



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm)  
[executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov](mailto:executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov)

## EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

Thursday, August 27, 2020

12:10 to 1:00 p.m.

Conference Call

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Marsha G. Slough (Chair), Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie, Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Mr. Patrick M. Kelly, Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, and Hon. David M. Rubin

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Samuel K. Feng (Vice-chair) and Hon. Marla O. Anderson

**Committee Staff Present:** Ms. Amber Barnett and Mr. Cliff Alumno

**Invited Guests Present:** Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Chair, Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee

**Staff Present:** Ms. Sarah Abbott, Ms. Mairead Ahlback, Ms. Michelle Allan, Mr. Peter Allen, Ms. Karene Alvarado, Ms. Irene Balajadia, Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Ms. Carolyn Bernabe, Mr. Richard Blalock, Mr. Bob Brow, Ms. Deborah Brown, Ms. Tina Carroll, Mr. Joe Carozza, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Mr. Oliver Cheng, Ms. Deborah Collier-Tucker, Ms. Jessica Craven, Ms. Nicole Davis, Ms. Penny Davis, Ms. Charlene Depner, Mr. Mike Courtney, Mr. Robert Downs, Ms. Kerry Doyle, Mr. Mark Dusman, Ms. Marcela Eggleton, Ms. Khulan Erdenebaatar, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Mr. Patrick Farrales, Ms. Sarah Fleischer-Ihn, Mr. Michael Giden, Ms. Ann Gilmour, Ms. Diana Glick, Ms. Bonnie Hough, Mr. Martin Hoshino, Ms. Donna Ignacio, Mr. Mark Jacobson, Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Mr. Cory Jasperson, Ms. Jamel Jones, Ms. Kathy Joson, Ms. Tracy Kenny, Ms. Mary Ann Koory, Ms. Maria Kwan, Ms. Jayne Lee, Ms. Ingrid Leverett, Mr. Eric Long, Mr. Rob Lower, Mr. Chris Magnusson, Ms. Anna Maves, Mr. Jason Mayo, Ms. Pella McCormick, Ms. Linda McCulloh, Ms. Susan McMullan, Ms. Kristi Morioka, Ms. Fran Mueller, Mr. Rob Oyung, Ms. Kara Portnow, Mr. Corey Rada, Mr. Daniel Richardson, Ms. Anne Ronan, Ms. Gabrielle Selden, Mr. Jonathan Sibayan, Mr. Brian Simeroth, Ms. Christy Simons, Mr. Jagan Singh, Ms. Laura Speed, Mr. Corby Sturges, Ms. Sonya Tafoya, Mr. Gregory Tanaka, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Millicent Tidwell, Ms. Oksana Tuk, Mr. Catrayel Wood, Mr. John Wordlaw, Ms. Martha Wright, Ms. Josely Yangco-Frona and Ms. Carrie Zoller

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

#### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m., and Mr. Alumno took roll call.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the draft minutes of the June 25, 2020, conference call.

**Action:** *The committee approved the minutes of the June 25, 2020, conference call.*

---

## **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

---

### **Item 1**

#### **Agenda Setting for the September 25, 2020, Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)**

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

**Action:** *The committee set the agenda for the September 25, 2020, Judicial Council meeting by approving reports for placement on the business meeting agenda.*

### **Item 2**

#### **Request to Revise 2020 Annual Agenda: Court Executives Advisory Committee (Action Required)**

The committee reviewed a request from the Court Executives Advisory Committee presented by Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Chair, to establish a new subcommittee that would be charged with working on a new project to assist with the annual review of the *Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual*.

**Action:** *The committee approved the request from the Court Executives Advisory Committee.*

### **Item 3**

#### **Request to Revise 2020 Annual Agenda: Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee (Action Required)**

The committee reviewed a request from the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee presented by Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Chair, to add two new projects to its 2020 annual agenda to develop two new California rules of court in consultation with the Judicial Council's Legal Services office.

**Action:** *The committee approved the request from the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.*

### **Item 4**

#### **Technical Revision to Judicial Council Form: Writ of Execution (form EJ-130) (Action Required)**

Acting on behalf of the Judicial Council under rule 10.11(a) of the California Rules of Court, the committee reviewed a request from Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee staff for an urgent technical revision to Judicial Council form EJ-130 to correct an inadvertent error in the revisions that the council approved at its May meeting, and which would take effect on September 1. The form is one of several being revised to implement recent legislation relating to some new exemptions.

**Action:** *Acting on behalf of the Judicial Council under rule 10.11(a) of the California Rules of Court, the committee approved the request from Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee staff.*

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

With the business concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Approved by the committee on [insert date].

DRAFT



# Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Ave.  
San Francisco, CA  
94102-3688

## Meeting Agenda

## Judicial Council

Meeting materials  
are available through  
the hyperlinks in  
this document.

*Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed  
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.6(a))*

*Requests for ADA accommodation should be directed to  
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov*

---

Friday, November 13, 2020

Videoconference

---

### **CLOSED SESSION (RULE 10.6(B))—PLANNING, PERSONNEL, AND DISCUSSION PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE**

**Session: 9:00 – 9:45 p.m.**

**Transitional Break: 9:45 – 10:05 a.m.**

### **OPEN SESSION (RULE 10.6(A)) — MEETING AGENDA**

*A link to the live video stream of the meeting will be available in the Meeting Information Center 15 minutes before the start of the open meeting.*

**Session: 10:05 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

#### **Call to Order**

#### **Public Comment**

*This meeting will be conducted via videoconference and public comments will be accepted in writing only.*

*Submit written comments for this meeting by 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 11, to:*

[judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov](mailto:judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov)

*Please visit the link below and follow the instructions provided under the “Written Comments” section.*

<http://www.courts.ca.gov/28045.htm>

*Comments received after the deadline will not be delivered to Judicial Council members.*

**Approval of Minutes**

**20-213**            **Minutes of September 25, 2020 Judicial Council Meeting**

**Chief Justice's Report**

*10 minutes*

**Administrative Director's Report**

**20-214**            **Administrative Director's Report**

*10 minutes*

**Judicial Council Internal Committee Written Reports**

**20-207**            **Judicial Council Internal Committee Written Reports**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

*A council member who wishes to request that any item be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Discussion Agenda is asked to please notify Roma Cheadle at 415-865-7640 at least 48 hours before the meeting.*

[20-205](#)

**Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts | Continued  
Distribution of Children's Waiting Room Funds During Temporary  
Closure (Action Required)**

**Summary:**

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve a request from the Superior Court of Los Angeles to continue receiving children's waiting room funds during the unforeseen temporary closure of its children's waiting rooms in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. By continuing to receive funding, the court will have sufficient resources to provide safe and healthy children's waiting room settings for children when it is determined that they can be reopened.

[20-084](#)**Collaborative Justice | Recommended Allocations of Fiscal Year 2020-21 Substance Abuse Focus Grants (Action Required)****Summary:**

As part of the Budget Act of 2020 (Stats. 2020, ch. 23), the Legislature allocated a total of \$1.16 million for California collaborative and drug court projects to maintain, expand, or enhance collaborative courts. In November 2005, the Judicial Council established a caseload-based methodology for allocation of these funds (the Substance Abuse Focus Grants) to the courts. The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council allocate the fiscal year (FY) 2020-21 funds to courts using the council's methodology. Additionally, \$75,000 in federal Court Improvement Program funds have been made available for FY 2020-21 to fund the noncompetitive Dependency Drug Court Augmentation to the focus grant program. The committee recommends funding programs in 48 courts for FY 2020-21 with these annual grants and providing augmentation grants to dependency drug courts in 18 counties.

[20-158](#)**Judicial Branch Education | Temporary Extension and Reduction of Requirements; Instructor-Led Training (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Advisory Committee recommends adopting two rules of court relating to branchwide education. The first would grant a temporary extension of time for completing content-based education requirements and a prorated reduction of hours for hours-based education requirements contained within existing rules. The second would allow instructor-led training via live webinars to satisfy the provisions in the rules that require "traditional (live, face-to-face)" or "in person" training. Both rules are necessary due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the imposition of social distancing measures, which have forced CJER and other approved education providers to postpone or cancel in-person education since mid-March 2020.

[20-200](#)**Judicial Council | 2020 Summary of Legislative Policy (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Legislation Committee recommends adopting the updated Legislative Policy Summary reflecting actions through the 2020 legislative year. Adoption of this updated summary of positions taken on court-related legislation will assist the council in making decisions about future legislation, consistent with the judicial branch's strategic goals.

[20-063](#)**Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation | Notification of Reduced or Dismissed Convictions for Probation Transfer Cases (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Legislation Committee and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council sponsor legislation to amend Penal Code sections 1203.425, 1203.9, and 13151 to require notification of reductions of felonies to misdemeanors and dismissals of convictions in probation transfer cases between receiving courts and transferring courts.

[20-037](#)**Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation | Recognition of Tribal Court Orders Relating to the Division of Marital Assets (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Legislation Committee of the Judicial Council, the California Tribal Court-State Court Forum (Forum), and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee (Committee) recommend that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2022, sponsor legislation to add section 1733.1 to the Code of Civil Procedure, amend sections 1731(b)(2) and (3), 1733(b), 1735(a), 1736(b), and 1737(a), add section 2611 to the Family Code, and amend section 70603 of the Government Code to ensure that final divorce or dissolution judgments issued by tribal courts that include division of pension or other deferred compensation assets are effective and, in particular, are recognized as meeting the requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) (Public Law 93-406; 88 Stat. 829) and other similar statutes that restrict the transfer or division of such assets.

[20-198](#)**Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation | Video Appearances in All Civil Actions and Proceedings (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Legislation Committee, Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend the Judicial Council sponsor legislation to provide statutory authority for courts to permit video appearances in any civil actions or proceedings including trials and evidentiary hearings. The proposal originates with recommendations included in reports from the Commission on the Future of California's Court System and the Information Technology Advisory Committee's Remote Video Appearances Workstream.

[20-201](#)**Jury Instructions | Civil Jury Instructions (Release 38) (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions recommends approving for publication the new and revised civil jury instructions prepared by the committee. These revisions bring the instructions up to date with developments in the law over the previous six months. On Judicial Council approval, the instructions will be published in the official 2021 edition of the *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI)*.

[20-194](#)**Language Access Plan | Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2020-21: Requests and Proposed Allocations (Action Required)****Summary:**

The 2018 Budget Act included \$2.55 million ongoing funding for language access signage and technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. In September 2019, the Judicial Council approved a grant program to disburse this funding to the trial courts on an annual basis (up to \$1 million per year for language access signage grants, and up to \$1.35 million per year for language access technology grants). For the grant program's second year (fiscal year 2020-21 cycle), 23 courts applied for signage and technology needs. The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend approving the proposed grant award recommendations for the 23 courts that applied, setting aside remaining funding as contingency funding to be used in case of need by the awarded courts, and directing Language Access Services (LAS) staff of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts to draft and execute intra-branch agreements (IBAs) with awarded courts for fiscal year (FY) 2020-21.

[20-060](#)**Report to the Legislature | State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures in 2019-20 (Action Required)****Summary:**

Judicial Council staff recommend approval of the *Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for 2019-20* for transmittal to the Legislature. Government Code section 77209(i) requires the Judicial Council to report annually to the Legislature on the use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and include any appropriate recommendations.

[20-059](#)**Report to the Legislature | Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2019-20 (Action Required)****Summary:**

Judicial Council staff recommend approval of the Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2019-20 for transmittal to the Department of Finance, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and the Department of Finance. Penal Code section 1463.010 (c) requires the Judicial Council to report annually, on or before December 31, information required to be collected and reported pursuant to Government Code section 68514 (a).

In 2019-20, statewide collections programs collected \$1.0 billion in total revenue, of which \$586.2 million was nondelinquent (forthwith) court-ordered debt and \$423.3 million was from delinquent accounts. This is a decline of xx percent over the \$1.40 billion collected in the prior fiscal year. There are many contributing factors to the decline, the primary contributor to the reduction in revenue is the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent recession. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, statewide collection efforts were suspended or limited from mid- March to early June. The Franchise Tax Board suspended delinquent debt collections on March 20, 2020,



efforts resumed on July 16, 2020. Other contributing factors, as reported by collections programs include high unemployment rates caused by the mandated shelter in place and increased access to ability to pay determinations and greater use of community service in lieu of cash payments for fines.

Since reporting began in 2008–09, a total of \$7.4 billion in delinquent court-ordered debt has been collected by court and county collections programs. The total outstanding delinquent debt at the end of 2019-20 was \$7.7 billion. This figure represents a 27 percent decrease from the \$10.6 billion balance reported for 2018-19.

#### [20-204](#)

### **Rules and Forms | Miscellaneous Technical Changes (Action Required)**

**Summary:**

Various members of the judicial branch, members of the public, and Judicial Council staff have identified errors in the California Rules of Court and Judicial Council forms resulting from typographical errors and changes resulting from legislation, and previous rule amendments and form revisions. Judicial Council staff recommend making the necessary corrections to avoid causing confusion for court users, clerks, and judicial officers.

#### [20-217](#)

### **Rules and Forms | Civil Practice and Procedure: Emergency Rules for Remote Depositions and Electronic Service in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic (Action Required)**

**Summary:**

The chairs of the Judicial Council's six internal committees recommend that the council repeal California Rules of Court, emergency rule 11 (Depositions through remote electronic means) and emergency rule 12 (Electronic service). Senate Bill 1146 (Stats. 2020, ch. 112), enacted on September 18, 2020, codified and made permanent the provisions in these rules. As the two rules were intended to be temporary and are no longer needed, the council should repeal them.

#### [20-061](#)

### **Trial Court Allocations | Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf of The Trial Courts (Action Required)**

**Summary:**

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends approving six new requests and two amended requests totaling \$3,777,553 from eight trial courts for Trial Court Trust Fund funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts. Under the Judicial Council-adopted process, a court may request reduced funding as a result of a court's exceeding the 3 percent fund balance cap, to be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund for the benefit of that court.

#### [20-216](#)

### **Judicial Branch Technology | Court Modernization Funding (Action Required)**

**Summary:**

At its September 25, 2020 meeting, the Judicial Council approved 13 program categories to be funded with the \$25M for the modernization of court operations through the use of technology that was included in the California Budget Act of 2020

for fiscal year 2020/2021. The council also delegated to the Technology Committee the task of making the individual allocations and reporting back to the council. The Technology Committee recommends adding clarifying language to expand the scope for one of the programs to give courts increased flexibility in improving access to justice through modernization and the use of technology.

## DISCUSSION AGENDA

[20-170](#)

### **Pretrial Reform | Pretrial Reform and Operations Workgroup Update and Recommendations on Use of Pretrial Risk Assessment Instruments (No Action Required)**

**Summary:**

The Chief Justice appointed the Pretrial Reform and Operations Workgroup (PROW) (the Workgroup) in January 2019 to review progress on reforms to California's system of pretrial detention and release and identify next steps. PROW was charged with (1) reviewing progress on reforms to California's system of pretrial detention and release; (2) developing recommendations for funding allocations of court pilot projects, should they be included in the final State Budget for fiscal year 2019-20; (3) developing a plan for judicial branch education on pretrial issues; and (4) conducting an examination of pretrial risk assessment instruments.

