



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: September 9, 2019
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 August 12, 2019 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 September 6, 2019, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Rita Alderucci. Only written comments received by September 6, 2019, 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- 4)

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, Chair

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. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

2019-2020 Language Access Signage and Technology (Action Requested)

Consider approval of a grant program to disburse \$2.55 million for language access signage, technology infrastructure support, and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council for 2019-2020 and ongoing.

Presenters: Mr. Don Will, Assistant Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Mr. Douglas Denton, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 4

2019-20 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for V3 Case Management System (CMS) (Information)

Update on the status of the V3 courts' CMS transition projects and on a recommendation to reallocate unspent funds provided in a 2016-17 budget change proposal for Sacramento Superior Court as it relates to the V3 CMS transition.

Presenters: Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer and Director, Judicial Council Information Technology
Ms. Kathy Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology

A D J O U R N M E N T

Adjourn

Information Technology Advisory Committee Status Report - August 2019

This report was provided at the **August 19, 2019** ITAC meeting. Status updates are submitted by workstream sponsors and subcommittee chairs.

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Michael Groch (San Diego); Technical Lead, John Yee, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); Project Manager, Fati Farmanfarmaian, JCIT, along with JCIT technical resources.</p> <p>The full workstream team/membership has been formed. Executive Sponsor, Judge Groch, distributed a branch memorandum inviting nominations for workstream membership. The request called for those individuals with an interest and experience in intelligent chat and the technology to deliver court services. The request also set membership expectations and defined next steps. A final membership list was approved by the ITAC and JCTC Chairs.</p> <p>A workstream kickoff meeting was held on August 28 and included a full team orientation and educational demos of the intelligent chat technology.</p> <p>Ongoing meetings with the core team and full workstream are occurring 3-4 times per month and the workstream model is proving quite effective. The SharePoint site is robust and well populated with tools and data. An example is the collaborative user story sheet which forms the basis of the POC project selected by the team.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support more formalized piloting.</p>
<p>(a) Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The group has completed its research and conversations into the innovation grant projects related to Intelligent Chat. The workstream will leverage the Innovation Grant Courts as POCs to inform the Findings and Recommendation report.</p>

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.	Completed	The group has completed identifying key performance indicators and benchmarks. The workstream will include this deliverable in the Findings and Recommendation report.
(c) Capture learnings and report findings.	Completed	Completed the draft Findings and Recommendation report.
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	The workstream will recommend and ask ITAC at its August 19 meeting to sunset the workstream and in lieu of a phase 2, to transition the effort to JCIT.
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	The workstream is seeking approval from ITAC to conclude phase 1 at their August 19 meeting, and to sunset the workstream. In lieu of a phase 2, the group will recommend a full transition to JCIT.

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)



Highlight: Vendor presentations completed, a demo site is being developed to further test the solutions currently offered.

	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge James Mize, (Sacramento); Business Lead, Heather Pettit, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); and Project Manager, Rick Walery, (IT Director, San Mateo).</p> <p>In late August, a memorandum was distributed to the branch (appellate and trial court presiding judges, CEOs, and CIOs) seeking nominations for members, and including expectations and next steps. Final membership was approved in September, after which a kickoff meeting was held in October.</p> <p>The project team has been formed. The team includes members from a diverse set of courts and the Judicial Council. Expertise on the team ranges from multiple members with IT-related experience, a member who previously was a translator, and multiple members with first-hand knowledge or working with LEP customers at a court.</p> <p>Additionally, the budget change proposal for FY19-20 was approved to support a formal pilot to further test the technology.</p>
Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.	In Progress	<p>The project team has been divided into 2 tracks – a Metrics track, and a Vendor track. The metrics track is meeting regularly to define the specific standards that a solution should include to ensure success, including the response time, accuracy, and ability to translate full sentences (as opposed to word-for-word translation).</p>
Determine how, or if, the work for this initiative aligns with existing work of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) and the work of The Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.	In Progress	<p>The project team attended presentations prepared by students in the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. One of the presentations demonstrated text-based translation services, which leveraged Google’s translation API.</p> <p>In addition, the group reviewed the findings and recommendations from the</p>

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1) (cont'd)



Highlight: Vendor presentations completed, a demo site is being developed to further test the solutions currently offered.

	Status	Description
Setup a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative.	In Progress	The workgroup received presentations from 4 vendors, demonstrating their offerings in this space. The group determined that there was not a current solution offered that fully met their needs, and opted to develop a demo site to test the APIs for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voice to text transcription • Text to text translation • Text to speech output
Pilot various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment, will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting.	In Progress	The workgroup engaged with the Judicial Council to develop a demo site to test the APIs offered by 4 vendors. Once complete, the group will conduct further tests using pre-written scripts, evaluating the accuracy and responsiveness of the transcription and translation.
Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.	Not Started	
Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the Annual Agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Samantha Jessner (Los Angeles); Court Lead, Jake Chatters (CEO, Placer); Project Manager, Alan Crouse (Deputy CEO, San Bernardino), along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT), Language Access Plan and VRI programs.</p> <p>The full initiative team/membership has been formed and approved. Eight courts, representing a diversity of size; participants from the VRI Workstream and remote video innovation grant, are a part of the team for this directive—specifically, the Superior Courts of Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Mono, Orange, Placer, Sacramento, and San Bernardino.</p> <p>The workstream held its kickoff and meets monthly. It has formed 4 subgroups/subcommittees and assigned a Chair/lead to each - Procedures, Evidence, Rules, and Technology. The subcommittees will develop initial recommendations on topics including but not limited to user technical requirements, evidence exchange, and presentation rules.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support pilot deployments to the courts.</p>
<p>(a) Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The Core Team identified a number of recent studies by the Center for Legal and Court Technology, the National Association for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers, the State Justice Institute, and the Self-Represented Litigation Network. Thus, an initial set of challenges were explored and developed for further refinement and investigation by the team. (continued on next page)</p>

