



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/committee.htm
committee@jud.ca.gov

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 28, 2023
10:00 AM to 12:15 PM
Videoconference

**Advisory Body
Members Present:**

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice- Chair; Mr. Mike Baniel; Mr. Brian Cotta; Mr. Adam Creiglow; Hon. Julie Culver; Hon. Tara Desautels; Mr. Jason Galkin; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. James Mize; Hon. Ioana Petrou; Mr. Jake Pison; Hon. Bruce Smith; Mr. Neal Taniguchi; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; and Mr. David H. Yamasaki; and Hon. Theodore Zayner

**Advisory Body
Members Absent:**

Assembly Member Damon Connelly; Hon. Truc T. Do; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Amy Guerra; and Mr. Anh Tran

Others Present:

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Ms. Heather Pettit; and Judicial Council staff

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 9, 2023 meeting.

There were no public comments received for this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Item 1

Chair's Report

Update:

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed members, informed them that the calendar years 2023-24 Tactical Plan for Technology was approved by the Judicial Council on July 21, and thanked Tactical Plan Workstream members for their hard work and commitment to ensuring the plan incorporated metrics for each initiative, and aligned with the California Courts Connected framework. The chair also informed the committee members the Judicial Council approved the IT Modernization Funding program allocations to the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2023-24. Finally, the chair reviewed the topics on today's agenda.

Item 2

Judicial Council Technology Committee

Update: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie also recognized the approvals of the IT Modernization Funding program and the Tactical Plan for Technology; and discussed the effectiveness of the workstreams. The Technology Committee's goal in the coming months is to inform the Judicial Council and other advisory committees about the work of ITAC and the Technology Committee. The Technology Committee will meet next on August 14, 2023 to consider the proposed allocations for the Language Access Services Signage and Technology Grant program, and the IT Modernization Funding FY 2023-24 Branchwide programs, as well as an update to the California Courts Connected Framework Judge Brodie thanked Judge Hanson and ITAC for its work and partnership with the Technology Committee.

Item 3

Language Access Services Signage and Technology Grant Program (Action Required)

Update: Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Providing Access & Fairness / Chair, Language Access Subcommittee presented the proposed allocations for the FY 2023-24 Language Access Services Signage and Technology Grant program.

Action: ITAC members approved the FY 2023-24 Language Access Services Signage and Technology Grant program allocations and recommended providing to the Technology Committee for consideration.

Item 4

Hybrid Courtroom Workstream Update

Update: Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Workstream Executive Sponsor, Mr. Adam Creiglow, Workstream Co-Sponsor, and Ms. Heather L. Pettit, CIO/IT Director, Judicial Council presented an update on the Hybrid Courtroom workstream activities, including a preview of the final report.

Action: ITAC members received the update and Judge Hanson thanked the presenters for their work on the Hybrid Courtroom activities.

Item 5

Liaisons Reports

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Hon. Louis R. Mauro, and Hon. Kimberly Menninger provided updates on partnering committee activities in their roles as liaisons from ITAC to partnering bodies.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/committee.htm
committee@jud.ca.gov

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

October 20, 2023

10:00 AM to 10:30 AM

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Vice- Chair; Mr. Mike Baniel; Mr. Brian Cotta; Mr. Adam Creiglow; Mr. Jason Galkin; Mr. Brett Howard; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Mr. Jake Pison; Mr. Neal Taniguchi
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Assembly Member Damon Connelly; Hon. Julie Culver; Hon. Tara Desautels; Hon. Truc T. Do; Ms. Rebecca Fleming; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Amy Guerra; Mr. AJ Guzman; Hon. Ioana Petrou; and Hon. Bruce Smith
Others Present:	Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Ms. Heather Pettit; and Judicial Council staff

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

There were no public comments received for this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom's Final Findings and Recommendations (Action Requested)

Update: Hon. Samantha P. Jessner and Mr. Adam Creiglow, Hybrid Courtroom Workstream Executive Sponsors, presented the final findings and recommendations from the Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream.

