developed and established based on findings and reports from the project.
10	Establish (1) guidelines for courts to early identify language access needs and document the needs in their case management system and/or case record or file; (2) guidelines to track provision or denial of language access services and document same in their case management system and/or case record or file; and (3) protocols for justice partners to early communicate LEP court user language needs to the court.	December 2016. Subcommittee members are working with the major case management systems that are being used throughout the state to catalogue system capabilities and functionality.
11	Create a living tool-kit and meaningful website available to all on the California Courts public web page, including resources such as I-Speak cards and multilingual signs and templates.	Completed. On December 31, 2015, the Language Access Toolkit went live on the California Courts website (http://www.courts.ca.gov/lap-toolkit-courts.htm).
12	Develop and share translation protocols.	Currently being reviewed by the Subcommittee. Will be completed by June 2016.
13	Establish guidelines regarding use of bilingual volunteers.	Due June 2016.
14	Develop and enhance existing course content and develop new educational programs that will enhance judicial branch training regarding the Language Access Plan.	The subcommittee is currently reviewing draft educational materials received from NCSC. The subcommittee will begin to develop new content for judges in early 2016 and court staff shortly thereafter. The subcommittee anticipates that this will be an ongoing effort for judicial education.
15	Identify multilingual standardized videos to assist court users, and update existing online course (“Interpreter Orientation: Working in the California Courts”) for new and prospective interpreters.	June 2016 for updates to online course for new interpreter orientation and to identify existing video inventory; June 2017 for completion of review of existing multilingual standardized videos and a recommendation for additional ones.
16	NCSC to conduct a survey of the courts identifying different points of contact at their courts, and the level of service required, to help define language proficiency standards for bilingual staff.	Survey distributed and awaiting responses.
17	Define standards for bilingual staff; identify existing and develop new training programs for bilingual staff and court interpreters.	Dependent upon #16.

Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

Subgroup or working group name: Budget and LAP Monitoring Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding funding and monitoring.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 9

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 0

Date formed: May 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:3-4 times per year

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: In 2016, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 LAP recommendations. The subcommittee has also begun to lay the foundation to commence work in 2016 on a variety of the Phase 2 recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

Subgroup or working group name: Technological Solutions Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding technology.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 7

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 0

Date formed: May 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:3-4 times per year

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: In 2016, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 LAP recommendations. The subcommittee has also begun to lay the foundation to commence work in 2016 on a variety of the Phase 2 recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

Subgroup or working group name: Translation, Signage and Tools for Courts Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding translation, signage and other tools to assist the trial courts and LEP court users.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 7

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 0

Date formed: May 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: 3-4 times per year

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: In 2016, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 LAP recommendations. The subcommittee has also begun to lay the foundation to commence work in 2016 on a variety of the Phase 2 recommendations. Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

Subgroup or working group name: Language Access Education and Standards

Purpose of subgroup or working group: Supports implementation of LAP recommendations regarding language access education and standards.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 7

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 0

Date formed: May 2015

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: 3-4 times per year

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: In 2016, the subcommittee is focusing on completion of deliverables and end products for the Phase 1 LAP recommendations. The subcommittee has also begun to lay the foundation to commence work in 2016 on a variety of the Phase 2 recommendations. The Task Force plans to make regular updates to the council regarding LAP implementation progress and product development, including any need to adjust the phasing of the LAP recommendations.

Upcoming Meetings of the Task Force: *To conduct its charge, including conduct of community outreach meetings regarding LAP implementation, the Task Force requests that the Council support its plan to hold the following in-person meetings in 2016:*

- *2nd Community Outreach Meeting – March 22, 2016*
- *3rd In-Person Meeting – May 24, 2016*
- *4th In-Person Meeting – TBD (September or October 2016)*
- *3rd Community Outreach Meeting – TBD (November or December 2016)*

Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Kathleen E. O’Leary and Hon. Laurie D. Zelon, Cochairs
Staff:	Ms. Kyanna Williams, Lead Counsel; Ms. Carolynn Bernabe, Senior Administrative Coordinator, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Advisory Body’s Charge: Makes recommendations for improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. Recommends to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research, proposals for the education and training of judicial officers and court staff. (California Rule of Court 10.55.)	
Advisory Body’s Membership: The advisory body’s current membership is: 28 members with 3 Appellate justices; 13 Trial court judicial officers; 1 Lawyer with expertise or interest in disability issues; 2 Lawyers with expertise or interest in additional access, fairness, and diversity issues addressed by the committee; 2 Lawyers from a trial court self-help center; 1 Legal services lawyer; 1 Court executive officer or trial court manager who has experience with self-represented litigants; 1 County law librarian or other related professional; 2 Judicial administrators; and 2 Public members.	
Subgroups/Working Groups: None	
Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2016:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate with other Judicial Council advisory bodies to improve access to the courts and improve the public’s perception of fairness in various case-types and across subject matter areas. 2. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council for policies that improve access to the courts and improve the public’s perception of fairness in various case-types and across subject matter areas. This includes, but is not limited to, recommendations for best practices, Judicial Council sponsored legislation, Standards of Judicial Administration, California Rules of Court, and Judicial Council forms. 	

3. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council for policies that support the Conference of Chief Justices and State Court Administrator's Resolution 5, [*Reaffirming the Commitment to Meaningful Access to Justice for All*](#).
4. Provide recommendations to the Judicial Council for policies that ensure that "The makeup of California's judicial Branch will reflect the diversity of the state's residents". (Goal I, [*The Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch*](#).) This includes diversity in judicial officer, court leadership, court staff, and court volunteer positions.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Collaborate and Provide Subject Matter Expertise:</p> <p>a) Serve as lead/subject matter resource for issues of access, fairness and diversity for other advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action. Such efforts may include providing expertise and review to working groups, advisory committees, and subcommittees as needed on any item(s) under the committee’s charge.</p> <p>b) Serve as subject matter resource for other stakeholders on subjects under the committee’s charge so as to increase efficiency and avoid duplication of services within the branch.</p> <p>c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers in legal substance and procedure, useful technology and efficient business practices, and cultural and diversity awareness; make recommendations to the</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Committee Charge.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Respective advisory bodies</p> <p>Resources: To be determined (This item may include collaboration with various Judicial Council advisory bodies, including, but not limited to: Traffic; Criminal Law; Civil and Small Claims; Information Technology; CJER Access, Ethics and Fairness Curriculum Development; Family and Juvenile Law; Collaborative Court; Trial Court Presiding Judge; and Court Executive Officer.)</p>	Ongoing	Coordination to ensure that matters under the committee’s charge are systematically addressed across subject matter areas; to lend the committee’s depth of expertise; and to avoid duplication of resources throughout the Judicial Council and the branch.