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team progressed through an issue and topic log created from the results of the studies and crafted initial recommendations. These recommendations were used during mock proceedings.</p> <p>The team prepared scripts for the mock hearing proceedings and finalized the location and dates for the mock run.</p> <p>Mock hearings were held at the San Bernardino Superior Court February 15, 2019 via Web Cam – Blu Jeans Video Conference platform. Several participants attended in-person and participated remotely. Case types tested were Small Claims and Civil Harassment. Evidence sharing was tested via Share Point application.</p>
<p>(b) Capture learnings and report findings.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team completed their draft Findings and Recommendations report.</p>
<p>(c) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team is recommending not initiating a phase 2 at this time. Instead, the group recommends that the rule and legislative proposal amendments outlined in the Findings and Recommendations report complete, as well as the innovation grant recipient courts who received grants in this area to finish their efforts, so that their efforts can be leveraged going forward.</p>
<p>(d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>The core team members will present their final report and recommendations to ITAC on August 19. If approved, the workstream will sunset, and a phase 2 will not begin until those recommendations are completed.</p>

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update



Highlight: Approved by the Judicial Council at their May meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.	Completed	Kickoff meeting held.
(b) Review, gather input, and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.	Completed	Several working meetings held, initiatives drafted and reviewed by workstream members. Remaining sections drafted, reviewed and finalized. Initiative drafts finalized by workstream leads. Full plan submitted to Editing and Graphics Group.
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Completed	The plan was circulated for branch and public comment, and feedback was incorporated where appropriate.
(d) Finalize, and seek approval by the JCTC and the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset the workstream.	Completed	The plan was approved by the Judicial Council at their May meeting.

3. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot



Highlight: Final VRI Pilot report approved by the Judicial Council on March 15, 2019.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Support implementation of the Assessment Period of the VRI pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment), as requested.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2018: Onsite training was conducted at the three VRI pilot courts: Sacramento, Merced and Ventura Superior Courts. The pilot courts went live with VRI events. February 2018: SDSU Research Foundation (the independent evaluator) began collecting data. March-April 2018: SDSU conducted onsite observation in Sacramento to gather additional data. July 2018: The pilot courts successfully shared interpreters from county to county (inter-court). The VRI pilot was completed on July 31, 2018. August 2018: SDSU conducted an online survey with pilot stakeholders to gather feedback and additional data. September 2018: Equipment removal began at the pilot courts.
(b) Review pilot findings; validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDSU submitted their final report in December 2018. A December 14, 2018 VRI Workstream meeting took place to review the pilot findings and the draft guidelines for VRI, including recommended minimum technology guidelines.
(c) Identify whether new or amended rules of court are needed (and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up).	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VRI Workstream determined that no new or amended rules of court are needed at this time.
(d) Consult and collaborate with LAPITF, as needed, in preparing recommendations to the Judicial Council on VRI implementations.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2019: LAPITF approved the draft JC report and VRI guidelines. February 2019: ITAC/JCTC also approved the draft JC report and VRI guidelines. March 2019: The Judicial Council approved the final report and VRI guidelines.
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In progress	<p>Note: Need to develop Leveraged Procurement Agreements with the two approved equipment vendors (Paras and Associates and TeleSpace/Connected Justice Consortium). An online VRI Resource Center and best practices document are currently in development with NCSC. Post-pilot staffing for VRI is TBD.</p>
At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In progress	<p>Note: ITAC may want to consider a Workstream to help oversee the implementation of the new VRI program for the branch.</p>

4. E-Filing Strategy



Highlight: Continued progress with master service agreements.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Finalize master agreements with the three (3) E-Filing Managers (EFMs) selected to provide services.	In Progress	We have an executed master agreement with 2 of the 3 selected EFM Vendors, JTI and ImageSoft. An agreement has been reached with Tyler Technologies. The JCC Legal Services Offices are updating the EFM Master Agreement with the revised language. Execution of the agreement is expected forthwith.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	Not Started	Once the final master agreement is executed by Tyler we will be in a position to kick-off the program and define the certification process all 3 EFM vendors will use to certify EFSPs.
(c) Monitor the progress of EFSP accessibility compliance.	In Progress	In March 2018, JCIT conducted a survey of the 58 trial courts to determine compliance with AB 103. Based on survey results, currently 24 of the 58 trial courts provide electronic filing and electronic document service either directly, through vendor services, or a combination of vendor and in-house services. We are actively preparing to reach out to all 58 Trial courts to query and document any updates to their CMS and/or E-Filing in the interim.
(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	In Progress	The E-Filing program provided an in initial presentation of the program for the April CITMF meeting to introduce the team and solicit input from Trial courts seeking to participate in the program. This allowed for the development of the initial roadmap and deployment strategy.
(e) Report on the plan for implementation of the approved NIEM/ECF standards, including effective date, per direction of the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016 meeting.	In Progress	The Los Angeles Superior Courts recently implemented a JTI E-Filing solution for Civil and Small Claims cases. This solution was developed based on the requirements and standards for the statewide program. This solution will effectively become the baseline California E-Filing Standard. The standard will evolve as additional courts and case-types are included in the program.
(f) Consult and report on the implementation of the court cost recovery fee that will support the statewide e-filing program.	In Progress	We have held a number of discussions with regard to the cost recovery fee. Currently the legal department are reviewing statutes to determine feasibility of implementing the cost recovery fee and distributing the funds collected.
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support of the ongoing e-filing program being funded through the court cost-recovery fee.	In Progress	The 3 JCIT staff positions for the program have been filled. While we await execution of the final Master Agreement with Tyler, we are coordinating with the finance and legal departments on the funding aspects of the program.
(h) At the completion of these objectives and with the approval of the JCTC, formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

5. Identity and Access Management Strategy



Highlight: Policy track recommendations drafted.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select.	Completed	Microsoft Azure AD Identity Service acquired under a Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA), County of Riverside RFQ #PUARC-1518, Microsoft Master Agreement Number 01E73970.
Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	In Progress	Roadmap recommendations are being drafted. Los Angeles will be the first court to deploy applications (Attorney Portal and Remote Hearings Portal) using the Branchwide Identity Management service.
Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Initial Policy track recommendations are drafted.
Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Development.	In Progress	Sponsors or project managers for the aligned initiatives are members of the workstream.
Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In Progress	JCIT staff are participating in the pilot at Los Angeles Superior Court and are on the workstream.
At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In Progress	Feedback requested from ITAC on draft Policy track recommendations.

6. Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services



Highlight: The workstream has concluded their efforts, and presented their results at the June ITAC meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Provide input for, and track, a SRL E-Services Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process for FY 18-19 funding.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCP was approved \$3.2 million in FY 2018–19 \$1.9 million in FY 2019–20 \$709,000 ongoing
Develop requirements for branchwide SRL e-capabilities to facilitate interactive FAQ, triage functionality, and document assembly to guide SRLs through the process, and interoperability with the branchwide e-filing solution. The portal will be complementary to existing local court, and vendor resources.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is being done in conjunction with the next line item (c) as part of the development of the RFP (or several if deemed advantageous).
Develop and issue a request for proposal (RFP) or other solicitation, as needed, to support the implementation of the branchwide e-services portal.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In person kickoff meeting held on 7/12/18 RFP scope and initial content outline completed Follow-up meetings begin 7/30/18 Posted to Courts.ca.gov website on April 8, 2019
Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JCIT is funded a project (Digital Services Self-Help Pilot) as a pre-cursor to the SRL portal project which piloted a small subset of features to get some experience and understanding in this area. SRL E-Services workstream members participated on the Product Council for the Digital Services Pilot
Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate. Note: In scope for 2018 is the submission and tracking of a budget change proposal (BCP) and development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Descriptions and PARS (Position Action Requests) are in progress for four new positions funded by the BCP. Budget allocations and Project Team make-up are also in discussion JCIT will now own the Project phase of the SRL E-Services Portal. SRL E-Services workstream members participating on the Product Board for continuity.

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Tracks are documenting their findings, results, and final recommendations.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Orientation and introduction meeting held on July 30, 2018 for members and workstream track leads to review the three workstream tracks (Resources, Education, Tools) and related key objectives. Next steps are for each track to solicit additional workstream participants as needed based on the area of focus and kick off the individual tracks.
(a) Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.	Completed	(i) CEO survey complete (ii) IT leadership assessment complete, 3 courses delivered based on identified priorities
(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.	Completed	CEO survey complete with CIO input.
(c) Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.	In Progress	Judicial focus group / assessment complete CEO and Operations focus groups in progress. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(d) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.	In Progress	Needs assessment conducted. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(e) Evaluate and prioritized possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.	Completed	Research conducted.
(f) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, as appropriate.	In Progress	Workstream Sponsor and Track Leads are working closely with JCIT to determine inclusive and appropriate workstream track membership and alignment with JC IT resources.

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Tracks are documenting their findings, results, and final recommendations.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(g) Provide recommendations for Phase 2 based on findings and including updated Tactical Plan for Technology.	In Progress	All tracks have begun discussions regarding their draft recommendations.
(h) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

8.1. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 1)



Highlight: Digital Evidence Survey Results Accepted by ITAC and JCTC.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Review existing statutes and rules of court to identify impediments to use of digital evidence and opportunities for improved processes.	Completed	Existing statewide statutes and rules reviewed and documented. Findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(b) Survey courts for existing business practices and policies regarding acceptance and retention of digital evidence.	Completed	Survey completed and findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(c) Survey courts and justice system groups regarding possible technical standards and business practices for acceptance and storage of digital evidence.	Completed	Surveys completed and findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(d) Seek approval on recommendations and next steps from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2.	Completed	Digital Evidence Survey Results presented at ITAC and JCTC and accepted.

8.2. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 2)



Highlight: Proposed Project Manager identified, orientation and kickoff being scheduled.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Investigate and draft proposed best practices, policies, and standards for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence, and circulate recommendations to the branch for input and feedback.	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(b) Research and recommend existing technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence.	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(c) Develop and propose changes to evidence-based rules of court and statutes in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(d) Review the Trial Court Records Manual for any needed updates to reflect revisions of rules and statutes, and any proposed best practices, policies and standards	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(e) Report findings to ITAC and JCTC, providing recommendations on next steps, and formally sunset this phase of the workstream	Not Started	

9. Data Analytics : Assess and Report (Phase 1)



Highlight: Contracted with Gartner to build a branch data governance framework; launch pilot projects with 19-20 BCP funding; seek 20-21 BCP funding for permanent resources for data analytics

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify, evaluate and prioritize possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness.	In Progress	Gartner work to build data governance framework kicks off August 29, 2019.
(b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level.	In Progress	Gartner work kicks off August 29, 2019.
(c) Assess and report priorities for data collection.	Not started	This work will be undertaken in a second phase, once (a), (b), and (d) are complete.
(d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	
(e) Identify whether new or amended proposed rules of court and/or statutes are needed and advise the Rules and Policy Subcommittee for follow up.	In Progress	This will be more fully fleshed out once other objectives are complete.
(f) Based on findings and recommendations, scope and initiate Phase 2 of the workstream	In Progress	

10 Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (Phase 2)



Highlight: Vendor engaged; pilot court in discovery phase.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<i>Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:</i>		
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Roster approved on February 28, 2019. Workstream kickoff held on March 29, 2019. Biweekly meetings scheduled.
(b) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Monterey County has engaged with the selected vendor, and is in the process of conducting discovery and assessments.
(c) Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.	Completed	Agreement completed November 20, 2018, with Infiniti Consulting, Inc.
(d) Publish design solution templates from judicial branch entities (JBEs) that implement technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.	Not Started	
(e) Host knowledge-sharing sessions for interested JBEs (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).	In Progress	One session - a proposal conference - held as part of the RFP for the Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, on May 31, 2018. After the conclusion of the pilot phase, additional avenues for knowledge sharing will be made available to the judicial branch technology community.
(f) Evaluate the need for a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (a))	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	
(h) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

11 Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment



Highlight: Solicitation for workstream membership will occur shortly.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Not Started	
(b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies.	Not Started	
(c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs.	Not Started	
(d) Evaluate and describe scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch.	Not Started	
(e) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.	Not Started	
(f) Report findings and recommendations to ITAC.	Not Started	
(g) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

12 Branchwide Information Security Roadmap



Highlight: Solicitation for workstream membership ended August 8, 2019; proposed membership to be submitted to chairs.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Solicitation for membership was released, and closed August 8, 2019.
(b) Define methods and activities for expanding branch information security capabilities.	Not Started	
(c) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security best practices, risk management, and incident response.	Not Started	
(d) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework.	Not Started	
(e) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream	Not Started	

