



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 OPEN MEETING

February 13, 2019
12:10 to 1:10 p.m.
Conference Call

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marla O. Anderson (Vice-chair), Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie, Hon. Samuel K. Feng, Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Hon. Gary Nadler, Mr. Patrick M. Kelly, and Ms. Gretchen Nelson

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Douglas P. Miller (Chair), Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, and Hon. David M. Rubin

Committee Staff Present: Ms. Amber Barnett, Ms. Roma Cheadle, and Mr. Cliff Alumno

Staff Present: Mr. Cliff Alumno, Ms. Karene Alvarado, Ms. Deborah Brown, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Mr. Mike Courtney, Ms. Penny Davis, Mr. Douglas Denton, Ms. Marcela Eggleton, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Sarah Fleischer-Ihn, Mr. Michael Giden, Mr. Jason Haas, Mr. Greg Keil, Ms. Seung Lee, Mr. Chris Magnusson, Ms. Anna L. Maves, Ms. Susan McMullan, Ms. Donna Newman, Ms. Melissa Ng, Ms. Kara Portnow, Ms. Anne M. Ronan, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Mr. Brian Simeroth, Mr. Gary Slossberg, Ms. Laura Speed, Ms. Sonya Tafoya, and Ms. Josely Yangco-Fronza

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the following draft minutes:

- December 13, 2018, Executive and Planning Committee meeting; and
- December 14, 2018, Executive and Planning Committee action-by-e-mail.

Action: *The committee approved the draft minutes listed above.*

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Court Facilities: Revised *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy* (Action Required)

The committee reviewed the revised *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*.

Action: *The committee approved the revised *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*.*

Item 2

Agenda Setting for March 15, 2019, Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)

The committee reviewed available draft reports for the Judicial Council meeting in March.

Action: The committee set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in March by approving reports for placement on the business meeting agenda.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Approved by the committee on [insert date].

DRAFT



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 (OPEN AND CLOSED ITEMS)

Tuesday, March 5, 2019
1:45 p.m.

Advisory Body Members Who Participated: Hon. Douglas P. Miller (Chair), Hon. Marla O. Anderson (Vice-chair), Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie, Hon. Samuel K. Feng, Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Mr. Patrick M. Kelly, Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, Hon. Gary Nadler, Ms. Gretchen Nelson, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Hon. David M. Rubin

Advisory Body Members Who Did Not Participate: None

Committee Staff: Amber Barnett and Cliff Alumno

ACTION BY E-MAIL

The chair concluded that prompt action was required; therefore, in accordance with rule 10.75(o)(2) of the California Rules of Court, written public comment was not accepted on the proposed action.

OPEN DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

Item 1

Agenda Setting for March 15, 2019, Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)

The committee reviewed available draft reports for the Judicial Council meeting in March.

Action: *The committee set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in March by approving reports for placement on the business meeting agenda.*

CLOSED ITEM

Item A

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

Recommendation for a Statutorily Mandated Appointment by the Judicial Council

Review materials for the statutorily mandated appointment by the Judicial Council.

Action: *The committee developed its recommendation for the Judicial Council regarding the statutorily mandated appointment.*

CLOSURE OF ACTION

The action by e-mail concluded on Tuesday, March 5, 2019, at 4:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on [insert date].

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Richard Vlavianos, Chair, Judge, Superior Court of San Joaquin County Hon. Rogelio Flores (Ret.) Vice-Chair, Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Francine Byrne, Principal Manager, Criminal Justice Services Ms. Carrie Zoller, Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.56 of the California Rules of Court charges the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee (CJCAC) 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, mental health 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 Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee;4. Advise the council of potential funding sources;5. Make recommendations regarding grant funding programs that are administered by the Judicial Council staff for drug courts and other treatment courts; and,6. Recommend appropriate outreach activities needed to support collaborative justice courts. <p>The committee currently has 24 members (nine 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</p>	

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

representative from the mental health field, one social services representative, one non-profit community organization representative, and three public members). The attached term of services chart provides the composition of the committee.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

1. Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee
2. Mental Health Subcommittee
3. Veterans in the Courts and Military Families Subcommittee

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Amend form MIL-100, Notification of Military Service	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Amend the Notification of Military Service form to better meet the requirements of Penal Code section 858, which requires judicial officers to notify defendants at arraignment that there are certain provisions of law specifically designed for individuals who have active duty or veteran status and who have been charged with a crime. Primary reasons to amend the form includes title clarification, to include veterans and address issues of form usability, especially in non-criminal case types. Project supports ongoing project/activity # 6.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Form revision effective date January 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Department of Veterans Affairs, California State Legislature, local courts, justice system partners, and public.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Veterans in the Courts and Military Families Subcommittee</p>		
2.	Project Title: Develop and Implement the Behavioral Health Education Series, a series of 8–10 webinars or other educational sessions on mental health, substance abuse, collaborative justice courts, and relevant legislation	Priority 1⁴

