



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

MEMORANDUM

Date

April 16, 2026

Action Requested

Please review

To

Members of the Technology Committee

Contact

Lisa Chavez, Supervisor
Information Technology
Lisa.Chavez@jud.ca.gov

From

Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
Information Technology Advisory
Committee, and Executive Sponsor IT
Modernization workstream

Subject

IT Modernization Local Court Project
Funding FY 2026-27

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an update on the work of the Information Technology Advisory Committee's (ITAC) Information Technology (IT) Modernization workstream; and submit its completed evaluation of the fiscal year (FY) 2026-27 project proposals to the Technology Committee for consideration.

Background

Beginning with the fiscal year (FY) 2022-23 program cycle, the Technology Committee directed ITAC to oversee the IT Modernization workstream activity on an ongoing basis. For the FY 2026-27 cycle, our workstream was formed consisting of 29 members including judicial officers, court executives, technology leaders, and operations experts across the appellate and trial courts; and representing a mix of small, medium, and large courts. The workstream held its kickoff in February and completed all project evaluations in April. The workstream reviewed and evaluated 149 project proposals from a total of 44 courts.

Project Requirements

The Technology Committee defined the requirements for the IT Modernization Local Court Project grant program, including that each project must:

- Benefit the public (direct or indirect)
- Must be modernization (not hardware replacement)
- Fall within at least one of the approved program categories
- Expend or encumber funds by end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2027)
- Be completed by the end of the third fiscal year (June 30, 2029)
- Report bi-annually on measurable, successful outcomes
- Comply with branchwide policies and standards

As in years past, the workstream checked projects for their alignment with these requirements, and as a result the workstream determined that 143 out of 149 projects met project requirements. The workstream recognized that local court IT budgets and the additional Technology Resource Planning “Cluster” allocation that the trial courts receive separately is more intended for those purposes, such as ongoing maintenance and operations or hardware replacement.

Also, the workstream reviewed the alignment between the project proposal details and the selected program category. This check ensures alignment with defined categories, regardless of funding priority. The workstream recommended changing the categories for 39 projects to ensure more accurate classifications.

Evaluation Elements & Process

This year the Technology Committee established a new evaluation rubric with a goal of providing a more robust review of the projects and enabling the ability to rank the projects for funding consideration, similar to traditional grant programs. The workstream was provided an evaluation template that included three levels of assessment, outlined below.

1. Project requirements

- As mentioned above, the workstream first determined whether each project proposal met the **project requirements** and, if so, whether its **program category** was properly aligned.
- Next, the workstream evaluated **application quality** based on the clarity and completeness of the content (not grammar). For example, was the project proposal clear and complete, generally understandable but missing some detail, or vague or incomplete?

2. Funding priorities

- The Technology Committee identified three funding priorities for FY 2026-27: Cyber/Information Security, Case Management Systems and Enhancements, and IT Infrastructure.
- The workstream was asked to confirm whether the selected funding priority aligned with the project category and, if so, to evaluate the project's level of impact. For example, did the project directly address the funding priority, loosely align with it, or have little to no impact? If the selected category did not match the funding priority, a score of zero was applied.

3. Key factors

- **Level of Collaboration:** The workstream assigned a score only when letters of support were provided with scoring based on the number of courts involved. If it was not a collaboration project, a score of zero was applied.
- **Level of Branch Impact:** The workstream assessed each project to determine how many other courts could *potentially* benefit from the project.
- **Level of Public Benefit:** The workstream evaluated whether the project provided an exceptional, moderate, or minimal level of public benefit.
- **Baseline Security:** The workstream assessed whether the project strengthened, improved, or had no impact on the court's *core* cybersecurity posture.
- **Modernization/Innovation:** The workstream evaluated the project's level of modernization or innovation, ranging from breakthrough improvements to significant, moderate, limited, or minimal enhancements.

To arrive at our decisions, the workstream took the following steps:

- Formed subteams that reviewed all project proposals, implementation plans, and letters of support (if applicable). The workstream did not review the project budgets, as its charge was limited to evaluating the project merits; nor did any member review proposals from its own court. The teams evaluated each project—based on the elements above—including flagging projects that did not meet requirements.
- Subteam leads, with support of IT leadership staff, conducted a final calibration review of the evaluation recommendations across the teams to ensure consistent application of the criteria. For example, projects with similar objectives and characteristics, such as digitization efforts and remote video upgrades, were compared to ensure consistent evaluation across key factors.
- Received approval from ITAC on the evaluation elements and their alignment to the criteria set forth by the Technology Committee, the workstream's completion of the project evaluation, and the submission of the workstream's evaluation results to the Technology Committee.