Action: The members voted to approve the final findings and recommendations from the Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream for recommendation to the Technology Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



Judicial Council of California

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

www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm

INVITATION TO COMMENT

[ITC prefix as assigned]-__

Title

Court Technology: Minimum Standards for Courtroom Technology to Permit Remote Participation in Court Proceedings (Senate Bill 133)

Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes

Adopt minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings

Proposed by

Information Technology Advisory Committee
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Action Requested

Review and submit comments by January 12, 2024

Proposed Effective Date

April 1, 2024

Contact

Saskia Kim, (916) 643-6951

Saskia.Kim@jud.ca.gov

Jenny Grantz, (415) 865-4394

Jenny.Grantz@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary and Origin

Senate Bill 133 (Stats. 2023, ch. 34) requires the Judicial Council to adopt by April 1, 2024, and the trial courts to implement by July 1, 2024, minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings. The Information Technology Advisory Committee recommends adoption of these proposed standards to satisfy the statutory mandate.

Background

SB 133 requires the Judicial Council to adopt, by April 1, 2024, minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings. These standards must include “hard-wired or other reliable high-speed internet connections in the courtroom for the judicial officer and court reporter, and monitors, dedicated cameras, speakers, and microphones so the judicial officer, court reporter, and court interpreter can appropriately see and hear remote participants, as well as to ensure that remote participants can appropriately

This proposal has not been approved by the Judicial Council and is not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules Committee, or its Legislation Committee. It is circulated for comment purposes only.

see and hear the judicial officer and other courtroom participants.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 367.76(o); Welf. & Inst. Code § 679.5(n).) Trial courts must implement these standards by July 1, 2024.

The Proposal

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommends adoption of the proposed standards to satisfy SB 133’s mandate. As required by the statute, these standards identify the minimum courtroom technology necessary to permit participation in remote proceedings. The standards include the two provisions explicitly required by the statute, as well as additional provisions needed to permit remote participation in proceedings that satisfy the other statutory requirements for remote proceedings. (See, e.g., Code Civ. Proc., §§ 367.75, 367.76.) When drafting the standards, the committee drew from the work of ITAC’s Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream and its final findings and recommendations¹ and solicited the Workstream’s feedback. The committee also solicited feedback from the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, the Court Executives Advisory Committee, and Facilities Services.

The standards set forth specific objectives the courts must meet, such as the requirement that “[c]ourt technology must allow the judicial officer and all other courtroom participants to see and hear, and be seen and heard by, remote participants.” The committee chose this format rather than specific technical specifications in order to ensure a baseline standard necessary for participation in remote proceedings. The committee therefore focused on the objectives courts must meet to enable the judicial officer, court reporter, court interpreter, and all other participants to successfully participate in remote proceedings.

The standards state the statutory consequence for failing to implement the standards by the July 1, 2024, deadline and clarify which proceedings this consequence applies to. Under Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(f)(2) and Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5(k)(2), if the standards cannot be met in a proceeding listed in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(a)(1) (civil commitment and other specified proceedings) or Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5(b) (juvenile justice proceedings) that will be reported by an official reporter or official reporter pro tempore, the court reporter must be physically present in the same room as the judicial officer for that proceeding.

The standards must be met only in a courtroom in which a court is conducting a remote proceeding. This satisfies the statutory mandate to “permit remote participation in proceedings” that satisfy the other requirements of SB 133. (Code Civ. Proc., § 367.76(o); Welf. & Inst. Code § 679.5(n).) Courts are not required to have this equipment in courtrooms when they are not conducting remote proceedings. The introductory sentence of the standards conveys this principle.

¹ Information Technology Advisory Com., *Report of the Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream: Findings and Recommendations* (Nov. 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12422512&GUID=2201DBD5-407E-4906-BB84-C7EFCAC38665>.

The standards reflect several key considerations. First, the statutes requiring these standards are part of a larger statutory scheme concerning remote proceedings, which sets forth various requirements for the conduct of remote proceedings. (See, e.g., Code Civ. Proc., §§ 367.75, 367.76.) While the standards themselves are part of this statutory scheme, they set requirements for what court-provided technology must be able to do, rather than how remote proceedings must be conducted. The proposed standards therefore concern the technology and equipment that courts must have in the courtroom, and not how or when it may be used.