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
	<p>Project Summary: This project was initiated in response to courts’ requests for increased training on mental health and substance abuse and will provide educational sessions through webinars, podcasts and/or in- person meetings. The sessions are geared towards judicial officers, court staff, and justice system partners. Educational series topics include working with court users with serious mental health disorders, collaborative court principles and practices, and effective practices in drug and mental health treatment. Additional information can be found using this link. Project supports ongoing project/activity # 1 and 5.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 8–10 webinar/education sessions will be completed by January 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Resources may include consultation with Judicial Council staff from the Center for Judicial Education and Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Local trial courts and justice system partners, Council on Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health, California Department of State Hospitals.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
3.	<p>Project Title: Assist in Court Implementation of Mental Health Diversion Programs as set forth in AB 1810 (Pen. Codes §§1001.35 and 1001.36)</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
	<p>Project Summary: Penal Code sections 1001.35 and 1001.36 establish mental health diversion for eligible criminal defendants with mental health disorders. Support will be provided through 2–3 in-person regional summits to be held in conjunction with the Behavioral Health Education Series to address implementation and procedural issues. This project supports ongoing activities/projects #1, 5 and 6.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2–3 regional trainings will be completed by September 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Minimal fiscal impact. CJCAC members will provide court space and logistic support.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Local trial courts and justice system partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
4.	Project Title: Effective Practices in Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts: Juvenile Collaborative Court Briefing; Girls' Court Study; STAR Court Evaluation	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Project will identify the efficacy of applied collaborative court principles in juvenile court, by preparing an overview of current findings for collaborative courts in multiple types of juvenile collaborative courts, and by conducting original studies on innovative, emerging court types addressing human trafficking cases in juvenile court. The studies include a descriptive study of Girls' Courts and an evaluation of the STAR Court in Los Angeles, one of the first such courts in the state. The committee will provide guidance identifying issues of relevance and review the report. The projects fulfill the committee charge and JCC partnerships with policymaking bodies, including the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission and the Child Welfare Council's Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team Committee. This project supports ongoing projects/activities #4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Project completion date: December 2019</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health. No additional fiscal impact to Judicial Council staffing is anticipated.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Violence Against Women Project, Trial Courts, Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission, the Child Welfare Council's Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team Committee</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP)</p>		
5.	Project Title: Act as Resource to Identify Challenges and Opportunities Related to Developing Pretrial Release Responses for Defendants with Behavioral Health Issues	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Upon request, the committee will act as a resource to ensure that the unique needs and challenges of arrested individuals with mental health and substance abuse issues are considered when pretrial programs are implemented.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing through December 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Justice system partners.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> Mental Health Subcommittee.	
6.	<i>Project Title:</i> Create a Homeless Courts Blueprint	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Project will involve preparing an overview of homeless court program models, highlighting examples of successful homeless courts, and providing guidance on strategies and factors to consider when starting or expanding a homeless court. This project supports the ongoing projects/activities #4 and 5.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> The guide will be completed by the fall of 2019.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health. No additional fiscal impact to Judicial Council staffing is anticipated.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include judges and court staff, the ABA Commission on Homelessness and Poverty, justice partners, and the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Mental Health Subcommittee, Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee, and Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
7.	<i>Project Title:</i> Identify Effective Practices and Policy Options to Address Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) Cases.	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> This project focuses on identifying and documenting existing and promising practices related to adult Incompetent to Stand Trial cases and competency evaluations. Judicial Council staff surveyed and/or interviewed key stakeholders in local jurisdictions to identify current processes and challenges, as well as local solutions and feasibility of technological solutions. This project supports ongoing activities/projects #1 and 5.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Survey results will be analyzed and distributed to the CJCAC in early 2019. Project findings will inform next steps for information distribution and possible action items.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: JCC staff resources noted above, local trial courts, policymakers, Council for Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health, and Department of State Hospitals.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Mental Health Subcommittee.</p>	
8.	<p>Project Title: Implementation of Legislation Regarding Juvenile Competency Evaluations</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
<p>Project Summary: This joint project with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee implements the Rule of Court changes required by passage of AB 1214, which mandated the Judicial Council to adopt a rule of court identifying the training and experience needed for an expert to be competent in forensic evaluations of juveniles, as well as adopt rules for the implementation of the other requirements in this subdivision. This project supports ongoing activities/projects #1 and 7.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Rule of Court revision effective date: January 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Legislatively mandated partners include judges, defense counsel, district attorneys, chief probation officers, counties, advocates for people with developmental and mental disabilities, experts in special education testing, psychologists and psychiatrists specializing in adolescents, professional associations and accredited bodies for psychologists and psychiatrists, and other interested stakeholders.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Joint working group with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		
9.	<p>Project Title: Propose Standards of Judicial Administration that Define Collaborative Courts and Update Current Standards Related to Drug Court Diversion</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
<p>Project Summary: California’s Standards of Judicial Administration regarding collaborative and drug courts will be updated to reflect changes in criminal law and collaborative court practices following changes in criminal justice policy including Public Safety Realignment and Proposition 47. The Committee will review current standards (Standard 4.10), as well as existing national standards, and propose revisions to existing standards or new standards to define adult and juvenile collaborative courts in order to provide clear guidance to trial courts regarding the definitions and effective practices in these courts. This project supports ongoing activity/project #5.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> March 2019, deadline to complete proposal draft.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts and justice partners.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Criminal Law Advisory Committee and Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
10.	<p>Project Title: Conduct Study of Veterans and Veterans Treatment Court as Directed by Senate Bill 339</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> As directed by SB 339, continue work on a statewide study of Veterans and Veterans Treatment Courts (VTC) that includes a survey of VTCs that are currently in operation as well as an assessment of counties that do not operate VTCs. The study will evaluate the impact of VTCs on a number of outcomes for veterans including but not limited to recidivism, mental health and substance use disorders, and employment outcomes. In addition, the study will include an assessment of counties that do not operate VTCs and identify barriers to program implementation. The study will also explore the scope of court processing for veterans in a traditional criminal court setting, veterans’ diversion program, and/or veterans’ tracks within other collaborative court programs to address the needs of veterans in the criminal justice system. The committee will provide guidance identifying issues of relevance and reviewing report. Project supports ongoing project/activity #4, 5, and 6.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Project completion date: June 2020.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Project is supported by funding provided to the Judicial Council specifically for the completion of this project. Resources will include council staff from Governmental Affairs.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Department of Veterans Affairs, California State Legislature, local courts, justice system partners, and public.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	<p>Project Title: Mental Health: Continued Implementation of Assigned Recommendations of Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force and Identification of Priority Issues and Best Practices in Mental Health</p>	<p><i>Priority 1</i></p>
<p>Project Summary: Review the recommendations from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force (MHIITF) that were identified as within Judicial Council purview and in need of continuing work for implementation, and were assigned, individually or in collaboration with other Judicial Council advisory bodies, to the CJCAC. The recommendations may be found at this link.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing development and active implementation in coordination with advisory committees that are also assigned to review and work on the recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13, 16: Mental health protocols/information sharing; Encourage collaborative justice courts for MH issues/local protocols for MH CJ courts; - 21: Video based linkages; - 28, 36, 65 (Recommendations related Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) issues): Dedicated competency calendars; legislative work to give judicial officers hearing competency matters access to a variety of alternative procedural and dispositional tools; JOs should avoid fixed sentences that mandate state prison for probation violations for offenders with mental illness; - 95, 96: Experts in juvenile law, psychology, and psychiatry should further study the issue of juvenile competence; Existing legislation should be modified, or new legislation should be created to refine definitions of competency to stand trial for juveniles in delinquency matters and outline legal procedures and processes; - 97: Youth exiting the juvenile delinquency system should receive appropriate reentry and aftercare services; - 107: Education and training related to juvenile development, mental health issues, co-occurring disorders, developmental disabilities, special education, and cultural competency related to these topics should be provided to all judicial officers, et al.; - 111: Assessments and evaluations of the current data, processes, and outcomes of juvenile competence to stand trial in California should be conducted; and, - 132: California Courts website should include links to national and international research on collaborative justice and mental health issues, information regarding mental health court and calendar best practices, and subject matter experts available to assist the courts. • Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding mental health in areas such legislation tracking, and continued support for education, research, and the improved dissemination of information including increasing the accessibility and relevancy of mental health resources on the Judicial Council website, including resources for judicial officers and other 		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>court staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist in identifying emerging issues and needs for litigants with mental health issues, such as accommodation needs, issues related to incompetence to stand trial, and confidentiality. Identify opportunities for collaboration with mental health initiatives and programs (e.g., Stepping Up Initiative). <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health. Council staff from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts and Criminal Justice Services will work with Legal Services and CJER staff, as appropriate.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts and California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Mental Health Subcommittee, Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee; and Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee.</p>	
2.	Project Title: Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocations	Priority 1
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Make recommendations to, and carry out the directives of the Judicial Council regarding allocations and administration of the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant (SAFG), a legislatively mandated grant program, 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report to the Judicial Council on grant activities. Recommend to the Judicial Council grant allocations to local courts based on the Judicial Council approved allocation methodology; Review biannual reports regarding funding distribution, invoicing, and deliverables reports from local courts; Recommend methods of allocation and grants administration for next annual funding cycle; and, Identify methods to increase funding through the SAFG program. <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Funded through external earmarked funding for collaborative and drug courts. Resources include council staff from the Judicial Council’s Branch Accounting and Procurement.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
3.	<p>Project Title: Parolee Reentry Court Grant Program</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
	<p>Project Summary: Continue the work of the Parolee Reentry Court program that distributes approximately \$1.1 million from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) through the Judicial Council to six parolee reentry courts. Funding for the project is reevaluated annually by CDCR. This project will involve the identification of potential longer term, ongoing funding to assist parolee reentry courts in program planning in future years.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Current funding will expire June 30, 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Approximately \$1.1 is allocated to the courts and judicial council to implement the program. Resources include council staff from Branch Accounting and Procurement.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Local courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
4.	<p>Project Title: Assist Local Courts to Obtain Funding and In-kind Assistance, such as Federal or State Grants for Local Collaborative Court Projects</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
	<p>Project Summary: Distribute information on grants and other funding opportunities and assist local courts, upon their request, to obtain funding and other assistance for local collaborative court projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify funding and support efforts to increase funding for courts in collaboration with partners that may include, but are not limited to, the California State Legislature, California Office of Traffic Safety, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services 	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle; and, • 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 meetings to assist local courts in seeking local, federal, and private funding. <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Increases funding for local courts; Judicial Council staff resources partially funded by external earmarked funds for Collaborative and Drug Courts. Additional resources include council staff from Governmental Affairs.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local collaborative courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, Homeless Court Network, National Center for State Courts, and Center for Court Innovation.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>	
5.	<p>Project Title: Conduct Multidisciplinary Education to Support Effective Practices and Beneficial Outcomes in Collaborative Courts. Identify and Distribute Information on New or Pending Policy Changes</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>
	<p>Project Summary Continue execution of a multi-prong outreach, educational and training approach that supports the development of effective practices and beneficial outcomes in collaborative courts. Outreach activities include notifying collaborative courts of policy changes that may be of impact (such as Proposition 47, mental health or competency issues, legalization of marijuana, diversion, or human trafficking, etc.) and identifying promising practices developed in response to the change. Educational and training activities include developing educational recommendations and assisting in implementation of judicial and multi-disciplinary education curricula in areas related to collaborative justice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to create, in consultation/collaboration with Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), in-person and virtual trainings and educational materials in topic areas relevant to collaborative court programs such as best practices for high risk/high need cases, mental health, substance use disorders and treatment access for adults and youth, veterans and military families, military sexual trauma, reentry, human trafficking, and relevant policy/legislative changes. 	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to collaborative with justice system partners on training activities. Partners may include, but are not limited to, California Association of Collaborative Courts (CACC), National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP, NDCI, NCDC, Justice for Vets), the California Association of Youth Courts (CAYC), the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), the Department of Veterans Affairs, California Judges Association (CJA), and the American Bar Association (ABA), Commission on Homelessness and Poverty, and ABA Judicial Committee on Human Trafficking. • Continue to work with the CJER Advisory Committee to make recommendations for and assist in implementation of judicial and multidisciplinary education curricula in the area of collaborative justice. This includes providing guidance to committee staff regarding preparation of collaborative justice related educational toolkits and job aids and identification of faculty. • Continue to distribute information on effective practices through regular webinars, and hosting listservs for collaborative court and mental health professionals. <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Provides distance and in person education for local courts at reduced cost; provides information regarding effective/efficient court practices to reduce case processing costs and recidivism. Resources include council staff from Public Affairs and CJER.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts, State Bar, Department of Veterans Affairs, California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, Homeless Court Network, National Drug Court Institute, Center for Court Innovation, and National Center for State Courts</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> CJER Advisory Committee and curriculum committees in criminal law, family and juvenile law, and probate and mental health law.</p>	
6.	<i>Project Title: Veterans and Military Families: Identify Priority Issues and Best Practices</i>	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding Veterans and Military Families in areas such as legislation tracking, continued implementation of the MIL-100 form, and continued support for education, research, and the improved dissemination of information as outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track and review proposed legislation regarding court involved veterans and military families; 	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work toward implementing legislation and develop education job aids involving court involved veterans and military families in judicial education programs, including development of a script to assist judicial officers to meet the mandates of Penal Code section 858 to inform criminal litigants of their rights at arraignment and under Penal Code sections 1170.9 and 1179.91, and of the availability of the MIL-100 form. • 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 in the courts, such as implementation of Penal Code sections 1001.3, 1001.80, 1170.9, and 1170.91; 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; • In collaboration/communication with CJER and the CJER Advisory Committee or relevant judicial education educational programs, assist in implementation of educational programs through organizations of panels, identification of faculty, and content review for educational programs, such as Military Families and Veterans Court programs at the Juvenile Law Institute and Family Law Institute. Provide guidance to committee staff during each stage of content development, dissemination, and review; • Provide advisement and review to ensure an up to date and publicly accessible roster of Veterans Treatment Courts is maintained; • In coordination with the California Lawyers Association, the State Bar, ABA, Department of Veterans Affairs, Federal Department of Defense, California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet), local Veterans’ agencies, Veterans’ advocacy groups, county bar organizations, researchers, veterans’ groups and homeless groups follow trends and developments regarding court involved veterans’ and military families; • Research and provide information on the website related to best practices for addressing the needs of women veterans and military families (i.e., domestic violence) in our courts to improve treatment and case processing outcomes; and, • Seek opportunities to leverage statewide and national resources to assist in developing a statewide strategic plan for veterans’ treatment courts <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Staff partially funded through external earmarked funding for collaborative and drug courts.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and Center for Court Innovation</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee, Mental Health Subcommittee, and CJER Advisory Committee.	
7.	<i>Project Title: Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts: Identify Priority Issues and Best Practices</i>	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> 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 efforts to address juvenile competency through legislation and implementation of policy changes in this area. Continue work in support of youth and peer courts, including developing a Youth Court Toolkit, holding the annual Youth Summit in partnership with the California Association of Youth Courts, and hold youth court roundtables to provide local assistance to courts seeking to implement or improve their peer court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to provide subject matter expertise and guidance to committee staff in developing and maintaining updates of briefing papers on evidence-based practices on assessments, girls’ court, and human trafficking, including a briefing on juvenile collaborative court models; • Provide subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with staff to other groups in the area of human trafficking; • Continue to provide subject matter expertise on educational and training programs that focus on substance use disorders and enhanced educational support in delinquency and dependency cases; • 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 Advisory Committee, and the Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP) Planning Committee; • 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 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 Advisory 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. Continue support of the child welfare system and dependency drug courts by exploring the issue of women in prison and the impact of parental incarceration on children; 	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide education and technical assistance in the area of the needs of homeless youth; and • Holding a youth court track at the biennial Beyond the Bench conference for youth and adults. <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Funded through external earmarked funding for collaborative and drug courts.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee, Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee, Mental Health Subcommittee, and CJER Advisory Committee</p>	
8.	<i>Project Title:</i> Non-criminal Mental Health Cases	<i>Priority 2</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Continue to identify and address mental health issues through application of collaborative court principles in noncriminal case types, including civil, probate, family, and juvenile, including supporting courts seeking to implement Family Law Treatment Courts.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Funded through external earmarked funding for mental health. Resources include council staff from Budget Services.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Veterans Courts and Military Families Subcommittee, Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee, Mental Health Subcommittee, and Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Prioritized and implemented recommendations from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force as noted below, identifying Incompetent to Stand Trial cases in both adult and juvenile courts as a priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assigned MHIITF completed and implemented recommendations: 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, 67, 90, 93, 94, 96, 108, 109, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 124, 131 • Deferring until such time resources allow initiation of recommendation, or if out of purview, referring to partner agencies: 1, 14, 15, 18, 21, 37, 38, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66, 71,72, 26, 80, 84, 89, 92, 94, 99, 101, 102, 103, 106, 113, 134
2.	<p>In conjunction with the American Bar Association, co-hosted a summit on Homeless Courts. This national summit was attended by 110 judges, attorneys, court personnel, service providers, advocates, and individuals with lived experience from 13 states. Participants shared views and experiences and developed plans to help overcome the challenges faced by homeless courts. As part of the summit, participants also had an opportunity to attend a convening of the homeless court in San Diego and meet with the staff involved with that court.</p>
3.	<p>Held a Veterans and Military Families Summit that was attended by approximately 70 judicial officers, court staff, veteran mentors, court teams, and partners involved in veterans’ courts. This event was at capacity and had a waitlist of those who had hoped to be able to attend. Topics included issues in starting or expanding veterans treatment courts, meeting the needs of female veterans, military sexual trauma, and the effective use of mentors.</p>
4.	<p>Hosted the Annual Youth Court Summit. Themed “Uniting Together to Lead Tomorrow” the Summit was held at Sonoma State University and attended by nearly 250 youth and adults. Held in partnership with the California Association, this year’s summit featured discussions on topics such as criminal justice reform, creative sentencing options, brain development, and ways for youth to make social impacts and change.</p>
5.	<p>Partnered with the California Association of Collaborative Courts on their annual conference to provide educational programs for judicial officers, collaborative court coordinators, court staff and partners. Over 400 representatives from the trial courts and justice system partners were in attendance. Held a Youth Court Regional Roundtable at the California Association of Collaborative Courts annual conference for the purpose of training court staff and community leaders on how to create a youth court in their jurisdiction.</p>
6.	<p>Supported the development of the Behavioral Health Education series. The first two webinars had over one hundred live participants. Launched behavioral health resource page that provides webinar materials as well as national and local resources related to mental health, substance abuse and the courts.</p>
7.	<p>In partnership with the California Association of Collaborative Courts, set agenda and hosted two in person meetings of the drug court coordinator working group to discuss topics relevant to collaborative courts including new legislation, substance abuse and mental health training needs, and program sustainability. Nearly 100 people representing 40+ jurisdictions participated in the meetings.</p>

Tribal Court–State Court Forum
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Abby Abinanti, Chief Judge, Yurok Tribal Court Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado
Lead Staff:	Ms. Ann Gilmour, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Committee’s Charge/Membership:	
<p>Rule 10.60 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Tribal Court–State Court Forum (Forum), which is to make 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 overlap. Rule 10.60 (b) sets forth additional duties of the Forum.</p>	
<p>The Forum currently has 30 members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourteen tribal court judges (nominated by their tribal leadership, representing 20 of the 23 tribal courts currently operating in California; these courts serve approximately 36 tribes) • The Governor’s Tribal Advisor • The Director of the California Department of Social Services Office of Tribal Affairs. • One appellate justice. • Seven chairs or their designees of the following Judicial Council advisory committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness ○ Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research ○ 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 	

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

- Five trial court judicial officers.
- One retired judge (advisory)

The current [roster](#) is available on the committee's web page.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

- Participate in the joint ad hoc rules and forms subcommittee to implement Tactical Plan for Technology, 2017–2018.
- Subcommittee on the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) to review and respond to California ICWA Compliance Task Force Report (ongoing project #1) and federal *Regulations for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings* and *Guidelines for Implementing the Indian Child Welfare Act* enacted in 2016 and AB 3176 *Indian Children* (Waldron; 2018 Chaptered as 833) (ongoing project #2), 2018–2019.