The Workgroup has met frequently since its appointment, both in-person and virtually, to fulfill these charges. It has reviewed progress on pretrial reforms, developed funding recommendations and provided ongoing oversight to the Pretrial Pilot Program, and developed judicial branch education programs on pretrial issues. The documents provided as Attachment A, *Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument Recommendations and Areas for Further Policy Development*, and Attachment B, *Fundamentals of Pretrial Risk Assessment Instruments*, are the culmination of PROW's comprehensive examination of pretrial risk assessment instruments (PRAIs) and recommended best practices for their use by California trial courts and justice partners. PROW submits this report, including the attached documents relating to its fourth charge, for the consideration of the Judicial Council.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Pretrial Reform and Operations Workgroup  
Ms. Shelley Curran, Criminal Justice

*20 minutes*

**20-206 Trial Court Budget | \$50 Million One-Time COVID-19 Backlog Funding in 2020-21 (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the definition, reporting requirements, and methodology recommendations in relation to the first and second half of the \$50 million in one-time COVID-19 backlog funding included in the 2020 Budget Act. These recommendations are in response to a Judicial Council motion from July 24, 2020, and will provide trial courts the necessary information for spending the \$25 million distributed to date as well as the second \$25 million planned for subsequent distribution based on data and need.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice-chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Ms. Fran Mueller, Budget Services  
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Business Management Services

*15 minutes*

**20-202 Judicial Branch Technology | Proposed Judicial Branch Data and Information Policy (Presentation Only. No Report or Materials)****Summary:**

The Data Analytics Workstream of the Information Technology Advisory Committee will give an informational presentation of proposed Judicial Branch Data and Information Principles and Policy Concepts. These principles and concepts will be vetted internally and through a public comment process before being presented to the Judicial Council for approval in March 2021.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Tara Desautels and Mr. David Yamasaki, Executive Co-Sponsors, Data Analytics Workstream, Information Technology Advisory Committee  
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Business Management Services

*20 minutes*

[20-149](#)**Judicial Branch Technology | Futures Commission Directive:  
Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services (Action Required)****Summary:**

Following the final recommendations in the Report to the Chief Justice: Commission on the Future of California's Court System, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye directed the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) to explore and make recommendations related to the use of intelligent chat technology to facilitate informational and self-help services for the public. To that end, ITAC recommends the Judicial Council accept the Intelligent Chat Workstream findings and final report. The report presents a comprehensive business case for the use of chatbots where a person would interact with an automated system on a website to ask questions and receive information, for informational and self-help services. The report provides background research on the current state of chat technology, outlines key findings and deliverables, and sets forth recommendations for the use of intelligent chat to benefit court customers.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee  
Hon. Michael Groch, Executive Sponsor, Intelligent Chat Workstream, Information Technology Advisory Committee  
Mr. John Yee, Information Technology

*20 minutes*

[20-210](#)**Court Facilities | California Trial Court Facilities Standards, 2020  
Edition (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee recommends adoption of the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards, 2020* edition. Various code provisions and best management practices have changed over time from the Judicial Council's current trial court facilities standards. Upon adoption, Judicial Council Facilities Services will apply these facilities standards for design and construction of trial court facilities.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair, Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair, Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Ms. Pella McCormick, Facilities Services

*15 minutes*

[20-208](#)**Indian Child Welfare Act | State Court Best Practices Guide and Toolkit (No Action Required)****Summary:**

In collaboration with the Office of Government Affairs, staff of the Tribal Court-State Court Forum have created a toolkit of state court best practices, policies, procedures, and tips for enhancing court compliance with the requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), and improving outcomes for Indian children, families, and tribes interacting with the California state courts in cases governed by ICWA.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Abby Abinanti and Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury, Cochairs, Tribal Court-State Court Forum

Ms. Leily Arzi, Former Legal Fellow, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council of California

Ms. Ann Gilmour, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

*15 minutes*

[20-072](#)**Report to the Legislature | Cost-Benefit Analysis of California Courts' Self-Help Centers (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Budget Act of 2018 (Stats. 2018, ch. 29) provided \$19.1 million per year in additional funding for self-help centers for a three-year period. It required that the Judicial Council prepare a cost-benefit report assessing the costs and benefits of each method by which self-help services are provided and how cost-effectiveness may vary across issue areas. It further required an assessment of the impacts of self-help services on trial court operations. This report is submitted in response to that statutory requirement.

**Speakers:**

Ms. Charlene Depner, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Ms. Bonnie Rose Hough, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

*10 minutes*

[20-091](#)**Family and Juvenile Law | Court Adoption and Permanency Month (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends adopting a resolution proclaiming November to be Court Adoption and Permanency Month. As it has since 1999, in observance of National Adoption Month, the Judicial Council can recognize the ongoing efforts of California's juvenile courts and their justice partners to provide children and families with access to fair, understandable judicial proceedings leading to timely, well-informed, and just permanency outcomes. The resolution will also give courts the opportunity to raise community awareness of the importance of finding safe, stable, and permanent homes for every child or youth in foster care.

**Speakers:**

Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Co-Chair, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

*15 minutes*

**INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)**[20-058](#)**Court Facilities | Lease Revenue Bond Issuance, Fall 2019 and Spring 2020****Summary:**

The Administrative Director presents this report on actions taken in connection with lease-revenue bonds issued by the State Public Works Board (SPWB) in fall 2019 and spring 2020, for the financing of court facilities projects as authorized and directed by the Judicial Council. No new lease-revenue bonds were issued by the SPWB on behalf of the Judicial Council in fall 2019 and spring 2020. However, a refunding of existing bonds was approved by SPWB, and seven interim loan were issued for construction.

[20-203](#)**Court Security | Trial Court Screening Equipment Replacement for Fiscal Year 2019-20****Summary:**

Each year, the Administrative Director approves the list of entrance screening equipment to be funded that year through the Screening Equipment Replacement Program, which provides funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund to replace outdated or malfunctioning screening equipment in the trial courts. This report updates the council on the equipment that was replaced in fiscal year (FY) 2019-20 using that funding.

[20-212](#)**Report to the Legislature | 2020-21 Trial Court Trust Fund Backfill Report - Quarter 1****Summary:**

Provision 3 of Item 0250-113-0001 in the Budget Act of 2020 requires the Judicial Council to submit quarterly reports to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the estimated General Fund required to backfill the Trial Court Trust Fund due to shortfalls in revenue supporting trial court operations. This report is due no later than one month after the prior fiscal quarter. The first report is due in October 2020 for the period of July-September 2020.

[20-056](#)**Report to the Legislature | Allocation and Reimbursements to the Trial Courts in 2019-20****Summary:**

Government Code section 77202.5(a) requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature annually on allocations and reimbursements to the trial courts. On September 30, 2020, Judicial Council staff submitted to the Legislature the report entitled 2019-20 Allocations and Reimbursements to the Trial Courts.

[20-057](#)**Report to the Legislature | Allocation of the State-Level Reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund****Summary:**

Pursuant to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), the Judicial Council is required to set aside funds in the Trial Court Trust Fund and allocate them for the trial courts to use for unforeseen emergencies, unanticipated expenses for existing programs, or unavoidable funding shortfalls. On October 1, 2020, Judicial Council submitted the Report of Allocation of the State-Level Reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund in 2019-20 to the Legislature and the Department of Finance.

[20-095](#)**Report to the Legislature | Court Innovations Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2019-20****Summary:**

The Budget Act of 2016 allocated \$25 million to the judicial branch to promote court innovations and efficiencies through the Court Innovations Grant Program. The Budget Act of 2016 requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature no later than September 30, 2017 and each year thereafter the progress on that program and its projects. This year's report was submitted as required.

[20-211](#)**Report to the Legislature | Standards and Measures that Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice****Summary:**

Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice is a report to the Legislature required by Government Code section 77001.5 requiring the Judicial Council to adopt and annually report on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice. The report includes, but is not limited to, the following subjects: (1) providing equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants; (2) case processing, including the efficient use of judicial resources; and (3) general court administration.

[20-209](#)**Trial Courts | Public Notice by Courts of Closures or Reduced Clerks' Office Hours (Gov. Code, § 68106-Rep. No. 50)****Summary:**

Government Code section 68106 (1) directs trial courts to notify the public and the Judicial Council before closing courtrooms or clerks' offices, or reducing clerks' regular office hours; and (2) directs the council to post all such notices on its website and relay them to the Legislature. This is the 50th report to date listing the latest court notices received by the council under this statutory requirement. Since the previous report, three superior courts-the Superior Courts of San Bernardino, Santa Clara, and Madera counties-have issued new notices.

**Circulating Orders****Appointment Orders****Adjournment (approximately 12:30 p.m.)**



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

---

### MEMORANDUM

---

**Date**

September 29, 2020

**To**

Members of the Executive and Planning  
Committee

**From**

Judicial Council staff  
Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager  
David Smith, Senior Research Analyst  
Office of Court Research, Budget Services

**Subject**

Conversion of One Vacant Subordinate  
Judicial Officer Position in the Superior  
Court of Los Angeles County

**Action Requested**

Approve Staff Recommendation

**Deadline**

October 8, 2020

**Contact**

David Smith  
415-865-7696 phone  
[david.smith@jud.ca.gov](mailto:david.smith@jud.ca.gov)

---

#### Executive Summary

Office of Court Research staff recommend that the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee confirm the conversion of one vacant subordinate judicial officer (SJO) position in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The court has notified council staff of this vacancy and has requested that the position be converted to a judgeship. Confirming this request for an SJO conversion is consistent with established council policy of improving access to justice by providing constitutionally empowered judges who are accountable to the electorate in matters that are appropriately handled by judges.

#### Recommendation

Office of Court Research staff recommend that the Executive and Planning Committee confirm the conversion of one vacant SJO position in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The vacancy is the result of the retirement of the commissioner serving in this position on October 30, 2019. The conversion will take effect on the date on which the committee approves the court's request.



Council staff also recommend that the Executive Committee acknowledge that the Superior Court of Los Angeles County may treat this converted position as a position that the court may temporarily fill until a judge is named and sworn to fill it.

### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

The 2002 report of the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group led the Judicial Council to sponsor legislation to restore an appropriate balance between judges and SJOs in the trial courts. The 2002 report found that many courts had created SJO positions out of necessity in response to the dearth in the creation of new judgeships during the 1980s and 1990s. As a result, many SJOs were working as temporary judges. This imbalance between judges and SJOs was especially critical in the area of family and juvenile law.<sup>1</sup>

In 2007, the Judicial Council approved a methodology for evaluating the workload appropriate to SJOs relative to the number of SJOs working in the courts. In the same year, the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722), which adopted the Judicial Council's methodology. This resulted in a list of 25 courts in which a total of 162 SJO positions would be converted. Government Code section 69615(c)(1)(A) allows for the annual conversion of up to 16 SJO vacancies upon authorization by the Legislature in courts identified by the Judicial Council as having SJOs in excess of the workload appropriate to SJOs.<sup>2</sup>

Subsequent council action established and refined guidelines for expediting the conversion of SJO vacancies. These guidelines included:

- The adoption of four trial court allocation groups and a schedule that distributes the 16 annual SJO conversions across these groups in numbers that are proportional to the total number of conversions for which the groups are eligible;
- The delegation of authority to the Executive Committee for confirming SJO conversions;
- The establishment of guidelines for courts to notify the council of SJO vacancies and timelines for the redistribution of SJO conversions across the allocation groups; and

---

<sup>1</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group Rep., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Duties and Titles* (July 2002), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/sjowgfinal.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/sjowgfinal.pdf) (as of June 7, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., *Update of the Judicial Workload Assessment and New Methodology for Selecting Courts with Subordinate Judicial Officers for Conversion to Judgeships* (Feb. 14, 2007), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/022307item9.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/022307item9.pdf); and the update of this report and SJO allocation list, Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of Conversions Using More Current Workload Data* (Aug. 11, 2015), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf) (as of June 7, 2017).

- The establishment of criteria for the Executive Committee to use in evaluating and granting requests by courts to exempt SJO vacancies from conversion.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the above policies to expedite conversions, in 2015 the council refreshed the workload data used to determine the courts with eligible conversions. A list of eligible positions was established for the remaining conversions, and courts were notified of any changes in status based on the updated workload assessment.<sup>4</sup>

### **Analysis/Rationale**

The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is eligible for a total of 79 of the 162 conversions authorized by the Legislature and has previously converted 78 positions, with the last conversion occurring in December of fiscal year (FY) 2019–20. The court is the sole member of Allocation Group 1, which is allotted seven conversions each year. The conversion of the current vacant SJO position to a judgeship in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County represents the final SJO conversion for which the court is eligible. Conversion of the present position would allow the court reasonable certainty and clarity concerning staffing and judicial workload over the next few years.

### **Policy implications**

Confirming this conversion is consistent with well-established tenets of council policy on SJO conversions.

### **Comments**

This proposal, which is consistent with council policy on SJO conversions, did not circulate for comment.

### **Alternatives considered**

The proposed conversion of a vacant SJO position is consistent with council policy. On that basis, no alternatives were considered.

### **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

To date, there have been minimal implementation costs for the trial courts. On appointment of a new judge to sit in a converted position, funding equal to the judge's estimated compensation—which includes salary and benefits but does not include retirement—is removed from the trial

---

<sup>3</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of the Policy for Deferrals of Conversions to Judgeships* (Aug. 26, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4625050&GUID=80FC1733-CB19-4468-9822-E63668EBC1C4> (as of June 7, 2017).

<sup>4</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of Conversions Using More Current Workload Data* (Aug. 11, 2015), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf) (as of June 7, 2017).

court's allocation that previously funded the SJO position. This funding is then transferred to the statewide fund for judicial salaries and benefits, Program 45.25.

**Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Letter from Presiding Judge Kevin C. Brazile, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, to Justice Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Executive and Planning Committee, September 14, 2020, regarding the conversion of a vacant SJO position



# The Superior Court

111 NORTH HILL STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
CHAMBERS OF  
**KEVIN C. BRAZILE**  
PRESIDING JUDGE

TELEPHONE  
(213) 633-0400

September 14, 2020

The Honorable Marsha G. Slough, Chair  
Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Re: Request for Conversion of One Commissioner Position

Dear Justice Slough:

The Los Angeles Superior Court greatly appreciates the prompt action taken on previous SJO conversion requests.

I am writing to request that you forward to the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee our request to expedite approval of the conversion of one vacant commissioner position in the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles to a judgeship in the 2020-2021 fiscal year, pursuant to Government Code Section 69615.

The vacancy was created by the retirement of Commissioner Sharon Lewis-Miller, who retired on October 30, 2019.

As the above position is instantly available, and as we have a pressing need for judges, I hope and trust that the Committee will approve this request and promptly forward notice of the resulting vacancies to the Governor's office.

This conversion concludes all the SJO conversions scheduled for our Court.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Very truly yours,

  
KEVIN C. BRAZILE  
Presiding Judge

KCB:BB:rm

c: Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California  
Leah Rose Goodwin, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council of California

# Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch

## Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020

Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 (Amended [Date])

### I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. David Rosenberg, Judge, Superior Court of Yolo County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Mr. Grant Parks, Principal Manager, Audit Services
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.63</a> of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch (audit committee), which is charged with advising and assisting the council in performing its responsibilities to ensure that the fiscal affairs of the judicial branch are managed efficiently, effectively, and transparently, and in performing its specific responsibilities relating to audits and contracting, as required by law and good public policy. <a href="#">Rule 10.63(c)</a> sets forth additional duties of the committee, such as to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review and approve of a yearly audit plan for the judicial branch,</li><li>• Advise and assist the council in performing its responsibilities under the Judicial Branch Contract Law,</li><li>• Review and recommend to the council proposed updates and revisions to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual, and</li><li>• Make recommendations concerning any proposed changes to the annual compensation plan for Judicial Council staff.</li></ul> <p>Rule 10.63(d) sets forth the membership position of the committee. The audit committee currently has eight members and one non-voting advisor. The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.</p>	
<b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b> There are no subcommittees or working groups operating under this advisory committee.	
<b>Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)</b> The audit committee generally meets by telephone quarterly. The advisory committee does not expect to hold any in-person meetings during the 2020 calendar year. Approximate dates for the meetings to be held in 2020 are:	

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

- February 10, 2020
- June 30, 2020
- July 10, 2020 – Special meeting to review changes to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual.
- October 2020
- December 2020

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b><i>Project Title:</i> Review Audit Reports and Recommend Policy Changes, As Appropriate</b>	<b><i>Priority</i><sup>5</sup> 1</b>
		<b><i>Strategic Plan Goal</i><sup>6</sup> II</b>
	<p><b><i>Project Summary</i><sup>7</sup>:</b> The audit committee reviews audit reports issued by external entities (i.e., the State Controller’s Office and State Auditor’s Office) and periodically issues public audit advisories or internal memoranda to highlight systemic and important issues for trial court management. Some of the audit reports presented to the audit committee are required by law. Section 77206(h) of the Government Code requires the State Controller’s Office (SCO) to audit the revenues, expenditures, and fund balances of each trial court on a cyclical basis. The annual budget act appropriates over \$540,000 for these audits each year. Similarly, section 19210 of the Public Contract Code requires the California State Auditor’s Office (CSA) to audit the procurement practices of at least five trial courts and the Judicial Council on an alternating biennial schedule. The annual budget act appropriates \$325,000 to reimburse CSA each year. Audit reports issued by both the SCO and the CSA are discussed by the committee in public session for transparency.</p>	
	<p>Section 77206(g) of the Government Code authorizes the Judicial Council to inspect, review, and perform comprehensive oversight and analysis of court financial records wherever they may be located. State law also authorizes council staff to investigate allegations of financial impropriety or mismanagement. The Judicial Council’s audit staff often review court compliance with key financial, operational and procurement-related policies in high risk areas, such as: cash handling procedures, the reporting of case filings data to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS); and vendor payment practices. Trial court management may address the audit committee in closed session to share their perspectives on any draft audit findings. To promote transparency, the final audit report (along with those from the SCO and CSA) are posted publicly on the judicial branch’s website following the audit committee’s approval.</p>	
	<p>Despite the challenges of Covid-19, the audit committee expects the legislatively-mandated audits performed by the SCO and CSA will continue. However, the frequency of audit committee meetings will likely diminish since most of the audit reports and related findings appearing before the committee are developed by the Judicial Council’s own staff. The audit committee does not wish to overly burden trial courts as they properly place their primary focus on responding to the pandemic. The audit committee had previously taken steps to curtail the scope of the council’s audit work by greatly reducing or eliminating auditor travel given public health considerations. Therefore,</p>	

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as implementation or a program in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of [The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch](#) the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

# Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup>

the council’s audit staff will only conduct audit work remotely for those courts that have expressed both a willingness and a desire to continue with the FY 2020—21 audit plan. If necessary, audit staff will be redeployed to other fiscal or budgetary projects that will not require trial court involvement. Next year’s FY 2021–22 audit plan will identify which courts should be audited based on the time elapsing since their previous audit, which may include courts originally scheduled for audit during the current fiscal year.