13.1. Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions



Highlight: Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6, Penal Code sec. 1203.01, and rules 2.251, 2.255, 2.257, and 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were circulated for public comment and approved by ITAC and the JCTC.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Proposals to amend statutes to support e-business. First, amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to allow courts to recover actual costs of permissive electronic filing as they can with mandatory electronic filing, and clarify a provision for signatures made not under penalty of perjury. Second, amend Penal Code section 1203.01 to provide an alternative to mailing certain statements and reports.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6 and Penal Code sec. 1203.01 were circulated for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 7, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and proposals and recommended the proposals to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposals and has recommended them to the Judicial Council. The proposals will next be considered by PCLC. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to sponsor the proposed legislation at its November meeting.</p>
<p>(b) Proposals to amend the electronic filing and service rules to provide greater clarity and remove paper dependencies. First, amend rule 2.251 to clarify how notice of electronic service is to be given and provide standardized language for consent. Second, amend rule 2.257 to revise language on signatures of opposing parties, and make minor revisions consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to rules 2.251, 2.255, and 2.257 of the California Rules of Court were submitted circulated for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 10, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and recommended the proposal to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposal and recommended to it to the Judicial Council. RUPRO will next consider the proposal. The Judicial Council will consider whether to amend the rules as proposed at its September meeting.</p>
<p>(c) Proposals to amend rules on remote access to electronic records. Make minor amendments to rule 2.540 to add more clarity and additional local government entities.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to rule 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were submitted for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 10, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and recommended the proposal to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposal and recommended to it to the Judicial Council. RUPRO will next consider the proposal before it goes to the council. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to amend the rule at its September meeting.</p>

13.2 Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data



Highlight: The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee has determined standards are not needed at this time.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body – to develop standards if needed to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems to be included in the Trial Court Records Manual with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF). Rules & Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee planned to add a section to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> (TCRM), “if needed,” to provide standards for trial court records as data. The subcommittee has tentatively concluded it may not be necessary to add such standards. The subcommittee instead is considering expanding and updating the TCRM section that provides general standards for electronic court records. The contemplated revisions, among other things, would acknowledge that electronic court records may include records in the form of data (for example, data submitted using fillable forms). This approach may be simpler, clearer, and less repetitive.</p>
<p>(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of records in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Not needed at this time.</p>

13.3. Privacy Resource Guide



Highlight: The Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) has been published.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy resource guide addressing, among other things, electronic access to court records and data, to align with both state and federal requirements (completed 2018)	Completed	
Continue development of court privacy resource guide, outlining the key requirements, contents, and provisions for courts to address within its specific privacy policy (completed 2018).	Completed	
(a) Circulate the draft guide for branch comment; revise as appropriate.	Completed	
(b) Finalize and seek approval of the guide by ITAC.	Completed	ITAC approved publication of the guide at their April 15, 2019 meeting.
Proposed updated 2019 objectives: (b) Revise and update the Privacy Resource Guide with new privacy related laws, rules, forms, standards and best practices on an annual basis with a projected publication date after January 1, 2020 to allow for inclusion of published rules and law effective as of January 1, 2020. (c) Monitor and analyze how the Privacy Resource Guide is being used for the calendar year 2019, and make recommendations for which Judicial Council entity will be responsible for maintaining and updating the Privacy Resource Guide beyond 2019.	Completed	ITAC approved these proposed updated objectives at their April 15 meeting. The Annual Agenda has been updated.

14.1. Rules Modernization: Uniform Formatting Rules for Electronic Documents



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee approval, the proposed uniform formatting rules will be submitted to the Judicial Council for approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Develop uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed or otherwise submitted to the appellate courts.	In Progress	JATS developed proposed rules for formatting electronic documents filed in or submitted to the appellate courts. AAC and ITAC have recommended that the Judicial Council approve the proposal with changes following public comment. JCTC and RUPRO will consider the committees' recommendation in August. If JCTC and RUPRO approve, it will go to the Council in September 2019, and if approved, go into effect January 2020.

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee’s approval, the proposal to amend rule 8.500 will be submitted to the Judicial Council.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Numbering of materials in requests for judicial notice. Consider amending rule 8.252, which requires that materials to be judicially noticed be numbered consecutively, starting with page number one. The problem is that such materials are attached to a motion and declaration(s) and are electronically filed as one document, making pagination and reference to those materials in the briefs confusing for litigants and the courts. This project may be addressed by the uniform format rules project.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>This project has been included in the uniform formatting rules proposal.</p>
<p>(b) Method of notice to the court reporter. Consider whether to amend rule 8.405, which governs the filing of an appeal in juvenile cases, to remove or modify the requirement in subdivision (b)(1)(B) that the clerk notify the court reporter “by telephone and in writing” to prepare a transcript. This language may be outdated or inconsistent with other rules requiring notification by the clerk.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.</p>
<p>(c) Clarify the filing date of an e-filed document. Amend rule 8.77 to clarify that an e-filed document received by the court before midnight that meets the filing requirements is deemed to have been filed that day. This project addresses an ambiguity in the rule that has resulted in inconsistent treatment of e-filed documents that are received after business hours.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.</p>

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules (Cont'd)



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee’s approval, the proposal to amend rule 8.500 will be submitted to the Judicial Council.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(d) Court of Appeal service copy of a petition for review. Amend rule 8.500(f)(1) to remove the requirement of a separate service copy of a petition for review. Once the Supreme Court accepts a petition for review for filing, the Court of Appeal automatically receives a filed/endorsed copy of the petition. The filing of the petition satisfies the service requirements for the Court of Appeal. This project is intended to eliminate an inefficiency.	In Progress	JATS developed a proposal to amend rule 8.500. Following public comment, AAC and ITAC have recommended that the Judicial Council approve the proposal without modification. JCTC and RUPRO will consider the committees’ recommendation in August. If JCTC and RUPRO approve, it will go to the Council in September 2019, and if approved, go into effect January 2020.
(e) Amend rule 8.70 to clarify content. Consider amending rule 8.70 to clarify the subdivision (c)(2)(B) definition of a document and make subdivision (c)(2)(D) parallel with the rest of (c)(2).	Not Started	Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.

14.3. E-Filing and E-Readers for Incarcerated Individuals



Highlight: A pilot program is being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Research and explore options with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) regarding the use of e-readers by incarcerated individuals.	In Progress	AAC and ITAC are developing a pilot program for the electronic delivery of certain filings and communications in inmate civil cases and habeas proceedings. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will discuss the proposal at a meeting on April 5, 2019. Justice Mauro will report to JCTC on April 8, 2019.
(b) Potentially recommend to the Judicial Council the development of a pilot program with one prison and one court to test promising options.	In Progress	The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will discuss the proposal at a meeting on April 5, 2019. Justice Mauro will report to JCTC on April 8, 2019.

