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 March 24, 2017

Title
Judicial Branch: Court Innovations Grant Program Award Recommendations

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by
Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair

Agenda Item Type
Action Required

Effective Date
March 24, 2017

Date of Report
March 2, 2017

Contact
Maureen Dumas, 916-263-2290
maureen.dumas@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

After reviewing 118 grant applications from 42 trial and appellate courts that participated in the Court Innovations Grant Program, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee recommends awarding 53 grants totaling $23.5 million to 29 courts involving 39 jurisdictions. These grants will fund exciting advancements testing new approaches for making courts more accessible, easier to use, less costly, and better able to facilitate positive outcomes.

In accordance with category limitations contained in the Budget Act of 2016, $11.3 million will be allocated to collaborative court programs; $7.5 million to self-help, family and juvenile court programs; $4.7 million to other efficiencies across all types of court programs, and $625,000 to the Judicial Council for grant program administration. Additionally, three to four percent of the funding in each category will be retained as a contingency for unforeseen costs courts encounter over the three-year grant period. The grant period begins June 1, 2017, and ends June 30, 2020.

Recommendation

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective March 24, 2017:

- Approve awards of approximately $23.5 million to 28 superior courts and one appellate court from the Court Innovations Grant Program, as stated in Attachment A:
  - $11.3 million allocated to collaborative court programs;
  - $7.5 million allocated to self-help, family, and juvenile court programs;
  - $4.7 million allocated to other efficiencies across all types of court programs;

- Approve the allocation of $625,000, out of $1.25 million statutorily authorized, for program administration costs, and approve the retention of three to four percent of the funding in each category as a contingency against unforeseen costs courts may encounter over the grant period; and

- Authorize staff to send the Notice of Intent to Award to trial and appellate courts and to work with the trial and appellate courts to negotiate and execute an Intra-Branch Agreement for each approved project by June 1, 2017.

Previous Council Action

The Chief Justice and the Judicial Council have been committed to expanding innovative and efficient services and programs to improve access to justice statewide. The Governor's proposed 2016 budget included funding to further these goals, proposing $30 million for court innovations and efficiencies. Following legislative modification, the final Budget Act of 2016 reduced the funding to $25 million and required it to be allocated in three categories: $12 million for collaborative courts, $8 million for family, juvenile and litigant self-help programs, and $5 million for other efficiencies.

In June 2016, the Chief Justice appointed the Ad Hoc Working Group for Innovations Grants to create rules for the program. The working group met multiple times to develop the Request for Applications (RFA; see Attachment B), which includes grant program submission requirements, a timeline, and information on grant scoring criteria. On August 25, 2016, the council approved the RFA, making it the "rule book" for awarding innovation grants. The JBBC then became responsible for evaluating the resulting grant proposals and awarding grant monies through a competitive process.

On September 1, 2016, the JBBC released the RFA. Two state-wide teleconferences were conducted on September 20, 2016 to provide courts with the opportunity to ask specific questions regarding the grant application, grant program requirements, and terms and conditions for funding. Courts were asked to submit a Notice of Intent to Apply by September 26, 2016, and then submit final applications for the Court Innovations Grant Program by October 31, 2016.

The RFA process gave trial and appellate courts flexibility in crafting proposals. Applicants could submit multiple grant applications for multiple categories. Courts were also allowed to submit one grant application for multiple categories if a proposed program could be justified in more than one grant category. Applications could be filed by an individual trial court or an individual appellate court; collaboratively by two or more courts, provided there was a designated lead court; or in conjunction with justice partners or other government entities, provided that a court was the applicant. In the end, 118 grant applications from 42 courts (38 trial courts and four appellate courts) were received, totaling over $70 million in requested funding.

Rationale for Recommendation

Using the approved grant process, the JBBC evaluated the grant proposals. The JBBC met in person seven times to evaluate and score the proposals. To avoid conflicts of interest, members of the JBBC abstained from discussing or ranking proposals that were from or that benefitted their own courts. JBBC members left the room or withdrew from the telephonic meeting during those discussions, and rejoined only after the subject discussions concluded.

The JBBC developed its recommendations for each category using the following definitions:

- Collaborative Courts—Proposals that promote collaborative justice principles of a multidisciplinary, non-adversarial team approach with involvement from the court, attorneys, law enforcement, and/or community treatment and service agencies.
- Self-help, Family, and Juvenile Courts—Proposals that improve or address the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of self-represented litigants, children, youth, and families in courts.
- Other Efficiencies Across All Types of Courts—Proposals that result in savings and efficiencies for the courts while ensuring access to and quality of justice for court users in case types.