The annual audit plan approved by the audit committee identifies both the courts to be audited and the scope of those audits. The audit committee reviews draft audit reports in closed session and discusses the results with court officials. Once approved for public release, the audit reports are posted on the judicial branch’s public website. At times, the advisory committee will note systemic issues in audit reports, such as in the areas of cash handling procedures, court procurement practices, and the accuracy of case filings data reported to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). As a result, the audit committee will periodically issue audit advisories to the courts recommending best practices. Alternatively, the audit committee at times will issue letters to other advisory committees suggesting changes to branch policy.

**Status/Timeline:** Ongoing.

**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** There are no direct fiscal impacts. However, the periodic recommendations made by audit committee may result in fiscal impacts that must be evaluated by those committees designated with oversight responsibilities in the given policy area (e.g., Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Court Executives Advisory Committee, etc.).

*This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.*

**Internal/External Stakeholders:** The courts we audit are external stakeholders, particularly court executive officers and financial staff.

**AC Collaboration:** No direct collaboration with other advisory committees or working groups. Limited collaboration with external audit agencies (such as the State Auditor’s Office and State Controller’s Office), who also periodically audit judicial branch entities. Those external audits are also reviewed and discussed during open meetings of the audit committee.

2.	<b>Project Title:</b> Recommend Updates to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II</b>

**Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:** The Judicial Branch Contract Law (Pub. Contract Code, §§ 19201–19210) requires the Judicial Council to adopt a contracting manual that is consistent with the Public Contract Code and substantially similar to the State Contracting Manual and State Administrative Manual. The manual contains procurement and contracting policies and procedures that must be followed by all judicial branch entities. To the extent that there are legislative amendments to the Public Contract Code that are applicable to judicial branch entities, the Judicial Council must update the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual so that the manual remains consistent with the Public Contract Code. **For 2020, the audit committee completed this work in July 2020.**



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing, (Generally, the audit committee holds a special meeting in July to discuss and approve suggested revisions before forwarding the changes to the council for final approval and adoption).</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council’s Legal Services office are responsible for monitoring changes to state procurement laws and developing proposed changes for the audit committee’s consideration at its July meeting. Legal Services absorbs the cost of this work within its existing budget.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Attorneys within Legal Services are critical to ensuring appropriate updates are made to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual in a timely manner.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Attorneys within Legal Services periodically communicate with a group of court procurement officials, known as the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual Working Group. This group was originally established to help create the original version of the contracting manual; however, this working group is not formally established under the audit committee and is not an official working group created by any other advisory committee.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title: Issue Audit Advisories, as Necessary, to Proactively Address Areas of Risk</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 32</b></p>
		<p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Since the creation of the audit committee in October 2017, audit staff and the committee have issued seven audit advisories on topics such as: cash handling procedures, grant administration, court procurement practices, and data quality standards for court reporting to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). As the audit committee discusses audit findings and sees systemic and important issues that require action, it will often direct committee staff to draft audit advisories that explain to the courts the given problem, risks, and suggested recommendations for corrective action. Doing so provides each court with an opportunity to review their own practices and make changes—prior to an audit—to improve judicial administration.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Include JCC staff/fiscal resources, fiscal impact to JCC, trial courts, and other relevant resource needs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.

## II. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	During fiscal year 2018–19, the audit committee reviewed 18 audit reports containing 124 audit findings and recommendations. The courts agreed or generally agreed with these findings 87 percent of the time.
2.	The audit committee issued two audit advisories to all courts regarding: cash handling procedures (November 2018) and court procurement practices (March 2019).
3.	The audit committee considered and forwarded proposed revisions to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual in July 2019, resulting in the Judicial Council approving a revised manual in September 2019.

**Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020**

**Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 (Amended [TBD])**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Luis A. Lavin, Cochair, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Catherine Ongiri, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> <a href="#">Rule 10.55</a> 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.  <a href="#">Rule 10.55(c)</a> sets forth the membership position of the committee. PAF has 30 members. The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.	
<b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Judicial Diversity Toolkit Working Group: Review and consider ideas and recommendations in collaboration with members of the State Bar's Council on Access and Fairness (COAF) for future updates to design and content to the newly created <i>Pathways to Achieving Judicial Diversity in the California Courts</i>; lead efforts on disseminating information statewide through collaboration with justice partners.</li><li>2. Language Access Subcommittee: The Language Access Subcommittee (LAS) will advise and present recommendations to PAF regarding the Language Access Plan (LAP) and its overarching goal of ensuring access to justice for all court users, especially court users with limited English proficiency. When appropriate, the LAS will make recommendations to PAF in the areas of technology, education, and translation; as well as on legislative and rule of court proposals to enhance language access services throughout the judicial branch.</li></ol>	

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

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

**Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

Regular bi-monthly teleconference meetings on third Thursdays, 12:15–1:15 p.m., beginning February 2020.

April 17, 2020, annual in-person meeting in San Francisco. *Cancelled due to COVID-19 pandemic.*

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

DRAFT

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Form MC-410: Request for Accommodations by Persons with Disabilities	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 2(b) <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> I, V
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> PAF will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Circulate the revised MC-410 form and proposed MC-410-INFO sheet and address any public comments; and</li> <li>b) Implement information sheet, MC-410 INFO to accompany form MC-410 to be effective January 1, 2021.</li> </ul> <p>This proposal redesigns the MC-410 and recommends the adoption of a new information sheet, the MC-410-INFO, to accompany and explain the process to request an accommodation for disability. The goal of the redesign process is to preserve the substantive and legal content of the MC-410 and present that content in plain language, with enhanced visual accessibility and compliance with standards for web accessibility of materials.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> <u>Ongoing- Complete upon approval by Judicial Council of Consent Agenda at September 2020 meeting.</u></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC and CJER staff with disability expertise.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TBD.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

2. <b>Project Title: ADA Bench Card Update (New)</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2 <u>Deferred</u></b>
<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b>	
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Work in collaboration with the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) to review and make recommendations to update and revise the ADA Bench card for judicial officers.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> <u>Deferred due to impacts on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic. TBD 2020.</u></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts (CFCC) and CJER.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TBD.</p>	

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Diversity in The Branch</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> PAF will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Continue to update the newly revised toolkit, <i>Pathways to Judicial Diversity</i> based on feedback received from users. Conduct presentations and continue the rollout of the toolkit statewide in collaboration with justice partners, provided sufficient resources are available.</li> <li>b) Continue to serve as subject matter resource with justice partners and stakeholders on initiatives for increasing diversity in the judicial branch.</li> <li>c) Continue to collaborate with CJER staff on improving and expanding educational resources in areas under PAF’s purview and expertise related to diversity, inclusion, and fairness.</li> </ul> <p>This task was included on the committee’s prior Annual Agenda. Items <i>a</i>, <i>b</i>, and <i>c</i> were updated to include new details.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> CJER, State Bar’s Committee on Access and Fairness (COAF), California Judges Association, California Lawyers Association (CLA), and California Change Lawyers.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Judicial Diversity Toolkit Working Group.</p>		
2.	<b>Project Title: Futures Recommendations for an Early Education Program in Civil and Small Claims</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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>The project is being done at the direction of the Chief Justice.</p>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> December 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC; Legal Services (LS); and Information Technology (IT) staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&amp;SCAC); Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC); Judicial Council's Digital Services Team; and TBD.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title: Support for Implementation of California Rules of Court, Rule 1.300</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The PAF Language Access Subcommittee will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Work with Judicial Council staff, trial courts and a consultant to develop solutions and recommendations to assist the courts and justice partners with implementation of rule 1.300; and</li> <li>b) The project scope includes consultation with stakeholders and development of recommendations and concrete solutions that will allow courts to partner with other courts and with community service providers in the use of technology and other means to expand LEP access to court-ordered services in their language.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Spring 2021 (for report with recommendations).</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC's Language Access Services Program staff, including program budget for consultant projects as needed (already funded) and Information Technology staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, LEPs, public, community providers, and justice partners.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> PAF Language Access Subcommittee and Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
4.	<b>Project Title: Language Access Signage and Technology Grants</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>
<p data-bbox="176 342 1262 378"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The PAF Language Access Subcommittee will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="201 381 1938 521">a) In coordination with the Judicial Council Executive Office, PAF Language Access Subcommittee, and the Information Technology Advisory Committee, the Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts (CFCC) Language Access Services Program will disburse ongoing monies (\$2.35 million each year) from the 2018 Budget as grants to trial courts for language access signage and technology initiatives on an annual basis.</li> <li data-bbox="201 565 1923 670">b) For fiscal year 2019-20, Language Access Services Program staff plans to make recommendations for Judicial Council approval in March 2020 on signage and technology projects. For fiscal year 2020-21, the grant cycle will commence in Summer 2020, to allow courts more time to apply.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="176 711 1761 743">The Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program commenced in September 2019, following council approval.</p> <p data-bbox="176 792 527 824"><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p data-bbox="176 865 1944 898"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, Branch Accounting and Procurement, Information Technology, ongoing monies from 2018 Budget Act.</p> <p data-bbox="176 906 1902 979"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="176 1019 1493 1052"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, LEPs, public, community providers, and justice partners.</p> <p data-bbox="176 1092 1566 1125"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> PAF Language Access Subcommittee and Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>		
5.	<b>Project Title: Public Outreach Campaign: Phase 2</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>
<p data-bbox="176 1308 1955 1450"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The PAF Language Access Subcommittee will do the following: This phase of continuing public outreach is intended to build communication channels, including through ethnic media outlets, justice partners and community organizations, and to inform the public as well as help those working directly with LEP individuals to fully access these resources.</p>		

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p>This ongoing outreach work will build on the work commenced in 2019, through a contract with the National Center for State Courts, that included developing a suite of multilingual material including print materials, audio files and videos which are now posted to the Language Access Toolkit. Phase 2 will be a public outreach campaign to inform LEP court users across the state of language services available in the court and to provide information on common court procedures.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Spring 2021.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, including program budget for consultant projects as needed (already funded), Public Affairs, and Information Technology (Webcontent).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, LEPs, public, and justice partners.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> PAF Language Access Subcommittee.</p>	
6.	<b>Project Title: Annual Language Access Survey</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The PAF Language Access Subcommittee will do the following: As a follow-up to surveys conducted in 2016–2019, the Language Access Services Program will send out a language access survey to all 58 trial courts in the state in July 2020, using the SurveyMonkey online instrument, to determine courts’ current provision of court interpreters in all civil matters.</p> <p>The survey also includes questions regarding courts’ provision of other language access services. The survey will help the Language Access Subcommittee, PAF, and Judicial Council staff obtain a better picture of the extent to which language services are provided by the courts, as well as areas that may need improvement.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> December 2020 (Survey Report).</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Trial courts and public.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> PAF Language Access Subcommittee.</p>	
7.	<b>Project Title: Collaborate and Provide Subject Matter Expertise</b>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> PAF will do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>c) Provide education and technical assistance to the court self-help centers; make recommendations to the Judicial Council, as needed, regarding reports to the legislature on self-help services, requests for funding for self-help and updates to the <a href="#">Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers in California Trial Courts</a> as provided by <a href="#">California Rules of Court, rule 10.960(e)</a>.</li> <li>d) Continue collaborations with the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC), Criminal Law Advisory Committee (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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, Governmental Affairs, and Criminal Justice Services (CJS) staff.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> 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 Advisory Committee (CEAC), Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee (CJCAC), TAC, CLAC, C&amp;SCAC, ITAC; and CJER Access, Ethics, and Fairness Curriculum Development Committee.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Project Title: Improving Access and Fairness through Technology</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> PAF will do the following:</p> <p>a) Continue coordinating with the Judicial Council’s Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) on developing a Self-Represented Litigant E-Portal. (See <a href="#">The Critical Role of the State Judiciary in Increasing Access for Self-Represented Litigants: Self-Help Access 360</a>); and</p> <p>b) Discuss and explore with ITAC other intersections between access, fairness, and technology.</p> <p>Explore how to encourage use of technologies that benefit court-users with disabilities.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC and IT staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> ITAC.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
9.	<b>Project Title: Guidelines for Machine Translation (including web use) and Use of Tablets to Assist LEP Court Users</b>	Priority <sup>5</sup> 1 <b>Deferred</b> Strategic Plan Goal <sup>6</sup> I
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The PAF Language Access Subcommittee will do the following:            Work on developing guidelines for courts on the appropriate use of machine translation for web, computers or tablets to assist LEP court users with accurate information in their language.</p> <p>These guidelines will help inform court staff so they are trained and ready to work with translation technology, enabling them to confidently and accurately guide LEP court users through court conversations and/or the conduct of court business.</p> <p>Development of guidelines will also support related Futures Commission and ITAC work to explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation at service counters and in self-help centers.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Deferred due to impacts on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic. Spring 2021 (for report with recommendations)</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, including program budget for consultant projects as needed (already funded) and IT staff.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, LEP, public, community providers, and justice partners.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> PAF Language Access Subcommittee, Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>		
10.	<b>Project Title: Mental Health Recommendations</b>	Priority <sup>5</sup> 21 <b>Deferred</b> Strategic Plan Goal <sup>6</sup> I
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Continue to review and implement recommendations referred to PAF from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce. <a href="#">Final Report of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Taskforce</a>.</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>		

# Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup>

**Status/Timeline:** Deferred due to impacts on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic. Ongoing.

**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** CFCC and CJER staff.

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

**Internal/External Stakeholders:** None.

**AC Collaboration:** Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, CJCAC, CJER Advisory Committee, and TBD.

DRAFT

### III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Futures Recommendations on Early Education Program 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"> <li>• Developed content used in a prototype digital tool created by the Digital Services Team to test the digital version of the simple flowchart for dealing with debt collection (limited civil) matters;</li> <li>• After user testing, determined that release of the simple flowchart, which is complete, would leave SRLs with additional needs and questions that court self-help centers are not currently equipped to resolve;</li> <li>• Expanding the simple flowchart to include every step/form to complete a limited civil matter from identification of the legal issues to Judgment After Trial;</li> <li>• Began development of plans to collect existing training and create needed additional training to assure court self-help centers are prepared to assist with limited civil cases;</li> <li>• Created a prototype limited to post judgment remedies, focusing on digitizing the claim of exemption process. This prototype is published here: <a href="https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/debt-collection">https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/debt-collection</a></li> </ul> <p>Status: Ongoing; User testing will continue, and the team is expanding the concept into the overall design of the new website. User testing informs the team of needed revisions, then more user testing is needed for each revision.</p>
2.	<p><b>Diversity in the Branch:</b> PAF in collaboration with members of the State Bar’s Council on Access and Fairness (COAF) completed all revisions, updates, and a redesign to the Judicial Diversity Toolkit, renamed: Pathways to Judicial Diversity. The updated and redesigned Pathways to Judicial Diversity link is also posted as a resource on the JRN website for judicial officers. The newly revised toolkit was presented throughout the state including at the California Lawyers Association (CLA) Annual Meeting, Change Lawyers and UCLA School of Law in Los Angeles, and at the Beyond the Bench Conference in December.</p> <p>Status: The redesign of the toolkit is complete. Presentations of toolkit will be ongoing in 2020.</p>
3.	<p><b>Language Access Rule of Court:</b> PAF took lead responsibility for this proposal to approve and adopt new California Rules of Court, rule 1.300 and forms LA-350, LA-400, and LA-450 upon the sunset of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force in March 2019.</p> <p>Status: Rule 1.300 and forms LA-350, LA-400, and LA-450 went into effect 9/1/2019.</p>
4.	<p><b>Signage and Technology Grants:</b> The 2018 Budget Act included \$2.35 million in ongoing funding for courts for language access signage and technology. Language Access Services (LAS) worked with courts to identify funding needs and the process to disburse this as a grant program launched in September 2019 with approval from the council.</p> <p>Status: Ongoing.</p>