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Implement Assembly Bill 3176 Indian Children (Waldron; Stats. 2018, ch. 833)	Priority: 1b⁴
<p>Project Summary: AB 3176 <i>Indian Children</i>, amends provisions of the <i>Welfare and Institutions Code</i> to conform California law to the requirements of the federal Indian Child Welfare Act Regulations and Guidelines adopted in 2016. The legislation directs the Judicial Council to enact rules and forms necessary to implement the legislation.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The Forum will work with staff and other relevant committees to make recommendations for Rules and Forms revisions to the Judicial Council during the Spring RUPRO cycle for an effective date of January 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council’s Center for Family, Children & the Courts (CFCC), Governmental Affairs, Legal Services, and Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the California Department of Social Services, the California Attorney General’s Office and the California Tribal Families Coalition.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, with respect to recommendations that impact the work of those bodies.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
2.	Project Title: Revise ICWA Rules and Forms to Comply with Court of Appeal Decisions in <i>In re E.H.</i> (D073635) and <i>In re. J.Y.</i> (C082548), and Make Any Other Technical Amendments as Appropriate	Priority: 1a
<p>Project Summary: While implementing AB 3176 above, the Forum will also incorporate amendments and revisions to ICWA rules and forms required by the Court of Appeal decision in <i>In re. E.H.</i> suggested that the ICWA-030 should be revised to conform with requirements to include all available lineal descendancy information relevant to the possible Indian status of a child. The decision in <i>In re. J.Y.</i> finds that California Rule of Court, rule 5.725(e) implementing Tribal Customary Adoption is inconsistent with statute and suggests the Judicial Council amend it. Finally, additional technical revisions to ICWA rules and forms that have been suggested by users, courts, and others since a comprehensive revision of these rules and forms was last undertaken in 2006.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The Forum will work with staff and other relevant committees to make recommendations for rules and forms revisions to the Judicial Council during the Spring RUPRO cycle for an effective date of January 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: California Department of Social Services, tribal governments and entities, and other child welfare practitioners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, with respect to recommendations that impact the work of those bodies.</p>		
3.	Project Title: Explore Feasibility of a Legislative Proposal to Authorize and Facilitate Remote Appearances by Tribes in Cases Governed by the <i>Indian Child Welfare Act</i>	Priority: 2
<p>Project Summary: Federal regulations governing ICWA adopted in 2016 stipulate that if possible, state courts should allow alternative methods of participation in cases involving an Indian child, such as participation by telephone, videoconferencing or other methods.⁵ In addition, the California ICWA Compliance Taskforce Report commented that court and agency failure “...to allow tribes to participate remotely in court proceedings denies tribes the ability to participate and exercise their rights under the Cal-ICWA.”⁶</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The Forum will work with staff and other relevant committees and staff of the Office of Governmental Affairs to potentially make recommendations for legislation for the 2020 session.</p>		

⁵ See 25 C.F.R. §23.133.

⁶ See California ICWA Compliance Taskforce Report [at page 40 \(side note\)](#).

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC, Governmental Affairs, and Legal Services staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include the California Department of Social Services, the Legislature and the California Tribal Families Coalition.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, with respect to recommendations that impact the work of those bodies.</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Review and Respond to California ICWA Compliance Task Force Report and Recommendations	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: In March of 2017, the California ICWA Compliance Task Force presented its report to California Attorney General Xavier Becerra⁷. The report includes issues and recommendations related to compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act in California. Several of the findings and recommendations relate to the work of the judicial branch. These recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandating increased ICWA training for bench officers, attorneys and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA);⁸ • Support the development and implementation of consolidated ICWA courts or calendars and joint jurisdiction courts;⁹ • Facilitate remote appearances by tribes in ICWA cases; • Addressing challenges of out-of-state tribes and their members located in California in ICWA cases; • Seek funding for appointed counsel for tribes in ICWA cases; and • Ensure that tribes get access to all paperwork, pleadings and minutes on the same basis as other parties. <p>Status/Timeline: Continue to work on implementing recommendations from the California ICWA Compliance Task Force report as feasible.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC, CJER, Governmental Affairs, and Legal Services staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the California Department of Social Services, the California Attorney General’s Office, and the California Tribal Families Coalition.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee, with respect to recommendations that impact the work of those bodies.</p>		

⁷ Available at <https://www.caltribalfamilies.org/news/ICWAComplianceTaskForceFinalReport2017.pdf/view>

⁸ See recommendations 6 and 7 of the California ICWA Compliance Taskforce Report.

⁹ Recommendations 16 and 17.

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
2.	<p>Project Title: Develop a Legislative Proposal to Facilitate Recognition of Tribal Court Orders Regarding the Division of Marital Assets as “Qualified Domestic Relations Order” Within the Meaning of 29 USC §1056(d)(3)(B) to Divide Pensions and Other Benefits Within the Scope of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) and Other Pension Plans.</p>	<p><i>Priority 2b</i></p>
<p>Project Summary: As part of its charge under Rule 10.60(b)(2) the Forum is to make recommendations relating to the recognition and enforcement of court orders that cross jurisdictional lines. Domestic relations is an area where tribal courts in California are increasingly exercising jurisdiction. The effectiveness of these orders is undermined when they are not fully recognized and enforced. Tribal courts report that some of their clients are having difficulty having division of marital assets orders issued with respect to pension benefits subject to ERISA recognized by plan administrators. As part of its statute governing the recognition and enforcement of foreign money judgements, Oregon has adopted a provision to recognize qualifying tribal court orders as domestic relations orders for ERISA purposes. The Judicial Council sponsored legislation in 2014 to establish the Tribal Court Civil Money Judgement Act (Code of Civ. Proc. §§1730-1742). A provision could be added, like the Oregon provision, to clarify that qualifying tribal court orders must be considered as domestic relations orders for ERISA purposes under California law.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Subject to approval by Judicial Council and Legislature: likely effective date would be January 1, 2021.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC, CJER, and Legal Services staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders could potentially include members of the family law bar and pension plan administrators.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		
3.	<p>Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Judge to Judge Communication Between State and Tribal Court Judges</p>	<p><i>Priority 2</i></p>
<p>Project Summary: As part of the Forum’s charge under rule 10.60(1) and (2), the Forum considers whether, in different case types, it is necessary and appropriate to facilitate judge to judge communication between state and tribal courts to promote the recognition and enforcement of orders across jurisdictional lines. Provision for such communication is included in California Code of Civil Procedure section 1740 and in Family Code section 3410. As tribal courts in California expand their activities, it may be appropriate to include such provisions in relation to other case types.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>	
4.	<p>Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Legislation to Improve the Recognition and Enforcement of Tribal Court) Orders</p>	<p>Priority 2</p>
	<p>Project Summary: As part of its mandate under rule 10.60(b)(2) to make recommendations relating to the recognition and enforcement of court orders that cross jurisdictional lines, the Forum continuously looks for areas where legislative action would be appropriate. In the past the Forum has partnered with the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee to recommend legislation (SB 406) which established the Tribal Court Civil Money Judgement Act (Code of Civ. Proc. §§1730-1742). As originally passed, that Act was to sunset on January 1, 2018. During 2017 the Forum worked with staff of the Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs to provide information to the California Law Revision Commission studying the effect of the Act and other statutes governing recognition and enforcement of foreign orders. Legislation was finalized that lifted the sunset.</p> <p>This coming year the Forum will further this objective through item 2 in ongoing projects above. Work with the Traffic Advisory Committee to determine if it would be feasible to create a proposal to improve the recognition and enforcement of tribal court traffic orders issued by tribal courts related to impaired and dangerous driving is currently on hold as the Traffic Advisory Committee focuses on the recommendations from the Future’s Commission report.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing. This was not advanced this current year as the Traffic Advisory Committee was prioritizing other work. The Forum will continue to consider whether it is feasible to advance this initiative.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC and Governmental Affairs staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Traffic Advisory Committee.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
5.	Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Ethics	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary⁵: State and tribal court judges may sit on each other’s benches and hear cases in the other jurisdiction through a joint-jurisdiction court or on an ad hoc or ongoing basis. The Forum will continue to work with the California Supreme Court’s Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics and make recommendations and request advisory opinions or amendments to the canons as appropriate and necessary to facilitate such collaborations.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics.</p>		
6.	Project Title: Policy Recommendation: Tribal Access to the Child Abuse Central Index	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary⁵: The Tribal Access to the Child Abuse Central Index (Index) is used to aid law enforcement investigations and prosecutions, and to provide notification of new child abuse investigation reports involving the same suspects and/or victims. Information is also used to help screen applicants for licensing or employment in child care facilities, foster homes, and adoptive homes. The purpose of allowing access to this information on a statewide basis is to quickly provide authorized agencies, including tribal agencies, with relevant information regarding individuals with a known or suspected history of abuse or neglect.</p> <p>While tribal agencies can obtain information from the Index, they cannot readily submit information to the Index.</p> <p>This practice poses several problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Suspected or known abusers may remain in the home of a child posing safety risks; (2) Unnecessary duplication of effort by agencies; (3) Delays in entry into the Index due to double investigations; and (4) Barriers to sharing information among tribal and nontribal agencies that should be working together to protect children. The forum will explore consulting with the Department of Justice to consider executive branch action to permit tribal access to the Index. <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> California Department of Justice.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
7.	Project Title: Policy Recommendation: Technological Initiatives	Priority 2
	<p>Project Summary:</p> <p>(A) Both federal and state law require mutual full faith and credit for domestic violence restraining orders issued by tribal and state courts. A crucial aspect of promoting the mutual recognition and enforcement of such court orders is facilitating knowledge between state and tribal courts as to the protective orders issued by their respective courts. The Forum and staff have worked to provide tribal courts with the ability to read orders contained in the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) and to facilitate entry of appropriate orders issued by tribal courts into CCPOR.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> In 2018 tribal courts were invited to and participated in the CCPOR user forum.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC, CJER, and Information Technology (IT) staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include tribal courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>	
	<p>(B) Since its inception, the Forum has been exploring ways to improve and simplify the process of doing inquiry and providing notice in cases governed by the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). The Forum will continue to explore these opportunities, including whether document assembly programs might be helpful in reducing the time required and errors in ICWA inquiry and populating forms with the information gathered. The Forum will also monitor any ongoing e-notice pilot programs or other technological advances in other jurisdictions and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on replicating those in California.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> This is an ongoing Forum charge.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> IT and CFCC staff with document assembly expertise.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.	
8.	<i>Project Title: Policy Recommendation: Funding for Innovative Practices and System Improvements</i>	<i>Priority 2</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> The Forum seeks to support innovative practices and system improvements including seeking funding for such initiatives as a pilot program to facilitate tribal participation and improve outcomes in ICWA cases by providing appointed counsel for tribes in these cases.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> In 2017 the Judicial Council submitted a federal grant application which would have provided inter alia funding for a pilot project to provide appointed counsel to tribes in ICWA cases. The Forum and Tribal/State Programs Unit staff will continue to seek out available funding.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>		
9.	<i>Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</i>	<i>Priority 2</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> One of the guiding principles of the Forum is to improve access to justice by providing tribal and state courts access to resources for capacity building and collaboration on an equal basis, sharing resources, and seeking out additional resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Judicial Council and other resources that may be appropriate to share with tribal courts. 2. Identify tribal justice resources that may be appropriate to share with state courts. 3. Identify grants for tribal/state court collaboration. 4. Share resources and information about partnerships through Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter. 5. Publicize these partnerships at conferences, on the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), and at other in-person or online venues. 6. Disseminate information to tribal court judges and state court judges monthly through the Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter with information on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grant opportunities; ○ Publications; 		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ News stories; and ○ Educational events. <p>7. Foster tribal court/state court partnerships, such as the Superior Court of Los Angeles County’s Indian Child Welfare Act Roundtable and the Bay Area Collaborative of American Indian Resources—court-coordinated community response to ICWA cases in urban areas and the providing technical assistance to the joint-jurisdiction collaborations between the Yurok Tribe and the Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt and the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians and the Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing. During this year two tribal court systems were provided with access to unlocked Judicial Council Juvenile, Family, Probate and Domestic Violence forms that the staff of the court systems adapted for their use.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
10.	Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Tribal/State Collaborations that Increase Resources for Courts	Priority 2
	<p>Project Summary: A primary goal of the Forum is to improve relationships between state and tribal courts and foster collaboration between those courts. There are currently two active joint-jurisdiction projects ongoing between Forum member state and tribal courts – the Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado collaborative with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians Tribal Court and the Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt collaboration with the Yurok Tribal Court. The Forum will explore ways to assist courts that wish to expand their joint-jurisdiction programs to include veteran’s programs or other specialized focus areas. The Forum will explore ways to support and increase the numbers of joint jurisdiction courts and other innovative models such as regional ICWA courts and dedicated ICWA courts or calendars, including providing education, developing tools and resources and seeking opportunities for additional grant funding to support such courts.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing. This year the JCC staff are supporting these collaborations by sharing resources and agreements and offering technical assistance on collaborations.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Collaboration and joint-jurisdiction courts should provide fiscal savings by improving the sharing of resources across jurisdictions. CFCC staff will continue to provide support to this project.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include superior courts and tribal courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
11.	<p>Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Education and Technical Assistance to Promote Partnerships and Understanding of Tribal Justice Systems</p>	<p>Priority 2</p>
	<p>Project Summary: The Forum will continue to develop educational events, resources and tools, and provide technical assistance to promote partnerships and understanding between state and tribal justice systems including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 2. Make recommendation to Judicial Council staff to provide technical assistance to evaluate the joint jurisdictional court and to courts wishing to replicate the model. 3. Make recommendation to the Judicial Council staff to continue developing civic learning opportunities for youth that exposes them to opportunities and careers in tribal and state courts. 4. Make recommendation to explore, at the option of tribes, opportunities for state and federal court judges to serve as a tribal court judge. 5. Collaborate with federal courts and federal justice partners on educational and other events related to justice and safety in tribal communities. 6. Develop and implement strategy to seek resources for tribal/state collaborations. 7. Continue to provide the State/Tribal Education, Partnerships, and Services (S.T.E.P.S.) to Justice—Domestic Violence and Child Welfare programs and provide local educational and technical assistance services. 8. Continue the first joint jurisdictional court in California. The Superior Court of El Dorado County, in partnership with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, is operating a family wellness court and next year will provide technical assistance to evaluate the joint jurisdictional court. (See Court Manual). 9. Establish partnership between the Superior Court of Humboldt County and the Yurok Tribal Court to develop a civics learning opportunity for youth in the region. <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC and CJER staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.</p>	
12.	Project Title: Education: Judicial Education	Priority 2
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> CJER toolkits, located on the Judicial Resources Network, will be updated to include federal Indian law. Develop 10-minute educational video to be posted online and shared statewide with justice partners. 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 curriculum committees: (1) Access, Ethics, and Fairness, (2) Civil, (3) Criminal, (4) Family, (5) Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency, and (6) Probate.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing. This past year Forum members and staff of the Tribal/State Programs Unit are collaborated with CJER to create a “Continuing the Dialogue” episode on the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 which was screened by CJER and is now available on the CJER and Tribal/State Programs webpages. In the upcoming year the focus will be on a toolkit on tribal issues in human trafficking cases.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC and CJER staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.</p>	
13.	Project Title: Education: Truth and Healing	Priority 2
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Consider collaboration among the three branches of state government in partnership with tribal governments to promote a truth and healing project that acknowledges California’s history, as described in Professor Benjamin Madley’s book, <i>An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe</i>, with respect to indigenous peoples, fosters an understanding of our shared history, and lays a foundation for healing, which promotes a call to action.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing. As a step towards the goal of Statewide Truth and Healing, Forum members and staff of the Tribal/State Programs Unit are participating in a civic engagement project in Humboldt County which will infuse curriculum with an understanding of local Indian history.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include Tribal Governments and Humboldt County Civic Engagement Project.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
14.	Project Title: Legislation	Priority 2⁴
	<p>Project Summary: Review and recommend positions on legislation related to tribal courts, tribal justice systems and the Indian Child Welfare Act.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Governmental Affairs staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None</p>	