Once categorized, each proposal was scored according to the guidelines. Scoring of each proposal considered the following:

- Project Attributes—Program need, benefit, accessibility, innovation, modernization, efficiency, replicability, and sustainability.
- Project Management—Project implementation plan, program management capability, and program evaluation and outcome.
- Cost Proposal—Proposed costs and budget justification.

To maximize the grant dollars to the extent possible, the JBBC considered every application critically, striving to ensure that each request met the goals and requirements of the Court Innovations Grant Program. To that end, the JBBC reviewed the applications and proposed budgets in detail considering many factors, including:

- Did the application seek to initiate a new, innovative program, or did it seek funding to continue an existing program?
- Did the application seek funding for equipment or costs that would normally be paid out of a court's annual budget?
- Did the proposed program require the hiring of new employees when current employees could assume some or all program responsibilities?
- Did the application seek to initiate a program that already exists and is being tested elsewhere?
- Did the application seek to initiate a program that may soon be eclipsed by a larger branch initiative?
- Were applications submitted for similar programs and, if so, how did the applications compare?
- Did the application demonstrate that the proposed program could be sustained and replicated?
- What is the return on the investment of the proposed program?
- Were there legal or branch-policy constraints in approving any portion of the proposal?

In scoring applications, the JBBC used a 300-point scale, assigning points in these areas: program need, program benefits, project attributes (accessibility, innovation, modernization, efficiency, replicability, sustainability), project management (implementation plan, management capability, program evaluation and outcomes), and cost. The JBBC also noted that project attributes, such as innovation or modernization, varied among the applicant courts based on several factors, including court size, community, and location. When considering all factors, the JBBC focused on the programs that would have not only an impact on the branch but also a direct impact on the communities that the applicant court served.

The grant awards recommended today are also an opportunity for the branch, through outcomes evaluation to gauge the effectiveness of these types of programs, not just in the lead court but also across jurisdictions. Further, products, services, materials, or technology resulting from a grant-funded program will be shared throughout the branch for use by all courts.

Those courts awarded a grant will collaborate with other courts to share information, reduce duplication of effort, identify differences in approaches to each project, and share best practices. Communication and sharing of information and ideas increase the likelihood of success and keep the door open for innovation in courts of all sizes.

The JBBC also recommends allocating $625,000 for necessary administrative costs and retaining three to four percent in each category for contingency reserve to address unforeseen cost increases in the awarded grant projects. After year two, the JBBC will assess how much of the contingency funding remains and how to best use these monies to promote innovation across the judicial branch. The JBBC will return to the council with a proposal for those funds.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The Budget Act of 2016 stipulated that the Court Innovations Grant Program funds be distributed through a competitive grant program developed by the Judicial Council. The legislation further required that a maximum of $12 million be awarded for collaborative courts; a maximum of $8 million for self-help, family, and juvenile courts; and a maximum of $5 million for other efficiencies across all types of courts.

The JBBC evaluated all grant applications submitted according to the developed rules and believes the awards being recommended for approval best fit the program's goals of promoting innovative and efficient access to justice.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

The legislation establishing the Court Innovations Grant Program requires the council to develop and implement a plan to disseminate information about the innovative practices funded through this program and to consider the adoption of appropriate modifications to the California Rules of Court and other judicial branch policies, procedures, and programs to support the expansion of successful programs funded through this grant. Courts receiving funding from the Court Innovations Grant Program will be required to report quarterly to the Judicial Council on expenditures, impacts, and potential savings associated with the funded programs. This information will then be compiled and used by council staff to develop an annual report to the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the grant program, its impacts, and any potential savings.

To implement this program through 2020, the council Special Projects Office will administer it as part of the JBBC staff efforts. The Budget Act of 2016 designated up to $1.25 million, or five percent of funds allocated for the Court Innovations Grant Program to the Judicial Council to administer the program and support the expansion of successful programs in other courts. Council staff has determined that to allow for additional funds for grant awardees it will utilize only $625,000, or 2.5 percent, for grant fund administration, including auditing activities.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The Court Innovations Grant Program supports the following goals of the Judicial Council's strategic plan for the judicial branch: Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Goal II, Independence and Accountability; Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration; Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; Goal V, Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence; and Goal VI, Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Court Innovations Grant Program—Awards Recommended for Approval
2. Attachment B: Request for Applications—Court Innovations Grant Program