The workstream was advised that their evaluations would not guarantee funding or determine project ranking. Once the workstream's assessment was received, it was explained that the Technology Committee would then apply weighting to the respective evaluation elements, consider final project approval, and submit its funding recommendations to the Judicial Council.

Evaluation Results & Recommendations

The workstream conducted this assessment based on the criteria and process defined and will submit its results—of individual court project evaluations—to the Technology Committee. Furthermore, the following summarizes our key results from the evaluation process:

- A total of 143 out of 149 projects met project requirements and were evaluated based on the approved criteria.
- As designed, the evaluations themselves **will not determine project ranking** since no weighting is applied. Ranking will be determined by the Technology Committee.
- For the **Level of Branch Impact** factor, 28% of the projects were marked as “Cannot Evaluate” based on the information in the application; and 31% of the projects were scored as “0,” indicating the project would have limited or no branchwide impact. Because this factor was consistently challenging to assess, we recommend removing it from weighting or assigning it a low weighting.

Thank you, again, for designating ITAC to complete this evaluation process. We understand and appreciate the importance of this assignment, its impact on the courts, and its role in increasing access to justice through technology.

Please let me know if I may provide any additional information.

SFH/LC

Attachment: IT Modernization Workstream Members

cc: Information Technology Advisory Committee
Mr. John Yee, Director/Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council
Mr. Andraé Randolph, Principal Manager, Judicial Council
Ms. Jamel Jones, IT Manager, Judicial Council
Ms. Lisa Chavez, IT Supervisor, Judicial Council

Attachment: IT Modernization Workstream Members

Role on Workstream	Name	Court	Cluster Size	Title/Position
1. Executive Sponsor	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson	Superior Court of Orange	Large	Judge
2. Member	Hon. Sean Dabel	Superior Court of San Mateo	Medium	Judge
3. Member	Hon. Kimberly Menninger	Superior Court of Orange	Large	Judge
4. Member	Hon. Maria Morga	Superior Court of Alameda	Large	Judge
5. Member	Monica L. Alemán	Superior Court of Calaveras	Small	Court Executive Officer
6. Member	Ofer Amrami	Superior Court of Los Angeles	Large	Deputy Chief Information Officer/ Cyber Security Officer
7. Member	Kate Bieker	Superior Court of Ventura	Medium	Court Executive Officer
8. Member	Kelli Beltran	Superior Court of Riverside	Large	Chief Operations Officer
9. Member	Jeff Carrico	Superior Court of Calaveras	Small	Chief Information Officer
10. Member	Tim Cool	Superior Court of Riverside	Large	Chief Deputy of Information Technology
11. Member	Jerame Evans	Superior Court of Nevada	Medium	Director of Information Technology
12. Member	Ravi Ganji	Superior Court of San Bernardino	Large	Director of Information Technology
13. Member	Richard Gillespie	Superior Court of Sacramento	Large	Chief Information Officer
14. Member	AJ Guzman	Superior Court of Sutter	Medium	Director of Information Technology & Facilities
15. Member	Elke Harris	Superior Court of Los Angeles	Large	Director of Family Law, Probate, and Mental Health Operations
16. Member	Karmann Hung	Court of Appeal, First Appellate District	n/a	Court Technology Manager
17. Member	Jim Lin	Superior Court of Inyo	Small	Court Technology Systems and Records Management Specialist
18. Member	Christopher Lopez	Superior Court of Los Angeles	Large	Court Operations Manager

Attachment: IT Modernization Workstream Members

Role on Workstream	Name	Court	Cluster Size	Title/Position
19. Member	Mitchell S. Lowther	Superior Court of Shasta	Medium	Court Information Technology Manager
20. Member	Robert Oliver	Superior Court of Sonoma	Medium	Court Executive Officer
21. Member	Anthony Paradiso	Superior Court of Stanislaus	Medium	Information Technology Manager
22. Member	Chad Peace	Superior Court of San Mateo	Medium	Court Executive Officer
23. Member	John Rayl	Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District	n/a	Court Technology Manager
24. Member	Christopher Roman	Superior Court of San Bernardino	Large	Data Analytics Manager
25. Member	Michael Roxas	Superior Court of Alameda	Large	Director of Information Technology
26. Member	Nocona Soboleski	Superior Court of Kings	Medium	Court Executive Officer
27. Member	Kristine Swensson	Superior Court of Los Angeles	Large	Finance Director
28. Member	Jessica Thompson	Superior Court of Santa Barbara	Medium	Director of Information Technology
29. Member	Reginald (Reggie) Washington	Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District	n/a	Court Technology Manager