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Education: Indian Civil Rights Act: Fifty Years Later (Video in the series: Continuing the Dialogue) Tribal/State Programs Unit staff collaborated with CJER staff on this video program featuring current and former Forum members. Attempting to impose certain constitutional restrictions and protections upon tribal governments and to guarantee Native Americans equal protection under the Bill of Rights, Congress passed the Indian Civil Rights Act. The history of the Act, the effects of the Act, and the state of tribal courts fifty years after enactment are discussed in this edition of the Continuing the Dialogue broadcast series. Chief Justice Abby Abinanti, Chief Judge Claudette White, Tribal Advisor to the Governor Cynthia Gomez (retired), and Professor Joseph Myers, moderated by Chief Judge Christine Williams, explore California tribal court issues and how they relate to and are intertwined with the work of the state’s judicial branch. The video is available here: http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/cjer/judicial/3422.htm</p>
2.	<p>Policy Recommendation: Rules and Forms – Revise Pro Hac Vice Requirements for Attorneys Representing Indian Tribes and Indian Parents in Indian Child Welfare Act Cases The Forum worked with the California State Bar and the California Supreme Court through the Spring 2018 RUPRO process to develop and vet amendments to California Rule of Court, rule 9.40 which governs out of state attorneys wishing the practice before California courts.</p>
3.	<p>Education: Joint Jurisdiction Courts Presentation at Collaborative Courts Conference The California Association of Collaborative Courts’ annual Conference took place in Sacramento September 12–14, 2018. For the first time ever, the conference featured a tribal track. Staff and Forum members worked to coordinate these sessions with the organizers. In addition, Forum Cochairs Presiding Justice Dennis M. Perluss and Chief Justice Abby Abinanti presented a session on the collaborative work of the Forum, and Forum members Chief Judge Christine Williams and Presiding Judge Suzanne Kingsbury participated in a presentation on their joint jurisdiction court. The documentary, Tribal Justice was screened and Forum members Chief Justice Abby Abinanti and Chief Judge Claudette White whose courts are featured in the documentary were in attendance and held a question and answer session after the screening.</p>

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

Annual Agenda¹—2019

Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Earl Johnson, (Ret.)
Lead Staff:	Ms. Bonnie Hough, Principal Managing Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Committee's Charge/Membership: The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee is required by Government Code section 68651(b)(5) 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. The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee currently has 15 members. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 appellate justice• 2 retired appellate justices• 1 retired judge• 2 law professors• 7 attorneys with experience in legal aid programs• 1 attorney with the State Bar of California• 1 attorney with the California Chamber of Commerce The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.	

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

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

None.

DRAFT

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: <i>Prepare Updated Request for Proposal for 2020–23 Grant Cycle</i>	Priority 1⁴
	<p>Project Summary⁵: In order to make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding grants for the 2020–23 grant cycle, a Request for Proposal (RFP) should be circulated in the fall of 2019. The Committee will need to review the RFP and suggest any changes before it is circulated.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: This review is scheduled for the summer of 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff and committee expenses are covered by an administrative allocation of grant funds.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: The legal services community and partner courts are the external stakeholders.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
2.	Project Title: <i>Proposed Legislative Changes in 2019</i>	Priority 1⁴
	<p>Project Summary⁶: Review legislation identified by Governmental Affairs that relate to the Shriver Civil Counsel Act including Assembly Bill 330 (Gabriel) Appointed legal counsel in civil cases.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: This bill was introduced on January 31, 2019.</p>	

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

⁶ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Center for Families, Children & the Courts and Governmental Affairs staff and committee expenses are covered by an administrative allocation of grant funds.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> The legal services community and partner courts are the external stakeholders.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities	
1.	<p>Project Title: Research and Data Collection. Provide input on design of evaluation of the pilot projects.</p>	<i>Priority 1⁴</i>
<p>Project Summary⁵: Government Code section 68651 required that an evaluation of the pilot projects be submitted to Legislature on or before January 31, 2016. That evaluation was completed, and a supplemental report was submitted in August 2017. The committee has identified key questions to research in the next phase of evaluation of the project in order to determine best practices in providing these services.</p> <p>This research supports the Judicial Council’s 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>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council staff and contractor time is covered by an administrative allocation for the grant.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: The Judicial Council will work closely with the pilot projects and contract with a research firm to assist in data collection and analysis.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
2.	<p>Project Title: Implementation and Oversight of Pilot Projects. Provide oversight for pilot projects. If additional funds become available, make recommendations to the Judicial Council on distribution.</p>	<i>Priority 1⁴</i>
<p>Project Summary⁵: The committee will provide continuing oversight of the pilot projects that were approved by the Judicial Council at its July 2017 meeting. The work is required by Government Code section 68651 which requires the Judicial Council to establish pilot projects and to form an advisory committee to review applications and oversee those projects.</p> <p>This work supports the Judicial Council’s 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>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff and committee expenses are covered by an administrative allocation of grant funds.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: The pilot programs – legal services and their court partners are stakeholders.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: The committee will work with the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee regarding any distribution of cy pres funds received as a result of revised Code of Civil Procedure section 384 which provides that 25 percent of distributions of cy pres funds are to be distributed</p>	
3.	<p>Project Title: Review Recommendations from the Evaluation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project</p>	<p><i>Priority 2⁴</i></p>
	<p>Project Summary⁵: In its report to the Judicial Council regarding the Evaluation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project, the Committee made recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council. At the Judicial Council meeting of July 27, 2017, these recommendations were referred back to the Committee for further development and referral to appropriate subject matter committees.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The Committee has determined that other committees have in their annual agenda items that will address most of the recommendations from the report, including simplification of forms, expanding e-filing and expanding litigant education. The committee will make comments on proposals from those other committees as appropriate. The committee has directed that the evaluation efforts for this year focus on mandatory settlement conferences and assessment of triage strategies. The committee intends to develop short reports on these topics which can be used to develop future recommendations.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC staff time and that of outside researchers is covered by the administrative funds set aside for the project.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Staff to the Shriver project will work with committee staff for the other committees to which recommendations may be made.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: The committee will work with the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee, the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee regarding these recommendations.</p>	

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	A synopsis of the results of the evaluation of each subject matter area served by the Shriver projects was developed.
2.	Comprehensive evaluation is ongoing.
3.	The committee continues to monitor grants awarded that provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.