Court Innovations Grant Program - Awards Recommended for Approval

#	Court	Proposed Program Name	Funds Requested	Proposed Awards[1]
Collaborative Courts				
1	Alameda Superior Court	Collaborative Court Management Information System	$ 150,000.00	$ 114,223.00
2	Contra Costa Superior Court	Domestic Violence and Collaborative Services Court	$ 1,573,655.95	$ 1,573,655.95
3	Contra Costa Superior Court	Veteran's Treatment Court	$ 367,975.00	$ 367,975.00
4	Fresno Superior Court	Human Trafficking Court Planning and Implementation	$ 386,699.00	$ 383,651.00
5	Humboldt Superior Court	Family Dependency Drug Court	$ 1,414,209.82	$ 1,414,209.82
6	Inyo Superior Court	Reentry Court	$ 273,712.00	$ 273,712.00
7	Mendocino Superior Court	Adult Drug Court	$ 374,611.91	$ 283,261.00
8	Placer Superior Court[2]	Video Appearances	$ 280,000.00	$ 280,000.00
9	Sacramento Superior Court	Monitor and Measure the Achievement of Program Goals	$ 311,849.00	$ 311,849.00
10	San Diego Superior Court	Evidence-Based Sentencing Triage Assessment Unit	$ 5,270,881.29	$ 1,259,645.81
11	San Francisco Superior Court	Veterans Justice Court	$ 318,592.00	$ 318,592.00
12	San Joaquin Superior Court	Community Supervision Court	$ 1,982,207.93	$ 1,881,853.18
13	San Mateo Superior Court	DUI and Restitution Court	$ 1,012,477.00	$ 1,012,477.00
14	Santa Cruz Superior Court	Collaborative Justice System	$ 1,174,633.00	$ 1,174,633.00
15	Sonoma Superior Court	Veterans Court Enhancements	$ 56,476.00	$ 56,476.00
16	Stanislaus Superior Court	Homeless Court Program	$ 593,089.91	$ 593,089.91
		Collaborative Courts Subtotal	**$ 15,541,069.81**	**$ 11,299,303.67**
Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts				
17	5th District Court of Appeal	Self-Help and Learning Center Website	$ 317,916.00	$ 317,916.00
18	Butte Superior Court	Remote Video-Conferencing Technology	$ 576,140.00	$ 576,140.00
19	Contra Costa Superior Court	California's Virtual Self Help Site	$ 970,365.00	$ 970,365.00
20	El Dorado Superior Court	One Family/One Judge Pilot Project	$ 66,599.00	$ 66,599.00
21	Los Angeles Superior Court	Self-Help Traffic Avatar (Gina) Expansion	$ 59,373.00	$ 59,373.00
22	Monterey Superior Court	California Court Access App	$ 789,940.00	$ 789,940.00
23	Orange Superior Court	Enhance Self-Help Portal	$ 326,800.00	$ 326,800.00
24	Placer Superior Court[2]	Video Appearances	$ 280,000.00	$ 280,000.00
25	Riverside Superior Court	Attorney and Litigant Electronic Courtroom Self Check-In	$ 179,250.67	$ 179,250.67
26	Riverside Superior Court	Intelligent Self-Help Kiosk	$ 629,292.70	$ 629,292.70
27	Riverside Superior Court	Traffic Avatar	$ 67,124.93	$ 67,124.93
28	San Bernardino Superior Court	Customer Relationship Management Portal	$ 651,301.20	$ 430,755.51
29	San Bernardino Superior Court	Video-Conferencing Child Custody Recommending Counseling	$ 35,537.60	$ 35,537.60
30	San Diego Superior Court	Access to Information Made Simple	$ 276,320.00	$ 276,320.00
31	San Mateo Superior Court	Develop and Provide Expanded Online Self-help	$ 336,000.00	$ 336,000.00
32	Santa Barbara Superior Court	Instant Family Law Orders	$ 471,143.23	$ 312,926.00
33	Shasta Superior Court	Cooperative Parenting Program	$ 681,026.74	$ 603,558.92
34	Sonoma Superior Court	Queuing/Appointment/Calendaring System	$ 56,586.00	$ 56,586.00
35	Tuolumne Superior Court	Expand Small Claims-Civil Mediation Program	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00
36	Ventura Superior Court	Internet Based Self-help Workshops	$ 932,404.00	$ 932,404.00
37	Ventura Superior Court	Juvenile Delinquency Family Engagement Workshops	$ 239,424.00	$ 88,182.00
38	Yolo Superior Court	Online Interactive Multilingual Tool	$ 91,500.00	$ 91,500.00
		Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts Subtotal	**$ 8,058,044.07**	**$ 7,450,571.33**
Other Efficiencies				
39	5th District Court of Appeal	Modernize the Transcript Assembly Program	$ 793,000.00	$ 793,000.00
40	Contra Costa Superior Court	Expanding LEP Court Access	$ 239,000.00	$ 239,000.00
41	Humboldt Superior Court	Interactive Video Conferencing System	$ 170,919.87	$ 170,919.87
42	Los Angeles Superior Court	E-Filing	$ 114,760.00	$ 114,760.00
43	Los Angeles Superior Court	Justice System Partner and Litigant Portal	$ 637,500.00	$ 637,500.00
44	Merced Superior Court	Video Conference Hearings Project	$ 236,302.94	$ 194,540.00
45	Monterey Superior Court	Cloud Based Disaster Recovery Solution	$ 209,361.00	$ 209,361.00
46	Orange Superior Court	Automating the Courtroom Check-in	$ 246,190.00	$ 246,190.00
47	Orange Superior Court	Conservatorship Accountability Portal	$ 212,972.00	$ 212,972.00
48	Orange Superior Court	Court User Portal	$ 511,200.00	$ 511,200.00
49	Orange Superior Court	Improving Court Management Through the Use of Analytics	$ 938,851.34	$ 938,851.34
50	Sacramento Superior Court	Videoconferencing of Mental Health Hearings	$ 52,860.00	$ 52,860.00
51	San Bernardino Superior Court	Remote Video Proceedings	$ 255,692.72	$ 244,698.58
52	San Mateo Superior Court	Automated Line Queuing System	$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00
53	Santa Cruz Superior Court	SMS Notifications	$ 119,390.28	$ 35,760.00
		Other Efficiencies Subtotal	**$ 4,863,000.15**	**$ 4,726,612.79**
		Grand Total	**$ 28,462,114.03**	**$ 23,476,487.79**