It is also important to note that implementation of these standards will not preclude a remote participant from choosing to appear via audio rather than video when permitted by the court (and provided it is not a civil commitment or juvenile justice proceeding where audio-only participation is prohibited, unless it falls under one of the exceptions in the statutes governing remote proceedings in those matters). Nor do the standards control whether a particular remote participant takes advantage of the available technology.

Second, the standards apply only to court-provided technology and do not apply to technology provided by remote participants. The statute requires the council to adopt standards for “courtroom technology,” and the proposed standards therefore focus on technology and equipment used in the courtroom or otherwise provided by the court. The standards define “court technology” to mean “the court-provided technology, equipment, and platforms used in courtrooms or by judicial officers or court staff to participate in remote proceedings and that is necessary to meet these standards” and specify that each standard applies to “court technology” or “court-provided” equipment. The standards do not require courts to control or provide equipment for remote participants because this is beyond the scope of the statutory mandate.

Alternatives Considered

The committee did not consider taking no action because the council is required by law to adopt minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings. As discussed in the explanation of the proposal, the committee considered several alternatives when drafting the proposed standards and concluded that the current proposal best satisfies the statutory mandate.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The committee anticipates that courts might have to purchase and install equipment to meet these standards by the statutory deadline, and that judicial officers and court staff might require training on how to use any new equipment. However, because the council is required by law to adopt minimum standards for courtroom technology for remote proceedings and courts are required to implement those standards, these impacts cannot be avoided.

Request for Specific Comments

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committee is interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?
- Is it clear that the standards set requirements for what court-provided technology must be able to do, rather than how remote proceedings must be conducted?
- Is it clear that the standards apply only to court-provided technology and do not apply to technology provided by remote participants?

The advisory committee also seeks comments from *courts* on the following cost and implementation matters:

- What would the implementation requirements be for courts—for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training) or revising processes and procedures (please describe)?
- Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.
- How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?

Attachments and Links

1. Minimum Standards for Courtroom Technology to Permit Remote Participation in Court Proceedings, at pages 5–6
2. Link A: Senate Bill 133
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB133

Minimum Technology Standards

Effective July 1, 2024, in a courtroom in which the court is conducting a remote proceeding, the court must comply with the following minimum technology standards.

(a) As used in these standards:

- (1) “Court technology” means the court-provided technology, equipment, and platforms used in courtrooms or by judicial officers or court staff to participate in remote proceedings and that is necessary to meet these standards.
- (2) “Participants” means judicial officers, court staff, parties, attorneys, witnesses, jurors, court reporters, and court interpreters.
- (3) “Remote proceeding” has the meaning provided in California Rules of Court, rule 3.672.

(b) The court must have a hard-wired or other reliable high-speed internet connection in the courtroom for the judicial officer and court reporter.

(c) The court must provide monitors, dedicated cameras, speakers, and microphones so the judicial officer, court reporter, and court interpreter can see and hear remote participants.

- (1) Court-provided microphones must have a mute or off function.
- (2) Court-provided microphones must allow a participant to hear, and be heard by, all other participants when necessary.
- (3) Court-provided monitors must allow participants to see and identify the participant who is speaking.
- (4) Court technology must provide participants with the capability to alert the court to behavior that is disruptive and may not be visible to all.
- (5) Court technology must provide the ability for the judicial officer or designated courtroom staff to mute or remove from the remote proceeding any remote participant or any unauthorized person who joins the remote proceeding.
- (6) Court technology must allow remote participants to be identified either visually or audibly during the proceeding.
- (7) Court-provided speaker equipment must be of sufficient clarity so that the judicial officer and all other participants may hear one another when necessary.

- (d) Court technology must allow the judicial officer and all other courtroom participants to see and hear, and be seen and heard by, remote participants.
- (e) Under Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(f)(2) and Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5(k)(2), on or after July 1, 2024, if these standards cannot be met in a proceeding listed in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(a)(1) or Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5(b) that will be reported by an official reporter or official reporter pro tempore, the court reporter must be physically present in the same room as the judicial officer for that proceeding.