DRAFT

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Brian McCabe, Judge, Superior Court of Merced County
Vice-Chair:	Mr. Shawn Landry, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Yolo County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf, Analyst, Court Interpreters Program, Court Operations Services
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.51 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP), which is: To assist the council in performing its duties under Government Code sections 68560 through 68566 and to promote access to spoken-language interpreters and interpreters for deaf and hearing-impaired persons, the advisory panel is charged with making recommendations to the council on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Interpreter use and need for interpreters in court proceedings; and(2) Certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters. <p>Rule 10.51(b) sets forth the additional duties of the panel that are: Reviewing and making recommendations to the council on the findings of the study of language and interpreter use and need for interpreters in court proceedings that is conducted by the Judicial Council every five years under Government Code section 68563.</p> <p>Rule 10.51(c) sets forth the membership position of the committee. The Court Interpreters Advisory Panel currently has 14 members, consisting of: 10 voting members; and, 4 non-voting advisory members. Rule of Court 10.51 calls for 11 voting members; but currently CIAP does not have an appellate court justice; and will be recruiting during the 2019 nomination cycle.</p> <p>The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.</p>	

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

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

- 1) Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee
- 2) Language Access Subcommittee

DRAFT

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Review Research on Skills Assessment Research and Recommended Protocols	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: This project is directly related to the Court Interpreter Credential Review Procedures. Following the Invitation to Comment period, the Credential review procedures were approved by CIAP on July 11, 2018, for submission to the Judicial Council. CIAP anticipates the final procedures will proceed to the Judicial Council for final approval and adoption in March or May of 2019, for an effective date (still to be determined) of July 1 or September 1, 2019. Internal operational procedures and resources required are under review and are being finalized. Guidelines for the courts and guidelines for the public will be developed and will be completed in Spring 2019.</p> <p>Skills Assessment Research and Recommended Protocols: Concurrent with the final internal review of the California Court Interpreter Credential Review, the next step is to review the report produced by National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in 2018, <i>Skills Assessment Options for Certified and Registered Interpreters</i>, detailing their research, findings, and recommendations. CIAP will explore the feasibility and best available methods for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Legally defensible diagnostic for Judicial Council to assess a credential review allegation that alleges gross incompetence (currently only re-testing available option); and 2) Possible options for courts to assess a court interpreter’s behavioral non-technical interpreting skills; and possible assessment of technical interpreting skills courts may use to identify and rectify possible weaknesses in the knowledge, skills, and abilities unique to court interpreters. <p>To support the development of a skills assessment tool:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC has completed a survey and analysis of court interpreter skills assessment issues with select stakeholders, including court executive officers, court personnel, and interpreters. 		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation to Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) for input on court needs, type of assessment tool courts will utilize, and resources needed. • Procurement and RFP, seeking a contract for development of the diagnostic recommended. (Late Spring 2019) <p>Origin of project: LAP Recommendation #64 and Government Code section 68564(g): The Judicial Council shall establish 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>Status/Timeline: Initial research has been completed by NCSC. We hope to issue a non-competitive bid for work to commence in Spring of 2019 and anticipated completion is September 30, 2019. Work to be contracted is predicated on cost and feasibility.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Based on the complexity of the diagnostic (language neutral or in various languages), the cost of developing skill assessment diagnostic, the final diagnostic method selected, and the cost of possible training of court staff on how to administer the diagnostic is estimated at a range of \$50,000 to \$150,000.</p> <p>Resources: Court interpreter program staff, Legal Services, Human Resources, CJER, NCSC contract consultants, and psychometrician. CEAC for input on tool needed for use in the courts.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Interpreter community, judicial officers, justice partners, and court personnel who routinely interact with California court interpreters.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Language Access Subcommittee under Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and CEAC.</p>	
2.	<p>Project Title: Develop Limited English Proficient (LEP) Party Waiver of Court Appointed Interpreter Services—Overseen by the CIAP Language Access Subcommittee</p> <p>Project Summary: Develop a policy and process for an LEP litigant’s right to waive the services of a court appointed interpreter; and assess if a corresponding rule of court is needed in order to implement the recommended waiver policy.</p> <p>Origin of Project: LAP Recommendation #75.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Commence in 2019; for effective/completion by January 1, 2020.</p>	<p>Priority 1</p>

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: May require additional Court Interpreter Program analytical staff .25–.50 FTE (requested FTE position, currently not filled) Staff resources from Legal Services and Labor and Employment Relations Unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: LEP litigants, courts, justice partners, such as the state bar and/or legal services providers.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Language Access Subcommittee under Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness.</p>	
3.	Project Title: Review and Update Compliance Requirements for Certified Court and Registered Interpreters	Priority 1
	<p>Project Summary: Review, update, and if required, recommend policy changes to the Compliance Requirements for Certified Court and Registered Interpreters. (Last major update in 2011, minor changes in 2013.)</p> <p>Origin of Project: Staff has identified several areas of improvement and identified points of clarification based on feedback from the interpreter community, providers and the courts. Government Code 68562(d) requires that all certified court and registered interpreters of spoken languages meet annual renewal/continuing education requirements, specifically the code states: 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>Key objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide simplified and easy to navigate compliance requirements for court interpreters and continuing education providers. • Review and make policy changes, if required, to address gaps in the current requirements. • Incorporate change to auditing annual compliance paperwork, and going to an honor system acknowledging compliance. • Include information on ethical canons applicable to court interpreters <p>Updating, clarifying, and organizing the current requirements in an easy to understand document will address many of the continuing misunderstanding regarding the requirements to maintain credentialing status. Articulating compliance requirements in a more simplified manner provides a much needed service to the interpreter community and education providers, as well as closing gaps in the current compliance requirements. We anticipate that we may have fewer late submissions of annual renewal requirements if the key communication tool is simplified and easier to understand.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Status/Timeline: Completion date: Fall 2019. Approval of policy changes to compliance were delegated to the Administrative Director by the Judicial Council on August 24, 2000.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: None Resources: Court Interpreter Program and Language Access Services staff and 1–2 CIAP interpreters consult.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Interpreter community, Court Interpreter Minimum Continuing Education providers, and court HR/Training Managers.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
4.	<p>Project Title: Update Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons, Including Exploring the Development of a Nationally Feasible Credentialing Program for American Sign Language Interpreters</p>	Priority 1e
	<p>Project Summary: California continues the work for reviewing options for testing American Sign Language (ASL) related court interpreters. The Language Access Subcommittee will review options and may recommend or provide input on an approach. A review and modification of the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines must be done concurrently with the plan being developed.</p> <p>The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) began work in June 2018 to develop a nationally accepted credentialing process to qualify ASL interpreters. NCSC is conducting an important study in 2019 to assist with recommendations regarding possible national credentialing options for ASL interpreters working in the courts. As a component of this project, NCSC will review available information of all known generalist or court/legal specialty credentialing instruments for ASL interpreters.</p> <p>NCSC will also review actual test content, testing components, and specifications of the exam tools. The goal of this review process is to identify exam components or exam models that may be useful for future national ASL credentialing solutions. NCSC is working with testing experts, ASL subject matter experts with legal expertise, and a senior psychometrician to map available test content to the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) developed in 2017 and adopted in early 2018 by an ad-hoc advisory committee made up of subject matter experts from the ASL community. NCSC staff will also conduct a feasibility study to assist with recommendations pertaining to the ongoing support of a national credentialing process for ASL court interpreters. The feasibility study will include a review of any available and viable tests that could be incorporated into a new credential by adoption. It will also include a review of initial exam development costs</p>	

New or One-Time Projects³

and timelines, ongoing exam maintenance costs, and other ongoing costs that support valid and reliable test administration, including rater recruitment and training and ongoing psychometric analysis.

Key Milestones:

- Partnering with national stakeholders to develop and adopt a list of nationally accepted Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for ASL interpreters that can be used to inform test development or development of a credentialing process. Work in progress.
- Mapping KSAs to a credentialing process that includes a variety of testing, training and educational requirements. Work in progress.
Completion: February 2019.
- Developing remote interpreter training on how bias affects court interpreters, as needed, and as part of a credentialing process.
Completion: April 30, 2020.
- Partnering with national stakeholders to develop and implement a credentialing process, including any necessary exams or exam modifications that will be in line with the updated Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs. Completion: **December 30, 2020.**

Origin of Project: The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) is the approved testing entity for California ASL court interpreters. In August 2015, RID stopped testing for legal interpreters. Changes in testing accommodations (provided by RID prior to stopping testing) requires a review of our underlying testing guidelines. There is a need for California to take up the challenge and recommend a viable solution for testing ASL interpreters and recommend any changes to the underlying testing guidelines.

Status/Timeline: Work is currently in progress. Anticipate completion of guidelines and credentialing process for implementation: December 2020.

Fiscal Impact/Resources: Development of a new ASL legal interpreter performance exam estimated \$200,000–\$450,000. Ongoing maintenance and/or administration of a nationally standardized credentialing process: \$80,000–\$125,000. Additional CIP staff analyst required: .50–.75 FTE= \$45,000–\$67,500. Explore if costs may be shared by NCSC/CLAC member states and/or the local or national bar associations.

Internal/External Stakeholders: Legal services staff; local and national deaf community representatives, local and national legal certified interpreters and interpreter trainers, federal and state courts nationally, Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID).

AC Collaboration: Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness.

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
5.	Project Title: Update Recommended Guidelines for the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Updating these guidelines may require a change to the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines identified in Project 3 above. To assure consistency, both sets of updates should be done concurrently or in close proximity to each other. The <i>Recommended Guidelines on the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</i> (DI Guidelines) will be reviewed by the entire CIAP panel. Changes to the testing related guidelines would need to be recommended to the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California began accepting applications for a new category of interpreter: the Enrolled Deaf interpreter. This change requires an update of the DI Guidelines. This may also require a change to the underlying ASL court interpreter testing related guidelines.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: TBD/Completion will depend on availability of staff resources and may not begin until 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: May require additional staffing (see project #3).</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Legal Services, ASL hearing and deaf court interpreters and deaf community representatives.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: May include Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Develop and implement court interpreter discipline process (From 2017 and 2018 Annual Agenda) Completed post credential discipline process, known as <i>The California Court Interpreter Credential Review Procedures</i>. Project includes recommending an amendment to existing California Rules of Court, rule 2.891, <i>Periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct</i>, established in 1979, which calls for a biennial review by the courts to review all court interpreter skills. To be repealed and replaced with rule 2.891, <i>Request for Court Interpreter Credential Review</i>.</p> <p>Status: CIAP approved the final credential review procedures in July of 2018. Legal Services and Court Operations are reviewing the Credential Review Procedures and establishing internal operational procedures and roles for both CIP and Legal Services. Once the internal procedures and roles have been established, the new rule 2.891, Request for court interpreter credential review and the credential review procedures will proceed to the Judicial Council for final approval in May 2019, for a (still to be determined) September 1, 2019 or later effective date. Operational guidelines for the courts and a full communication rollout is being developed and will be completed by Spring 2019.</p>
2.	<p>Completed March 2019: Develop and Implement Policy for De-designation of Certified Languages Whose Use in the Courts has Declined.</p> <p>Legal review has affirmed that the same criteria used to certify languages can be used to de-certify a language as per Government Code section 68562, and grants the Judicial Council authority to, both, designate and de-designate languages for certification programs, even though the statute does not address de-designation specifically.</p> <p>On January 23, 2019, CIAP affirmed the criteria for de-designation of certified languages is inherent in the code and voted to recommend the council delegate authority to the Administrative Director to de-certify languages in the future. The report to the council will be submitted for approval at their May 2019 meeting.</p>
3.	<p>Work in Progress: Update Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons, including development of a nationally feasible credentialing program for ASL interpreters.</p> <p>As of December 2018, NCSC has conducted a review of publicly available information pertaining to currently and formerly available ASL credentialing examinations. NCSC obtained information on testing specifications, components, and psychometric properties. NCSC is now working to obtain actual test content for ASL credentialing exams to be mapped to the list of developed KSAs.</p>

Court Security Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Lead Staff:	Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services
Committee's Charge/Membership: Rule 10.61(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Court Security Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning. Rule 10.61(b) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. The Court Security Advisory Committee currently has 10 members. The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.	
Subcommittees/Working Groups²: None.	

