



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: February 8, 2016
Time: 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the January 11, 2016 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by February 5, 2016, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 2255 N. Ontario Street, Suite 220, Burbank, California 91504, attention: Jessica Craven. Only written comments received by February 5, 2016, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Review California's Language Access Plan: Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Project (Action Required)

The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force has proposed a pilot program that will provide important information for developing a long term Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) strategy for the California judicial branch. A Request for Proposal (RFP) has been developed to obtain equipment for testing, validation, and to finalize technical guidelines for the pilot program. Review for possible recommendation to the Judicial Council.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Item 4

Update on Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Budget Change Proposal

An update and report on the work related to the civil case management system (V3) replacement budget change proposal.

Presenter: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, JCTC member

Item 5

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

An update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system.

Presenter: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Item 6

Request For Proposal (RFP) for eCourt (Action Required)

A report on the eCourt option for the Sustain Justice Edition Courts will be provided.

Presenter: Mr. David Koon, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 11, 2016
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. David E. Gunn; Hon. Gary Nadler; Mr. Mark Bonino; Mr. Jake Chatters; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Advisory Body Members Absent: Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Others Present: Mr. Curt Soderlund; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Kathy Fink; Mr. David Koon; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Lucy Fogarty; and Mr. Cory Jasperson

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised that no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The members unanimously approved the minutes of the December 14, 2015 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Judge Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams.

Action: The committee discussed the activities of ITAC and received the report.

Item 3

Review of ITAC Annual Agenda

Update: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair of ITAC, reviewed the ITAC annual agenda with the committee.

Action: The committee asked questions, discussed the annual agenda, and voted unanimously to approve the ITAC annual agenda.

Item 4

Update on Oracle Survey

Update: Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Principal Manager in Judicial Council Information Technology, provided an update and report on the survey distributed to the trial courts on using the Oracle products.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 5

Update on Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Budget Change Proposal

Update: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein provided an update and report on the work related to the civil case management system (V3) replacement budget change proposal.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 6

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

Update: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein provided an update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system including an upcoming meeting with the courts.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 7


Discussion on Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) Presentation

Discussion: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair of JCTC, facilitated a discussion on the upcoming JCTC presentation to the Judicial Council at its February 2016 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting



February 8, 2016

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script
- Approve minutes

*Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. Marsha G. Slough



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

*Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair, Information Technology
Advisory Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Review California's Language Access Plan: Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Project

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update on Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Budget Change Proposal

Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, JCTC member



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Request For Proposal (RFP) for eCourt

Mr. David Koon, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update on Oracle Survey

*Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Judicial Council
Information Technology*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Adjourn

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force:

Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Project

Executive Summary

The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force proposes to pilot technology solutions for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for the Trial Courts of California. A request for proposals (RFP) has been developed in order to obtain equipment for testing, validation, and to finalize technical guidelines. The pilot project will provide important foundational building blocks in developing a long term VRI strategy for the California judicial branch.

Given the state's size and population, appropriate uses of video remote technology that allow for remote sessions while protecting due process remains one of the most critical recommendations of the Strategic Action Plan. Identifying suitable and cost-effective video remote interpreting equipment is a critical step in the Task Force's Technological Solutions Subcommittee's efforts to create a VRI Pilot Project, per LAP's Recommendation No. 16, which states:

16. The Judicial Council should conduct a pilot project, in alignment with the Judicial Branch's Tactical Plan for Technology 2014–2016. This pilot should, to the extent possible, collect relevant data on: due process issues, participant satisfaction, whether remote interpreting increases the use of certified and registered interpreters as opposed to provisionally qualified interpreters, the effectiveness of a variety of available technologies (for both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation), and a cost-benefit analysis. The Judicial Council should make clear that this pilot project would not preclude or prevent any court from proceeding on its own to deploy remote interpreting, so long as it allows LEP court users to fully and meaningfully participate in the proceedings. (Phase 1)