Statutory References

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(o): By April 1, 2024, the Judicial Council shall adopt, and trial courts shall implement by July 1, 2024, minimum standards for the courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in proceedings subject to this section. Those standards shall include, but not be limited to, hard-wired or other reliable high-speed internet connections in the courtroom for the judicial officer and court reporter, and monitors, dedicated cameras, speakers, and microphones so the judicial officer, court reporter, and court interpreter can appropriately see and hear remote participants, as well as to ensure that remote participants can appropriately see and hear the judicial officer and other courtroom participants.

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(f)(2): Beginning July 1, 2024, when the court conducts proceedings [defined in Code Civ. Proc., § 376.76(a)(1)] that will be reported by an official reporter or official reporter pro tempore, the reporter shall be physically present in the same room as the judicial officer if the court cannot provide the technology standards described in subdivision (o).

Welfare & Institutions Code section 679.5(n): By April 1, 2024, the Judicial Council shall adopt, and trial courts shall implement by July 1, 2024, minimum standards for the courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in juvenile justice proceedings. Such standards shall include, but not be limited to, hard-wired or other reliable high-speed internet connections in the courtroom for the judicial officer and court reporter, and monitors, dedicated cameras, speakers, and microphones so the judicial officer, court reporter, and court interpreter can appropriately see and hear remote participants, as well as to ensure that remote participants can appropriately see and hear the judicial officer and other courtroom participants.

Welfare & Institutions Code section 679.5(k)(2): Beginning July 1, 2024, when the court conducts proceedings [defined in Welf. & Inst. Code, § 679.5(b)] that will be reported by an official reporter or official reporter pro tempore, the reporter shall be physically present in the same room as the judicial officer if the court cannot provide the technology standards described in subdivision (n).

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)
Annual Agenda¹—2024
Approved by Technology Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
Lead Staff:	Jessica Craven, IT Supervisor, Judicial Council Information Technology
Committee’s Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The committee makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through the use of technology and for fostering cooperative endeavors to resolve common technological issues with other stakeholders in the justice system. The committee promotes, coordinates, and acts as executive sponsor for projects and initiatives that apply technology to the work of the courts.</p> <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>ITAC currently has 20 members. The ITAC website provides the composition of the committee.</p> <p>Subcommittees²:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rules & Policy Subcommittee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trial court rules and statutes revisions• Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) [suspended status for 2024]• Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee	

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

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

Subcommittees/Working Groups³:

All proposed projects for the year are included on the Annual Agenda, as follows:

Workstreams continued from 2023:

- 1. Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom (continued):** Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP).
- 2. Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation (continued):** Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies, and propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes.
- 3. IT Modernization Program FY 2023-24 (continued):** Evaluate status reports tracking progress for the remainder of the FY; and provide related program support activities to complete the FY 2023 – 2024 cycle.

New workstreams to begin in 2024:

- 4. Tactical Plan for Technology Update (new):** Update the Tactical Plan for Technology for 2025-2026.
- 5. IT Modernization Program FY 2024-25 (new):** Review and recommend court applications/project proposals; evaluate status reports tracking progress; and provide related program support activities for FY 2024 – 2025.
- 6. Digital Evidence, Phase 3: Pilot, Evaluation, Request for Proposal (RFP) (new):** Initiate electronic evidence pilot project in small-medium sized court(s), investigate vendor options more broadly, evaluate San Diego’s solution, and use all findings to develop an enterprise RFP for a branchwide solution(s).
- 7. Understanding Artificial Intelligence (AI) Impacts to the Courts (new):** Provide a clear understanding of AI types; identify and assess the benefits and risks of use cases.

Subcommittees (ongoing):

- 8. Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee:** Review and provide feedback on security-related recommendations made by the Office of Information Security and other entities; review and recommend policies and other security-related proposals for action by ITAC and the Court Executives Advisory Committee.
- 9. Rules & Policy Subcommittee:** The Rules and Policy Subcommittee currently does not have any assignments; however, the subcommittee will reengage should this change, including for input on potential technology-related legislative items.

Meetings Planned for 2024⁴ (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)

Date/Time/Location or Teleconference:

³ 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.