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

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Emergency- and Security-Related Concerns for the Branch	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, and make additional recommendations as needed. The <u>origin</u> of this project is the committee’s charge under rule 10.61. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be reports to Judicial Council, which may include recommendations that the council direct its facilities and budget advisory committees on specific or urgent priorities.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Recommendations that may have a fiscal impact will be discussed with appropriate Judicial Council staff and advisory bodies first. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit of the Facilities Services office.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Depending on recommendations, stakeholders could include Judicial Council offices (Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, Appellate Court Services, Center for Judicial Education & Research, Court Operations Services, Leadership Support Services, and Legal Services). External stakeholders include the trial courts and appellate courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Depending on recommendations, collaborators could include the Court Executives Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, and the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
2.	Project Title: Trial Courts' Screening Equipment Replacement	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of sufficient funding to support and improve the program. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related Budget Change Proposals (BCPs), for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #2 has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the Trial Court Trust Fund. However, competitively bid contracts, which include lower pricing for some equipment, were executed in fiscal year (FY) 2017–18, resulting in a lower estimated expenditure in FY 2018–19, allowing for a one-time budget reduction to \$1.9 million. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
3.	Project Title: Trial Courts' Security Equipment and Systems	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's provision and maintenance of duress alarm systems, access control systems, and video surveillance systems. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The service in project #3 (previously known as the Trial Court Security Grant Program) had a budget of \$1.2 million funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. One-time limited funding has been provided for maintenance and repairs each year, starting in FY 2015–16. A BCP requesting an annual augmentation of \$6 million was submitted to the State Department of Finance and was included in the Governor's budget proposal for FY 2019–20. This dedicated funding will be used to maintain and improve current programs and services, including, but not limited to projects that refresh, maintain, and replace security systems; such as video surveillance, electronic access control, duress alarm, and specialized systems used to control access to secure court holding areas. The committee will resume oversight responsibility for projects related to the expenditure of these funds. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
4.	Project Title: Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit’s Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal for the Judicial Council’s facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. While system training and exercises were originally provided, a lack of sufficient funding eliminated the ability to provide these services. With the dedicated funding described in project #3, these services can be resumed. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users) and Judicial Council/appellate courts (secondary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
5.	Project Title: Trial Courts' Court Security Plans	Priority 1 ⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Court Security Plan services—specifically, through a module included in the online planning system mentioned in Project #4, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e). The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this service as a necessary and appropriate function, and rule 10.172 on Court Security Plans. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. A lack of sufficient funding has prevented staff from requesting changes to the module that would streamline work. With the dedicated funding described in project #3, the necessary changes to the web-based tool can be pursued. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users of module).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None at this time.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Met objectives to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch, and to advocate for funding to support those functions/existing emergency- and security-related programs. For <i>ongoing</i> projects summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial Courts’ Security Equipment and Systems • Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning • Trial Courts’ Court Security Plans <p>Related programs had a budget from the <u>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund</u>. However, the Trial Court Security Grant Program was eliminated when its \$1.2 million budget was redirected effective FY 2015–16. Staff attempted to regain dedicated funding for trial court security system installation, maintenance, and replacement through the BCP process, but their BCPs for FY 2015–16, 2016–17, 2017–18, and 2018–19 were not successful. A limited amount of operations and maintenance funding was made available on a one-time basis to address minimum maintenance and repairs, but funding to continue limited service was not identified. As systems age, components become obsolete and cannot be repaired, and costs increase. Committee actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 2018: Provided input to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee regarding an Initial Funding Request (IFR). A \$6 million request was included in the Judicial Council’s FY 2019–20 BCP request to the State Department of Finance. • October 2018: At an in-person meeting, received presentation from BOLDplanning, the company that the Security Operations unit worked with in 2006 to design a customized online planning system for the courts. That system is located at coop.courts.ca.gov; the unit provides it at no cost to the courts and it allows them to create and maintain various types of plans. The unit facilitated five user workshops for the courts after; however, ongoing trainings and annual exercises are at the cost of the courts, as the unit’s planner position was eliminated. Due to staff changes, many court logins may be outdated and new users may require Continuity of Operations Plan guidance. Members agreed on the need to have discussions at the top level of each court and to share information about best practices. Members may examine the topic at future meetings and develop recommendations. • October 2018: At the same in-person meeting, received information about the system module that courts can use to create court security plans and the status of trial court conformance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.172 on plan submission, notification, and content. The Security Operations unit contacted trial courts to obtain current information about the format and location of their plans, and provided members with information on that and the technical conformance of the courts to plan content requirements. Staff time to obtain the quantitative compliance information is extensive; qualitative reviews are not practicable or required. Members discussed methods for improving compliance, such as sharing information with court leaders at institutes, and creating or updating best practices and guidelines. Members may examine the topic at future meetings and develop recommendations. • October 2018: At the same in-person meeting, received information about the provision and maintenance of security systems. The BCP for FY 2019–20, requesting \$6 million, with options for alternate funding levels of \$4 million and \$2 million, was

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	<p>submitted to the State Department of Finance, and is currently under consideration for approval. This BCP would provide funding to refresh, maintain, and replace security systems; including, but not limited to, video surveillance, electronic access control, duress alarm, and specialized systems used to control access to secure court holding areas. If the BCP is successful, the Security Operations unit will begin a security system “refresh and replace” process. To aid in prioritization of systems, the unit is using consultants to compile information about system locations, age, type, cost to refresh as opposed to replace, and alternatives. [The BCP described above was successful, resulting in a \$6 million annual augmentation included in the Governor’s budget proposal for FY 2019–20.]</p>

DRAFT

Court Facilities Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District
Lead Staff:	Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Facilities Services Mr. Chris Magnusson, Facilities Supervisor, Facilities Services
<p>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</p> <p>Rule 10.62 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC), which is to make recommendations to the Judicial Council concerning the judicial branch capital program for the trial and appellate courts.</p> <p>Rule 10.62(b) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. CFAC currently has 21 members. The current composition shown on the committee roster's web page is as follows:</p> <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 	

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

Subcommittees²:

1. Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee (CCRS) – Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair
2. Independent Outside Oversight Consultant (IOOC) Subcommittee – Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Chair
3. Subcommittee on Courthouse Names – Hon. Keith D. Davis, Chair

DRAFT

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	<p>Project Title Reassessment of Unfunded Trial Court Capital Projects per Legislative Mandate</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
<p>Project Summary⁵: Review of the reassessment of unfunded trial court capital-outlay projects, which involves: (1) revising the Judicial Council’s <i>Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects</i>; (2) assessing certain facilities occupied by the trial courts to update records on physical condition, security, access to court services, and overcrowding; (3) developing court facility plans and needs-based projects; (4) applying the revised prioritization methodology to all projects; and (5) updating the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan. Senate Bill 847 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) revises Government Code section 70371.9 to require the Judicial Council to update its October 24, 2008, prioritization methodology as well as to reassess capital projects in its Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: This reassessment is proposed for the November 2019 Judicial Council meeting and due by December 31, 2019, to two legislative committees: Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review and the Assembly Committee on Budget.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, and Legal Services. Assistance provided from consultants under contract with the Judicial Council’s office of Facilities Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; local county governments; justice partners; Department of Finance; Legislature; and Office of Governor.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Executive and Planning Committee.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

# Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	<p>Project Title Judicial Branch Courthouse Construction Projects</p>
	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Review of Judicial Council-approved new courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available construction program budget. Submit recommendations for Judicial Council consideration on how projects should proceed with available project budgets.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; justice partners; Department of Finance; and State Public Works Board.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee.</p>	
2.	<p>Project Title Recommendations of the Independent Oversight Consultant (IOC)</p>
	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Review and monitor implementation of IOC recommendations.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Independent Outside Oversight Consultant Subcommittee.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
3.	Project Title Courthouse Construction Project Cost Reductions	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Oversight of reductions to courthouse project costs. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; justice partners; Department of Finance; and State Public Works Board</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee.</p>		
4.	Project Title Judicial Branch Capital Program Funding	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Coordinate with the Judicial Council and its Executive and Planning Committee to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, Legal Services, and Governmental Affairs.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; justice partners; Department of Finance; Legislature; and Office of Governor.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Executive and Planning Committee.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
5.	<p>Project Title Additional Funding for Existing Courthouse Operations, Maintenance, and Facility Modifications</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
<p>Project Summary⁵: Coordinate with the Judicial Council and its Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council's offices of Facilities Services, Budget Services, and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; justice partners; Department of Finance; Legislature; and Office of Governor.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Ongoing: Review of Judicial Council-approved new courthouse construction and renovation projects in relation to available construction program budget and recommend how to proceed.
2.	Ongoing: Review and monitor implementation of IOC recommendations.
3.	Ongoing: Oversight of reductions to courthouse project costs.
4.	Ongoing: Coordinate with the Judicial Council and its Executive and Planning Committee to provide funding for the Judicial Branch Capital Program.
5.	Ongoing: Coordinate with the Judicial Council and its Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee to seek additional funding for existing courthouse operations, maintenance, and facility modifications.
6.	Completed: On February 14, 2018, CCRS approved the 100 Percent Design Development Report for the New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Sacramento County.
7.	Completed: On April 3, 2018, the CFAC approved—to move forward in its current design and with a funding augmentation of \$4.6 million—the completion of the Working Drawings phase for the Renovation and Addition to Willows Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Glenn County.
8.	Completed: On April 3, 2018, the CFAC approved the request for a land transaction with the California Department of Finance/Department of State Hospitals to acquire property on the Metropolitan State Hospital (MSH) campus in the City of Norwalk for the New Mental Health Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The CFAC also approved Judicial Council Facilities Services staff to continue the site selection process for other viable sites in the event the acquisition of the MSH site does not occur.
9.	Completed: On April 3, 2018, the CFAC approved a funding augmentation of \$5.5 million and to take all necessary steps to acquire—whether through cash payment or equity stake in the land under the existing Figueroa Courthouse—additional land from the County of Santa Barbara for the New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County. The project would be constructed on a more regularly-shaped site and in a single phase, which preserves intact the land under the existing Figueroa Courthouse for future divestment with funds estimated between \$21–23.5 million returned to the Immediate and Critical Needs Account.

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
10.	Completed: On May 21, 2018, CCRS approved the 100 Percent Design Development Report for the New Modesto Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Stanislaus County.
11.	Completed: On June 27, 2018, CCRS approved the 100 Percent Design Development Report for the New Mid-County Civil Courthouse project for the Superior Court of Riverside County.
12.	Completed: On September 27, 2018, the CFAC did not take action but received informational reports on the status of the 10 SB 1407 courthouse capital projects funded through the enacted 2018 Budget Act (FY 2018–19), the implementation of the project labor agreement for the New Central San Diego Courthouse project for the Superior Court of San Diego County, and the post-occupancy evaluations of the newly completed trial courthouses in Merced and Tehama counties.
13.	Completed: On December 7, 2018, the CFAC reviewed a draft version of the <i>Revision of Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects</i> and approved its issuance for public comment from the trial courts/general public, with the responses to be discussed at the next scheduled CFAC meeting. Senate Bill 847 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) revises Government Code section 70371.9 to require the Judicial Council to update its October 24, 2008, prioritization methodology as well as to reassess capital projects in its Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan. This CFAC meeting which was broadcasted live via webcast video and available at http://jcc.granicus.com/player/clip/826 .

Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Glenn County
Vice-chair	Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Lead Staff:	Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Facilities Services Mr. Jagan Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services
<p>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</p> <p>Rule 10.65 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC), which is to make recommendations to the Judicial Council on facilities modifications, maintenance, and operations; environmental services; and utility management. In addition, the committee performs the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Makes recommendations to the Judicial 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 Judicial 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 on 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 Judicial Council’s <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>. <p>Rule 10.65(c) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. TCFMAC currently has 11 members. The current composition shown on the committee roster’s web page is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior court judge – 5 members • Court executive officer – 3 members 	

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

- Deputy Court Executive Officer – 1 member
- The chair and vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee, as non-voting members – 2 members

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

None.