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	Judicial Council, as needed, regarding updates to the Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts as provided by CRC 10.960(e) .		Key Objective(s) Supported: 2, 3, and 4		
2.	<p>Education</p> <p>a) Collaborate with CJER staff on improving and expanding educational resources in areas under PAF's charge. This may include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exploring with CJER staff ways to improve and expand resources that educate judicial officers, temporary judges, court employees, and/or court volunteers on unconscious bias. ii. Exploring with CJER staff, emerging and persistent access and fairness challenges that court-users with disabilities, particularly those with mental health disabilities, may face. iii. Discussing with CJER staff what educational resources are available to judicial officers, temporary judges, court staff, and the public on the appropriate and varying uses of animals in courts. Consider whether additional education may be appropriate to address the differences between service animals, 	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Committee Charge; Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Committee Charge; prior annual agendas.</p> <p>Resources: CFCC staff; CJER staff; and Criminal Justice staff working on traffic court.</p> <p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 2, 3 and 4</p>	Dec. 2016	2(a) - Improved and expanded education for judicial officers, temporary judges, court employees, and court volunteers.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>emotional support animals, and court-house dogs.</p> <p>iv. Collaborating with CJER staff and the Traffic Advisory Committee in exploring ways to improve education on traffic court processes for judicial officers, temporary judges, and court clerks who work with traffic litigants.</p> <p>b) Make a recommendation to Judicial Council staff to expand information in the following areas when updating the publication <i>Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants: A Benchguide for Judicial Officers</i>.</p> <p>i. Counteracting unconscious bias.</p> <p>ii. Working with LGBTQIA litigants.</p> <p>iii. Cultural and diversity awareness.</p> <p>iv. Working with litigants with disabilities, including those with mental health disabilities.</p> <p>c) Make a recommendation to Judicial Council staff to: Review the 2003 publication <i>Native American Resource Guide for Bench Officers</i>; determine what information within the guide continues to be most useful for judicial officers; identify which portions of the guide are not</p>				<p>2(b) – Updated and expanded information in the areas of unconscious bias, working with LGBTQIA litigants, cultural and diversity awareness, and working with litigants with disabilities, in the publication, <i>Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants: A Benchguide for Judicial Officers</i>.</p> <p>(c) – An assessment of the publication, <i>Native American Resource Guide for Bench Officers</i>;</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>addressed in other Judicial Council resources and whether that information should be updated; and for any information that is updated, recommend how that information can best be made available to judicial officers.</p> <p>d) Make a recommendation to Judicial Council staff to gather and share with courts, information on best practices for improving the user-friendliness of court resources and facilities, with an emphasis on the needs of self-represented litigants. This process may include, but is not limited to, consultation with courts, self-help centers, family law facilitator programs, legal services programs, and other justice system partners with expertise in the needs of self-represented litigants, court-users with disabilities, plain language translation, and law and design.</p>				<p>updates to the guide, if appropriate.</p> <p>2(d) - Information shared with courts regarding strategies for making court resources and facilities more user-friendly, particularly for self-represented litigants.</p>
3.	<p>Diversity</p> <p>a) Consider ways to implement the recommendations outlined in PAF's report, <i>Judicial Branch: Summit Report to Promote Diversity in the California Judiciary</i>. This work may include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>i. Exploring strategies for sharing information with courts about existing diversity pipeline programs that encourage judicial branch careers (e.g. careers as attorney's, judicial officers, court executive officers, and court-staff).</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Accepted by the Judicial Council at its July 28, 2015 business meeting; Follow-up from the 2006 diversity summit held by the Judicial Council in collaboration with the State Bar of California.</p>	Dec. 2016	3(a)(i) – The committee will have gathered useful information about existing pipeline programs.

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>(Page 4, <i>Judicial Branch: Summit Report to Promote Diversity in the California Judiciary</i>)</p> <p>ii. Recommending that Judicial Council staff update the Judicial Resource Network to include information about how judicial officers, court leadership and court staff can participate in or support the creation of law academy programs in the high schools in their jurisdictions. (Page 4, <i>Judicial Branch: Summit Report to Promote Diversity in the California Judiciary</i>.)</p> <p>b) Review and consider ideas and recommendations that may come out of the October, 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit. (The summit is being planned by the Interagency Judicial Summit Planning Committee, which consists of representatives from the State Bar’s Council on Access and Fairness, the Judicial Council, the California Judges Association, and staff from the State Bar and Judicial Council.)</p>	2	<p>Resources: To Be Determined</p> <p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		<p>3(a)(ii) - New information on law academy programs, which represent a critical and growing part of the judicial diversity pipeline, being made available to courts via the Judicial Resources Network.</p> <p>3(b) – Committee discussion about and consideration of ideas and recommendations from the October 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit.</p>
4.	<p>Improving Access and Fairness through Technology:</p> <p>a) Coordinate with the Judicial Council’s Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) on developing a Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal. (See item #5 on ITAC’s 2016</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Committee Charge</p> <p>Origin of Project:</p>	Ongoing	4(a) – ITAC will receive PAF’s expertise on issues of access and fairness for self-represented litigants throughout

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Annual Agenda. (See also, The Critical Role of the State Judiciary in Increasing Access for Self-Represented Litigants: Self-Help Access 360)</p> <p>b) Discuss and explore with ITAC other intersections between access, fairness, and technology.</p>		<p>Committee Charge, prior annual agenda, and ITAC Annual Agenda.</p> <p>Resources: CFCC staff and ITAC staff</p> <p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 2, 3 and 4</p>		<p>the development and implementation of the Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal.</p> <p>4(b) - Establishment of an ongoing relationship between PAF and ITAC on intersecting issues related to access, fairness, and technology.</p>
5.	<p>Improving Access and Fairness for SRLs in Traffic Court: Consider ways to improve access and fairness for self-represented litigants in traffic court. This will include ongoing collaboration with the Traffic Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and other relevant Judicial Council advisory bodies and staff and will be conducted through the Judicial Council's ordinary processes for policy adoption, rulemaking and legislative proposals. This work may include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>a) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation establishing that all traffic infraction penalties be established at a state level; work with counties to explore standardizing statewide penalties associated with traffic infractions.</p>	1(e)	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Strategic Plan for the Judicial Branch, Goal I; Strategic Goal 3: Modernization of Management and Administration.</p> <p>Committee charge.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Prior annual agenda; Judicial Council's Statewide Action Plan For Serving Self-Represented Litigants.</p> <p>Resources: None</p>	Dec. 2017	Approval and/or implementation of PAF's policy recommendations for improving access and fairness for self-represented litigants in traffic court.