⁴ Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

January 17 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
February 21 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
March 20 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
April 17 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
July 17 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
August 21 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
September 18 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference
November 20 / 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. / Teleconference

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

DRAFT

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)	
1	Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom	<i>Priority 1⁵</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: December 13, 2021	<i>Strategic Plan Goal I and IV⁶</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP); develop minimum technology standards for remote proceedings to satisfy statutory mandate of SB 133.</p> <p><i>Remaining Key Objectives:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Define consistent standards for branchwide solutions, platforms, and programs in support of hybrid courtrooms. b) Review and evaluate the 2020 <i>California Trial Court Facilities Standards</i> to align with hybrid court proceedings. c) Develop and define quantitative and qualitative metrics associated with hybrid court proceedings and remote court services to measure efficacy and areas for improvement, and make recommendations on the collection of associated data by which courts would comply with AB 177 and SB 241. d) Review the California Rules of Court to identify and recommend any potential rule changes needed. e) Assist with development of an RFP to establish branch Master Service Agreements (MSAs) and other procurement vehicles, where needed. f) Develop minimum standards for courtroom technology for remote proceedings that will satisfy the statutory requirements. Senate Bill 133 (2022–2023 Reg. Sess.) requires the Judicial Council to adopt, by April 1, 2024, minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings. Trial courts must implement these standards by July 1, 2024. g) Seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council, if appropriate. Formally sunset the workstream. 		

⁵ 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 or accurately reflect the law; 1(b) Council or an internal committee has directed the committee to consider new or amended rules and forms; 1(c) Change is urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(d) Proposal is 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 changes in law; 2(b) Responsive to identified concerns or problems; 2(c) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

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

Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)

Objectives met or resolved previously/last year:

- *Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.*
- *Explore hybrid court proceedings involving a combination of in-person and remote participants and their use of technology.*
- *Assess the differing technology needs associated with supporting in-person, remote, and hybrid services and proceedings.*

Origin of Project: Access 3D; California Courts Connected framework; AB 177; AB 716; SB 241; SB 133 (Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(o) and Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5(n)).

Status/Timeline: July 2023; March 2024 (for SB 133 standards)

Fiscal Impact/Resources:

- 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:

- *ITAC:* Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Samantha P. Jessner and Adam Creiglow
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology, Executive Office, Legal Services, Office of Governmental Affairs, and Facilities Services

AC Collaboration: Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Remote Appearance Rules, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Data Governance Group (newly formed),

#	Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)	
2	Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: September 25, 2019	<i>Strategic Plan Goal I and IV</i>
<p>Project Summary: Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to the use of electronic evidence; propose changes to rules and statutes related to electronic evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p>Remaining Key Objectives: Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <p>a) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p>Objectives met or resolved previously/last year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting electronic evidence. • Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to electronic evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee. • Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of electronic evidence. • Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria. <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Final findings and recommendations report is being completed; projected sunset of workstream March 2024.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger • Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services 		

#	Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed	

#	Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)	
3	IT Modernization Program FY 2023-24	<i>Priority 1</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: April 18, 2023	<i>Strategic Plan Goals III, IV, and VI</i>
<p>Project Summary: Evaluate status reports tracking progress; and provide related program support activities.</p> <p>Remaining Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review the courts’ progress reports, including identifying projects needing branch attention; report findings to staff for assistance. b) At the completion of these objectives for the fiscal year, formally sunset the workstream, and begin the cycle again for the new fiscal year. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identified core team (sponsor and leads); formed group membership for fiscal year cycle; held kickoff meeting(s).</i> • <i>Refined category requirements and success metrics.</i> • <i>Reviewed and evaluated court applications/project proposals based on program criteria and intentions.</i> • <i>Proposed a list of approved projects for FY23-24 cycle to ITAC for recommendation to the Technology Committee.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Budget Act of 2022 provides a permanent allocation of \$12.5 million to support local court projects proposed by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts. Beginning in the FY23-24 cycle, the Technology Committee assigned ITAC the task of evaluating court proposals and progress reports.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: July 2024 – In 2023, the workstream reviewed the applications for FY23-24 and made recommendations to ITAC. The workstream will now meet quarterly to review the progress reports through the end of the FY.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>		