The goal of the pilot project is to define statewide technical standards, validate programmatic guidelines, and to preapprove acceptable vendors so courts have an appropriate method to expand access to interpreters to limited English proficient litigants. Among the benefits of remote interpreting is the facilitation of prompt availability of language access for litigants by providing certified and registered interpreter services with less waiting time and fewer postponements; this saves both the court user's and the court's valuable time. In addition, having qualified interpreters more readily available through remote interpreting can decrease the use of less qualified interpreters, can decrease dismissals for failure to meet court deadlines, and can decrease the frequency of attorneys or parties waiving interpreter services or proceeding as if the LEP person is not present, in order to avoid delays. By decreasing interpreter travel time between venues and increasing the number of events being interpreted by individual interpreters, remote interpreting allows more LEP litigants to be served, in more areas, utilizing the same personnel and financial resources, thereby greatly expanding language access.

The proposed VRI pilot for spoken language pilot would not preclude trial courts from identifying and implementing alternative solutions which are consistent with technical requirements as approved by the Judicial Council, and which meet the programmatic guidelines as established in the Language Access Plan (LAP).

The pilot will be at zero cost to the court, with the vendor(s) providing and supporting the equipment for evaluation for a period of up to six months. The hope is to engage up to three vendors who are experienced and capable of executing an efficient project. The project seeks to pilot vendor equipment in up to 3 courtrooms in at least 1, or as many as 2, court jurisdictions for both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation, and using California certified and registered interpreters employed by, or contracting with, California courts.

The courts, vendors and the judicial council will collaborate in data collection and evaluation of the solutions, as appropriate.

Once the Judicial Council has approved the project, the Task Force, working with Judicial Council staff, will finalize the VRI Pilot Project RFP. A working draft has already been developed. The RFP will be posted on the Judicial Branch public website. Vendor submissions will be evaluated and scored. The pilot project will last up to six months once vendors have been selected and equipment has been installed or otherwise deployed. It is anticipated that the VRI pilot will launch in one or more courts, utilizing equipment provided for evaluation at no cost, and will include provision of technical support to courts. The participating court(s) and judicial council staff will collaborate to collect data and evaluate the project, as appropriate. Judicial Council staff will then draft proposed technical standards for statewide use of VRI, and evaluate the effectiveness of the programmatic guidelines already developed in the LAP.

The VRI pilot will enable the Judicial Council to collect data, determine best practices, promote efficiencies and cost savings for courts (including, potentially when sharing interpreter resources between courts), increase court user satisfaction, and address and remedy any due process concerns. The 2011-12 American Sign Language (ASL) pilot was effective for the judicial branch to develop recommended guidelines, which provide assistance to court and judicial staff to help identify appropriate use of VRI for ASL interpreted events. The anticipated VRI pilot, which will include spoken language, will similarly establish appropriate technical guidelines, serve to validate LAP programmatic guidelines, and will assist trial courts and judicial staff in establishing appropriate use cases and best practices for VRI more broadly.

The U.S. Department of Justice specifically mentions VRI as an efficient tool that can improve and increase language accessibility for LEP court users for the California courts.¹ The National Center for State Courts (NCSC), in conjunction with the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA), launched their own RFP related to remote interpreting in 2015, creating technical guidelines that the Subcommittee has leveraged as a starting point for minimum standards. VRI technology is also already being used in several in-state counties, including Fresno, whose technical guidelines and best practices are also being leveraged for this RFP.

Long-term expansion of the VRI pilot will require supplemental funding for equipment and operational costs. One possible source of such funding may be from Court Innovations Grants, as proposed in the Governor's proposed 2016-17 Budget.

¹ See Attachment C, May 22, 2013 letter from the U.S. Department of Justice, at p.9, attached to California's Language Access Plan: Status Report, Item J for the October 25, 2013 Judicial Council business meeting, available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20131025-itemJ.pdf.