14.4. Appellate Document Management System



Highlight: Pilot program training to begin in May.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Receive status updates and provide feedback to Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT) staff on implementation of a new document management system in the appellate courts. The Third Appellate District and the Fifth Appellate District are piloting the initial implementation.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Training for the pilot programs in the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts was scheduled to begin in May 2019. Deployment of the pilot programs was scheduled for July 2019.</p>



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on September 24, 2019

Title

Language Access Plan: Signage and
Technology Grants

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

September 24, 2019

Submitted by

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair
Hon. Laurie D. Zelon, Cochair
Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair, Language
Access Subcommittee
Advisory Committee on Providing Access
and Fairness
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
Information Technology Advisory
Committee

Date of Report

August 19, 2019

Contact

Douglas G. Denton, 415-865-7870
douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The 2018 Budget Act included \$2.55 million ongoing for language access signage and technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend approving a proposed grant process and directing the Language Access Services unit (LAS) of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by PAF, ITAC, and the Judicial Council. Following council approval of grant awards each year, LAS will disburse funding to awarded courts annually, beginning in fiscal year 2019–20.

Recommendation

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective September 24, 2019:

1. Adopt the proposed *Language Access Signage and Technology Grants: Process Overview*; and
2. Direct LAS to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by PAF, ITAC, and the Judicial Council.

Text of the proposed *Language Access Signage and Technology Grants: Process Overview* is included as Attachment A.

Relevant Previous Council Action

In January 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (Language Access Plan, or LAP). The LAP provides recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all of California's approximately 7 million limited-English-proficient (LEP) residents and potential court users.

In March 2015, the Chief Justice formed the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force to advise the council on implementation of the 75 recommendations in the LAP, to expand meaningful access for all LEP court users.

In May 2017, the Judicial Council received an informational report, *Wayfinding and Signage Strategies for Language Access in the California Courts: Report and Recommendations*, which was prepared by the National Center for State Courts under the direction of the task force. The report compiles best practices from around the state in courthouse design and in the use of signage and wayfinding strategies to enhance access for LEP court users.

In January 2019, the council approved formation of a standing Language Access Subcommittee under PAF to undertake language access efforts after the sunset of the task force in February 2019.

In March 2019, the council approved the *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events*. The guidelines were prepared under the direction of the task force and ITAC, following a VRI pilot project that took place in 2018 in the Superior Courts of Merced, Sacramento, and Ventura Counties. The revised guidelines were adapted from existing VRI guidelines in the Language Access Plan. The council also voted to create a new VRI program for the judicial branch to expand LEP court user access to qualified (certified and registered) court interpreters.

Analysis/Rationale

Effective March 2019, PAF's Language Access Subcommittee has worked to ensure the continuation of efforts to achieve and maintain access to justice for California's LEP court users. PAF and the subcommittee will partner with ITAC, as appropriate, on technology issues.

To support judicial branch language access expansion efforts, the 2018 Budget Act included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year

for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. The relevant language from the 2018 May Revision budget change proposal (BCP)¹ is included below:

Signage (Electronic and Static) - \$1,000,000

Recommendations #39 and #42 of the Language Access Plan direct the council to “assist courts by providing plain-language translations of the most common and relevant signs likely to be used in a courthouse and provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized icons, symbols, and displays to limit the need for text and, therefore, translation” and to “provide information to courts [for] better wayfinding strategies, multilingual (static and dynamic) signage.” With over 475 court buildings dispersed across 58 counties statewide, easy-to-understand signage is essential to help LEP court users navigate the courthouse and ensure they receive appropriate services. Meaningful access to these 475 buildings starts with wayfinding, which requires the use of clear and intuitive visual cues to minimize confusion and assist all persons who enter a building. Wayfinding is accomplished through strategic and immediate visual information indicating the location of common, important public spaces: information desks, elevators, stairs, and restrooms. Wayfinding is then supplemented by appropriate signage. These important navigational tools can help to remove confusion and language access barriers and reduce the apprehension that many court users may have about going to an unfamiliar courthouse. [¶] . . . [¶]

Court Language Access Infrastructure and Equipment - \$1,550,000

Courts are not currently funded for language access expansion or maintenance costs outside of direct interpreter services provided in the courtrooms. Various items vital to the day-to-day operations of a court should be funded to assist in the expansion of services to LEP court users:

- 1) Technology
- 2) Interpreter Equipment
- 3) Multi-Language Communication
- 4) Telephonic or other remote interpreting technologies

This funding would be allocated to various courts on an ongoing basis based on equipment and infrastructure refresh and update schedules that will be established to ensure that all courts receive the necessary funding to maintain adequate infrastructure for language access needs.^[2]

(State of Cal., Language Access Plan Augmentation, *Budget Change Proposal* (pp. 4–5).)

¹ See State of Cal., Language Access Plan Augmentation, *Budget Change Proposal* (May 2018), https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/1819/FY1819_ORG0250_BCP2379.pdf.

² Of the \$1,550,000 for technology, \$200,000 is dedicated to the Judicial Council for upgrades to the Language Access Toolkit and other council language access infrastructure support (such as translation costs for statewide

LAS is planning to disburse this funding for trial courts each year, beginning in fiscal year 2019–20, as a grant program (see attached overview). The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant program follow:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court users to navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in their language.
- Encourage courts to establish for grant funding an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

Policy implications

The grant program will likely launch in October 2019, with applications due from interested courts by November 2019. Once applications are received, potential grantees will be determined by Judicial Council staff, who will work closely with the Executive Office and follow the priorities established for the first year in the attached grant overview. Recommendations for grantees will then be formed by staff working with the Executive Office before advisory body approval. This approval process will include approval of recommendations by PAF and its Language Access Subcommittee, ITAC, and ultimately the council. Following approval of recommended grantees by the council by March 2020, awarded courts would need to encumber funding by June 2020, funding would then be reimbursed to the courts by December 2020, and the grant cycle would repeat every year.

Under the grant program, courts will be able to apply for funding for audio or video remote solutions, including video remote interpreting (VRI), if permitted by their memorandums of understanding and any other agreements between court administration and court employees or independent contractors. All courts, including courts that participate in the grant program and request funding for VRI equipment in 2020, will be asked to follow the council’s VRI guidelines for spoken language–interpreted events.³ Doing so will help to ensure proper use of VRI solutions in the courts, because VRI is still an emerging technology and must be carefully implemented by individual courts to ensure due process for LEP court users.

forms, web content, and other multilingual resources for LEP court users). The amount available to trial courts for technology is therefore \$1,350,000 each year.