#	Continued Workstream (Ending 2024)
	<p data-bbox="176 207 590 240"><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i></p> <ul data-bbox="254 256 953 345" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="254 256 953 293">• <i>ITAC</i>: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson<li data-bbox="254 310 953 345">• <i>Judicial Council Staffing</i>: Information Technology <p data-bbox="176 394 978 427"><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>

DRAFT

#	New Workstream (Ending 2025)	
4	Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: TBD	<i>Strategic Plan Goal I</i>
<p>Project Summary: Update <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> for effective date 2025-2026.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. b) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology. c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. d) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Solicitation of membership is pending. Targeting approvals for the final update to ITAC at its November 2024 meeting, the Technology Committee at its December 2024 meeting, and the Judicial Council at its January 2025 meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>Internal/External Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology <p>AC Collaboration: Broad input from the branch and the public</p>		

#	New Workstream (ending 2025)	
5	IT Modernization Program FY 2024-25	<i>Priority 1</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: TBD	<i>Strategic Plan Goals III, IV, and VI</i>
<p>Project Summary: Review and recommend court applications/project proposals; evaluate status reports tracking progress; and provide related program support activities.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership for fiscal year cycle; hold kickoff meeting(s). b) Refine category requirements and success metrics. c) Review and evaluate court applications/project proposals based on program criteria and intentions. d) Propose a list of approved projects to ITAC for recommendation to the Technology Committee. e) Review the courts’ progress reports, including identifying projects needing branch attention; report findings to staff for assistance. f) At the completion of these objectives for the fiscal year, formally sunset, the workstream, and begin the cycle again for the new fiscal year. <p>Origin of Project: Budget Act of 2022 provides a permanent allocation of \$12.5 million to support local court projects proposed by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts. Beginning in the FY23-24 cycle, the Technology Committee assigned ITAC the task of evaluating court proposals and progress reports.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Solicitation of membership pending; recommendation to Judicial Council in July 2025</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream: Sponsor: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>		

#	New Workstream (Ending 2025)	
6	Electronic Evidence, Phase 3: Pilot, Evaluation, Request For Proposal (RFP)	<i>Priority 1</i>
	Workstream membership approval date: TBD	<i>Strategic Plan Goal I and IV</i>
<p>Project Summary: Initiate electronic evidence pilot project in small-medium sized court(s), investigate vendor options more broadly, evaluate San Diego’s solution, and use all findings to develop an enterprise RFP for a branchwide solution(s). vendor</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>Based on findings from Phase 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pilot electronic evidence technology with smaller/medium-sized court(s) to collect additional data and requirements (Phase 2 included data from larger courts). b) Investigate vendors in the space (including using product demonstrations, education sessions, and proof of concepts). c) Evaluate the solution used by the Superior Court of San Diego County to assess and consider as part of the set of enterprise solutions for the branch. d) Develop an enterprise RFP for solution(s)/product(s) to meet the needs and requirements of the various court sizes. e) Seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council (if applicable) on any recommendations. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22. ITAC September 2023 meeting on agenda planning, anticipating closure of Ph 2 in 2023 and next steps.</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: Initiation of workstream is pending. Anticipated workstream would take 18 months to complete work.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> f) <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Brett Howard g) <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology <p>AC Collaboration: Other Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>		

#	New Workstream (Ending 2025)	
7	Understanding Artificial Intelligence (AI) Impacts to the Courts	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approval date: TBD		<i>Strategic Plan Goals III and IV</i>
<p>Project Summary: Research AI types; identify potential use cases; and assess the benefits and risks to the branch.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Research and provide a clear understanding of the various types of AI. b) Identify court use cases by specific categories (e.g., internal creating efficiencies, public-facing, etc.). c) Assess the benefits and risks to the branch when using AI for specific court use case(s), including considering: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the ability to improve court efficiencies through AI resources; increase capacity of workload; and initiate potential business process reengineering; and ii. the issues of bias and transparency. d) Present findings to ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council (if applicable). Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: ITAC September 28, 2023 meeting</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Initiation of workstream is pending. Anticipated workstream would take 12 months to complete work.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>		