DRAFT

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	<p>Project Title Budget Allocations for Statewide Trial Court Facility Modifications Planning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019–20</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
<p>Project Summary⁵: Request the Judicial Council, per section IV.D. of the council’s <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>, review and approve the facility modification budget report for FY 2019–20, to direct Judicial Council staff’s implementation of facility modifications within the fiscal year based on the annual appropriation of funding from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Proposed for the July 2019 Judicial Council meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
2.	<p>Project Title Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Reports for FY 2018–19</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
<p>Project Summary⁵: Provide the Judicial Council with a report for informational purposes summarizing the committee’s allocation of facility modification funding after the end of each quarter in FY 2018–19. These information-only reports are submitted as required by the council’s <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Status/Timeline: Proposed for the following Judicial Council meetings: March 2019 for the FY 2018–19, Q1 and Q2 reports; May 2019 for the FY 2018–19, Q3 report; September 2019 for the FY 2018–19, Q4 report.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
3.	<p>Project Title 2018–19 Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee Annual Report</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Provide the Judicial Council with a report for informational purposes summarizing the committee’s allocation of facility modification funding for FY 2018–2019. This information-only report is submitted annually as required by the council’s <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i>.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Proposed for the November 2019 Judicial Council meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
4.	<p>Project Title Energy-Efficiency Facility Modification Projects</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Develop and implement Priority 3 energy-efficiency facility modification projects for lighting and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) improvements within existing court facilities statewide.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Continued through FY 2018–19.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services. Savings through energy-efficiency facility modification projects conserves Court Facilities Trust Fund (CFTF) resources.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
5.	<p>Project Title Courthouse Security Systems Maintenance and Replacement</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
6.	<p>Project Title Initial Funding Requests (IFRs) for Developing Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for FY 2020–21</p>	<p>Priority 1⁴</p>
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Maintain and replace security equipment, including aging camera, access control, and duress alarm systems, within existing court facilities statewide. These projects are necessary to maintain trial court facilities at an industry level of care.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Continued through FY 2018–19.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Security Advisory Committee.</p>	
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Recommendation on facilities IFRs for developing FY 2020–21 BCPs that address the following needs: operations and maintenance, energy efficiency measures, and deferred maintenance.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: IFRs proposed for review by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in March 2019 and concepts approved in May 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts, justice partners, Department of Finance (DOF); Legislature; and Office of Governor.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
1.	Project Title Judicial Branch Facility Modification Projects	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Review and approve facility modification projects proposed by the trial courts, regional service providers, VFA, Inc. (an asset management firm of deferred facility modification projects), and Judicial Council staff. Approved projects receive funding allocations for execution by Judicial Council staff. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing. The committee meets every 30 to 60 days to review proposed projects.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
2.	Project Title Judicial Branch Facility Operations and Maintenance	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Oversight of judicial branch facilities operations and maintenance spending through annual budget allocation approval and re-evaluation as needed. Oversight of policy issues on operations and maintenance of existing facilities, noncapital-related real estate transactions, energy management, and environmental management and sustainability, including but not limited to, review of the Judicial Council’s preventive maintenance and energy management plans. Submit recommendations as needed for Judicial Council consideration.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
3.	Project Title Judicial Branch Capital Program	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: Collaborate with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee in the development of the Judicial Branch 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.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts; justice partners; DOF; and State Public Works Board.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Facilities Advisory Committee.</p>		
4.	Project Title Renovation Feasibility Studies – Seismic	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: Review renovation feasibility studies prepared for the trial court facilities on the TCFMAC’s August 2017 approved list. In the Judicial Council’s October 2017 Seismic Risk Rating Database, these trial court facilities are among those with the highest seismic risk ratings (i.e., categories of <i>Very High</i> or <i>High</i>) for damage, business interruption, and injury or fatalities of occupants.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Coordination through lead staff to the committee with input from the Judicial Council’s offices of Facilities Services and Budget Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts and justice partners.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Ongoing: Reviewed and approved facility modification projects, including security-related facility modifications, proposed by the trial courts, regional service providers, VFA, Inc. (an asset management firm of deferred facility modification projects), and Judicial Council staff.
2.	Ongoing: Oversaw judicial branch facilities operations and maintenance spending and of policy issues on operations and maintenance of existing facilities, noncapital-related real estate transactions, energy management, and environmental management and sustainability.
3.	Ongoing: Collaborated with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee in the development of the Judicial Branch Capital Program.
4.	Ongoing: Reviewed and approved Court-Funded Facilities Requests including but not limited to facility modifications, expansions of existing space, temporary space, lease extensions, and feasibility studies.
5.	Ongoing: Monitored progress of deferred maintenance list projects for roof and elevator/lift/escalator replacements in trial court facilities.
6.	Ongoing: Allocated funding to energy-efficiency projects in existing facilities statewide—\$7.5 million in FY 2016–17 for 63 Priority 3 facility modification projects and \$6.5 million in FY 2017–18 for 44 Priority 3 facility modification projects.
7.	Completed: As informational items in March, May, and September 2018, the Judicial Council received FY 2017–18 quarterly activity reports on the allocation of funding for trial court facility modifications.
8.	Completed: On January 29, 2018, and to pay for Deferred Maintenance project change orders, the TCFMAC approved a contingency for the Deferred Maintenance Fund of \$750,000 from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund/Immediate and Critical Needs Account.
9.	Completed: On May 25, 2018, the TCFMAC approved a <i>preliminary</i> Deferred Maintenance Funding project list (II), based on \$100 million in deferred maintenance funding considered by the Governor for inclusion in the FY 2018–19 May Revise Budget.
10.	Completed: On May 25, 2018, the TCFMAC reviewed facilities FY 2019–20 BCPs prioritized by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC). Of the 15 BCPs considered, the JBBC prioritized facilities BCPs as follows: No. 4 – Operations and Maintenance (\$31.4 million ongoing funding), No. 7 – Security (\$6 million ongoing funding), and No. 9 – Energy projects (\$30 million one-time funding).
11.	Completed: On July 20, 2018, the TCFMAC reviewed and approved the projected facility modifications budget for FY 2018–19.

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
12.	Completed: On July 20, 2018, the TCFMAC approved \$45 million for a <i>final</i> Deferred Maintenance Funding project list (II) and \$5 million for facility assessments, based on \$50 million in deferred maintenance funding included in 2018 Budget Act (FY 2018–19).
13.	Completed: On July 20, 2018, the TCFMAC reviewed and approved the judicial branch’s Five-Year Master Plan – Trial Court Facilities Deferred Maintenance List for FY 2019–20 for submission to the DOF.
14.	Completed: On July 20, 2018, the TCFMAC discussed revising the Judicial Council’s 2012 <i>Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy</i> .
15.	Completed: On November 30, 2018, and as an informational item, the Judicial Council received the TCFMAC’s annual report for FY 2017–18.
16.	Completed: On November 30, 2018, and as recommended by the TCFMAC, the Judicial Council approved the annual report to the Legislature of CFTF expenditures, which was for all expenditures made in FY 2017–18.
17.	Completed: On December 3, 2018, the TCFMAC approved a new policy on asbestos containing materials for adoption by the Executive and Planning Committee on behalf of the Judicial Council.

Workload Assessment Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Lorna Alksne, Superior Court of San Diego County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Budget Services Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Research Analyst, Budget Services
<p>Committee’s Charge/Membership: Per Rule 10.66 adopted effective January 1, 2015, 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (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. <p>Rule 10.66(c) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) currently has 14 members. The current committee roster is available on the committee’s web page.</p>	
<p>Subcommittees/Working Groups²: None at this time.</p>	

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

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Interim Updates to Resource Assessment Study Model	Priority 2⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: As new laws are passed or changes in court data collected are made, updates may need to be made to the workload models to reflect those changes. As needed, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee will review those updates and propose changes to the model as needed.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing/TBD.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Changes made will be accomplished within existing resources. The trial courts may need to be consulted to help define the changes needed.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Department of Finance and Legislature.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: TBD/As needed.</p>		
2.	Project Title: Workload Modeling (various, TBD)	Priority 2⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: The judicial branch seeks to become a more data-driven organization; as part of that effort, the branch may need to implement new workload models to allocate resources more effectively. In last year’s annual agenda, WAAC partnered with TCBAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to develop a new allocation methodology for AB 1058 funding. Similarly, WAAC may be called upon to provide its expertise in developing funding models for other funding streams.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing/TBD.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Changes made will be accomplished within existing resources. The trial courts may need to be consulted to help define the changes needed.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Department of Finance and Legislature</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> TBD/As needed.</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Judicial Workload Study Update	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: The Judicial Council is obligated to report on the number of judicial officers needed in the trial courts based on workload in a biennial report to the legislature under Government Code section 69614(c)(1). This assessment, formally called the Judicial Needs Assessment, draws on a workload study that is updated periodically to reflect changes in the law, technology, and case processing practices. In October 2013, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee approved a motion stating that the workload studies (both staff and judicial) should be updated every 5 years, though not concurrently. The judicial workload study is used to update the caseweights (i.e., time per filing) and other model parameters that are needed to estimate workload-based need for judicial officers. In the previous year, the time study portion of the workload study was completed. Over 900 judicial officers (judges, commissioners, and pro tems) from 19 courts submitted data on their daily activities for a four-week period. The data are currently being cleaned, validated, and analyzed.</p> <p>The committee’s work in the coming year will be to finalize the workload measures and seek council approval for their adoption. When necessary, the chair will make presentations to the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and Court Executives Advisory Committee so that committee members can be apprised of the work of the committee.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing; expected completion date is mid-2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The study is being conducted with existing JC resources, primarily from the Budget Services, Research and Evaluation Unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Stakeholders include the trial courts and the Department of Finance; Legislators use the study results as the basis for legislation proposed for new judgeships.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: We will keep TCPJAC informed, but they will not be asked to do more than serve in an advisory capacity.</p>		
2.	Project Title: Judicial Needs Assessment (Interim Update)	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: Government Code section 61614(c)(1) requires the Judicial Council to prepare biennial updates of the Judicial Needs Assessment in even-numbered years. An assessment was issued in November 2018, but the workload analysis was done on the basis of the old caseweights. An updated assessment will be issued in November 2019 to reflect the most current workload measures.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Will be completed by November 1, 2019.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Completion of this report requires 0.25 FTE of an analyst (existing position) for a two-month period of time.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: The needs assessment is used as the basis for Budget Change Proposals for new judgeships, Subordinate Judicial Officers conversion requests, and to seek authorization for additional judgeships.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>	
3.	<p>Project Title: Report to Legislature on Judicial Administration Standards and Measures that Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice, Pursuant to Government Code Section 77001.5</p>	<p><i>Priority 1</i></p>
	<p>Project Summary: Government Code section 77001.5 requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature annually on judicial administration standards and measures.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The report will be completed by November 1, 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: .10 FTE Senior Analyst or Analyst (existing position) for a three-month period.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None</p>	

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Judicial Needs Assessment, submitted to Legislature on November 1, 2018.
2.	Report on Standards and Measures (Gov Code § 77001.5), submitted to Legislature on November 1, 2018.
3.	Time study portion of Judicial Workload Study completed; over 900 judicial officers (judges, commissioners, and pro tems) from 19 courts participated.

DRAFT

Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2019

Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Fresno
Lead Staff:	Dr. Mary Ann Koory, Senior Education Developer, Center for Judicial Education and Research
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.50(b) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee, is to make 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. Rule 10.50(c) sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>The Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Advisory Committee currently has 16 voting members and 3 advisory members. The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.</p>	
Subcommittees/Working Groups²: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Appellate Practice Curriculum Committee2. Civil Law Curriculum Committee3. Criminal Law Curriculum Committee4. Family Law Curriculum Committee5. Judicial Branch Access, Ethics & Fairness Curriculum Committee6. Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee7. Juvenile Law Curriculum Committee8. Probate Law Curriculum Committee9. Trial and Appellate Court Operations Curriculum Committee10. B.E. Witkin Judicial College Steering Committee11. CJER Online User Group	

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

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Developing the 2020–2022 Education Plan	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: Curriculum Committees and work groups will perform a needs assessment on the current curriculum in their respective assignment areas and draft a two-year education plan ready to submit to the Judicial Council for review and approval.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: A draft of the 2020–2022 Education Plan will be submitted to the Judicial Council for review and approval in November 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CJER Contact: Karene Alvarado</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: N/A</p> <p>AC Collaboration: N/A</p>		
2.	Redesigning the Criminal Primary Assignment Orientation	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Criminal Primary Assignment Orientations (PAO) are offered three times a year for judges new to the assignment, new to the bench or returning to the assignment after a significant period away. A work group of 16 judicial officers will convene to shift instructional design away from a didactic black-letter model to a skills- and analysis-focused model, reflecting a change in the assessment of what is critical for new criminal judges. In addition, the redesign will standardize the curriculum, eliminating redundancy, and affording consistency across each offering of the Criminal PAO, while still allowing for individual faculty style.</p>		

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> The redesign will be complete by January 2020.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CJER Contact: Wynne Nielsen</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> N/A</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> N/A</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	2018–2020 Education Plan	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: The CJER Advisory Committee will continue to oversee the execution of the 2018–2020 Education Plan launched July 1, 2018.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The 2018–2020 Education Plan will be complete on June 30, 2020.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CJER Contact: Karene Alvarado</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: N/A</p> <p>AC Collaboration: N/A</p>		
2.	California Court Leadership Certification	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: June 2019 will mark the first full year of the CCLC process—a set of documents that allows court administrative staff to assess their competencies and then chart an individualized path using CJER-provided and other sources of education, as well as performing court-based projects to demonstrate the competencies they are developing. Our first full year will be critical to test the efficacy of supporting documents and competency assessment forms, and to start receiving and soliciting feedback from our first users.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: First calendar year feedback received and adjustments will be completed in June 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CJER Contact: Rhonda Sharbono</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: N/A</p> <p>AC Collaboration: N/A</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	The 2016–2018 Education Plan was completed August 2018.
2.	The California Court Leader Certification process was launched on June 30, 2018 for court administrative staff to assess their competencies and then chart an individualized education path using CJER-provided and other available courses and resources, as well as performing court-based projects to demonstrate the competencies they are developing. CEAC and court leadership have been informed of the launch, and enrollment has begun. Information and registration for the CCLC process can be found on this page on <i>CJER Online</i> .
3.	The 2018–2020 Education Plan was launched on July 1, 2018.
4.	Curriculum Committees completed their 2018 review of their respective <i>CJER Online</i> toolkits, and made recommendations for culling and updates. Recommended changes were completed on December 2018.
5.	The recommendations from the Mental Health Implementation Task Force were implemented as appropriate.

Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness
Annual Agenda¹—2019
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [DATE]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Laurie D. Zelon, Cochair, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal Second Appellate District, Division Seven Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Interim Lead Staff:	Ms. Jenie Chang, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<p>Committee’s Charge/Membership: Rule 10.55 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF), which is to make 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. The committee also makes recommendations to the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), proposals for the education and training of judicial officers and court staff.</p> <p>PAF has 28 members. The current committee roster is available on the committee’s web page.</p>	
<p>Subcommittees/Working Groups²:</p> <p>Participation in the <i>Gender Expression/Identity Joint Ad Hoc Working Group</i></p> <p>Language Access Plan: Review and consider recommendations from Language Access Subcommittee (LAS). Recommend appropriate action within the committee’s purview.</p>	

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

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

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Futures Recommendations for an Early Education Program in Civil and Small Claims	Priority 1⁴
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Continue developing content for an education program to aid the growing number of self-represented litigants (SRLs) in civil litigation and small claims matters.</p> <p>This project is being done at the direction of the Chief Justice.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> December 2019</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC); Legal Services (LS); and Information Technology (IT) staff</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&SCAC), Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC); Judicial Council’s Digital Services; and TBD</p>	
2.	Project Title: Form MC-410: Request for Accommodations by Persons with Disabilities	Priority 2(b)
	<p>Project Summary: Redesign Judicial Council form MC-410 to make it more user-friendly and in plain language. This will make it easier for court-users to understand the form and correctly complete it. This will also make it easier to translate the form into multiple languages.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> TBD in 2019</p>	

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) staff with disability expertise</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: TBD</p>	
3.	Project Title: Gender Expression/Identity	Priority 2(b)
	<p>Project Summary: Finalize and then make recommendations for implementing best practices developed for addressing gender in court forms. These recommendations were formulated by joint ad-hoc working group tasked with assessing best practices and making recommendations for addressing gender expression/identity in Judicial Council court forms and education. The formation of this working group was prompted, in part, by the recent passage of Senate Bill 179, <i>Gender Recognition Act</i>. Senate Bill 179 recognizes <i>three</i> gender options: female, male, and <i>nonbinary</i>. The working group has the approval of both Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) and Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2019</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC, LS, and TBD</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Community-based organizations with expertise in gender expression/identity; Law enforcement agencies; local courts; and TBD</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, C&SCAC, Criminal Law Advisory Committee (CLAC), Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC), Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee (PMHAC), and TBD</p>	
4.	Project Title: Language Access Rule of Court	
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Approve and recommend proposal to adopt new rule 1.300 and forms LA-350, LA-400, and LA-450 to provide guidance to the courts on the provision of language assistance in court-ordered programs and services. The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force was the original proponent of this proposal, which was previously reviewed by the Committee. The proposal was submitted to the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) by the Task Force and has been circulated for public comment. It now requires a final review and recommendation to RUPRO for presentation and request for final approval by the Judicial Council at its May 2019 meeting. Because the Task Force has sunsetted, the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness will take lead responsibility for this proposal as of March 1, 2019.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p data-bbox="216 220 1486 256"><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Winter 2019 RUPRO cycle; recommended for implementation September 1, 2019</p> <p data-bbox="216 302 1367 337"><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> CFCC, LS, and Court Language Access Services Program staff</p> <p data-bbox="216 383 984 418"><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Courts and justice partners</p> <p data-bbox="216 464 548 500"><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Collaborate and Provide Subject Matter Expertise	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: PAF will do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Serve as lead/subject matter resource for issues under the committee’s charge to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action. b) Serve as subject matter resource for other stakeholders on subjects under the committee’s charge to increase efficiency and avoid duplication of services within the branch. c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers; make recommendations to the Judicial Council, as needed, regarding updates to the Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts as provided by California Rules of Court, rule 10.960(e). d) Continue collaborations with the TAC, CLAC, and other relevant Judicial Council advisory bodies and staff on recommendations to improve access and fairness in traffic court. These collaborations started in 2017 when Justice Hull (RUPRO Chair) directed PAF to collaborate with TAC and CLAC on recommendations to improve access and fairness in traffic court. This resulted in liaison relationships between the three committees as well as successful collaborations on several rules and forms, including the “Ability to Pay” rules and forms which went into effect in April 2018. PAF will continue to collaborate with and provide subject-matter expertise to CLAC and TAC as appropriate. e) Per a request from CLAC, provide subject matter expertise as CLAC undertakes a project to perform a user-centered design review of the Judicial Council’s criminal law forms. This may include recommendations regarding plain language translation, usability testing, use of informational sheets, and other factors affecting the user-friendliness of forms that CLAC seeks to review. <p>Tasks <i>a, b, and c</i> were included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda, while tasks <i>d and e</i> are new.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Criminal Justice Services (CJS)</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: This item may include collaboration with various Judicial Council advisory bodies, including, but not limited to: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC), Court Executives</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	Advisory Committee (CEAC), Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee (CJCAC), TAC, CLAC, C&SCAC, ITAC; and CJER Access, Ethics, and Fairness Curriculum Development	
2.	Project Title: Education in Subject Areas under PAF’s Purview	Priority 1
	<p>Project Summary: PAF will do the following:</p> <p>a) Racial Bias and Implicit Bias: Make recommendations to the Judicial Council for developing and expanding education for judicial officers and employees throughout the branch. Because this is a large task, PAF will develop its recommendations in phases. In this first phase, PAF will develop recommendations requiring all Judicial Council members as well as all Judicial Council advisory committee and taskforce members to receive education on racial bias that includes implicit bias. After developing this specific recommendation, PAF will broaden its focus to consider making recommendations for racial bias and implicit bias education for judicial officers and employees throughout the branch. PAF’s working group on racial bias and implicit bias recommendations developed this multi-phased approach during the committee’s 2018 in-person meeting.</p> <p>b) Ongoing collaboration with CJER: Continue to collaborate with CJER staff on improving and expanding educational resources in areas under PAF’s purview.</p> <p>This task was included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda. Item <i>a</i>, however, now includes more specific details for how the racial bias and implicit bias education will be developed.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC, CJER, and TBD</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: TBD</p> <p>AC Collaboration: CJER’s Judicial Branch Access, Ethics, and Fairness Curriculum Development Committee; and TBD</p>	
3.	Project Title: Diversity in the Branch	Priority 1
	<p>Project Summary: PAF will do the following:</p> <p>a) Update the guide <i>Pathways to Achieving Judicial Diversity in the California Courts</i>. PAF will do this in collaboration with members of the State Bar’s Council on Access and Fairness (COAF). The revised guide will receive a “digital first” redesign with a goal of making the content more user-friendly for judicial officers and branch leaders who are interested in performing outreach to diverse communities.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>b) Review and consider ideas and recommendations that come out of the 2016 Judicial Diversity Summit. (The Judicial Council co-hosted the summit. The Interagency Judicial Summit Planning Committee for the summit consisted of representatives from COAF, the Judicial Council, the California Judges Association, and staff from the State Bar and Judicial Council.)</p> <p>c) Collaborate with COAF on matters related to diversity in the branch.</p> <p>This task was included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda. Item <i>a</i>, however, has been updated to include new details.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC; Special Projects; COAF; and TBD</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: State Bar’s COAF; Interagency Judicial Summit Planning Committee; and TBD</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None</p>	
4.	Project Title: Mental Health Recommendations	Priority 1
	<p>Project Summary: Continue to review and implement recommendations referred to PAF from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce. Final Report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce.</p> <p>The Chairs of Executive and Planning Committee and Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) referred mental health recommendations to various advisory committees, including PAF. This task was included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and CJER</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, CJCAC, CJER Advisory Committee, and TBD</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
5.	Project Title: Improving Access and Fairness through Technology	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: PAF will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Continue coordinating with the Judicial Council’s Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) on developing a Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal. (See item #5 on ITAC’s 2017 Annual Agenda. (See also, The Critical Role of the State Judiciary in Increasing Access for Self-Represented Litigants: Self-Help Access 360) b) Discuss and explore with ITAC other intersections between access, fairness, and technology. c) Explore how to encourage use of technologies that benefit court-users with disabilities. <p>Tasks <i>a and b</i> were included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda, while tasks <i>c</i> is new.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and IT</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None</p> <p>AC Collaboration: ITAC</p>		
6.	Project Title: Improving Access and Fairness for Low and Moderate-Income Court Users (Economic Access)	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: PAF will continue to consider ways that simplification of court processes can be used to improve court services for low and moderate-income court-users.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: TBD</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None</p>		

III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Ability to Pay Rule and Forms PAF collaborated with CLAC and TAC on development of the Ability to Pay rule and forms. Status: California Rules of Court, rule 4.336 and forms TR/CR 320 and 321 went into effect April 1, 2018.</p>
2.	<p>Working Group on Permanent Medical Excuse from Jury Service PAF served as the sponsoring committee for a joint ad hoc working group to develop a rule of court for permanent excusal from jury duty for persons with serious, permanent disabilities that prevent them from participating in jury service. The working group included members of PAF, CEAC, TCPJAC, and Disability Rights California. Status: California Rules of Court, rule 2.1009 went into effect on January 1, 2019.</p>
3.	<p>Remote Access to Court Records: PAF participated in a joint ad hoc working group to develop rules, standards, and guidelines for online access to court records for parties, their attorneys, local justice partners, and other government agencies. Status: California Rules of Court, rules 2.515–2.528 and 2.540–2.545; amend rules 2.500–2.503 went into effect on January 1, 2019.</p>
4.	<p>Collaboration with Other Advisory Committees and Stakeholders Across various projects, PAF collaborated with many advisory committees and stakeholders, including: Criminal Law Advisory Committee; Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee; Court Executives Advisory Committee; Traffic Advisory Committee; Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee; Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee; and Disability Rights California. Status: Completed in 2018.</p>
5.	<p>Futures Commission Recommendations on Early Education in Civil and Small Claims Made significant progress on the workplan for the Futures Commission recommendations on Early Education in Civil and Small Claims. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hosted a convening of self-help, legal services, and other non-profit experts on civil debt collection; ○ Developed a glossary of civil legal terms; ○ Arranged for civil debt collection experts to provide training at the Self-Help and Family Law conference in August 2018; ○ Developed, user-tested, and refined a prototype for an interactive flowchart/user-guide on civil litigation ○ As part of the council’s Digital Services Team, Lead Counsel to PAF: helped develop comprehensive content on civil debt collection defense; user-tested the content; worked with the council’s Senior Content Strategist to refine the content; and vetted the content with a cohort of civil debt collection experts from various self-help centers. The content is now being finalized and considered for potential inclusion in the NexGen website project for 2019.

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	Status: Ongoing; will continue to move through the Futures Commission workplan in 2019 and 2020.
6.	<p>Bias and Implicit Bias Lead Counsel to PAF: continued to provide education related to bias and implicit bias to branch stakeholders upon request. This included an in-depth 4-part series of trainings provided to San Joaquin court staff, supervisors, and managers in 2018; CJER video that Lead Counsel co-designed, titled <i>Exploring Implicit Bias</i>, aired throughout the branch in 2018; collaborated with CJER staff on development of an educational video for court staff titled <i>Exploring Implicit Bias</i>. Status: Lead Counsel’s stakeholder education is ongoing.</p>
7.	<p>Diversity Lead Counsel to PAF continued to serve as the agency’s liaison to the State Bar’s Council on Access and Fairness. Status: Ongoing.</p>