#	Project Highlights and Achievements
5.	<p><b>Annual Language Access Survey:</b> As a follow-up to surveys conducted in 2016–2018, the LAS sent out a language access survey to all 58 trial courts in the state in July 2019 to determine the courts’ current provision of court interpreters in all civil matters. It also asked questions regarding courts’ provision of other language access services.  Status: Ongoing; Survey for FY 2018-19 completed, survey report with results is planned for release in early 2020.</p>
6.	<p><b>Public Outreach Campaign:</b> The current language access services contract with the National Center for State Courts includes deliverables to help the council develop a public outreach campaign to reach limited English proficient (LEP) court users across the state.  Status: Completed (Phase 1). Multilingual materials for the public outreach campaign loaded to the Language Access Toolkit.</p>
7.	<p><b>Gender Expression/Identity:</b> Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) directed committee staff, based on PAF’s recommendations, to address the need for gender neutrality on court forms by beginning with identifying those court forms requiring changes.  Status: Ongoing</p>
8.	<p><b>Mental Health Recommendations:</b> PAF staff in collaboration with staff from Collaborative Justice Court Advisory Committee, developed and presented workshops on working with techniques and culturally responsive approach to effectively engage with behavioral health issues.  Status: Complete.</p>
9.	<p><b>Form MC-410: Request for Accommodations by Persons with Disabilities:</b> During December 2019, the revised MC-410 was tested by experts. Drafts of the revised Judicial Council form MC-410, proposed Judicial Council form MC-410-INFO and the accompanying Invitation to Comment are currently undergoing internal reviews.  Status: The proposed revised form MC-410 and MC-410-INFO will be circulated during the spring cycle of 2020 with a proposed effective date of January 1, 2021.</p>
10.	<p><b>Comment to the State Bar:</b> On September 23, 2019, PAF drafted and approved public comments, in coordination with Governmental Affairs and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, that were submitted on behalf of the Judicial Council to the State Bar Task Force on Access Through Innovation of Legal Services (ATILS) regarding the proposal on Options for Regulatory Reforms to Promote Access to Justice.  Status: Complete.</p>

**Court Executives Advisory Committee  
Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2021  
Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee: [TBD]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Bernardino County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Donna Ignacio, Senior Analyst, Trial Court Leadership
<p><b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> Under <a href="#">rule 10.48(a)</a> of the California Rules of Court, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) is charged with making recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, <a href="#">rule 10.48(b)</a> sets forth the additional duties of the committee.</p> <p><a href="#">Per rule 10.48(c)</a>, CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts. <a href="#">Rule 10.48(d)</a> establishes the Executive Committee of CEAC. The Executive Committee consists of 18 members.</p> <p>The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.</p>	
<p><b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee</li> <li>2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee</li> <li><del>3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee</del></li> <li>4. CEAC Child Support Services Subcommittee</li> <li>5. CEAC Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee</li> <li>6. CEAC Nominations Subcommittee</li> <li>7. CEAC Records Management Subcommittee</li> <li>8. CEAC Trial Court Financial Policies Subcommittee</li> </ol>	

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

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

9. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on the California Department of Justice Senate Bill 384 Implementation
- ~~10. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Appointed Dependency Counsel – Title IV-E Program~~
- ~~11. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Security Services for the Trial Courts~~
- ~~12. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Interpreter Payment Policy~~
- ~~13. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Standards of Judicial Administration~~
- ~~14. CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities~~

### Meetings Planned for **2021**<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)

#### Joint TCPJAC/CEAC and CEAC Statewide Meetings:

- February 10, 2021 (webinar)
- August 12-13, 2021 (in-person, location TBD)

#### Joint TCPJAC/CEAC and CEAC Executive Committee Meetings:

- April 28, 2021 (in-person, Sacramento)
- October 27, 2021 (in-person, Sacramento)

Specific subcommittee/working group meeting dates are to be determined at this time. Meeting occurrences are estimates for 2021 and may be subject to change.

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee – 15 teleconferences

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee – 5 teleconferences

CEAC Child Support Services Subcommittee – 5 teleconferences

CEAC Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee – 5 teleconferences

CEAC Nominations Subcommittee – 6 teleconferences

CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – 3 teleconferences

CEAC Trial Court Financial Policies Subcommittee – 3 teleconferences

CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on the California Department of Justice Senate Bill 384 – 3 teleconferences

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

Assistant court executive officers are permitted to attend and be reimbursed for travel expenditures to statewide meetings in addition to members of the Court Executive Advisory Committee.

DRAFT

## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on the California Department of Justice Senate Bill 384 Implementation (One-Time)</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will consult with <a href="#">Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services and Information Technology the California Department of Justice (DOJ)</a> on the implementation of SB 384, <i>Sex offenders: registration: criminal offender record information systems</i>. The California Department of Justice (DOJ) seeks to learn of courts’ current processes and case management systems and receive input on matters of special concern to courts. The working group will share potential issues that should be considered when crafting this statewide process.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2020<del>1</del>.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> <a href="#">Criminal Justice Services, Information Technology and Trial Court Leadership</a> <del>and Legal Services</del> staff.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> DOJ.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
<del>2.</del>	<del><b>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Appointed Dependency Counsel – Title IV-E Program (New, One-Time)</b></del>	<del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, IV</b></del>

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

**# New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup>**

~~**Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:** CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will provide operational guidance to Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) as they work with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) on the interbranch agreement, program requirements, and invoicing procedures required by the plan to reimburse the judicial branch for qualified, court-appointed dependency counsel expenditures through federal title IV-E matching funds.~~

~~**Status/Timeline:** 2020.~~

~~**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** Trial Court Leadership and CFCC staff.~~

~~This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.~~

~~**Internal/External Stakeholders:** CDSS.~~

~~**AC Collaboration:** Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.~~

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
3.	<del>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Security Services for the Trial Courts (One-Time)</del>	<del>Priority 2<sup>5</sup> Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV, VI</del>
<p><del>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>: CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will assess the statewide scope of a growing problem concerning inadequate sheriff staffing levels in the trial courts or potential reduction of current security staffing levels by the sheriff. This working group is also charged with analyzing solutions and developing recommendations, for CEAC’s approval, regarding court security services for the trial courts. In recent years, and in an increasing number of courts, county sheriff’s offices have provided fewer officers than set forth in the courts’ MOUs. In addition, courts that have opened new and large court facilities have experienced the same decline in court security services. Because these decreased levels of sheriffs services have significant implications for the safety of judicial officers, court employees, and the public, CEAC has determined that it is essential to begin assessing the statewide scope of this problem and to develop recommendations.</del></p> <p><del>Status/Timeline: 2020.</del></p> <p><del>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services, Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services, and Security Operations.</del></p> <p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del>Internal/External Stakeholders: California State Association of Counties, California State Sheriffs' Association, and Department of Finance.</del></p> <p><del>AC Collaboration: Court Security Advisory Committee, Judicial Branch Budget Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC).</del></p>		
4.	<del>Project Title: CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Interpreter Payment Policy (One-Time)</del>	<del>Priority 2<sup>5</sup> Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</del>
<p><del>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>: CEAC, through an ad hoc working group, will assess the existing “Payment Policies for Contract Court Interpreters” policy and develop recommendations for recent audit findings related to independent contractor interpreter reimbursement claims.</del></p> <p><del>Status/Timeline: 2020.</del></p> <p><del>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Trial Court Leadership, Legal Services, Human Resources, and Audit Services staff.</del></p>		

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</del></p> <p><del><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Court Interpreters Advisory Panel.</del></p>	
5.	<p><del><b>Project Title:</b> CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Standards of Judicial Administration (One-Time)</del></p>	<p><del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></del></p> <p><del><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV, VI</b></del></p>
	<p><del><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> CEAC, through an ad hoc working group and in consultation with TCPJAC (as needed), will review the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommend additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures to improve the branch's ability to communicate the trial courts' objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort seeks to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self-help center hours, clerks' office hours, etc.). This project was conceived to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</del></p> <p><del><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2020.</del></p> <p><del><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Trial Court Leadership staff.</del></p> <p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</del></p> <p><del><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC.</del></p>	
6.	<p><del><b>Project Title:</b> CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities (One-Time)</del></p>	<p><del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></del></p> <p><del><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></del></p>



**# New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup>**

~~**Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:** Through the ad hoc working group, CEAC will:~~

- ~~• Review and provide, on an as needed basis, early court executive officer input on facility related proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations; and~~
- ~~• Discuss strategies and best practices for courts facing delayed court construction projects and provide input, as appropriate, to the Court Facility Advisory Committee (CFAC) on advocacy efforts.~~

~~The working group will also provide input and feedback on various facility issues being addressed by the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) and CFAC. The working group is charged with providing preliminary feedback on facility proposals on behalf of CEAC. Input on more substantive facility policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented CEAC for final review.~~

~~**Status/Timeline:** 2020.~~

~~**Fiscal Impact/Resources:** Facilities Services and Trial Court Leadership staff.~~

~~This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.~~

~~**Internal/External Stakeholders:** None.~~

~~**AC Collaboration:** Possible consultation with CFAC and TCFMAC.~~

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee	<b>Priority 1<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) is charged with developing, reviewing, commenting, and making recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new or amend existing laws. The subcommittee monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Legislation Committee.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Governmental Affairs and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC and Legislation Committee.</p>		
2.	<b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee	<b>Priority 1<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, III, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) is charged with developing, reviewing, and providing input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to the Rules Committee concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Legal Services and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> TCPJAC, Rules Committee, and various advisory bodies.</p>	
3.	<p><del><b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee</del></p>	<p><del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></del></p> <p><del><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></del></p>
	<p><del><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee (JTS) reviews and provides early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</del></p> <p><del><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</del></p> <p><del><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Information Technology, Trial Court Leadership, and Legal Services staff.</del></p> <p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</del></p> <p><del><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCPJAC and ITAC.</del></p>	
4.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> CEAC Child Support Services Subcommittee</p>	<p><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> VII</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Through the Child Support Services Subcommittee, CEAC will work in consultation with the Judicial Council Center for Family, Children, &amp; the Courts (CFCC) to provide information about significant fiscal and/or operational impacts on trial courts regarding proposed policy or operational changes by the program or the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). In addition, the subcommittee will develop comments and/or recommendations (for CEAC’s approval) concerning recommendations proposed by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee regarding the development of Assembly Bill (AB) 1058 data for the Judicial Branch Statistical</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p>Information System (JBSIS). The subcommittee will also convene to address any other critical issues related to the Plan of Cooperation (POC) and AB 1058 that might arise in the interim.</p> <p>In response to issues that arose with the 2015 DCSS model POC, CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and CFCC staff to discuss and resolve concerns prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies. CEAC requested that this former ad hoc working group be converted to a subcommittee to review future model POC. The subcommittee will meet annually in spring on an ongoing basis.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC, Trial Court Leadership, and Research and Evaluation staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> DCSS.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committee.</p>	
5.	<b>Project Title: Judicial Branch Statistical Information System Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> III</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> CEAC will continue to provide oversight responsibility over Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) through the JBSIS Subcommittee. JBSIS is authorized through California Rules of Court, rule 10.400, and CEAC has oversight responsibility of JBSIS as defined in rule 10.48, which governs CEAC.</p> <p>The subcommittee identified the following projects:</p> <p><b>Ongoing Review and Revisions of JBSIS Reporting Standards</b></p> <p>CEAC will continue to review and seek input from courts on the recent revisions to the filing definitions and recommend additional revisions as needed. CEAC will also identify additional areas in JBSIS for review that will be important for branchwide budget advocacy efforts, monitoring court operations, and workload analysis. For 2021, this work is anticipated to be extensive. The subcommittee will continue its review all JBSIS non-filings data in an effort to better match the quantity of data collection with the ability for courts and the branch to ensure a level of data integrity and quality. The subcommittee anticipates developing recommendations to better reflect the current trends in data analytics, with a focus on producing highly reliable data in a consistent and uniform fashion statewide. The</p>	

## # Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup>

subcommittee will conduct this work in collaboration with the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) Data Analytics Workstream.

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

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

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

- Continue and complete the review all JBSIS non-filings data in an effort to better match the quality of data collection with the ability for courts and the branch to ensure a level of data integrity and quality, and produce recommendations for Judicial Council review;
- Create a public database with ongoing JBSIS Q&A and technical assistance provided by the Judicial Council's Office of Court Research for greater transparency and consistency in guidance provided to courts (carries over from last annual agenda); and
- Provide ongoing input to Judicial Council's Audit Services on JBSIS filing audit.

**Status/Timeline:** Ongoing.

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

*This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.*

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

**AC Collaboration:** None.

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
6.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Nominations Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 1<sup>5</sup></b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and recommend to the council’s Executive and Planning Committee candidates for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of CEAC’s Executive Committee;</li> <li>• Nonvoting court administrator members of the council; and</li> <li>• Members of other advisory committees who are court executives or judicial administrators.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Executive and Planning Committee and various advisory bodies receiving nominations.</p>	
7.	<b>Project Title: CEAC Records Management Subcommittee</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> III</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Through the Records Management Subcommittee, CEAC will continue to develop and publish updates to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> (TCRM), with a focus on ensuring that content reflects current law and promoting best practices. The subcommittee will monitor the progress of proposed 202<del>10</del> Judicial Council-sponsored legislations, other legislation affecting court records management, and relevant amendments to the California Rules of Courts.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> TCRM Updates – Ongoing. Government Code sections 68152(a)(6) and 68153 – 202<del>0</del><u>1</u>.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Information Technology, Trial Court Leadership, and Legal Services staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Possible consultation with ITAC and Probate Mental Health Advisory Committee.</p>	
8.	<b>Project Title:</b> Trial Court Financial Policies Subcommittee	<p><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, III</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Through the Trial Court Financial Policies Subcommittee, CEAC will work with Judicial Council’s Branch Accounting and Procurement (BAP) to review and identify needed revisions to the <i>Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual (TCFPPM)</i>.</p> <p>Pursuant to the California Rules of Court, rule 10.804, the Judicial Council of California is required to adopt financial policies and procedures for the superior courts. The TCFPPM was established in 2001 which set out a system of fundamental internal controls that enable the superior courts to monitor their use of public funds, provide consistent and comparable financial statements, and demonstrate accountability. Annually, the manual is reviewed, and any suggested updates are submitted to the Judicial Council for approval. Throughout the year, BAP works with representatives from various courts to compile and draft recommendations for the next version of the manual. Prior to presentation to the Judicial Council, the rule 10.804(1)(b) requires that the amendments to the manual be made available to the superior courts, the Department of Finance, and the State Controller’s Office for comment.</p> <p>The subcommittee will review and comment on proposed recommendations. Subcommittee input will guide which compiled recommendations will be further vetted, and the final verbiage to be circulated for comment before going to the Judicial Council.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Trial Court Leadership and BAP staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
9.	<b>Project Title: Strengthen the Role of Court Executive Officers in Outreach to the Legislative and Executive Branches</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b>
<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup>II</b>		
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> CEAC will conduct outreach with the legislature with a focus on legislative staff in both the local districts and in the Capitol. This effort will entail the development of outreach materials for court executive officers and perhaps educational sessions with legislative staff to educate them on the judicial branch budget and the fiscal/operational needs of the trial courts. CEAC will also seek to strengthen communication with the executive branch and with the Department of Finance in particular. It will do so in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Budget Services.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council’s Administrative Director; Trial Court Leadership, Budget Services, and Governmental Affairs staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
10.	<b>Project Title: Serve as a Resource</b>	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Respective Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Respective advisory bodies.</p>		



## II. LIST OF 2020 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p><b>Educational Opportunities.</b> TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to conduct eight business meetings in 2020. These meetings covered topics including budget priorities, legislative updates, information technology updates, emergency preparedness and response, court operations, and COVID-19 pandemic planning and response. Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers. CEAC also shared and discussed the <i>Budget Impact Toolkit</i>—a newly created resource that includes various budget reduction strategies to assist with local planning for the upcoming budget shortfall.</p>
2.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2020, holding 11 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations to the Legislation Committee on 30 different bills identified by Governmental Affairs as having significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2020, the subcommittee meeting schedule will be set according to the Legislation Committee’s 2021 meeting schedule. The subcommittee will continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts, and recommend proposals for future consideration.</p>
3.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2020, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and reviewed 44 rule proposals throughout the course of the year. The subcommittee provided comment on 16 rule proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2021 and meet as needed.</p>
4.	<p><b>Child Support Services Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee reviewed the current Plan of Cooperation and submitted changes which affect timelines and requirements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The subcommittee provided feedback on Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommendations related to budget reductions to the AB 1058 Program. The subcommittee also provided input to CFCC on the 24th Annual AB 1058 Child Support Training Conference schedule and content.</p>
5.	<p><b>JBSIS Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee has made considerable progress on its 2020 objectives, including an extensive review of JBSIS data elements to determine which should continue to be collected and which were no longer needed, based on a set of agreed-upon review principles. The subcommittee reviewed the civil, small claims, family law, and juvenile (September 2020 planned) data elements and will continue this review into 2021. The subcommittee recommended, and the Judicial Council adopted, a proposal to add a new data collection category to improve felony disposition reporting. The subcommittee also reviewed and discussed various data reporting questions to help improve the consistency of JBSIS data reporting.</p>
6.	<p><b>Nominations Subcommittee.</b> Before the 2020 nominations cycle was postponed, the subcommittee identified, assessed, and recommended court executive/judicial administrator candidates for membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and other advisory bodies.</p>
7.	<p><b>Records Management Subcommittee.</b> The subcommittee is working on updates on the TCRM to include legislatively mandated updates and best practices for court records.</p>
8.	<p><b>CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Court Appointed Dependency Counsel – Title IV-E Program.</b> Over the past year, the working group has assisted CFCC staff in developing a process that would meet federal requirements and improve the quality of representation in child welfare proceedings in California. This included providing comments on the scope of work, contract templates and invoicing process.</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
9.	<p><b>CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Interpreter Payment Policy.</b> The working group revised and updated the Payment Policies for Contract Court Interpreters. The changes recommended by the working group include an increase to the daily compensation rates and standardized travel reimbursements rates in accordance with the Judicial Council Financial Policies and Procedures Manual. The proposed recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Council in January 2021.</p>
10.	<p><b>CEAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Trial Court Facilities.</b> In August 2020, the working group created the <i>Public Safety Power Shutoff Preparedness and Continuity of Operations Recommendations</i>. The document includes issues and impacts to trial courts and considerations resulting from Public Safety Power Shutoffs and provides guidance for the direct impacts to trial courts resulting from wildfires and smoke from wildfires, as well as how the Judicial Council can collaborate with trial courts.</p>
11.	<p><b>Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide.</b> In May 2020, the Judicial Council of California launched the Pandemic Continuity of Operations Working Group, consisting of presiding judges and court executives, to collect best practices and publish a framework to help the state’s 58 superior courts address interrupted services amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. In June 2020, the working group, in collaboration with Judicial Council staff contributors, published the Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide. This tool serves as a resource guide to assist trial courts with navigating the COVID-19 pandemic while maintaining ongoing modifications to public health restrictions from the state, counties, and cities.</p>

**Court Interpreters Advisory Panel**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020**

**Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 [Amended (Date)]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Brian L. McCabe, Judge, Superior Court of Merced County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Claudia Ortega, Supervising Analyst, Court Interpreters Program, Center for Families, Children & the Courts ( <i>Temporarily serving as lead staff.</i> )
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.51</a> 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"><li>(1) Interpreter use and need for interpreters in court proceedings; and</li><li>(2) Certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters.</li></ol> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.51(b)</a> 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><a href="#">Rule 10.51(c)</a> sets forth the following membership composition of the committee. CIAP currently has 14 members, which consists of 11 advisory panel members (voting) and 4 advisors (nonvoting) appointed by the Chief Justice to assist the advisory panel. A majority of the members must be court interpreters. The advisory panel must include the specified numbers of members from the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Four certified or registered court interpreters working as employees in trial courts, one from each of the four regions established by Government Code section 71807. For purposes of the appointment of members under this rule, the Superior Court of California, County of Ventura, is considered part of Region 1 as specified in section 71807, and the Superior Court of California, County of Solano, is considered part of Region 2 as specified in section 71807;</li><li>(2) Two interpreters certified or registered in a language other than Spanish, each working either in a trial court as an independent contractor or in an educational institution;</li><li>(3) One appellate court justice (position is currently vacant);</li><li>(4) Two trial court judges; and</li></ol>	

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

(5) Two court administrators, including at least one trial court executive officer.