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>b) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation to amend Penal Code section 1463.007 or create rules of court adopting a statewide system of debt collection procedures.</p> <p>c) Supporting and/or sponsoring legislation to provide community service as an option to all litigants who may be unable to pay their fines, penalties, and fees with a consistent statewide formula to convert traffic sentences to community service hours.</p> <p>d) Adopting a rule of court setting forth procedures with respect to local courts retaining jurisdiction over traffic matters and clarifying the situations in which they may use outside collection agencies.</p> <p>e) Adopting a court rule regarding the sending of courtesy notices in traffic matters, having the rule outline the minimum requirements for each county in sending the notices; the content of the notices; and the timeliness of the notices.</p> <p>f) Adopting a court rule regarding individual traffic courts' use of high quality materials prepared by the Judicial Council to educate litigants when they appear in court.</p>		<p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 1, 2, 3 and 4.</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>g) Developing high quality informational materials, on the traffic court process, to be disseminated to all counties.</p> <p>h) Providing additional education to judicial officers hearing traffic matters, with an emphasis on how judicial offices should exercise their discretion in considering one's ability to pay before imposing traffic penalties.</p> <p>i) Evaluating the possibility of a statewide electronic Traffic Information Portal.</p>				
6.	<p>Low and Moderate Income Court Users (Economic Access):</p> <p>a) Work with stakeholders to build stronger collaborations between courts and legal aid providers, with the goal of improving access and fairness for low income court users and other vulnerable court-user populations.</p> <p>b) Co-sponsor one or more conferences with the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) and/or other relevant stakeholder(s), for court administrators, self-help center attorneys, family law facilitators, legal aid attorneys and paralegals, court and legal services information and technology experts, and other appropriate court and legal services staff on issues related to self-represented litigants and to encourage sharing of resources and best practices.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p><i>Strategic:</i> Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; and Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.</p> <p><i>Operational:</i> Goal I, Objective 2: Identify and eliminate barriers to court access at all levels of service; ensure interactions with the court are understandable, convenient, and perceived as fair; Goal IV, Objective 1: Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.</p>	Dec. 2016	<p>6(a) – Ongoing discussion and collaboration with branch stakeholders.</p> <p>6(b) – Co-sponsorship of one or more conferences with LAAC and/or other relevant stakeholder(s) on issues related to self-represented litigants.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>c) Provide an educational presentation to the Judicial Council on access and fairness for low and moderate income persons.</p> <p>d) Host an educational meeting on access and fairness for low and moderate income persons. PAF members, key members of other judicial council advisory bodies, and select stakeholders and subject matter experts to be invited. Any meeting would be dependent on the availability of funds.</p> <p>e) Consider ways to fully implement the Judicial Council’s 2001 Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons. (See item 2, Judicial Council minutes approving the policy.) These recommendations include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pilot test a change to the Judicial Council’s Invitation to Comment form. ii. Improve outreach and education for Invitations to Comment. iii. Encourage individuals working with low and moderate-income communities to apply for Judicial Council advisory body positions. iv. Coordinate with the Legal Aid Association of California to video- 		<p>Origin of Project: Previous Annual Agenda.</p> <p>Resources: CFCC staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 1, 2 and 4</p>		<p>6(c) – Conduct an educational presentation for the Judicial Council.</p> <p>6(d) – Host educational meeting for PAF members, key members of other judicial council advisory bodies, select stakeholders and subject matter experts.</p> <p>6(e) – Approval and/or implementation of PAF recommendations for fully implementing the Judicial Council’s <i>Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</i>.</p>

#	Project ¹	Priority ₂	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>record one or two webinars on the Invitation to Comment process and the work of Judicial Council advisory bodies.</p> <p>v. Educate court executive officers and presiding judges about the Conference of Chief Justices Resolution on Reaffirming the Commitment to Meaningful Access to Justice for All.</p>				
7.	<p>Consider Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force Referrals: Review and consider recommendations number 39, 92, 106, 108, 113, 119, 124, and 134 from the Final Report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce. These recommendations were referred to PAF by the Chairs of E&P and RUPRO. PAF will recommend appropriate action within its purview and will collaborate with other advisory bodies and justice system partners as appropriate.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: As referred by the council</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council</p> <p>Resources: Legal Services staff; CFCC staff; Criminal Justice Services staff; Others to be determined.</p> <p>Key Objective(s) Supported: 4</p>	Ongoing	To Be Determined

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>Gender Fairness/Women of Color in the Courts Focus Groups: The former Access and Fairness Advisory Committee conducted focus groups to gather information on the experiences of women, including women of color, in the branch. PAF will develop policy recommendations based on the focus group findings and will disseminate the focus group information to CJER and to relevant stakeholders, including other advisory groups, with an emphasis on incorporating the data into educational programming. As part of this work, PAF will share information about the Judicial Council’s Pilot Mentoring Program for Trial Court Staff and the accompanying Toolkit.</p>	<p>Project completed January, 2016.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: A small group of PAF members met regularly throughout 2015 to compile, review and discuss the data collected in the Focus Groups on Gender Fairness/ Women of Color in the Courts. The project group found that focus group participants identified areas of access, fairness, and diversity where they felt courts had significantly improved in the last few decades. The project group also found, however, that participants had serious concerns about lack of education in many areas, including unconscious bias, cultural and diversity awareness, effective communication with self-represented litigants, and diversity in various jobs throughout the court system. The project group determined that more education was needed, at all levels of the courts, to address these and other access, fairness and diversity concerns.</p> <p>The <i>Access, Fairness and Diversity Self-Assessment Toolkit</i> was created by staff to address the project group’s recommendation for more education responsive to the access, fairness and diversity concerns identified in the focus group data. The toolkit addresses many of the concerns raised in the focus group data and provides links to high quality educational materials relevant to many of the identified concerns. Although the toolkit is a staff-initiated resource, staff sought PAF committee input throughout development of the toolkit because the committee had identified the need for greater education in many of these areas and because of the committee’s knowledge base on access, fairness and diversity issues.</p> <p>Courts may use the tool to conduct private, voluntary self-assessments of how well the court is addressing a number of</p>

		<p>access, fairness, and diversity issues. The self-assessments would be private and the courts would not be asked to share the results of any self-assessment with others. Where the court has identified a need for additional in-house education on a particular access, fairness, or diversity issue, the accompanying links make it easy for the court to identify useful educational resources to share with judicial officers and/or staff. The tool is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of access, fairness and diversity concerns that a court may want to consider. Rather, the tool highlights <i>common</i> access, fairness and diversity concerns that courts may have. Staff will periodically update the tool to reflect new access, fairness and diversity concerns and to include updated educational resources.</p> <p>PAF Cochair Justice Laurie Zelon shared the toolkit at the January 21, 2016 joint meeting of the Trial Court Presiding Judge Advisory Committee and Court Executive Officer Advisory Committee. Having received no negative feedback about the toolkit, staff finalized the toolkit.</p> <p>Since then, Justice Laurie Zelon shared the toolkit with Judicial Council members in a February, 2016 educational presentation. The toolkit is now accessible to all courts through the Judicial Resource Network.</p>
2.	<p>Review Court Processes Affecting Self-Represented Litigants: The Judicial Council directed PAF to consider an access and fairness review of court processes affecting self-represented litigants.</p>	<p>Project Completed March, 2016.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: Throughout 2015 a small group of PAF members met to discuss court processes that affect access and fairness for self-represented litigants. Initially, the project group discussed various court processes that impact high numbers of self-represented litigants, including traffic, small claims, and family court matters. The project group eventually decided to focus its energies on court processes related to traffic infractions. Thereafter, the project</p>

		<p>group gathered a wealth of information about current court processes throughout the state, read and considered the report entitled <i>Not Just a Ferguson Problem: How Traffic Courts Drive Inequality in California</i>, and discussed the various issues facing self-represented litigants in traffic infractions. Lead staff from the Traffic Advisory Committee participated in project group discussions of the recommendations.</p> <p>The project group developed a series of recommendations, which were presented to the full PAF committee on October 14, 2015. The committee approved the recommendations in concept, subject to suggested revisions. On December 09, 2015, the project group presented a revised draft of the recommendations to the full committee, which was approved subject to the inclusion of several suggested revisions made during the meeting.</p> <p>On January 25, 2016, the Traffic Advisory Committee met to review the revised recommendations and provide additional feedback to PAF. PAF will incorporate TAC’s suggestions and then focus on the approval and implementation process for these recommendations.</p>
<p>3. Economic Access: PAF will examine whether there are economic barriers to litigants' abilities to enforce legal rights and/or to comply with legal obligations and will identify promising practices. As part of this work, PAF will consider the access and fairness impacts of fines and fees on court users, including self-represented litigants. PAF will share educational information about economic barriers with CJER and relevant stakeholders, including other advisory bodies.</p>		<p>Project Completed October 2015.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: A small group of PAF members met regularly throughout 2015 to discuss issues affecting access to the courts and fairness in the judicial branch for low and moderate income Californians, also known as “Economic Access”. The project group discussed a variety of issues affecting low and moderate income families, including: The impact of court-closures and reduced court hours; best practices for how courts can consider public transportation services when determining where to locate court services and what time to begin calendars; The need for increased self-help services in certain substantive areas of law affecting low and</p>