³ See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf.

Comments

In August 2019, the attached grant process overview, which includes anticipated grant priorities for the first year, was reviewed and approved by PAF and ITAC. The grant process overview was also shared and reviewed with the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on August 7 as an informational item.

Alternatives considered

A variety of disbursement methodologies exist for ongoing funding; however, a determination was made to disburse the funding as a grant program to help the council identify and fund local needs, establish priorities, encourage courts to develop plans for ongoing funding, assist courts with uniform practices, and establish a mechanism to highlight progress and best practices each year.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

Funding will assist courts with language access signage and technology initiatives. The Signage and Technology Grant is a reimbursement grant, which means that the funds will be distributed after the conclusion of a successful project. Funding must be encumbered each fiscal year, and ongoing costs such as software maintenance and support should not be included in the request. (If a request covers multiple years, courts must undertake the project and then reapply each year.) However, because funding is ongoing for the trial courts, individual courts will be encouraged to establish an ongoing plan for grant funding that coordinates with other facilities or technology initiatives planned or underway in their court to support language access. Under the grant program, courts will be able to apply for both signage and technology needs. No more than 10 percent of the annual grant budget for each program will be allocated to any one court (i.e., no more than \$100,000 for signage and \$135,000 for technology), unless total funding requests are lower than the annual allocation. Because of limited funding, and depending on the number of requests received, funding of all grant requests may not be possible, and some requests may be approved only for partial funding. Applicants for the grant program should check with their Facilities and/or Information Technology departments to ensure that grant funding requests conform with courtwide planning efforts.

Council staff works regularly with court language access representatives to identify best practices and innovations taking place in language access, including in the areas of signage and technology. A report will likely be prepared at the completion of each grant year to identify successful signage and technology projects, which will allow the branch to share best practices and innovations with courts statewide and with the public.

Council staff in the Operations and Programs Division are working on development and launch of a VRI program in 2020, and regular updates to the council are planned before the program launch. These updates will inform court and public stakeholders of next steps, including the development of an implementation plan for VRI. The implementation plan will include a sufficient period of installation and training at courts before program launch.

PAF and ITAC also anticipate that judges, court staff, court interpreters, and attorneys will be extensively involved in training efforts to ensure that they are comfortable with the VRI equipment before use and that quality communication is ensured for LEP court users and their attorneys, including for confidential attorney-client communication. Implementation of VRI will also include use of feedback surveys to allow all courtroom participants and interpreters to provide input that can be used to continually improve the service offered by the VRI solution. These surveys will also enable the courts and the Judicial Council to continually monitor the program and refine the way in which the service is delivered.

The 2018 Budget Act also included new positions for the Judicial Council's LAS unit that are currently being recruited to help support the new grant program and the Language Access Toolkit.

Separately, the council is also pursuing a budget change proposal for fiscal year 2020–21 to fund VRI solutions in up to 15 courts, which will also help to establish VRI as a program beginning in 2020.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *Language Access Signage and Technology Grants: Process Overview*
2. Link A: *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/CLASP_report_060514.pdf
3. Link B: *Wayfinding and Signage Strategies for Language Access in the California Courts: Report and Recommendations* (Feb. 2017), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/LAP-Wayfinding-and-Signage-Strategies-Language-Access-in-the-CA-Courts.pdf
4. Link C: *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf

Language Access Signage and Technology Grants
Process Overview
August 19, 2019

Below is an overview of the proposed process for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grants. This process includes potential priorities for grants, solicitation of projects from trial courts for consideration of awarding grants, and ultimate distribution of funding to the courts on successful completion of court signage and technology projects.

Background

The 2018 Budget Act included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. Below is the relevant language from the 2018 May Revision budget change proposal¹:

Signage (Electronic and Static) - \$1,000,000

Recommendations #39 and #42 of the Language Access Plan direct the council to "assist courts by providing plain-language translations of the most common and relevant signs likely to be used in a courthouse and provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized icons, symbols, and displays to limit the need for text and, therefore, translation" and to "provide information to courts [for] better wayfinding strategies, multilingual (static and dynamic) signage." With over 475 court buildings dispersed across 58 counties statewide, easy-to-understand signage is essential to help [limited-English-proficient] LEP court users navigate the courthouse and ensure they receive appropriate services. Meaningful access to these 475 buildings starts with wayfinding, which requires the use of clear and intuitive visual cues to minimize confusion and assist all persons who enter a building. Wayfinding is accomplished through strategic and immediate visual information indicating the location of common, important public spaces: information desks, elevators, stairs, and restrooms. Wayfinding is then supplemented by appropriate signage. These important navigational tools can help to remove confusion and language access barriers and reduce the apprehension that many court users may have about going to an unfamiliar courthouse. [¶] . . . [¶]

Court Language Access Infrastructure and Equipment - \$1,550,000

Courts are not currently funded for language access expansion or maintenance costs outside of direct interpreter services provided in the courtrooms. Various items vital to the day-to-day operations of a court should be funded to assist in the expansion of services to LEP court users:

- 1) Technology
- 2) Interpreter Equipment
- 3) Multi-Language Communication
- 4) Telephonic or other remote interpreting technologies

¹ See State of Cal., Language Access Plan Augmentation, *Budget Change Proposal* (May 2018), https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/1819/FY1819_ORG0250_BCP2379.pdf.

This funding would be allocated to various courts on an ongoing basis based on equipment and infrastructure refresh and update schedules that will be established to ensure that all courts receive the necessary funding to maintain adequate infrastructure for language access needs.

(State of Cal., Language Access Plan Augmentation, *Budget Change Proposal* (pp. 4–5).)

Note: Of the \$1,550,000, \$200,000 is dedicated to the Judicial Council for upgrades to the Language Access Toolkit and other council language access infrastructure support (such as translation costs for statewide forms, web content, and other multilingual resources for LEP court users). The amount available to trial courts for technology is therefore \$1,350,000 each year.

The Language Access Services unit, Center for Families, Children & the Courts [CFCC], is planning to disburse this funding for courts each year, beginning in fiscal year 2019–20, as a grant program.