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

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

1. Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee – provides review and recommendations on interpreter professional development, adherence to professional standards and compliance requirements.
2. Interpreter Language Access Subcommittee (*Slightly Modified Name*) – works on specific projects related to language access and interpreting services, including recommendations from the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* that relate to court interpreters. These projects are undertaken in collaboration with the Language Access Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness. This subcommittee's former name (Language Access Subcommittee) is being modified to distinguish it from the Language Access Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness.

### Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup>

Conference calls – March 10, June 10, September 1, October/November.2020.

In-person meeting – None. (The May 28, 2020 meeting was cancelled in light of the Governor's order prohibiting large gatherings.), 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Judicial Council of California, San Francisco. Cancelled due to COVID-19 pandemic.

Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee – Conference calls and in-person meetings as needed.

Interpreter Language Access Subcommittee – Conference calls and in-person meetings as needed.

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

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

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Support for Implementation of Revised Rule 2.891 (Development of an Interpreting Skills Assessment Process)</b> – Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>  <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> This project is directly related to the recently adopted <i>California Court Interpreter Credential Review Procedures</i>. The Judicial Council approved the procedures and revised rule 2.891 of the California Rules of Court on September 24, 2019, for an effective date of January 1, 2020. The next step is development and implementation of a legally defensible process to assess an interpreter’s ability to interpret if a complaint alleging gross incompetence is lodged against the interpreter, and if following review and investigation, the complaint is deemed to have merit.</p> <p>CIAP’s Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee will conduct a comprehensive review of the report produced by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), <i>Skills Assessment Options for Certified and Registered Interpreters</i>, and consider other related research and reports. The subcommittee will explore the feasibility and best available methods for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Development of a legally defensible diagnostic process to assess an interpreter’s ability to interpret if a complaint alleging gross incompetence is lodged against the interpreter and the complaint is deemed to have merit.</li> <li>2) Identification of existing and possible development of options and resources that courts can utilize to strengthen an interpreter’s knowledge, skills, and abilities.</li> </ol> <p>This project originated with Recommendation #64 of the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i> (LAP) 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>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of [The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch](#) the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Initial research has been completed by NCSC. The anticipated completion date for the new skills assessment process is December 31, 2020. Work to be contracted is predicated on determined need, deliverables, cost, and feasibility.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Based on the complexity of the selected diagnostic or assessment process (language neutral or in various languages), the estimated ongoing cost is \$50,000 to \$150,000. This amount is currently funded, on an ongoing basis, as part of the Court Interpreters Program budget. Resources are: Court Interpreters Program, Legal Services, Human Resources, and CJER.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Interpreter community, judicial officers, justice partners, and court personnel who manage California court interpreters.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Consultation with the Court Executives Advisory Committee.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Project Title: Implement a Policy for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons to Waive a Court Appointed Interpreter</b> – Interpreter Language Access Subcommittee</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>55</sup> 1(e)</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I, IV</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Develop a policy for limited English proficient (LEP) persons to waive a court-appointed interpreter. It is anticipated that a new rule of court and form will also need to be developed in conjunction with development of this policy. This project originated with LAP Recommendation #75.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The anticipated effective date of the policy, new rule, and form(s) will be 2021.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> There is no fiscal impact associated with this project. Resources may require consultation with the Legal Services office and Human Resources’ Labor and Employment Relations unit.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> LEP litigants, courts, justice partners, such as the State Bar and/or legal services providers.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Rules and Project Committee (RUPRO), and the Language Access Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
3.	<b>Project Title:</b> Review the 2020 Legislatively Mandated Language Need and Interpreter Use Study	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 1
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Review the findings in the 2020 legislatively mandated <i>Language Need and Interpreter Use Study</i> and recommend to the council needed actions and considerations, which may include recommendations to designate currently registered languages as certified, de-designate currently certified languages based on a decline in their use, expand interpreter services, and take actionable steps on other identified needs and/or trends.</p> <p><b>Key objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the current statewide landscape concerning the need and use of interpreting services in California’s trial courts;</li> <li>• Evaluate trends and compare to previous studies</li> <li>• Develop sound recommendations for the council’s consideration;</li> <li>• Assist the strategic expansion of interpreters into needed areas; and</li> <li>• Continue to address the shortage of court interpreters in key languages.</li> </ul> <p>This project complies with Government Code section 68563  “<i>The Judicial Council shall conduct a study of language and interpreter use and need in court proceedings, with commentary, and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and to the Legislature not later than July 1, 1995, and every five years thereafter . . .</i>”</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The Language Access Implementation unit is in the process of developing this study. It will provide CIAP with a presentation on the study’s key findings and recommendations in March of 2020. If approved by CIAP, the final study and report will be submitted to the council in May 2020. The study is due to the Governor and Legislature by July 1, 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> There is no fiscal impact associated with this project. Resources are: Governmental Affairs, Court Interpreters Program, and the Language Access Implementation staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Interpreter community, the superior courts, the Governor, and the Legislature.</p>		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> I, IV

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.	
4.	<b>Project Title:</b> Review Rule 10.51, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2(b) DEFERRED</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> <b>I, II</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Review the current membership requirements of rule 10.51 of the California Rules of Court and make recommendations for membership amendments to the council.</p> <p><b>Key objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review realistic membership needs.</li> <li>• Consider modifications to the membership requirements to better leverage needed expertise.</li> </ul> <p>This project originated as CIAP efforts over several nomination cycles to recruit for the appellate court justice position have been unsuccessful. Consequently, this voting position has remained vacant since September 2018. In addition, as Spanish is the most interpreted language in the courts, the committee will assess whether one of the independent contractor interpreter positions (which is currently limited to an interpreter in a language other than Spanish (OTS)) should be opened to a Spanish independent contractor. Meeting the current requirement as stipulated in the current rule has been challenging, as it has been difficult to recruit qualified OTS independent contract interpreters.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> TBD. The anticipated effective date of the amended rule will be 2021. Deferred due to impact on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/ Resources:</b> There is no fiscal impact associated with this project. Resources are: Court Interpreters Program.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Interpreter community, appellate courts, and the trial courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> RUPRO and the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee.</p>		



#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Assess the Performance of the Interpreter Credentialing Exams</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2</b>
<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>		
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup></b> Thoroughly assess the performance of all interpreter credentialing examinations and make recommendations to the council on implementation of recommended changes.</p> <p><b>Key objectives include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thoroughly assess the performance of all interpreter credentialing examinations.</li> <li>• Thoroughly discuss and vet the level of the interpreter shortage in relation to the judicial branch’s needs.</li> <li>• Explore the feasibility of tiered testing or tiered passage for candidates who take the Bilingual Interpreting Exam (BIE) and score below the required passing score of 70 on all four sections, but are “near passers (e.g., candidates who score over 60 or 65 on one or more sections).</li> <li>• Explore the feasibility of providing “near passers” with an entry-level credential status that would enable them to interpret in the courts for less complex proceedings and gain in-court interpreting experience that will assist them with later passing the BIE section that they were previously not able to pass.</li> <li>• Identify methods to increase the number of qualified candidates taking the exams.</li> <li>• Identify methods to increase the exams’ passage rates.</li> <li>• Evaluate the current practice of California requiring that all four sections of the BIE be passed in one sitting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Make the exams more accessible by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offering remote testing opportunities.</li> <li>• Explore ways to keep test candidates motivated and interested in interpreting for the courts as they wait for their test scores.</li> <li>• Offer more BIE administrations annually; currently two exam administration are offered annually.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the Oral Proficiency Exam as the screening exam for the BIE.</li> <li>• Offer a pre-test (as offered by the American Translators Association) to gauge candidates’ readiness, providing them with insight to improve their test-taking abilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Because of the complexity of these matters, recommendations will be developed with an estimated completion date of December 2021.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>
	<p><b><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i></b> Expenses associated with possible development of new exams or modification of existing exams. This amount is currently funded in the Court Interpreters Program budget. Resources are: Court Interpreters Program, Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee, and consultant(s) as needed to assess the testing program.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i></b> Trial courts, interpreter community, public including LEP litigants, legal service providers, and justice partners.</p> <p><b><i>AC Collaboration:</i></b> Consultation with the Court Executives Advisory Committee.</p>

## II. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p><b>Completed September 2019: Develop and Implement the Court Interpreter Discipline Process</b></p> <p>On September 24, 2019, the council approved and adopted <i>The California Court Interpreter Credential Review Procedures</i>. The council also repealed rule 2.891 of the California Rules of Court, <i>Periodic review of court interpreter skills and professional conduct</i>, adopted in 1979, which called for a biennial review by the courts to review all court interpreter skills. This rule was replaced with new rule 2.891, <i>Request for Court Interpreter Credential Review</i> (effective January 1, 2020).</p>
2.	<p><b>Completed January 2019: Affirmation of the Criteria for De-designation of Certified Languages</b></p> <p>On January 23, 2019, CIAP affirmed that the criteria for designation of certified languages, as set forth in Government Code section 68562 (a), also grants the council the authority to both designate and de-designate languages for certification. CIAP also voted to recommend to the council that it delegate to the Administrative Director the authority to de-designate certified languages, consistent with the Administrative Director’s current authority to designate languages for certification.</p>
3.	<p><b>Completed August 2019: Review and Update the Compliance Requirements for Certified Court and Registered Interpreters</b></p> <p>On August 15, 2019, CIAP approved recommended policy changes, updates, and the new format of the compliance requirements. The following key objectives were met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide simplified and easy to navigate compliance requirements for court interpreters and continuing education providers.</li> <li>• Review and make policy changes, if required, to address gaps in the current requirements.</li> <li>• Incorporate a new process that requires interpreters to attest to completion of their continuing education and professional assignments requirements.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Assess the Feasibility of a Nationally Accepted Credentialing Process for American Sign Language (ASL) Interpreters; Update Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons</b></p> <p>Since early 2018, NCSC has been assisting the Court Interpreters Program with conducting research and developing recommendations concerning possible development of a nationally accepted credentialing process to qualify ASL court interpreters. NCSC has completed the following work under a contract with the council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 1: Conducted a thorough review of currently and previously available ASL assessments and reviewed publicly available documentation on the development and administration practices of these assessments;</li> <li>• Step 2: Identified assessments from Step 1 for further research and mapping to an approved list of Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for ASL court interpreters;</li> <li>• Step 3: Determined whether reviewed assessments identified in Step 2 could successfully be used to evaluate the KSAs required of ASL court interpreters; and</li> </ul>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 4: Conducted a feasibility study to help council staff to identify the most practicable options for a possible national ASL credentialing solution. This study addresses the one-time and ongoing costs of development of an ASL credentialing exam, the use of existing exams, and/or the development and implementation of a hybrid test that could include utilization of existing tests and new assessment tools. The study will also include estimated operational costs for administration of a possible ASL credentialing program and alternatives to creating this program.</li> </ul> <p>The Court Interpreters Program staff consulted with the CIAP chairs and determined that the potential options and costs for ASL court interpreter exam solutions would first need to be reviewed with the CIAP chairs, the Judicial Council’s Executive Office, and potentially with the Judicial Council prior to CIAP undertaking further work on this project.</p>
5.	<p><b>Update Recommended Guidelines for the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</b></p> <p>This project anticipated any changes to the <i>Recommended Guidelines on the Use of Deaf Intermediary Interpreters</i> (DI Guidelines), following identification of appropriate exam(s) for ASL court interpreters (see Ongoing Project 4). Similar to the above, the potential options and costs of a possible ASL credentialing program first need to be reviewed by the CIAP chairs, the Judicial Council’s Executive Office and potentially with the Judicial Council prior to CIAP undertaking any changes to the DI Guidelines.</p>

# Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

## Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020

Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 [Amended (Date)]

### I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Terry B. Friedman (Ret.)
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Bonnie Hough, Principal Managing Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> <p>The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee is required by <u>Government Code section 68651(b)(5)</u> to implement the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (<u>Assem. Bill 590 [Feuer]; Stats. 2009 ch. 457</u>) which was amended by the <u>Appointed Legal Counsel in Civil Cases Act (Assem. Bill 330 [Gabriel]; Stats 2019, ch. 217)</u>. The statute 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. <u>With the adoption of AB 330, program evaluations must be submitted to the Legislation every five years commencing June 30, 2020., which are required by the authorizing legislation.</u></p> <p>The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee currently has <u>145</u> members. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>1 appellate justice</u></li><li>• <u>32</u> retired appellate justices</li><li>• 1 retired judge</li><li>• 2 law professors</li><li>• <u>67</u> attorneys with experience in legal aid programs</li><li>• 1 attorney with the State Bar of California</li><li>• 1 attorney with the California Chamber of Commerce</li></ul> <p>The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.</p>	

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

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

None.

**Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

March:

- Teleconferences (Second week/12:00–1:30 p.m.): Working groups to review specific proposals
- **Videoconference ~~In-person meeting~~ (March 26, JCC San Francisco Office/10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.): Review proposals and evaluation**
- ~~Teleconference (TBD, 12:00–1:30 p.m.): Review of report to the legislature as required by AB 330~~

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Make Recommendations to the Judicial Council for the 2020–23 Grant Cycle	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 1
	<p data-bbox="1606 310 1978 391"><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> I</p> <p data-bbox="170 391 1978 500"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> In order to make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding grants for the 2020–23 grant cycle as required by statute, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was circulated in January and February of 2020. The Committee will review and make recommendations to the Judicial Council in the spring of 2020. <b>Initial recommendations were made based on projection of lower revenues due to the pandemic. If revenue is higher than anticipated, additional projects have been identified for funding.</b></p> <p data-bbox="170 500 1978 553"><b>Status/Timeline:</b> This review <del>was conducted in</del> <del>is scheduled for</del> March 2020. <b>Review is anticipated in November 2020.</b></p> <p data-bbox="170 553 1978 651"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts staff and committee expenses are covered by an administrative allocation of grant funds.</p> <p data-bbox="170 651 1978 764"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i> Budget Services has reviewed and has determined that this is not within their purview since the allocations are governed by statute.</p> <p data-bbox="170 764 1978 846"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> The legal services community and partner courts are the external stakeholders.</p> <p data-bbox="170 846 1978 933"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of [The Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch](#) the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Research and Data Collection</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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. AB 330 added a requirement that an evaluation be completed every five years with the first evaluation due to the Legislature on June 30, 2020. The committee provides input on the design of the evaluation and reviews results.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Judicial Council staff and contractor time is covered by an administrative allocation for the grant.  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> 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><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
2.	<b>Project Title: Implementation and Oversight of Pilot Projects</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The committee will provide continuing oversight of the pilot projects that were approved by the Judicial Council at its July 2017 meeting. It will further review proposals and make recommendations to the Judicial Council for the next 3-year cycle of grants which will commence on October 1, 2020. 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. If additional funds become available, the committee will make recommendations to the Judicial Council on distribution.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts staff and committee expenses are covered by an administrative allocation of grant funds.  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> The pilot programs – legal services and their court partners are stakeholders.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Review Recommendations from the Evaluation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 2 <b>Deferred</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> I, IV</p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Deferred due to impacts on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic. 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><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> CFCC staff time and that of outside researchers is covered by the administrative funds set aside for the project.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Staff to the Shriver project will work with committee staff for the other committees to which recommendations may be made.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> 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 as appropriate regarding these recommendations.</p>		

## II. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Recommendations were developed for the Judicial Council for distribution of the additional \$2.5 million in grant funds for the Shriver project allocated to the Judicial Council in the Fiscal Year 2019–20 budget. These were approved by the Judicial Council at its meeting on November 14, 2019.
2.	Applications were developed for the 2020–2023 grant cycle.
3.	The committee reviewed and worked to implement legislation identified by Governmental Affairs that relate to the Shriver Civil Counsel Act including <a href="#">Assembly Bill 330 (Gabriel)</a> <i>Appointed legal counsel in civil cases.</i>
4.	Comprehensive evaluation is ongoing.
5.	The committee continues to monitor grants awarded that provide representation and make court services more efficient and effective for those who remain unrepresented.