		<p>moderate income people; and policies and practices related to collection of court-ordered debt.</p> <p>Ultimately, the project group decided to focus on making recommendations for fully implementing the Judicial Council’s 2001 <i>Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</i>. The policies are designed to identify and address existing barriers as well as to prevent actions, rules, standards, and forms adopted by the council from creating additional barriers to participation by low and moderate income litigants. Although progress has been made since 2001, the <i>Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</i> was never fully implemented.</p> <p>The project group worked with staff to identify actions that had been taken to implement the various provisions in the <i>Access Policy for Low and Moderate Income Persons</i> and whether those actions had been successful. The project group then identified which parts of the policy had not been implemented and developed a series of recommendations for fully implementing those provisions.</p> <p>The project group presented its recommendations to the full PAF committee on October 15, 2016, which the committee approved.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Judicial Diversity: The Judicial Council and the State Bar convened a summit on judicial diversity where participants developed recommendations to further the goal of a more diverse bench and issued a final report and recommendations. The Judicial Council reviewed those recommendations and directed the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee (now, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness) to initiate the review and approval process for those recommendations that merit council action. PAF presented its recommendations to E&P, which then directed PAF to solicit Presiding Judge and CEO input on the various</p>	<p>Project Completed July 2015</p> <p>Overview of work completed: Justice Laurie Zelon, PAF cochair, presented the proposed recommendations to TCPJAC and CEAC during their January 29, 2015 joint meeting and members of those committees were invited to submit written comments on the recommendations. On June 4, 2015, TCPJAC and CEAC chairs provided a joint statement indicating their committees’ support for the recommendations in PAF’s report.</p>

<p>recommendations in the report. PAF presented its recommendations at the January 29, 2015 TCPJAC/CEAC meeting. PAF requested comments from both committees and will consider those comments before reporting back to E&P. PAF will continue its work on the review and approval process.</p>	<p>PAF Cochairs submitted the recommendations to the Judicial Council in the report, Judicial Branch: Summit Report to Promote Diversity in the Judiciary. The Judicial Council accepted the recommendations during its July 28, 2015 meeting.</p> <p>In furtherance of these recommendations, Judicial Council staff: Participated in pipeline programs designed to encourage high school students to consider careers in the law, including the judiciary; and served on the interagency Judicial Summit Planning Committee which is planning the 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit.</p> <p>As part of PAF's October 2015 in-person meeting, a small group of PAF members coordinated to educate members on state-wide and local court diversity pipeline initiatives.</p>
<p>5. Benchcards on LGBTQ Issues: PAF will contribute to the development of one or more benchcards to provide information to judicial officers on sexual orientation and gender identity terminology, effective communication with LGBTQ court-users, and common needs of LGBTQ litigants in different case types. PAF will also consider whether recommendations should be made for updating the existing publication Bench Reference Guide: What Do I Need to Know about Lesbian, Gay, bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) Youth in Juvenile Court?</p>	<p>This project has been removed from the annual agenda.</p> <p>Overview: The following publication does not need to be updated at this time: <i>Bench Reference Guide: What Do I Need to Know about Lesbian, Gay, bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) Youth in Juvenile Court?</i></p> <p>The PAF committee determined that item #2(b)(ii) above provided a better opportunity to address judicial officer education on the needs of LGBTQ court-users.</p>
<p>6. Consider Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force Referrals: Review and consider recommendations referred by the Judicial Council following the task force's final report to the council. Recommend appropriate action within PAF's purview.</p>	<p>See item #7 above.</p> <p>Overview: Before it sunset on December 31, 2015, the Judicial Council's Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce issued a final report outlining recommendations related to mental health and the judicial branch. The Chairs of E&P and RUPRO assessed the recommendations and on March 23, 2016 referred various recommendations to relevant advisory committees.</p>

		<p>Recommendations number 39, 92, 106, 108, 113, 119, 124, and 134 were referred to PAF for consideration. PAF will review those recommendations, consider what actions it may reasonably take on each recommendation, outline specific tasks the committee should take, and where appropriate begin action.</p> <p>PAF will also address mental health issues in items 2(a)(ii) and 2(b)(iv) above.</p>
7.	<p>Rules Modernization Project: Each advisory committee has been asked to include in their annual agenda for 2015 an item providing for the drafting of proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court related to their subject matter areas. This effort would be undertaken in coordination with CTAC, which is responsible for developing and completing the overall rules modernization project.</p>	<p>This project has been removed from the annual agenda.</p> <p>Overview: This item is most appropriate to Judicial Council advisory bodies whose work primarily focuses on rule-making.</p>
8.	<p>Subject Matter Resource:</p> <p>a) Serve as lead/subject matter resource for other advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action. Such efforts may include providing expertise and review to working groups, advisory committees, and subcommittees as needed on access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties.</p> <p>b) Serve as subject matter resource for other stakeholders on subjects under the committee’s charge so as to increase efficiency and avoid duplication of services within the branch.</p> <p>c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers in legal substance and procedure, useful technology and efficient business practices, and make recommendations to</p>	<p>This project is ongoing. See item #1 above.</p> <p>Overview of work completed: See description of project #1 above. PAF members used their expertise in access and fairness, to review court-processes affecting self-represented litigants in traffic court and make recommendations for improving those processes. PAF collaborated with the Traffic Advisory Committee, as well as chairs and staff for the Traffic and Criminal Law Advisory committees. Inter-committee member liaisons were also assigned as a result of these collaborations.</p>

	the Judicial Council regarding updates to the <i>Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts</i> as provided by CRC 10.960.	
9.	<p>Educational Recommendations:</p> <p>a) Make recommendations to the CJER Governing Committee for educational programming for judicial officers and court staff on methods of improving access to the judicial system, fairness in the state courts, diversity in the judicial branch, and court services for self-represented parties. Many of the educational recommendations are likely to relate to the subject-matter of items 1-6 above and item 9(b) below.</p> <p>b) Make recommendations regarding updates to the <i>Benchguide for Judicial Officers on Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants</i>.</p>	<p>9(a) This project is ongoing. See item #2(a) above.</p> <p>In 2015 PAF brainstormed suggestions for improving access, fairness, and diversity and submitted those recommendations to CJER staff. In 2015 a PAF member and PAF's lead staff acted as liaisons to CJER's Judicial Branch Access, Ethics and Fairness Curriculum Development Committee. PAF staff also acted as liaison to CJER's Qualifying Ethics 6 Planning Committee.</p> <p>9(b) This project is still in progress. See item #2(b) above.</p>
10	<p>Court Technology:</p> <p>PAF will remain available to provide information and subject-matter expertise to the Court Technology Advisory Committee as requested.</p>	This project is ongoing. See item #4 above.
11	<p>Encourage Pro Bono:</p> <p>Coordinate with the State Bar on ways the judicial branch can encourage pro bono service by attorneys. With CFCC staff assistance, the <i>Judicial Officer Pro Bono Toolkit</i> was updated in celebration of the 2014 National Pro Bono Month and presented by PAF cochair Hon. Kathleen E. O'Leary as part of her October 28, 2014 presentation to the Judicial Council on the final report of the Taskforce for Self-Represented Litigants. PAF will continue to educate judicial officers about the toolkit and make appropriate recommendations for updates to Judicial Council pro bono resolutions.</p>	This project has been removed from the annual agenda.
12	Self-Represented Litigants in Family Law Conference:	This project is ongoing. See item #6(b) above.