[1] *Proposed award amounts reflect budget decreases addressing supplanting concerns and ensuring compliance with judicial branch policies regarding travel, training and contracting.*

[2] *The Judicial Branch Budget Committee is recommending the Placer Superior Court Video Appearances project to be awarded split funding from both the Collaborative Courts and the Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts grant categories.*

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM

Grant Period: June 1, 2017–June 30, 2020

Eligible Applicants: California Appellate Courts and Superior Courts of California

REVISION NO. 2
REVISED DECEMBER 13, 2016

September 1, 2016	**Application Packet Released**
September 26, 2016	**Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply**
October 31, 2016	**Grant Application Due (by 5:00 p.m.)**

This Request for Applications (RFA) packet includes application guidelines and instructions regarding funding provisions, grant eligibility, and application submission requirements. The Judicial Branch Budget Committee reserves the right to modify the application guidelines based on outcomes of the initial grant period.

Dates and deadlines within the RFA may be modified by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee with the one exception that the grant application may not be due sooner than October 31, 2016.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICATION GUIDELINES FOR COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Organizational Background

The Judicial Council is the policymaking body of the California courts, the largest court system in the nation. Under the leadership of the Chief Justice and in accordance with the California Constitution, the council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. Judicial Council staff implements the council's policies.

1.2 Court Innovations Grant Program Overview and Purpose

As part of the Budget Act of 2016, the Legislature appropriated $25 million in one-time funding to develop and implement a competitive grant program to provide funding for court services and programs that promote innovative and efficient access to justice, including the development of new programs or practices and the adoption of existing best practices that better serve the public and court users. The Court Innovations Grant Program (Program) will be administered by the Judicial Council.

During the Great Recession, the state's judiciary, like all of California and the other two branches of government, suffered significant budget reductions. The judicial branch responded to these budget reductions in many ways, including its development and implementation of various innovative and efficient services and programs for the public and court users. These innovative and efficient services and programs have been well received; however, with fiscal support, these services and programs may be more readily and easily replicated by other courts. Further, with fiscal support, additional innovative and efficient services and programs may be developed and implemented for greater access to justice.

Following enactment of the 2015 State Budget, the Chief Justice and the Judicial Council furthered their commitment to the expansion of these and other innovative and efficient services and programs to improve access to justice statewide. The Governor's approach in designating specific funds for this purpose will enhance access to justice by facilitating statewide replication or development of innovative and efficient services and programs that better serve the public and court users.

2.0 GRANT CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

The competitive grant program will focus on high-priority innovations, modernizations, and efficiencies in the trial courts and appellate courts for the three grant categories listed below.

2.1 Collaborative Courts

Proposals that promote collaborative justice principles of a multidisciplinary, non-adversarial team approach with involvement from the court, attorneys, law enforcement, and/or community treatment and service agencies.

2.2 Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts

Proposals that improve or address the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs for self-represented litigants, children, youth, and families in the California courts.