**Tribal Court–State Court Forum**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020**

**Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 [Amended (Date)]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Abby Abinanti, Chief Judge, Yurok Tribal Court Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Ann Gilmour, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<p><b>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.60</a> 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. <a href="#">Rule 10.60 (b)</a> sets forth additional duties of the Forum. <a href="#">Rule 10.60(c)</a> sets forth the membership position of the forum. The Forum currently has 29 members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thirteen tribal court judges (nominated by their tribal leadership, representing 19 of the 23 tribal courts currently operating in California; these courts serve approximately 35 tribes. There is currently one vacancy due to a resignation.);</li><li>• Five trial court judges from counties in which a tribal court is located;</li><li>• One appellate justice;</li><li>• Seven chairs or their designees of the following Judicial Council advisory committees:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness</li><li>○ Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee</li><li>○ Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee</li><li>○ Criminal Law Advisory Committee</li><li>○ Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee</li><li>○ Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee</li><li>○ Traffic Advisory Committee</li></ul></li><li>• Two executive branch officials responsible for tribal-related work—the Governor’s Tribal Advisor and the Director of the California Department of Social Services’ Office of Tribal Affairs; and</li><li>• One retired judge (advisory);</li></ul> <p>The current <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee’s web page.</p>	

---

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

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

1. Participate in the joint ad hoc rules and forms subcommittee to implement Tactical Plan for Technology.
2. 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).

**Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

1. ~~In Person Meeting: March 19, 2020, 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Judicial Council San Francisco office.~~
2. Telephone Meetings, June 11, August 13, October 8, and December 10, 2020, 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.
3. Ad hoc meetings as required.

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Implement Assembly Bill 686 Mandating the Judicial Council Implement a Rule to Permit Remote Appearances by Tribes in Cases Governed by the Indian Child Welfare Act by July 1, 2021</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 1I</p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> I, VI</p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> On October 2, 2019, Governor Newsom signed AB 686 (Waldron). This bill revised section 224.2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code by adding subsection (k) as follows: (k) The Judicial Council, by July 1, 2021, shall adopt rules of court to allow for telephonic or other remote appearance options by an Indian child’s tribe in proceedings where the federal Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. Sec. 1901 et seq.) may apply. Telephonic or other computerized remote access for court appearances established under this subdivision shall not be subject to fees.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> To be undertaken during the spring 2020 RUPRO cycle with an anticipated effective date of January 1, 2021. <b>This proposal is mandated by legislation. It circulated for public comment during the Spring 2020 comment cycle.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished within existing Center for Families, Children &amp; the Court (CFCC) staff resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of *The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch* the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
2.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Develop Guidance and tools to assist courts tribes and justice partners in addressing COVID-19 related challenges. (New)</p>	<p><b>Priority 1a</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal I, VI</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Given the current situation in California, the committee anticipates that courts will continue to face logistical challenges in meeting the needs of litigants in family and juvenile law matters that would benefit from guidance, technical assistance, and if necessary, emergency rules.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing during state of emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Legal Services</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Department of Social Services, Department of Child Support Services, Family Court Services Directors, Chief Probation Officers of California, County Welfare Directors Association</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee</p>		
3.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Explore the Feasibility of a Pilot Project to Provide Appointed Counsel to Tribes in Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Cases Under Proposed Legislation Assembly Bill 685</p>	<p><b>Priority 2 <i>Deferred</i></b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal I.4-5,</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> The 2017 ICWA Compliance Task Force Report to the California Attorney General’s Bureau of Children’s Justice notes many issues that contribute to an inability for many tribes to effectively participate in cases involving their children governed by the Indian Child Welfare Act.<sup>8</sup> Among these is the fact that tribes are often the only party in a dependency proceeding that is not entitled to court appointed counsel. For tribes with limited resources and out of state tribes, this presents a real barrier to effective participation (see task force report p 44). AB 685 (Reyes) was introduced in February of 2019. As introduced, it would have appropriated \$1 million for a pilot project to be administered by the State Bar to provide attorneys for tribes in ICWA cases. The author asked if the Judicial Council might be willing to administer funds for the pilot projects in lieu of the State Bar. The legislation is not moving forward as anticipated.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Subject to legislative approval and appropriation it is anticipated that a pilot project could take three years to complete with evaluation to follow. Deferred due to impacts on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> During the current annual agenda period, work will be accomplished within existing resources. If money is appropriated for Judicial Council use in the future, additional resources may be available and allocated.</p>		

<sup>8</sup> The report is available at: <https://www.caltribalfamilies.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ICWAComplianceTaskForceFinalReport2017-1.pdf>

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>
	<p data-bbox="218 196 1940 266"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="218 310 1163 342"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Judicial Council's Governmental Affairs</p> <p data-bbox="218 383 695 415"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None at this time.</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<p><b>Project Title</b> 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><b>Priority 2</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Subject to approval by Judicial Council and Legislature: likely effective date would be January 1, 2022. <b>A legislative proposal was circulated for public comment during the spring 2020 comment cycle. Office of Governmental Affairs staff advice that they intend to move this forward. The legislation would help reduce workloads for state courts.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be completed within existing CFCC and Governmental Affairs staff resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Governmental Affairs and potentially members of family law bar and pension plan administrators.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
2.	<b>Project Title</b> Implement Assembly Bill 3176 <i>Indian Children</i> (Waldron; Stats. 2018, ch. 833)	Priority 2, 2(a) <b>New work deferred unless Covid-19 related</b>  <i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV, V</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> AB 3176 <i>Indian Children</i>, amends provisions of the Welfare and Institutions Code 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Much of the critical implementation work was done during the spring 2019 RUPRO cycle with an effective date of January 2020. Some implementation work is ongoing in minor supplemental RUPRO items to be completed in the spring 2020 RUPRO cycle and in updating job aids, educational resources, and training materials. The supplemental RUPRO items include establishing a mechanism for taking consent to a temporary foster care placement of an Indian child before a judicial officer as mandated by AB 3176 and creating an optional tribal information sheet to facilitate tribal input on key ICWA issues. <b>Rules and forms related to this item were circulated for public comment during the Spring 2020 cycle. Those proposals are moving forward as they align with providing remote access to the courts and facilitating remote submission of information by tribes in ICWA cases and equal access to justice. New work under this item that does not address the COVID-19 pandemic will be deferred.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished with existing CFCC staffing resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> May involve collaboration with Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) staff on updating education resources.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee with respect to recommendations that impact the work of those bodies.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
3.	<b>Project Title</b> Review and Respond to California ICWA Compliance Task Force Report and Recommendations	Priority 2 <b>New work deferred</b> <i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV, V</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> In March of 2017, the California ICWA Compliance Task Force presented its <a href="#">report</a> to California Attorney General Xavier Becerra. 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"> <li>• Mandating increased ICWA training for bench officers, attorneys, and Court Appointed Special Advocates (see recommendations 6 and 7 of the task force report);</li> <li>• Support the development and implementation of consolidated ICWA courts or calendars and joint jurisdiction courts (see recommendations 16 and 17 of the task force report);</li> <li>• Facilitate remote appearances by tribes in ICWA cases;</li> <li>• Addressing challenges of out-of-state tribes and their members located in California in ICWA cases;</li> <li>• Seek funding for appointed counsel for tribes in ICWA cases; and</li> <li>• Ensure that tribes get access to all paperwork, pleadings and minutes on the same basis as other parties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Continue to work on implementing recommendations from the California ICWA Compliance Task Force report as feasible. Rules and forms related to this item were circulated for public comment during the Spring 2020 cycle. Those proposals are moving forward as they align with providing remote access to the courts and facilitating remote submission of information by tribes in ICWA cases and equal access to justice. New work under this item that does not address the COVID-19 pandemic will be deferred.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished within existing resources.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> May require collaboration with CJER, Governmental Affairs, and Legal Services staff.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> 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>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
4.	<b>Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Judge to Judge Communication Between State and Tribal Court Judges</b>	<b>Priority 2</b> <b>New work deferred except if responding to Covid-19</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <b>The goal of facilitating judge to judge communication between state and tribal court judges is to improve efficiencies in cases that span both jurisdictions or could be heard in either jurisdiction. This could potentially reduce workloads for state courts and improve access to justice for underserved and remote tribal communities. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished within existing CFCC resources  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
5.	<b>Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Legislation to Improve the Recognition and Enforcement of Tribal Court Orders</b>	<b>Priority 2</b> <b>New work deferred</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal</b> <i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i> <b>I, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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</p>		

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p>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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing as feasible.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished within existing CFCC and Governmental Affairs staff resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None at this time.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None at this time.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Project Title: Policy Recommendations: Ethics</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b> <b>New work</b> <b>deferred</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished by existing CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Advisory Committee on the Code of Judicial Ethics.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
7.	<b>Project Title: Policy Recommendation: Tribal Access to the Child Abuse Central Index</b>	Priority 2 <b>New work deferred</b> <i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</i>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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. This practice poses several problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Suspected or known abusers may remain in the home of a child posing safety risks;</li> <li>(2) Unnecessary duplication of effort by agencies;</li> <li>(3) Delays in entry into the Index due to double investigations; and</li> <li>(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.</li> </ol> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished within existing CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> California Department of Justice.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
8.	<b>Project Title</b> Policy Recommendation: Technological Initiatives	<b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i> <b>Strategic Plan Goal I, V, VI</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b></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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <i>Technological initiatives have been a fundamental part of court responses to the COVID-19 pandemic both in state and tribal justice systems. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Existing CFCC, CJER, and Information Technology (IT) staff.  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> External stakeholders include tribal courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> This is an ongoing Forum charge.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Existing IT and CFCC staff with document assembly expertise.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i>  <b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.  <b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.	
9.	<b>Project Title: Policy Recommendation: Funding for Innovative Practices and System Improvements</b>	<b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i>  <b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. 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. <i>The goal of facilitating innovative practices and system improvements and seeking funding for this is to improve efficiencies in cases that span both jurisdictions or could be heard in either jurisdiction. This could potentially reduce workloads for state courts and improve access to justice for underserved and remote tribal communities. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Existing CFCC staff.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i>  <b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.  <b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
10.	<p><b>Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Sharing Resources and Communicating Information About Partnerships</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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"> <li>1. Identify Judicial Council and other resources that may be appropriate to share with tribal courts.</li> <li>2. Identify tribal justice resources that may be appropriate to share with state courts.</li> <li>3. Identify grants for tribal/state court collaboration.</li> <li>4. Share resources and information about partnerships through Forum E-Update, a monthly electronic newsletter.</li> <li>5. Publicize these partnerships at conferences, on the Innovation Knowledge Center (IKC), and at other in-person or online venues.</li> <li>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"> <li>○ Grant opportunities;</li> <li>○ Publications;</li> <li>○ News stories; and</li> <li>○ Educational events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 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. <i>The goal of facilitating partnerships between state and tribal courts is to improve efficiencies in cases that span both jurisdictions or could be heard in either jurisdiction. This could potentially reduce workloads for state courts and improve access to justice for underserved and remote tribal communities. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished with existing CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Tribal/State Collaborations that Increase Resources for Courts</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i></p> <p><i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</i></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. This year the JCC staff are supporting these collaborations by sharing resources and agreements and offering technical assistance on collaborations. <i>The goal of facilitating collaborations between state and tribal court judges is to improve efficiencies in cases that span both jurisdictions or could be heard in either jurisdiction. This could potentially reduce workloads for state courts and improve access to justice for underserved and remote tribal communities. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> 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><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> External stakeholders include superior courts and tribal courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
12.	<p><b>Project Title: Increase Tribal/State Partnerships: Education and Technical Assistance to Promote Partnerships and Understanding of Tribal Justice Systems</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i></p> <p><i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV, V</i></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Make recommendation to explore, at the option of tribes, opportunities for state and federal court judges to serve as a tribal court judge.</li> <li>5. Collaborate with federal courts and federal justice partners on educational and other events related to justice and safety in tribal communities.</li> <li>6. Develop and implement strategy to seek resources for tribal/state collaborations.</li> <li>7. Continue to provide the <a href="#">State/Tribal Education, Partnerships, and Services (S.T.E.P.S.) to Justice—Domestic Violence</a> and <a href="#">Child Welfare</a> programs and provide local educational and technical assistance services.</li> <li>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 <a href="#">Court Manual</a>).</li> <li>9. Establish partnership between the Superior Court of Humboldt County and the Yurok Tribal Court to develop civics learning opportunity for youth in the region.</li> </ol> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <i>The goal of facilitating partnerships between state and tribal courts is to improve efficiencies in cases that span both jurisdictions or could be heard in either jurisdiction. This could potentially reduce workloads for state courts and improve access to justice for underserved and remote tribal communities. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work accomplished within existing CFCC and CJER staff resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>	
13.	<p><b>Project Title: Education: Judicial Education</b></p>	<p><b>Priority 2</b> <i>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</i></p> <p><i>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV, V</i></p>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 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. <i>The goal the forum’s judicial education initiatives is to improve efficiencies in cases involving tribes and tribal people, and promote fair access to justice for tribal communities. Education about the impacts of COVID-19 in tribal communities, and ways tribal communities, tribal justice systems and tribal courts are addressing the challenges of COVID-19 may be of importance in the coming months. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</i></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Work will be accomplished with existing CFCC and CJER staff resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
14.	<b>Project Title: Education: Truth and Healing</b>	<b>Priority 2</b> <b>New work deferred</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV, V</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> 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> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. As a step towards the goal of Statewide Truth and Healing, the Forum’s annual in person meeting this past year featured a screening of the documentary “Dawnland” about the Main Truth and Healing Commission and a presentation from two of the commissioners from Main about that experience. Subsequently Governor Gavin Newsom announced the establishment of a Truth and Healing Council in California to be organized by the Governor’s Tribal Advisor, a Forum member. At this time the focus is on relationships with the tribal community. Courts may be brought into the Truth and Healing process at a later time.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be accomplished with existing CFCC staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Governor’s Tribal Advisor.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None at this time.</p>		
15.	<b>Project Title: Legislation, Regulations, and Requests for Public Comment</b>	<b>Priority 2</b> <b>New work deferred except initiatives related to Covid-19</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal I, IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary:</b> Review and recommend positions on legislation, regulations and requests for public comment related to tribal courts, tribal justice systems and the Indian Child Welfare Act.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <b>From time to time the federal government publishes proposed regulations and requests for public comment that may impact state and tribal justice systems in California. This has been true throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The Forum can</b></p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>
	<p data-bbox="205 186 1915 256">help promote Judicial Branch goals and interests at a federal level by assisting in formulating responses to these. Generally, new work under this item will be deferred unless it is helpful in responding to the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p data-bbox="205 316 1535 349"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Accomplished with existing CFCC and Governmental Affairs staff resources.</p> <p data-bbox="205 358 1927 428"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="205 488 709 521"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p data-bbox="205 570 531 602"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>

### III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	In collaboration with CJER, Forum staff and member Judge Sunshine Sykes served as faculty for a “10 Minute Mentor” video for judicial officers on the judge’s role in ensuring proper ICWA inquiry under the new requirements of AB 3176. This video is available on the CJER website at: <a href="http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/cjer/judicial/3553.htm">http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/cjer/judicial/3553.htm</a> .
2.	The Forum and Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee developed a comprehensive rules and forms proposal to implement the requirements of AB 3176. This proposal developed a new rule of court, amended 16 other rules of court, created 3 new forms and revised 27 other forms. The proposal was adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting on September 24, 2019, as <a href="#">item 195</a> on that agenda. The changes become effective January 1, 2020.
3.	The Forum developed comments on three federal requests for public comment published in the federal register: 1) comments on OMB Control Number 1076-0111 related to payment for appointed counsel in ICWA cases; 2) comments on RIN 1076-AF46 related to list of tribal courts maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and comments on OMB Control Number 1076-0186 Information Collected on State Court Proceedings under the Indian Child Welfare Act. These comments were ultimately approved and submitted on behalf of the Judicial Council by the Executive and Planning Committee.
4.	Forum members and staff planned and participated in the first ever Northern California Judges’ Dinner event held in collaboration with the Tribal Justice Collaborative. The event brings together state and tribal court judges and justice partners to recognize achievements in promoting collaboration and ICWA compliance. The northern California event was held in Oakland on October 3, 2019.
5.	Forum members and staff planned and participated in the second annual Bay Area ICWA Symposium held at the Judicial Council offices in San Francisco. The event took place on June 4, 2019.