	<p>Cosponsor conference with the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) for court administrators, self-help center attorneys, family law facilitators, legal aid attorneys, and appropriate court staff on issues related to self-represented litigants in family law and domestic violence and to encourage sharing of resources and best practices.</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p>Language Access and Interpreters in the Courts: PAF cochair Hon. Laurie D. Zelon is a member of the Judicial Council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (ITF) which advises the council on implementation of the recommendations issued by the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (2013–2015). PAF will remain available to provide information and subject-matter expertise to ITF as requested.</p>	<p>This project has been removed from the annual agenda.</p>

Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

<p>Subgroups/Working Groups: <i>Subgroup or working group name:</i> N/A</p>

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

Annual Agenda—2016

Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Earl Johnson, (Ret.)
Staff:	Ms. Bonnie Hough, Managing Attorney; Ms. Carolynn Bernabe, Administrative Coordinator
Advisory Body's Charge: This committee is required by Government Code section 68651(b)(5) in order to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Assem. Bill 590 [Feuer]; Stats. 2009 ch. 457). The act requires the Judicial Council to develop one or more model pilot projects in selected courts for three-year periods. The projects will provide legal representation to low-income parties on critical legal issues affecting basic human needs. At the direction of the Judicial Council, the implementation committee will make recommendations on which pilot projects will be selected and provide input into the design of the pilot projects evaluations, which are required by the authorizing legislation.	
Advisory Body's Membership: 15 Members, including 3 appellate justices; 1 retired judge; 4 legal aid attorneys, 4 private attorneys; 2 academics, 1 representative to the Chamber of Commerce, 1 former legislative staff member.	
Subgroups/Working Groups: The committee acts as a committee of the whole.	
Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016: Continue to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel pilot project including reviewing reports from the evaluation and to provide guidance to staff.	

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Research and data collection Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Supports Strategic Goal II and III, Independency and Accountability and Modernization of Management and Administration, as well as Operational Plan Object 4, “Measure and regularly report branch performance...” and Operational Plan Objective 2, “Evaluate and improve management techniques, allocation of funds, internal operations, and services; support the sharing of effective management practices branchwide.”</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code section 68651 requirement that evaluation of the pilot projects must be submitted to legislature on or before January 31, 2016.</p> <p>Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts Staff</p>	On-going	Report due to legislature in January 2016. Continuing evaluation to be conducted and report prepared by the end of 2016 to be used in recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding future direction of the project.

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Key Objective Supported: Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.		
2.	<p>Implementation of pilot projects Make grant recommendations to the Judicial Council if additional funding becomes available</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Supports Strategic Goal I, Access, Fairness and Diversity: As well as Operational Plan Objective 4: Expand the Availability of Legal Assistance, Advice and Representation for Litigants with Limited Financial Means.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code section 68651 requirement to establish pilot projects.</p> <p>Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts Staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Implement Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.</p>	On-going	Continue monitoring grants awarded which provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Research and data collection Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects	Ongoing – see # 1 above
2	Implementation of pilot projects Continue monitoring grants awarded which provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.	Ongoing – see #2 above

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.]*

Subgroup or working group name:

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:

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Superior Court of Fresno County
Staff:	Mr. Steven Chang, Manager, Judicial Council Finance
Advisory Body's Charge: Rule 10.64. Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee <u>Area of focus</u> The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for the trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. <u>Additional duties</u> In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee may make recommendations to the council on: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Trial court budget priorities to guide the development of the budget for the upcoming fiscal year;2) The allocation of trial court funding, including any changes to existing methodologies for allocating trial court budget augmentations and reductions; and3) Budget policies and procedures, as appropriate. <p>The advisory committee currently plans to meet in-person approximately five times in 2016 and several more times by teleconference, contingent on available funding.</p>	
Advisory Body's Membership: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The advisory committee consists of an equal number of trial court presiding judges and court executive officers reflecting diverse aspects of state trial courts, including urban, suburban, and rural locales; the size and adequacy of budgets; and the number of authorized judgeships.2) A presiding judge and court executive officer may be from the same court.3) The chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee serve as ex officio voting members.4) Notwithstanding rule 10.31(e), a presiding judge is qualified to complete his or her term on the advisory committee even if his or her term as presiding judge of a trial court ends.5) The Judicial Council's chief of staff, chief administrative officer, chief operating officer, and finance director serve as non-voting members.	

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- 1) 2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee
- 2) AB 1058 Funding Allocation Subcommittee (Joint subcommittee with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee)
- 3) Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Subcommittee (Joint subcommittee with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee)
- 4) Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee
- 5) Fiscal Planning Working Group
- 6) Funding Methodology Subcommittee
- 7) Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee
- 8) V3 Case Management System Working Group (Joint working group with Judicial Council Technology Committee)

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016:

1. Develop, review, and refine allocation methodologies related to trial court funding.
2. Develop recommendations regarding expenditures from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund to address any structural shortfall in either fund.
3. In order to provide for more effective fiscal management and planning for the trial courts, develop a proposal regarding the use of trial court funds that revert to the Trial Court Trust Fund pursuant to GC 77203.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)</p> <p>The Funding Methodology Subcommittee will continue to review and refine the WAFM model. The work plan for FY 2015-2016 includes evaluating the impact of civil assessments on WAFM.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. In April 2013, the Judicial Council approved the WAFM for use in allocating the annual state trial court operations funds with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be evaluated and submitted to the Judicial Council for approval.</p> <p>Origin of Project: This phase of the project is part of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee's annual work plan approved on August 5, 2015.</p> <p>Resources: Finance and OCR staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	Ongoing. It is expected that the evaluation of the impact of civil assessments will be completed by June 30, 2016.	An improvement to the WAFM to more accurately capture the WAFM-related funding needs of the trial courts.