#	Ongoing Project	
8	Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee Projects	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p data-bbox="178 318 1860 423">Project Summary: Review and provide feedback on security-related recommendations made by the council’s Office of Information Security and other entities; also, review and recommend policies and other security-related proposals for action by ITAC and the Court Executives Advisory Committee.</p> <p data-bbox="178 448 380 480">Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="226 496 1220 529">a) Review and make recommendations on branchwide incident management. <li data-bbox="226 537 1157 570">b) Review and make recommendations on branchwide security training. <li data-bbox="226 578 1157 610">c) Review and make recommendations on branchwide security policies. <li data-bbox="226 618 968 651">d) Research potential branchwide security portfolio offerings. <li data-bbox="226 659 1486 691">a) Review and make recommendations on branchwide security service and solution opportunities. <li data-bbox="226 699 1650 732">e) Present recommendations to ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council (when applicable). <p data-bbox="178 773 1591 805">Origin of Project: Strategic and Tactical Plans for Technology; Branchwide Information Security Workstream.</p> <p data-bbox="178 846 520 878">Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p data-bbox="178 919 1465 951">Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology, Legal Services, and Trial Court Leadership staff.</p> <p data-bbox="241 967 1902 1032"><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="178 1057 590 1089">Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="241 1105 1514 1138">• <i>ITAC:</i> Two appellate court representatives, two trial court judges, two chief information officers <li data-bbox="241 1146 758 1179">• <i>CEAC:</i> Four court executive officers <li data-bbox="241 1187 1577 1219">• <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, and Leadership Services Division <p data-bbox="178 1260 1062 1292">AC Collaboration: Other Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <small>Error! Bookmark not defined.</small>	
	9.1 Rules & Policy Subcommittee Project(s) (pending)	Priority 2(b) <small>Error! Bookmark not defined.</small> Strategic Plan Goal <small>Error! Bookmark not defined.</small>
<p>Project Summary: <i>TBD</i></p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council staff.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Project(s) will follow the regular rule cycle in 2024 for a January 1, 2025, effective date for the amendment.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Committee 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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology <p>AC Collaboration: Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee</p>		

#	Ongoing Project	
	9.2 Review and Provide Input on Pending Legislation (pending)	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Strategic Plan Goal I</i>	
<p>Project Summary: Review pending legislation related to court technology and provide input on the impact the legislation may have on the courts.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council Office of Governmental Affairs.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Committee 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>Internal/External Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Governmental Affairs, other Judicial Council offices <p>AC Collaborations: Other Judicial Council advisory bodies as needed</p>		

III. LIST OF 2023 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1	Tactical Plan Workstream —The workstream completed the update, and the Judicial Council adopted the next version of the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> , effective 2023-2024. The workstream was sunset.
2	Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation —The Workstream will be completing its final findings and recommendations report and will be presenting it to the Technology Committee for consideration at its December 2023 or January 2024 meeting. With the committee’s approval, the workstream will have completed its work and be sunset. A new workstream is anticipated to take on the next steps of this initiative.
3	Statewide e-Filing Program Review/Evaluation — The Workstream completed its final findings and recommendations report and presented it to the Technology Committee for consideration at its March meeting. With the committee’s approval, the workstream completed its work and was sunset.
4	Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom (continuing into 2024) — The Workstream completed its final findings and recommendations report, which was approved by the Technology Committee. The Judicial Council will receive an update on the recommendations at its November 2023 meeting. The workstream is currently developing minimum technology standards for remote proceedings to satisfy statutory mandate of SB 133.
5	IT Modernization Program FY 2023-24 (continuing into 2024) — The Workstream reviewed and made recommendations for FY 23-24 projects. The workstream is reviewing the first progress reports. The workstream will continue to review the progress reports through the end of this FY to ensure courts complete the work approved.
6.1 6.2	Rules & Policy Subcommittee project(s) — The subcommittee reviewed pending legislation related to court technology and provided input on the impact the legislation might have on the courts.
7	Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee projects — The subcommittee was launched and is reviewing and providing feedback on information security-related recommendations.
8	Projects Assigned by the Ad-Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3) — The P3 Workgroup completed its review of the recommendations. A final report was presented to the Judicial Council, and this workgroup has sunset.