Objectives of Grant Program

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant program follow:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court users navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in their language.
- Encourage courts to establish for grant funding an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

*Note: Courts may apply **for both** signage and technology needs.*

Application Timing and Process

- Applications are due on November 15, 2019.
- Recommendations will be developed by staff for review by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, its Language Access Subcommittee, and the Information Technology Advisory Committee.
- The decision on which projects to fund will be made by the Judicial Council by March 2020.
- All courts that submit Signage and Technology Grant requests will be notified as to whether they receive funding.
- Intra-branch agreements for the Signage and Technology Grant requests that are funded are expected to be delivered to the court executive officers for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council before April 30, 2020.
- Because of limited funding, and depending on the number of requests received, funding all requests may not be possible, and some requests may be approved only for partial funding.

- Courts requesting funding for more than one project in each category are asked to identify the top-priority project for their court.
- No more than 10 percent of the annual grant budget for each program will be allocated to any one court (i.e., no more than \$100,000 for signage and \$135,000 for technology).
- If total funding requests fall below the total annual allocation, courts may be awarded larger amounts to ensure that available funding under the program is disbursed as needed.
- Applicants should check with their Facilities and/or Information Technology departments to ensure that grant funding requests conform with courtwide planning efforts.

Grant Award and Reimbursement Process

- Funding must be encumbered each fiscal year, and ongoing costs such as software maintenance and support should not be included in the request. (If a request covers multiple years, courts must undertake the project and then reapply each year.)
- The Signage and Technology Grant is a reimbursement grant, which means that the funds will be distributed after the conclusion of a successful project.
- Courts that participate in the grant program and request funding for video remote interpreting equipment will be asked to agree to follow the council's *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events*.²
- Note: Courts that apply for VRI equipment in the courtroom must abide by local memorandums of understanding and agreements that allow for the appropriate use of VRI in the courtroom.
- Funds must be encumbered by the court in the current fiscal year, and the court must inform the Judicial Council that funding for the project has been encumbered by June 30, 2020.
- If the reimbursement request and invoices to support the requested reimbursement amount are not received by December 31, 2020, grant funding for the cost of the project will be **unavailable for reimbursement to the court**.

Potential Priorities for Grants

In 2019, Judicial Council staff developed the following potential priorities for the grant program and reviewed these priorities with the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee:

² See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf.

Signage Grants

Priority	Project
1	Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is unavailable in the <i>Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons</i> (at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lap-toolkit-Glossary_of_Signage_Terms_and_Icons.xlsx)
2	Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies, including electronic displays with automated maps, orientation guides with multilingual interface, and/or other types of multilingual electronic signage
3	Investment in multilingual nonelectronic signage (paper, plaques, etc.)
4	Equipment and startup costs for an automated queue-management system that will contain multilingual information

Technology Grants

Priority	Project
1	Interpreter equipment, including upgraded headsets and other communication equipment for interpreters (for example, wireless transmitters and receivers, charging stations, and carrying cases)
2	Telephonic/video remote solutions equipment for LEP assistance both inside and outside the courtroom (for example, speakerphones and equipment for video remote appearances, video remote interpreting, counter assistance, or other self-help remote assistance, including tablets, computer equipment, and monitors)
3	Scheduling software for language access services, multilingual avatars for LEP court users, or other software that allows for accurate multilingual communication between the LEP court user and the court
4	Multilingual videos for LEP court users, including translation costs
5	Audio-visual systems upgrades, broadband service, and/or other infrastructure enhancements (must directly relate to services provided to LEP court users)
6	Multilingual kiosks

Project Solicitation

An invitation will be sent to the language access representatives for all 58 trial courts from the Language Access Services unit inviting the courts to submit a request for funding if they have a language access signage and/or technology system project that they would like to have considered for grant funding. A solicitation email will come from the Language Access Subcommittee chair and will be shared with the presiding judges and court executive officers. The email will include a memo from staff that provides an overview of the goals of the grant program, criteria that will be considered when deciding which grants to recommend for funding, and a deadline to submit the grant project request form for consideration.

Evaluation of Project Funding Requests

Courts that request funding for signage and/or technology will need to submit a completed project request form to Judicial Council staff. As noted above, courts can submit funding requests for both

signage and technology. If courts submit more than one signage project (or more than one technology project), they will be asked to complete a separate project request form for each project and indicate the priority for each of their projects (e.g., top priority, 2nd priority). Judicial Council staff will review each submission and follow up with the courts on any missing information and questions. Staff will prepare an initial allocation in a spreadsheet by court of the proposed grant funding based on the amount of available funding, the number of project requests received, the overall goals of the program, and other criteria as specified in the solicitation memo.

Part of the evaluation process includes ensuring that the project falls within the scope and criteria of the grant program. Additionally, staff will review the scope of funding included in the project request to ensure that the funding being requested is for one-time costs. Any ongoing system maintenance costs will be removed from the requested funding amount. Staff will then categorize the projects into the various program priorities and will make an initial proposed allocation for each court, limiting the grant to no more than 10 percent for an individual court, unless total funding requests are lower than the annual allocation. The results of this analysis will be recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. Throughout this process, there will be multiple review cycles of the proposed allocations internally with management in CFCC, Information Technology, and the Executive Office.

Advisory Body Review and Approval

After management approval of the proposed grant requests, a memo will be prepared and sent from Judicial Council staff to the chairs of the Language Access Subcommittee, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, and Information Technology Advisory Committee for review. If the chairs have no questions about the memo or proposed allocations, the memo will be placed on the committee agendas for presentation to and consideration by the full committees. During the meetings, the recommendation memo, along with the proposed allocations, will be reviewed and any questions addressed.

Following approval by the advisory bodies, the proposed allocations will be recommended for approval by the Judicial Council at its March 2020 meeting.

Write and Issue IBAs

If the proposed allocations are approved by the council, a contract detail sheet and intra-branch agreement will be drafted for each court, sent to Judicial Council Branch Accounting & Procurement for processing, and ultimately signed by the court executive officers, per the schedule above.