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>Proposition 47 Funding</p> <p>The Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee will continue to review and refine the allocation methodology related to funds received for criminal justice realignment and the workload associated with Proposition 47.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Proposition 47 became effective on November 5, 2014. The Budget Act of 2015 included \$26.9 million from the General Fund to address increased trial court workload associated with Proposition 47. The Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017 includes \$21.4 million.</p> <p>Resources: Finance and CJS staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	Ongoing. The Subcommittee will continue to review and refine the allocation methodology based on updated statistical data and provision of additional funding in future fiscal years.	Appropriately allocate funds based on workload.
3.	<p>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding</p> <p>In collaboration with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation Subcommittee will review the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: April 17, 2015 Judicial Council meeting (recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee).</p> <p>Resources: Finance, OCR, and CFCC staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	April 30, 2016	Appropriately allocate funds based on workload.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p>Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator (AB 1058) Funding</p> <p>In collaboration with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services, the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Subcommittee will reconsider the AB 1058 allocation methodology developed in 1997.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: April 17, 2015 Judicial Council meeting (recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee).</p> <p>Resources: Finance, OCR, and CFCC staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	February 29, 2016	Appropriately allocate funds based on workload.
5.	<p>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Allocations</p> <p>The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee will review FY 2016-2017 allocations from the IMF and TCTF to ensure consistency with Judicial Council goals and objectives and propose solutions to address any structural shortfall in either fund.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Structural shortfalls in the IMF and TCTF.</p> <p>Resources: Finance and multiple other office staff that have programs funded from the IMF and TCTF</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>	Ongoing. Allocations for FY 2016-2017 will be approved by June 30, 2016.	Assist the Judicial Council in ensuring the solvency of the IMF and TCTF.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
6.	<p>V3 Case Management System Funding</p> <p>In collaboration with the Judicial Council Technology Committee, develop a plan for phasing out branch subsidies for the V3 case management system by June 30, 2019. Determine allocations each fiscal year pending the phase out.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: April 17, 2015 Judicial Council meeting.</p> <p>Resources: Finance and IT staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 2</p>	June 30, 2019	Eliminate the branch subsidies for the V3 case management system by identifying alternate ways for the courts' case managements systems to be funded.
7.	<p>State-Level Reserve Policy</p> <p>Develop a process for trial courts to follow to apply for funding for emergencies from the \$10 million reserve held in the Trial Court Trust Fund.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: The establishment of this reserve is part of the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017.</p> <p>Resources: Finance staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	August 31, 2016	Establish a process for trial courts to follow including establishing criteria and timelines.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
8.	<p>Fiscal Planning Proposal</p> <p>Develop a proposal to allow a trial court's funds that revert to the TCTF pursuant to GC 77203 be retained for the benefit of that court for specific one-time costs.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: This work was initiated by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Resources: Finance staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 3</p>	April 30, 2016	Results in a policy that will allow trial courts to set aside funds to plan for one- time expenditures approved by the Judicial Council.
9.	<p>Language Access Funding</p> <p>Develop a funding methodology for allocations of new Program 45.45 funds received as part of the Budget Act of 2016.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: The Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017 includes \$7 million to support implementation of a key element of the Judicial Council-approved Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts by expanding interpreter access into all civil proceeding.</p> <p>Resources: Finance staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	June 30, 2016	Appropriately allocate funds based upon criteria proposed by the committee.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
10.	<p>Reallocation of New Judgeships</p> <p>Assist in the development of a statutory framework that would authorize the Judicial Council to reallocate up to five existing vacant judgeships to areas with the greatest need. In addition, develop a funding methodology for a shift of resources, if necessary.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64.</p> <p>Origin of Project: The Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017 indicates the Administration is proposing to work with the Judicial Council to reallocate up to five vacant superior court judgeships.</p> <p>Resources: Finance and OCR staff</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: 1</p>	August 31, 2016	Appropriate reallocation of up to five vacant judgeships with a funding shift, if necessary.

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

Not applicable. There were no projects identified in the 2015 Annual Agenda.

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups – Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

#	Name and Purpose	Date Formed	Members	Meetings Per Year	Estimated Completion Date
1	2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee	October 2014	7	As needed	Ongoing
	This group reviews and makes recommendations on court supplemental funding requests received in conjunction with the 2% emergency reserve funding process and that relate to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses.				
2	AB 1058 Funding Allocation Subcommittee (New)	June 2015	5*		February 2016
	To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Committee will collaborate with members of Family and Juvenile Law Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services to reconsider the AB 1058 funding allocation methodology developed in 1997 and to report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting. *This is a joint subcommittee and has 10 members in addition to the five from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. Those members are from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the Department of Child Support Services.				
3	Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Subcommittee (New)	June 2015	4*		February 2016
	To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Committee will collaborate with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to review the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel and report back no later than the April 2016 Judicial Council meeting. *This is a joint subcommittee and has six members from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee in addition to the four members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.				
4	Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee	2013	10	2-4	Ongoing
	This group's focus will be funding methodology and allocations relating to criminal justice realignment, specifically Proposition 47 workload.				
5	Fiscal Planning Working Group (New)	July 2015	8	2-4	May 2016

#	Name and Purpose	Date Formed	Members	Meetings Per Year	Estimated Completion Date
	This group will develop fiscal planning and management guidelines, including a proposal to allow a trial court's funds that revert to the Trial Court Trust Fund pursuant to GC 77203 be retained for the benefit of that court for specific one-time costs.				
6	Funding Methodology Subcommittee	July 2013	15	2-4	Ongoing
	This group will continue to focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology approved by the council in April 2013.				
7	Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee	July 2013	14	2-4	Ongoing
	The primary focus of this group is the ongoing review of TCTF and IMF allocations supporting trial court projects and programs as well as any systemic cash flow issues affecting the trial courts.				
8	V3 Case Management System Working Group (New)	April 2015	3*	2-4	June 30, 2019
	This group will identify an alternate funding model for the V3 case management system as the judicial branch subsidies are being phased out by June 30, 2019. *This is a joint working group and has three members from the Judicial Council Technology Committee in addition to the three members from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.				

Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee

Annual Agenda—2016

Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Glenn
Staff:	Mr. Patrick McGrath, Facility Operations Manager, Real Estate and Facilities Management

Advisory Body's Charge: Rule 10.65. Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee

(a) Area of focus

The committee makes recommendations to the council on facilities modifications, maintenance, and operations; environmental services; and utility management.

(b) Additional duties

In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee:

- (1) Makes recommendations to the council on policy issues, business practices, and budget monitoring and control for all facility-related matters in existing branch facilities.
- (2) Makes recommendations to the council on funding and takes additional action in accordance with council policy, both for facility modifications and for operations and maintenance.
- (3) Collaborates with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee in the development of the capital program, including providing input to design standards, prioritization of capital projects, and methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost.
- (4) Provides quarterly and annual reports on the facilities modification program in accordance with the council policy.

(c) Membership

The committee consists of members from the following categories:

- (1) Trial court judges; and
- (2) Court executive officers.

The committee includes the chair and vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, as non-voting members.

Advisory Committee Comment

The Judicial Council policy referred to in the rule is contained in the *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy* adopted by the council.

In the execution of Rule 10.65, the committee oversees and approves a \$65 million budget for facility modification expenditures at California courts.

Advisory Body’s Membership: The committee consists of members from the following categories: Trial court judges and court executive officers. The committee includes the chair and the vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee as non-voting members.