**Workload Assessment Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020**

**Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 [Amended (Date)]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Lorna Alksne, Superior Court of San Diego County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Business Management Services Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Research Analyst, Business Management Services
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> Per <a href="#">Rule 10.66</a> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Improvements to performance measures and implementation plans and any modifications to the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study Model;</li><li>(2) Processes, study design, and methodologies that should be used to measure and report on court administration; and</li><li>(3) Studies and analyses to update and amend case weights through time studies, focus groups, or other methods.</li></ol> <a href="#">Rule 10.66(c)</a> sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee currently has 14 members. The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.	
<b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b> None.	

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

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

**Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

February 2020 – Date TBD, San Francisco, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Teleconference dates – TBD (estimate May and August)

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

DRAFT

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.



## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Adjustment Request Process (ARPs) Submissions (New)	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 2
<p data-bbox="170 394 1976 542"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process (ARP) is a process that provides courts the opportunity to request an adjustment to the Workload Formula. These requests are directed to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and then directed to the appropriate committee with the subject matter expertise related to the request. <b>Multiple Three ARPs have been directed to WAAC for their response and recommendation.</b></p> <p data-bbox="170 578 961 613"><b>Status/Timeline:</b> <b>To be completed by January 2021 <del>and</del> 2020.</b></p> <p data-bbox="170 654 1976 760"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Changes made will be accomplished within existing resources. The trial courts may need to be consulted to help define the changes needed. Completion of this project will be accomplished with 1.0 FTE Senior Analyst, .10 FTE Analyst, and .25 of Supervising Analyst for a period of 5 months (existing resources).</p> <p data-bbox="170 769 1976 841"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="170 881 762 917"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts.</p> <p data-bbox="170 954 548 990"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TCBAC.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Update	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> In October 2013, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee approved a motion stating that the workload studies (both staff and judicial) should be updated every five years, though not concurrently. The resource assessment study (RAS) is used to update the caseweights (i.e., time per filing) and other model parameters that are needed to estimate workload-based need for trial court staff.</p> <p>The committee’s work in the coming year will be to review RAS processes and policies and make any recommended changes as necessary. This review and assessment will begin the preparation for implementation of the next RAS update in the trial courts. 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing; expected completion date of process/policy review <u>is is 2020–21 end of calendar year 2021</u>; expected completion of next RAS <u>model</u> update is <u>FY 2023-24</u>. <u>Given how much things are in flux, the committee will reevaluate this timeline periodically to see if further adjustments are needed and discuss if any additional changes are needed.</u></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Completion of this project will be accomplished with 1.5 FTE Senior Analyst, 1.0 FTE Analyst, and .50 of Supervising Analyst for a period of 1 year (existing resources).</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, Department of Finance, and Legislature.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TBD/As needed.</p>		
2.	<b>Project Title:</b> Judicial Needs Assessment	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> III</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Government Code section 61614(c)(1) requires the Judicial Council to prepare biennial updates of the Judicial Needs Assessment in even-numbered years. 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. An assessment was issued in November 2018, but the workload analysis was done on the basis of the old caseweights. An updated assessment was issued in November 2019 to reflect the most current workload measures based on Judicial Workload Study update.</p>		

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Will be completed November 1, 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Completion of this report requires 0.25 FTE of an analyst (existing position) for a two-month period of time.  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial Courts, Department of Finance, and Legislature</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Report on Standards and Measures (Gov. Code § 77001.5)</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 1</p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> II</p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Government Code section 77001.5 requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature annually on judicial administration standards and measures.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Will be completed November 1, 2020.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Completion of this project will be accomplished with .20 FTE Senior Analyst/Analyst for a period of 2 months.  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
4.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Workload Modeling (various, TBD)</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup></b> 2</p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup></b> 3</p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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. Previously, WAAC partnered with TCBAC and the Family and</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p>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. <b>If projects arise related to this item, the committee will evaluate and determine if they meet the prioritization criteria.</b></p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing/TBD.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Unknown/TBD. Scope of work as yet to be determined.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts, Department of Finance, and Legislature.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TBD/As needed.</p>	
5.	<b>Project Title: Interim Updates to Workload Models</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2</b>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> As new laws are passed or changes in court data collected are made, updates may need to be made to the workload models (both staff (RAS) and judicial) to reflect those changes. As needed, WAAC will review and propose changes to the models. <b>If projects arise related to this item, the committee will evaluate and determine if they meet the prioritization criteria.</b></p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing/TBD</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Changes made will be accomplished within existing resources. Depending on scope of work could be up to .25 FTE Senior Analyst/Analyst. The trial courts may need to be consulted to help define the changes needed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial Courts, Department of Finance, and Legislature.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> TBD/As needed.</p>	

## II. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Judicial Workload Study update, approved by Judicial Council September 2019.
2.	Judicial Needs Assessment, submitted to Legislature November 2019.
3.	Report on Standards and Measures (Gov. Code § 77001.5), submitted to Legislature November 2019

DRAFT

**Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2020**

**Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: April 24, 2020 (Amended [TBD])**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Richard Vlavianos, Chair, Judge, Superior Court of San Joaquin County Hon. Lawrence G. Brown, Vice-Chair, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Ms. Francine Byrne, Principal Manager, Criminal Justice Services Ms. Carrie Zoller, Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
<p><b>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.56</a> 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(b):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Assess and measure success and effectiveness of local collaborative justice courts;</li><li>2. Identify and disseminate to trial courts locally generated best practices;</li><li>3. Recommend minimum judicial education standards and educational activities to support those standards to the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee;</li><li>4. Advise the council of potential funding sources;</li><li>5. Make recommendations regarding grant funding programs that are administered by the Judicial Council staff for drug courts and other treatment courts; and</li><li>6. Recommend appropriate outreach activities needed to support collaborative justice courts.</li></ol> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.56(c)</a> sets forth the membership position of the committee. 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 representative from the mental health field, one social services representative,</p>	

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

one non-profit community organization representative, and three public members). The current committee [roster](#) is available on the committee's web page.

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

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

**Meetings Planned for 2020<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

1. Full in-person committee meeting in fall 2020.
2. Teleconferences every 4th Wednesday of the month.
3. Subcommittee meetings as needed

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Act as Resource to Identify Challenges and Opportunities Related to Developing <b>Pretrial Release Court Responses for Defendants Individuals</b> with Behavioral Health Issues	<b>Priority</b> <sup>5</sup> 1 <b>Strategic Plan Goal</b> <sup>6</sup> IV
<p><b>Project Summary</b><sup>7</sup> 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. Activities may include identifying potential trainings or faculty, and creating resources to assist in identifying and accessing services for arrestee with behavioral health issues, etc. At a time when dramatic changes in release strategies are taking place, the Committee is very concerned that mentally ill individuals incarcerated in our jails are released with appropriate treatment plans. This requires mental health screening, followed by assessment, at the time of booking to enable Judges to make appropriate determinations and referrals to have these defendants enter in treatment or reengage in treatment rather than simply being released to the streets.</p> <p>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 and when court responses to the homelessness crisis are developed. Activities may include identifying potential trainings or faculty to educate judicial officers on these issues and creating resources to assist judicial officers in identifying and accessing services for individuals, where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Project will continue throughout 2020. CJCAC members and staff will continue to provide subject matter expertise to PROW appropriate advisory body staff. CJCAC members will continue to be available upon request.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of [The Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch](#) the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or "end of action" to be achieved for the coming year.



#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Pretrial Reform Operations Workgroup (PROW).</p>	
2.	<p><b>Project Title: Develop Additional Content for the Behavioral Health Education Series, a Series of Webinars or Other Educational Sessions on Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Collaborative Justice Courts, Treatment Capacity, and Relevant Legislation</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> V</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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 trainings. The sessions are geared towards court staff, judicial officers, and justice system partners. Educational series topics include working with court users with serious mental health disorders, collaborative court principles and practices, effective practices in drug and mental health treatment, and increasing access to treatment. The trainings will include 2 to 4 in-person trainings on mental health diversion conducted in partnership with County Behavioral Health Directors.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 6 to 8 webinar/education sessions will be completed by December 2020. <b>Item modified due to COVID-19 and resultant budget impact. One in-person training was conducted in January 2020. A webinar on accessing MSHA funds was posted June 2020. A webinar on juvenile psychotropic medication was recorded in June and will be posted soon. Three additional webinars were developed in partnership with the Council of Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health (CCJBH), County Behavioral Health Directors Association (CBHDA), Department of State Hospitals (DSH), and the Council of State Government (CSG). Two live on-line education events focused on COVID response have been held with a third anticipated to be held in September. Over 150 people registered for each of the first two webinars. Future webinars that may be conducted will focus on issues related to COVID 19 and the resulting budget crisis. Topics may include the impact of housing and health care challenges on court users.</b></p> <p><b>Additionally, with the rapid release of people in jail including those who have mental illnesses in response to COVID 19, there is a need in to prepare additional educational programs that provide strategies to be implemented when mentally ill defendants will be out of custody for an extensive period of time while their cases are in pretrial status.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff. Potential consultation with Judicial Council staff from the Center for Judicial Education and Research.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		

#	<b>New or One-Time Projects<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local trial courts and justice system partners, Council on Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health, California Department of State Hospitals, County Behavioral Health Directors Association, and Council of State Governments</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title: Submit 2020 CJCAC report to the Judicial Council that Includes an Update on the Implementation of Recommendations of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force and Identifies Current Issues and Provides Recommendations Related to Individuals with Mental Illness or Substance Use Disorder in the Courts</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The committee will create a report providing an update on the implementation of recommendations of the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force and identifying current issues related to individuals with mental illness or substance use disorder in the courts. The report will include recommendations geared towards improving outcomes for these individuals.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Report to be submitted in 2020. <b>Report has been drafted and is undergoing internal review. Report submission delayed to 2021 to incorporate discussion of impact of COVID-19.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
4.	<p><b>Project Title: Continue Development of a Resource Identifying Effective Practices and Address Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) Cases</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> V</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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. With the results compiled, staff will identify promising practices and conduct research related to competency restoration programs, and identify and document best practices in competency restoration.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Survey results were compiled, and project findings will inform next steps for information distribution and possible action items. Project will be complete in fall 2020. <b>Project timelines extended and delayed until funding becomes available. Although a BCP</b></p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
	<p data-bbox="184 207 1976 315">funding request and its associated research project have been deferred, CJCAC recognizes that COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in the need for additional support in this area. CJCAC will continue to act as subject matter experts and collaborate with justice system partners to address some of these issues as needed throughout the pandemic.</p> <p data-bbox="184 363 1335 396"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p> <p data-bbox="184 412 1913 477"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="184 526 1955 591"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local trial courts, policymakers, Council for Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health, and Department of State Hospitals.</p> <p data-bbox="184 639 512 672"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None</p>	
5.	<p data-bbox="184 769 1520 834"><b>Project Title: Continue to Support Development and Implementation of a Strategic Plan for Court Involved Veterans and Military Families</b></p>	<p data-bbox="1593 769 1730 802"><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p data-bbox="1593 818 1913 850"><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></p>
	<p data-bbox="184 915 1965 1143"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> This project began with a Department of Justice technical assistance award to the Judicial Council to provide statewide strategic planning assistance for California Veterans Treatment Courts. In conjunction with the Center for Court Innovation, court and system partners were brought together in June 2019 to begin drafting a strategic plan. It is anticipated that the California Association of Collaborative Courts will host a second convening of partners to further refine the plan and develop a strategy for implementation. The committee’s participation in the process will include identifying plan goals within judicial branch purview and assessing the feasibility of implementing those items.</p> <p data-bbox="184 1175 1934 1208"><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Timeline delayed and extended through 2021 due to impact on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p data-bbox="184 1256 1335 1289"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff.</p> <p data-bbox="184 1305 1913 1370"><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p data-bbox="184 1403 1923 1468"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Department of Veteran’s Affairs, local trial courts and justice system partners, veteran’s organizations, and Center for Court Innovation, California Association of Collaborative Courts.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.	
6.	<b>Project Title:</b> Effective Practices in Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts: Juvenile Collaborative Court Briefing; Girls’ Court Study; STAR Court Evaluation	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Timeline delayed due to COVID-19</b>
		<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Project will identify the efficacy of applied collaborative court principles in juvenile court, by completing 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.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Juvenile Collaborative Court Briefing completion date: <b>Completed, no additional action required</b>  Girls’ Court Evaluation completion date: <b>Completed June 2020, no additional action required.</b>  STAR Court Evaluation completion date: <b>Timeline delayed due to COVID-19 pandemic.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources</b> The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external funding for collaborative courts and mental health. No additional fiscal impact to Judicial Council staffing is anticipated.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Violence Against Women Project, trial courts, Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission, and the Child Welfare Council’s Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team Committee.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts Subcommittee, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Violence Against Women Education Project (VAWEP).</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
7.	<b>Project Title:</b> Explore Avenues for Permanent Funding for Collaborative Courts	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Deferred</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> I, II, VII</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Many of the state’s collaborative courts are supported by short-term or grant funding. To ensure the success and sustainability of collaborative courts, the committee will explore and pursue potential avenues for permanent funding, and encourage the expansion of local treatment and evaluation capacity, as appropriate. The committee anticipates submitting a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to support this effort.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> The proposed BCP will be deferred until FY 2022–23 or later. Deferred due to impact on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff. Potential consultation with Judicial Council staff from Budget Services.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local trial courts and justice system partners.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>		
8.	<b>Project Title:</b> Build Upon Pretrial Innovations in Statewide Data Sharing to Explore the Creation of a Similar Data Sharing Infrastructure for Collaborative Courts	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Deferred</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> VI</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> In order to enable and support requests for statewide data sharing among collaborative courts, the Pretrial Pilot Program is creating a statewide data sharing infrastructure for pretrial programs. The committee will monitor the progress of the program’s data sharing infrastructure and governance and explore whether a similar infrastructure would be feasible and could benefit collaborative courts.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> This is an exploratory project that will extend beyond 2020. Unless funding becomes available, this is deferred due to impact on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> This work will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff. Potential consultation with Judicial Council staff from Information Technology.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Services.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Collaborative Courts and local justice system partners.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Pretrial Reform Operations Workgroup (PROW). Information Technology Advisory Committee</p>	
9.	<p><b>Project Title: Complete Study of Veterans and Veterans Treatment Courts as Directed by Senate Bill 339</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>  <b>Project completed</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Project completion date–June 2020. <b>Project completed in June 2020, no additional action is required.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> 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><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Department of Veterans Affairs, California State Legislature, local courts, justice system partners, and public.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
10.	<b>Project Title:</b> Creation of the Homeless and Community Court Blueprint	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Project completed</b>
<b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> V</b>		
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> This project continues previous committee efforts to research and document homeless and community court models. The Homeless and Community Court Blueprint will provide an overview of Homeless Court and Community Court Programs to assist courts interested in developing or expanding their programs, giving example of successful courts, making implementation recommendations, and providing resource information.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Project completion date: March 2020. <b>Project complete, no additional action is required.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The project will be conducted by existing Judicial Council staff who are funded by external earmarked funding for mental health.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Consultation with local homeless and community courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Parolee Reentry Court Grant Allocations</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Current funding will expire June 30, 2021. <b>This item will continue as planned to provide maximum support for courts during the Covid-19 pandemic and budget crisis.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>		
2.	<b>Project Title: Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocations</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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"> <li>• Report to the Judicial Council on grant activities.</li> <li>• Recommend to the Judicial Council grant allocations to local courts based on the Judicial Council approved allocation methodology;</li> <li>• Review biannual reports regarding funding distribution, invoicing, and deliverables reports from local courts;</li> <li>• Recommend methods of allocation and grants administration for next annual funding cycle; and,</li> </ul>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify methods to increase funding through the SAFG program.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <b>This item will continue as planned to provide maximum support for courts during the COVID-19 pandemic and budget crisis.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts, collaborative court coordinators, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title: Assist Local Courts to Obtain Funding and In-Kind Assistance, such as Federal or State Grants for Local Collaborative Court Projects</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> VII</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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"> <li>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, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Improvement Program, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance to support existing and planned collaborative courts;</li> <li>Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle; and,</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <b>Item mainly completed with the 2020 grant cycle. Additional work will continue as planned to provide maximum support for courts during the COVID-19 pandemic and budget crisis.</b></p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Increases funding for local courts; Judicial Council staff resources partially funded by external earmarked funds for collaborative and drug courts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local collaborative courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, National Center for State Courts, and Center for Court Innovation.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Assist Local Courts to Obtain Funding and In-Kind Assistance, such as Federal or State Grants for Local Collaborative Court Projects</p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> VII</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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"> <li>• 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, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Improvement Program, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance to support existing and planned collaborative courts;</li> <li>• Assist local courts in identifying appropriate federal grant opportunities and preparing applications for funding of collaborative courts through the federal funding cycle; and,</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. <b>Item mainly completed with the 2020 grant cycle. Additional work will continue as planned to provide maximum support for courts during the COVID-19 pandemic and budget crisis.</b></p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Increases funding for local courts; Judicial Council staff resources partially funded by external earmarked funds for collaborative and drug courts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>		