Funds Disbursement

To be reimbursed, courts must expend grant funding by December 31, 2020. Upon successful completion of a project, the court then submits an invoice with a brief report on what was completed, along with a disbursement request and supporting invoices, to the Language Access Services unit for processing. A memo from Judicial Council staff along with the supporting documents from the court are then sent to Branch Accounting & Procurement for disbursement of the funding to the courts.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

August 12, 2019

12:00 - 1:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Ming W. Chin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; and Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Hon. Louis R. Mauro; Hon. Peter Siggins; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Michael Derr; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Kathy Fink; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Daphne Light; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; and Mr. Eric Long

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 16, 2019 open meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting and provided updates on recent meetings in which the Chair and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities. Justice Slough also provided an update to a recommendation to reallocate unspent funds provided in a 2016-17 budget change proposal for Sacramento Superior Court as it relates to the V3 CMS transition that went before the Trial Court Budget

Advisory Committee. Future steps include a presentation to the JCTC and then consideration by the Judicial Council.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams. Workstreams with key milestones highlighted included the Data Analytics and Security Roadmap. Judge Hanson also reported that at the June 21 ITAC meeting, the Self Represented Litigant E-Services Workstream presented its final report as it has concluded its work with the issuance of an RFP for establishing online branchwide self-help e-services.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 3

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposal to Amend the Penal Code Section 1203.01

Update: Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair of the ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, provided a report that included a review of the public comments on a proposal to amend Penal Code Section 1203.01 to allow an electronic alternative to mailing certain statements and reports.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

Item 4

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposal to Amend the Code of Civil Procedure Section 1010.6

Update: Hon. Peter Siggins provided a report that included a review of the public comments on a proposal to amend the Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to allow courts to recover actual costs of permissive electronic filing and mandatory electronic filing by local rule, and clarify a provision for signatures made not under penalty of perjury to account for signatures of non-filers.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

Item 5

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the Electronic Filing and Service Rules

Update: Hon. Peter Siggins provided a report that included a review of the public comments on a proposal to amend California Rules of Court, rules 2.251, 2.255. and 2.257, on the electronic filing and service rules.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

Item 6

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the Rules on Remote Access to Electronic Records

Update: Hon. Peter Siggins provided a report that included a review of the public comments on a proposal to amend California Rules of Court, rule 2.540, on remote access to electronic records.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

Item 7

Court of Appeal Service Copy of a Petition for Review

Update: Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Chair of the Appellate Advisory Committee, Vice-Chair of the Information Technology Advisory Committee, and Chair of the Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee provided a report on a proposal to amend California Rules of Court, rule 8.500(f), regarding petitions for review in the California Supreme Court, removing the outdated requirement to send to the Court of Appeal a separate service copy of an electronically filed petition to review. The committee was asked to consider recommending the proposal to the Judicial Council.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

Item 8

Uniform Formatting Rules for Electronic Documents

Update: Justice Mauro provided a report on a proposal to amend California Rules of Court, rules 8.40, 8.44, 8.71, 8.72, 8.74, 8.77, 8.78, 8.204, and 8.252, to create uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed in and submitted to the appellate courts. The report included a review of the public comments and a summary of modifications to the proposal that the Appellate Advisory Committee, the Information Technology Advisory Committee, and the Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee recommended based on the public comments. The committee was asked to consider recommending the proposal to the Judicial Council.

Action: The committee voted to approve the proposal for submission to the Judicial Council.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



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

August 28, 2019

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

Deadline

N/A

From

Kathleen Fink, Manager,
Judicial Council Information Technology

Contact

Kathleen Fink, Manager
415-865-4094
kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Civil Case Management System (V3)
Replacement Projects: Status July 22 –
August 27, 2019

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: The Monthly Project Status meeting was held on August 26, 2019. The Technology Committee Chairs met with the V3 court executives on August 27, 2019 for a discussion of status and knowledge transfer for the incoming Technology Committee Chair, Judge Brodie.

The next Monthly Project Status meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2019.

Project timelines have been extended for three of the four V3 courts, with details provided below. Judicial Council Information Technology is working with Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura to coordinate “lights on” planning and court funding for V3 support after June 2020.

Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs):

Sacramento Superior Court met the final deliverable for the FY 2016-17 IBA and the allocation and distribution are in process. The re-allocation of the FY 2016-17 funds is scheduled to be reviewed at the September 23-24 Judicial Council meeting.

Ventura Superior Court (Journal Technologies - eCourt):

Working sessions with JTI for requirements gathering and documentation for Civil continue to make good progress and are targeting completion in December. Lessons learned from the implementation at Los Angeles Superior Court are proving valuable.

An upgrade to the eCourt software is planned to accommodate very large cases.

Lack of vendor resources and demands on court resources have impacted projected timelines for the remaining case types. The target date for Civil and Mental Health is June 2020, with Probate case types following six to nine months after that. Risk factors are possible vendor resource and deployment management issues. Both Judicial Council and court executives are escalating with the vendor.

San Diego Superior Court (Tyler Odyssey):

The fourth round of the iterative data conversion testing is complete, with the next round to begin in September.

The first development delivery from Tyler is targeted for December 2019 and test planning is in progress.

In order to maintain operations performance and efficiency, significant changes to Tyler's base Odyssey product are required. This work will extend the project timeline. The target for Small Claims is September 2020 and for Civil and Probate is May 2021.

Sacramento Superior Court (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

Development by Thomson Reuters is underway.

A number of ancillary applications were developed by Sacramento to provide custom information based on V3 data. The court is investigating whether these applications will be needed once C-Track is deployed.

Lack of vendor and court resources have impacted projected timelines for the V3 case types. The target date for deployment is December 2021, with contingency planning for a possible delay to March 2022. Sacramento has added staff to the project and both Judicial Council and court executives are escalating with the vendor.

Orange Superior Court (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Deployment of V3 Release 15.01, including some changes developed and integrated by Orange, was postponed as the new print vendor was not ready. Targeting deployment in September.

Modernization efforts continue and User Acceptance Testing is in planning. The tool developed to automate code conversion is providing significant efficiencies.

August 28, 2019

Page 3

Slalom Consulting has completed discovery. They have proposed a list of projects, which is being prioritized.

Orange is on track to complete their conversion by June 2020.



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 August 28, 2019	Action Requested Please Review
To Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair Judicial Council Technology Committee	Deadline N/A
From David Koon, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology	Contact David Koon, Manager 415-865-4618 david.koon@jud.ca.gov
Subject Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement Projects: Status August 1 – August 31, 2019	

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 and \$896,000 in FY 18/19 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement project for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on August 21, 2019 for their monthly status meeting. At these meetings, the SJE courts review the status of the deployments of the new case management system. The focus of project activity is on the Plumas, Sierra and Humboldt courts who are the next courts scheduled to go-live in the fall of 2019.

Next Steps: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts will continue to meet monthly to review progress and upcoming milestones.