- Chair: Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Glenn (Voting Member)
- Vice-Chair: Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Voting Member)
- Hon. Jennifer K. Rockwell, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento (Voting Member)
- Hon. James L. Stoelker, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara (Voting Member)
- Hon. Vanessa W. Vallarta, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Monterey (Voting Member)
- Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego (Voting Member)
- Ms. Linda Romero Soles, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Merced (Voting Member)
- Ms. Jeanine D. Tucker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne (Voting Member)
- Ms. Christina M. Volkers, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino (Voting Member)
- Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Administrative Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District (Non-voting Member)
- Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara (Non-voting Member)

Subgroups/Working Groups: *N/A*

Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2016:

- Implement Rule 10.65 – *Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee*
- Implement Policy – *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*;
- Implement Charge – *Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge*; and
- Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs.
- Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure
- Implementation and evaluation of an update to the Seismic data set developed during the Transfer Process
- Increase and implement water conservation and energy efficiency efforts and best practices

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) provides continuous review of proposed facility modification projects that have been identified as potential projects by judges, court staff, regional service providers, VFA, Inc., and Judicial Council staff. These potential projects are evaluated by the Judicial Council’s Real Estate and Facilities Management staff and are evaluated using specific criteria pursuant to the Judicial Council policy and then presented for review to the advisory committee.</p> <p>Judicial Council staff and the TCFMAC meet in-person or via teleconference every 30 to 60 days to review the proposed projects. The advisory committee does not always agree with staff recommendations and does not always agree with staff application of specific criteria resulting in the prioritization. The proposed project list is reviewed and upon concurrence of the advisory committee, projects are either approved or denied for execution by staff.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.B and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Capital Programs (CP), and Office of Security (OS).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> 	Ongoing	<p>Facility modifications are reviewed and either accepted or denied by the advisory committee.</p> <p>Approved projects receive funding allocations and then staff executes the projects.</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>TCFMAC provides ongoing oversight to Judicial Branch facilities Operations & Maintenance spending via annual budget allocation approval and re-evaluation as needed throughout the year.</p> <p>The committee also provides recommendations to the Judicial Council on facilities funding-related issues and policies.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Capital Programs (CP), and Office of Security (OS).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs 	Ongoing	Justify the ongoing operations and maintenance expenditures and submit annual budget allocation proposal in addition to policy proposals as needed.
3.	<p>As of December 14, 2012, the advisory committee is responsible for providing ongoing oversight of policy issues related to the operations and maintenance of existing facilities, noncapital-related real estate transactions, energy management, and environmental management and sustainability. Typical duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Judicial Council Preventive Maintenance Plan 	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.B and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Capital Programs (CP), and Office of Security (OS).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> 	Ongoing	Justify the ongoing operating expenses of the Judicial Council’s existing building portfolio and assist the Capital Programs with design input that will reduce the long term operating and maintenance cost of future facilities.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) in the development of the Capital Program with an emphasis on design methods to reduce construction cost without impacting long-term operations and maintenance cost. • Implement an energy management plan that will leverage utility rebates, energy saving materials, and other energy conservation tasks to make the California courts as sustainable as possible. <p>Review and approve Court-Funded Facilities Requests including lease-related costs; allowable court operations expenditures under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court, and other facility improvements that are not allowable court operations expenditures under rule 10.810.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs • Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure • Implementation and evaluation of an update to the Seismic data set developed during the Transfer Process • Increase and implement water conservation and energy efficiency efforts and best practices 		
4.	The advisory committee will submit the following <i>Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Reports</i> to the Judicial Council as information only items:	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>, Section 5.E and <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p>	Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s December 2015 (Q1), February 2016 (Q2),	Provide an information only report to the Judicial Council detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2015–2016</i> in December 2015. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of July 2015, August 2015, and September 2015. • <i>Quarter 2 of Fiscal Year 2015–2016</i> in February 2016. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of October 2015, November 2015, and December 2015. • <i>Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2015–2016</i> in June 2016. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of January 2016, February 2016, and March 2016. • <i>Quarter 4 of Fiscal Year 2015–2016</i> in August 2016. The report will summarize actions taken by the advisory committee for the months of April 2016, May 2016, and June 2016. 		<p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> 	June 2016 (Q3), and August 2016 (Q4) meetings.	funding in the specified quarter.
5.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year</i>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.C and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p>	Submittal planned for the Judicial Council’s July 2016 meeting	Request the Judicial Council review the facility modification and operations and maintenance budget

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	2016–2017 to the Judicial Council as an action item in July 2016.		<p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs 		report for fiscal year 2016-2017. If approved, staff will implement the budget.
6.	The advisory committee will submit the <i>Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2015-2016</i> to the Judicial Council as an information only item in December 2016.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy, Section 5.C and Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group Charge</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council direction</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), Judicial Council Support Services (JCSS), and Editing/Graphics Group (EGG).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> 	Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council’s December 2016 meeting	Provide the Judicial Council a report detailing the advisory committee’s activities and a list of projects authorized for funding from the past fiscal year.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs		
7.	Develop and propose concepts for consideration for the branch Budget Change Proposals (BCPs). Submittal to the Judicial Council in July 2016.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Operational Plan Objective</p> <p>Origin of Project: To be proposed by REFM management team</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), and Capital Programs (CP)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Increase legislative and executive branch understanding of trial court facility operations and funding needs 	Planned for submittal to the Judicial Council’s July 2016 meeting	Increase funding allocations for the facility modification and operations and maintenance programs.
8.	Finalize the Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: Operational Plan Objective</p> <p>Origin of Project: To be proposed by Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM), and Legal Services (LSO)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p>	To be completed before July 2016	Update guidelines to align with updated Facility Modification Policy.

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure 		
9.	Update the CFR procedure to increase the allowable expenditure threshold for Small Project Work.	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: <i>Court-Funded Facilities Requests Procedure</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: To be proposed by Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)</p> <p>Resources: Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Rule 10.65 – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee</i> • Implement Policy – <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> • Implement Charge – <i>Trial Court Facility Modification Working Group Charge</i> • Revise TCFMAC Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure 		

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Advisory Committee Meetings	Ongoing
2	Operations and Maintenance Oversight	Ongoing
3	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 1 of Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on February 19, 2015
4	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 2 of Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on April 17, 2015
5	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on June 26, 2015
6	Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 4 of Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on August 21, 2015
7	Court Facilities: Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications and Planning in Fiscal Year 2015-2016	Judicial Council reviewed and approved the budget report on August 20, 2015
8	Court Facilities: Annual Report of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Report submitted to Judicial Council as information only item on December 11, 2015
9	Budget: Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget Requests for Trial Court Facilities Operations Needs	Completed August 20, 2015, results from DOF pending January 2016 release of Gov't budget
10	Status finalization of the Trial Court Facility Maintenance Pilot Program	Completed as of July 7, 2015. Results reported to the council as part of FY 14-15 Annual Report on December 11, 2015.
11	Finalization of the Implementation Guideline for the Facility Modification Policy and Court Funded Request Procedure	Coordination with Legal Services; project completion extended to July 2016

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups: <i>N/A</i>

Workload Assessment Advisory Committee

DRAFT Annual Agenda—2016

Approved by E&P: _____

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Lorna Alksne
Staff:	Deana Farole, Court Operations Services, Office of Court Research
Advisory Body's Charge: The committee makes recommendations to the council on judicial administration standards and measures that provide for the equitable allocation of resources across courts to promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. The committee must recommend: (1)Improvements to performance measures and implementation plans and any modifications to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study Model; (2)Processes, study design, and methodologies that should be used to measure and report on court administration; and (3)Studies and analyses to update and amend case weights through time studies, focus groups, or other methods.	
Advisory Body's Membership: 16 members: 8 judicial officers, 8 court executives	
Subgroups/Working Groups: AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee (with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee)	
Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2016: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct the staff workload study update and develop preliminary caseweights.• Complete and submit mandated reports to the legislature on judicial needs and standards and measures of judicial administration.	

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Staff workload study update. The update will consist of a time study of a sample of trial courts and is intended to update the caseweights and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload need. The committee's work in 2016 will consist of training participating courts on data collection, fielding the staff time study, preliminary data analysis, review and validation of data with study courts, supplemental data collection, and holding Delphi sessions to make adjustments to draft caseweights.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: In February 2013, the Judicial Council approved the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by council staff as the data become available. The need for regular updates to the workload model has become more urgent now that RAS is used as the foundation piece of the model used to allocate trial court funding (WAFM).</p> <p>Origin of Project: The SB 56 Working Group was formed in 2009 at the direction of the Administrative Director to provide trial court input and oversight to the Office of Court Research in its ongoing work to revise and improve the workload estimates for judges and court staff. In October 2013, the advisory committee voted to update the studies every 5 years, as</p>	Ongoing through spring 2017	Updated caseweights to measure trial court staff workload. These caseweights are used to estimate trial court staff need, which is then used for WAFM.