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local collaborative courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, California Association of Youth Courts, National Center for State Courts, and Center for Court Innovation.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Project Title: Mental Health: Identify Priority Issues and Best Practices; Continued Implementation of Assigned Recommendations of Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Identify priority policy issues and best practices regarding working to improve court responses for individuals with mental illness in the court system through legislation tracking, continued support for education, research, and the improved dissemination of information as outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Track and review proposed legislation that impacts mental health in adult criminal, family law, dependency, and juvenile justice cases; Identify emerging mental health legislation, policies, and best practices in areas such as competency restoration, conservatorship and Lanterman-Petris-Short Act (LPS) cases to advocate for improvements, as appropriate.</li> <li>• Track, review and comment, as appropriate, on all proposed rules and regulations of State departments and agencies that relate to mentally ill individuals in the courts.</li> <li>• Continue to support education, research, and the improved dissemination of information including increasing the accessibility and relevancy of mental health resources on the California Courts website.</li> <li>• Assist in identifying emerging issues and needs for litigants with mental health issues, such as accommodation needs, issues related to incompetence to stand trial, informed consent and confidentiality, and serving veterans and military families.</li> <li>• Identify opportunities for collaboration with mental health stakeholders, programs, and initiatives (e.g., Stepping Up Initiative and Words to Deeds).</li> </ul> <p>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 <a href="#">this link</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing review, development and implementation in coordination with advisory committees that are also assigned to review and work on the recommendation Examples of recommendations to be reviewed include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 13, 16: Mental health protocols/information sharing; Encourage collaborative justice courts for MH issues/local protocols for MH CJ courts;</li> <li>- 17: Develop teaching tool on how MH should guide case processing;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 28 (Recommendations related Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) issues): Dedicated competency calendars;</li> <li>- 39: Self-help centers to provide information on MH and the courts;</li> <li>- 97: Youth exiting the juvenile delinquency system should receive appropriate reentry and aftercare services;</li> <li>- 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;</li> <li>- 111: Assessments and evaluations of the current data, processes, and outcomes of juvenile competence to stand trial in California should be conducted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. Review of the recommendations was completed in 2020. MH report has been drafted and is undergoing internal review. The CJCAC will continue to focus on recommendations that are crucial to responding to the needs of courts and court users amid the COVID 19 pandemic and those focused on providing equal access to the courts for mentally ill offenders and juveniles.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The project, including staff costs, is partially funded by external earmarked funding for collaborative courts and mental health.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts and California Association of Collaborative Courts and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Project Title: Conduct Multidisciplinary Education to Support Effective Practices and Beneficial Outcomes in Collaborative Justice Courts; Identify and Distribute Information on New or Pending Policy Changes</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> V</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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 may include notifying collaborative courts of policy changes that may be of impact (mental health or competency issues, diversion programs, 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>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to create, in consultation/collaboration with Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) as appropriate, in-person and virtual trainings and educational materials in topic areas relevant to collaborative court programs such as drug court best practice standards, 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.</li> <li>• 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), National Drug Court Institute 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Continue to distribute information on effective practices through regular webinars, and hosting list-servs for collaborative court and mental health professionals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. Educational programming for collaborative courts now limited to trainings focused on the response to the COVID-19 pandemic and resultant budget impact. See New Project #3, p. 4 above.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> 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><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> 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><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CJER Advisory Committee and curriculum committees in criminal law, family and juvenile law, and probate and mental health law.</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
7.	<b>Project Title: Veterans and Military Families: Identify Priority Issues and Best Practices</b>	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b> <b>Timeline delayed due to COVID-19</b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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"> <li>• MIL-100: Revise the Notification of Military Status (form MIL-100), which informs the court that a party in a court case is or was in the military, including changing the form from optional to mandatory. The revisions to the current form will enable courts to improve early identification of court litigants in all case types who have a military affiliation, will assist courts in complying with Penal Code section 858 requirements, and will make the form easier to use and file.</li> <li>• Track and review proposed legislation regarding court involved veterans and military families;</li> <li>• Continue work and support toward implementing legislation regarding court involved veterans and military families;</li> <li>• Leverage judicial education programs to disseminate training materials, resources, and education job aids to assist judges, court staff, and veterans' stakeholders to better serve justice involved veterans and military families;</li> <li>• Identify educational materials and, at the request of relevant committees, serve as subject matter experts for areas pertaining to military families and veterans in the courts, such as Government Code section 12920, and Penal Code sections 858, 1001.3, 1001.80, 1170.9, and 1170.91; trauma informed care including post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, and other trauma informed services, family reunification, and reentry services for incarcerated veterans;</li> <li>• Collaborate 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;</li> <li>• Update and review Veterans Treatment Courts roster to ensure accuracy of information;</li> <li>• Coordinate with system partners including , American Bar Association, the State Bar, Department of Veterans Affairs, California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet), local veterans' agencies, veterans' advocacy groups, veterans' groups and homeless groups to follow trends and developments regarding court involved veterans' and military families, and to seek opportunities to collaborate in providing education and resources to court staff and partners;</li> <li>• Research and provide training and information on the website related to best practices for serving special veteran populations such as improving treatment and case processing outcomes for women veterans and military families in our courts, information on helping veterans who do not receive VA benefits due being less than honorably discharged from the military because of their</li> </ul>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p>sexual orientation, and ways to help address the unique challenges faced by older veterans; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In conjunction with the veterans court strategic planning process, assess additional unmet needs of court-involved veterans and military families that are within Judicial Branch purview, conferring with other Judicial Council advisory bodies, as appropriate, and determining strategies for assisting courts with improving case outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. MIL-100 has been approved by the Rules Committee and is anticipated to be considered for approval by the Judicial Council at their September meeting. Other project timelines deferred due to impact on the judicial branch relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Staff partially funded through external earmarked funding for collaborative and drug courts.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and Center for Court Innovation.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Advisory Committee.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Project Title: Juvenile Collaborative Justice Courts: Identify Priority Issues and Best Practices</b></p>	<p><b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 1</b>  <b>Timeline delayed and project modified due to COVID-19</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV</b></p>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> 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"> <li>Continue to provide subject matter expertise and guidance by developing and maintaining updates of briefing papers on evidence-based practices on assessments, juvenile collaborative courts, and human trafficking.</li> </ul>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish research on girls’/CSEC courts as that court model grows;</li> <li>• Provide subject matter expertise and guidance and coordinate with staff to other groups in the area of human trafficking;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Assist in branch coordination efforts to address permanency for children in foster care by providing subject matter expertise and guidance to promote and expand the use of Dependency Drug Courts as a best practice model;</li> <li>• Provide education and technical assistance in the area of the needs of homeless youth;</li> <li>• Hold a youth court track at the biennial Beyond the Bench conference for youth and adults;</li> <li>• Collaborate with juvenile justice partners and stakeholders, including the California surgeon general’s office in order to explore alternatives for youth when juvenile hall closes, including how to address placement challenges for very young children or those who are aging out of system; and</li> <li>• Create a Dependency Drug Court web resource.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. Project timelines are delayed and projects will be modified to focus on priorities related to responding to the impact COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Funded through external earmarked funding for collaborative and drug courts.  <input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CJER Advisory Committee.</p>



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
9.	<b>Project Title:</b> Non-Criminal Mental Health Cases	<b>Priority<sup>5</sup> 2</b> Timelines delayed and project modified
<p data-bbox="216 407 1864 475"><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Continue to identify and address mental health issues through application of collaborative court principles in noncriminal case types, including civil, probate, family, and juvenile.</p> <p data-bbox="216 524 1948 592"><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing. Project timelines are delayed and projects will be modified to focus on priorities related to responding to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p data-bbox="216 634 1356 667"><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Funded through external earmarked funding for mental health.</p> <p data-bbox="216 672 1944 740"><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p data-bbox="216 789 1896 857"><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Local courts, California Association of Collaborative Courts, and California Association of Youth Courts.</p> <p data-bbox="216 902 537 935"><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None</p>		

### III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	Developed and executed curriculum for two regional round tables in Sacramento and San Bernardino to assist courts in implementing mental health diversion programs set forth in AB 1810. The events allowed judges and court administrators to come together to brainstorm approaches for the implementation and procedural challenges presented by the new mental health diversion law (Pen. Code §§ 1001.35, 1001.36). Discussion topics included group report status updates on AB 1810 implementation and screening and evaluation. Panel topics included collaborative court practices and principles and determining appropriate treatment and supervising treatment compliance. Judges and court administrators from 31 of the 58 superior courts (representing counties where 86 percent of Californians live) attended one of the two regional round tables.
2.	Developed 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.
3.	In partnership with the Center for Court Innovation (CCI), hosted a two-day strategic planning session for Veterans Treatment Courts that was attend by over 20 participants representing local trial courts, treatment providers, defense and prosecuting attorneys, Veteran’s Affairs, and members of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. The session resulted in a strategic plan to support Veterans Treatment Courts in California. Committee staff worked with CCI to identify resources that will be provided to the California Association of Collaborative Courts to assist in the execution of the strategic plan.
4.	Hosted the Annual Youth Court Summit. Themed “Empowering Youth for Civic Engagement” the Summit was held at the University of Redlands and attended by nearly 200 youth and adults. Held in partnership with the California Association of Youth Courts, 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. A focus group was held at the summit for the purpose of gathering information from youth court directors to include in the Youth Court Toolkit that is being created by the juvenile subcommittee.
5.	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 300 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 jurisdictions.
6.	<p>Prioritized and implemented recommendations from the Mental Health Issues Implementation Task Force as noted below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assigned MHIITF completed and implemented recommendations: 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 67, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 103, 108, 109, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 124, 131</li> <li>• Deferring until such time resources allow initiation of recommendation, or if out of purview, referring to partner agencies: 1, 14, 15, 18, 21, 26, 37, 38, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66, 71,72, 80, 84, 89, 92, 94, 99, 101, 102, 106, 113, 134</li> </ul>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
7.	Updated California Courts website to include links to national and international research on collaborative justice and mental health issues, information regarding mental health and other collaborative courts, and best practice standards for drug courts.
8.	In a joint project with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, implemented 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.
9.	Developed and disseminated Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63) Information Sheet to help educate, familiarize, and assist local courts in the MHSA process for obtaining funding for court programs addressing mental health, including family law, dependency, juvenile justice, and adult criminal cases.

**Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2021**  
**Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Humboldt County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Mr. Corey Rada, Senior Analyst, Trial Court Leadership
<p><b>Committee’s Charge/Membership:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Rule 10.46(a)</a> of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC), which is to contribute to the statewide administration of justice by monitoring areas of significance to the justice system and making recommendations to the Judicial Council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, <a href="#">rule 10.46(b)</a> sets forth the additional duties of the committee.</p> <p><a href="#">Per rule 10.46(c)</a>, the TCPJAC is comprised of the presiding judges of all 58 superior courts. Additionally, <a href="#">rule 10.46 (d)</a> establishes an Executive Committee consisting of the committee chair, vice-chair, and members in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) All presiding judges from superior courts with 48 or more judges;</li> <li>(b) Two presiding judges from superior courts with 2 to 5 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category;</li> <li>(c) Three presiding judges from superior courts with 6 to 15 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category; and</li> <li>(d) Four presiding judges from superior courts with 16 to 47 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category.</li> </ul> <p>The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee’s web page.</p>	
<p><b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee</li> <li>2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee</li> <li>3. <del>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee</del></li> </ul>	

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

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

**Meetings Planned for [2021]<sup>3</sup> (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)**

Date/Time/Location or Teleconference:

Joint TCPJAC/CEAC and CEAC Statewide Meetings:

- February 10, 2021 (webinar)
- August 12-13, 2021 (in-person, location TBD)

Joint TCPJAC/CEAC and CEAC Executive Committee Meetings:

- April 28, 2021 (in-person, Sacramento)
- October 27, 2021 (in-person, Sacramento)

Specific subcommittee/working group meeting dates are to be determined at this time. Meeting occurrences are estimates for 2021 and may be subject to change.

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee – 15 teleconferences

TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee – 5 teleconferences

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

Assistant presiding judges are permitted to attend and be reimbursed for travel expenditures to statewide meetings in addition to members of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committees.

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

## COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<del><b>Project Title: Provide Input to CEAC During Its Review of the Standards of Judicial Administration to Clarify and Improve Access to Justice Measures (One-Time)</b></del>	<del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b> <b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> IV, VI</b></del>
<p><del><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> As needed, provide input to the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) as it reviews the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommends additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures. CEAC is conducting this review to improve the branch’s ability to communicate the trial courts’ objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort would seek to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self help center hours, clerks’ office hours, etc.). This project was conceived as a way to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</del></p> <p><del><b>Status/Timeline:</b> 2020.</del></p> <p><del><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Trial Court Leadership staff.</del></p> <p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</del></p> <p><del><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC.</del></p>		

<sup>4</sup> All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

<sup>5</sup> For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

<sup>6</sup> Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

<sup>7</sup> A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

# Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
	<b>Priority</b> 1 <sup>5</sup> <b>Strategic Plan Goal</b> <sup>6</sup> II, III
<p><b>Project Summary</b><sup>7</sup>: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) is charged with developing, reviewing, commenting, and making recommendations on proposed legislation to establish new or amend existing laws. The subcommittee monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Governmental Affairs and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC and Legislation Committee.</p>	
2.	<b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
	<b>Priority</b> 1 <sup>5</sup> <b>Strategic Plan Goal</b> <sup>6</sup> II, III, VI
<p><b>Project Summary</b><sup>7</sup>: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) is charged with developing, reviewing, and providing input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Legal Services and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</p>	

#	<b>Ongoing Projects and Activities<sup>4</sup></b>	
	<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC, Rules Committee, and various advisory bodies.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Project Title:</b> Legislative Advocacy of Adequate Funding for the Trial Court Trust Fund</p>	<p><b>Priority 1<sup>5</sup></b></p> <p><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> II, VII</b></p>
	<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Develop strategies on how presiding judges can strengthen their role and be better prepared to both advocate for and assist the Judicial Council, including Governmental Affairs, in advocating for adequate funding to the Trial Court Trust Fund.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Superior courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC and the Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
4.	<p><del><b>Project Title:</b> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee</del></p>	<p><del><b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b></del></p> <p><del><b>Strategic Plan Goal<sup>6</sup> VI</b></del></p>
	<p><del><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee (JTS) reviews and provides, on an as-needed basis, early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</del></p> <p><del><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</del></p> <p><del><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Legal Services, Information Technology, and Trial Court Leadership staff.</del></p>	



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>4</sup>	
	<p><del><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</del></p> <p><del><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</del></p> <p><del><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC and ITAC.</del></p>	
4.	<b>Project Title:</b> Serve as a Resource	<b>Priority 2<sup>5</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>7</sup>:</b> Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory bodies to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> None.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> CEAC and various advisory bodies.</p>		

## II. LIST OF 2020 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p><b>Educational Opportunities.</b> TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to conduct eight business meetings in 2020. These meetings covered topics including budget priorities, legislative updates, information technology updates, emergency preparedness and response, court operations, and COVID-19 pandemic planning and response. Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers.</p>
2.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2020, holding 11 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations to the Legislation Committee on 30 different bills identified by Governmental Affairs as having significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2020, the subcommittee meeting schedule will be set according to the Legislation Committee’s 2021 meeting schedule. The subcommittee will continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts, and recommend proposals for future consideration.</p>
3.	<p><b>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee.</b> Remained active throughout 2020, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and reviewed 44 rule proposals throughout the course of the year. The subcommittee provided comment on 16 rule proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2021 and meet as needed.</p>
4.	<p><b>Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide.</b> In May 2020, the Judicial Council of California launched the Pandemic Continuity of Operations Working Group, consisting of presiding judges and court executives, to collect best practices and publish a framework to help the state’s 58 superior courts address interrupted services amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. In June 2020, the working group, in collaboration with Judicial Council staff contributors, published the Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide. This tool serves as a resource guide to assist trial courts with navigating the COVID-19 pandemic while maintaining ongoing modifications to public health restrictions from the state, counties, and cities.</p>