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

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

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			<p>resources permit. In December 2013, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to establish the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee to succeed the SB 56 Working Group and to continue its work. In April 2014, the committee was renamed to the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC).</p> <p>Resources: 0.25 FTE Manager, 0.75 FTE Supervising Analyst, 1.5 FTE Senior Analyst, 1.0 FTE Analyst, 0.5 FTE Associate Analyst (existing staff); IT support to create web-based data collection interface (existing staff); subject matter expert consultants from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts and Criminal Justice Services (existing staff).</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #1</p>		
2.	To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will collaborate with members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload	1	Judicial Council Direction: At its April 17, 2015 meeting, the Judicial Council received and approved a recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Advisory Committee to form a joint subcommittee to study the AB 1058 funding methodology. The Judicial Council received a report	Workload-based funding methodology to be implemented no later than fiscal year 2018-2019.	The subcommittee will provide recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding updating the AB 1058 funding methodology.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997. The subcommittee will coordinate with the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on its program review and develop a workload-based funding methodology for implementation no later than fiscal year 2018-2019.</p>		<p>from the joint subcommittee at its February 26, 2016, meeting and approved a recommendation to reconstitute the joint subcommittee to allow for more time to consider different funding methodology options and coordinate with DCSS on its program review.</p> <p>Origin of Project: The AB 1058 funding methodology was first established in 1997 and has not since been updated. In reviewing the proposed midyear funding reallocations, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee acknowledge the need to reexamine the funding methodology to account for “the myriad of factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year.”</p> <p>Resources: 0.25 FTE Supervising Analyst (existing resources); CFCC staff (existing resources); Finance staff (existing resources)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: N/A (WAAC is acting in a consulting role</p>		

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
			and the key objective rests with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.)		
3.	Update the Judicial Needs Assessment: this project involves using updated filings data to project the need for judicial officers. Biennial updates in even-numbered years are required by Government Code Section 61614(c)(1).	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: The methodology for determining the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts was approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001 and modified and approved by the council in August 2004 and December 2011. The methodology was incorporated into statute in 2006 (Stats. 2006, ch. 390).</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code Section 61614(c)(1) requires the Judicial Council to prepare biennial updates of the Judicial Needs Assessment in even-numbered years.</p> <p>Resources: 0.10 FTE Manager or Analyst (existing resources)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #2</p>	Fall 2016	Report to Legislature, Judicial Council presentation (October 2016)
4.	Prepare report to legislature on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. Annual reports are required	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction: The Judicial Council must approve this statutorily mandated report before it is transmitted to the legislature.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Government Code Section 77001.5 requires the Judicial</p>	Fall 2016	Judicial Council report (October 2016) and Report to Legislature

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	pursuant to Government Code Section 77001.5.		<p>Council to report to the legislature annually on judicial administration standards and measures.</p> <p>Resources: 0.25 FTE Associate Analyst (existing resources)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #2</p>		

III. STATUS OF 2015 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2015 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Staff workload study update. The update will consist of a time study of a sample of trial courts and is intended to update the caseweights and other model parameters that are used to estimate workload need. The committee's work in 2015 will consist of discussing the study parameters and methodology, advising council staff on and assisting with recruitment of courts to participate in the study, and directing council staff to finalize updates of the data collection instruments in preparation for launch of the time study in early 2016.	Work on the staff workload study update will be ongoing through spring 2017. Recruitment is complete and 15 courts have committed to participating in the study. The data collection instruments have been revised, reviewed by court subject matter experts, and finalized. As of March 2016, the staff time study is in progress.
2	Convene Special Circumstances Subcommittee to study the impact of special circumstances cases on the felony caseweight and make recommendations to the full committee on how to handle such cases.	The subcommittee completed its work and reported back to the full committee at its August 27, 2015, meeting. The committee voted not to develop a special circumstances caseweight at this time, but to use the subcommittee's work to inform closer study of the associated workload in the 2016 update of the staff workload study.

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
3	<p>Improve data quality of filings data in the RAS categories, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with courts to ensure that data are reported in all of the RAS casetype categories • Evaluate court reporting practices for filings data to ensure they meet current JBSIS standards; update and clarify JBSIS standards as needed • Develop different possibilities for validating the filings data used in the RAS model, including establishing a data auditing process for filings data. <p>This project is a partnership with the Court Executives Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>All reporting of filings data has been aligned with the RAS casetype categories. The JBSIS working group will wrap up its work in 2016 and report back to CEAC, though it is expected that there will be ongoing work to update and clarify JBSIS standards as new issues arise. In November 2015, Office of Court Research staff provided CEAC with an update laying out options for a data auditing or validation program and CEAC will be considering those options in 2016. Office of Court Research staff will coordinate to provide WAAC with any needed updates on CEAC's efforts in this area.</p>
4	<p>To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will collaborate with members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting. [Note: This item was not initially on WAAC's annual agenda. It was added pursuant to council action on a report from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee in April 2015 and the amended agenda was approved in June.]</p>	<p>The subcommittee voted on its final recommendations in November 2015, which included not changing the AB 1058 allocation methodology at this time and coordinating with DCSS on its two-year program review and parallel process of reassessing funding allocations, as well as retooling the midyear reallocation process so it's done earlier in the year and helps to ensure more efficient use of funding. WAAC met in December to review and provide feedback on the subcommittee's recommendations for the purposes of the February 2016 report to the Judicial Council. WAAC voted in support of the subcommittee's recommendations and committed to further study of AB 1058 issues through the staff workload study update, to assist the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee with data that may be useful in its ongoing work with DCSS. At the February 2016 meeting, the Judicial Council voted to reconstitute the joint subcommittee to allow more time to consider different funding methodology options and coordinate with DCSS on its program review.</p>

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
5	<p>Develop an interim caseweight for complex civil cases, applying it to paid complex civil case fee filings, for the purposes of FY 2015-16 budget allocations. For future budget cycles, review the validity of the weighting and propose a long-term solution. [Note: This item was not initially on WAAC's annual agenda. It was added pursuant to council action on a report from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee in April 2015 and the amended agenda was approved in June.]</p>	<p>The Judicial Council approved the committee's recommendation to establish an interim caseweight of 2,271 minutes at its June 26, 2015, meeting. The data collection instruments for the update of the staff workload study have been revised to more specifically capture the workload in complex civil cases and a long-term solution will be proposed upon review and analysis of the new data.</p>

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

Subgroup or working group name: AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To reconsider the AB 1058 allocation methodology developed in 1997, with an eye to the myriad of factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 4

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 6 members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, 6 members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, 1 representative of the Department of Child Support Services, additional advisory members (Child Support Commissioners and Family Law Facilitators) TBD

Date formed: Initially formed 4/17/15; reconstituted 2/26/16.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Meetings had been occurring approximately once every two to three months; meeting frequency TBD for ongoing work.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: A workload-based funding methodology is to be developed for implementation no later than fiscal year 2018-2019.