2.3 Other Efficiencies Across All Types of Courts

Proposals that result in savings and efficiencies for the courts while ensuring access to and quality of justice for court users in case types distinct and apart from those categories listed above.

The purpose of the Court Innovations Grant Program is to encourage the development of new court services and programs that promote innovative and efficient access to justice, including the enhancement of existing programs or practices that better serve the public and court users.

Courts may provide proposals for:

- **Development** of a new program or practice.
- **Adoption** of an existing program or practice from another court.
- **Enhancement**, expansion, and/or improvement of an existing program or practice only if the proposal provides demonstrable results of the enhancement that are above and beyond the existing program or practice (verifiable cost savings to the court's budget, increased efficiency, and/or enhanced access to justice).[1]

Note: This is a competitive bidding process and therefore courts will not automatically receive Court Innovations Grant Program funding.

3.0 ELIGIBILITY AND APPLICATION

Superior Courts of California and California Appellate Courts are eligible to apply for any one of the three categories listed in Section 2.0 above. Courts may apply for more than one grant category (i.e., collaborative courts, self-help, family and juvenile courts, and other efficiencies across all types of courts). Note that separate applications must be submitted if a court is applying in more than one grant category.

[1] Funding will not be provided for existing programs or practices. Funding will only be provided for those elements verified to go beyond the existing program or practice.

Applications may be filed in one of three ways:

- Individual trial court or an individual appellate court;
- Collaboratively by two or more courts provided there is a designated lead court. The number of courts collaborating is not limited; or
- In conjunction with justice partners/other government entities, provided that the court is the applicant.

Additionally, applications submitted by courts that are already receiving grant monies will be accepted, provided that the current proposal is not for the same grant program.

Courts must submit a proposal that clearly details the initiative(s) for which funding is sought, including the grant category; the associated staffing, programs, and services to be delivered; detailed costs; and how the grant funds will be used to cover those costs. (Detailed information regarding proposal contents can be found in Section 8.0.)

4.0 AWARDS AND FUNDING

4.1 Amount of Funds Available

A total of $25,000,000[2] is available:

- Up to $12,000,000 for collaborative courts
- Up to $8,000,000 for self-help, family and juvenile courts
- Up to $5,000,000 for other efficiencies across all types of courts

4.2 Amount of Awards

The Judicial Council seeks to adequately fund as many qualified Court Innovations Grant Program projects as possible, emphasizing a diversity of project types among small, medium, and large sized courts. Courts of all sizes are encouraged to apply and every proposal will be considered on the merits for evaluation purposes.

Ultimately, the distribution of grant funds will be based on the number and type of proposals received for each of the grant categories noted in Section 2.0.

4.3 Disbursement of Grant Funds

Disbursement of grant funds will be made as follows:

- After notice of award, and upon notification to the Judicial Council that work has commenced, the first annual disbursement will be made at the beginning

[2] In accordance with Provision 20 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2016, up to 5% of the total appropriation is for the Judicial Council for the administration of the Court Innovations Grant Program.

of the project based on the information provided in the required Budget Detail Worksheets. Appellate courts will receive their funds as a transfer to their operations fund, and they will track their expenses related to the grant on a specific Project Cost Code (PCC). Trial courts will receive funds in their next monthly allocation, and their revenue and expenses will be tracked in a grant fund and grant work breakdown structure (WBS) code.

- Subsequent annual disbursements will be made at the beginning of fiscal years when the court and the Judicial Council have completed the following:
  - All outstanding reconciliation items from the prior fiscal year quarterly and annual reports are resolved.
  - If unused funds remain, the court has explained why any planned expenses did not occur.
  - If unused funds remain, the court has submitted a revised spending plan that documents the movement of planned expenses from one fiscal year to the next, as long as the total award is not exceeded, or the court acknowledges in writing they will not use the funds, which can be returned to the grant fund.
  - Unused funds documentation will be reviewed by the Judicial Council, and a decision will be made whether unused funds can roll over to a subsequent year or will be returned to the grant fund.

If the Judicial Council determines that courts will not be able to spend their full grant allocation, the Judicial Council may redistribute funds as necessary to support other grant programs or may solicit additional grant proposals.

The Judicial Council will seek to award as many qualified applications as possible and may consider awarding partial grants. Prior to awarding a partial grant, the Judicial Council will consult with the recipient court. Courts may be asked to submit modified project plans and revised budgets that reflect the award amounts offered.

Funds must be fully expended—not just encumbered—by June 30, 2020, after which any unexpended funds must revert to the State's General Fund.

4.4 Eligible Grant Expenditures

Program costs must be directly related to the objectives and activities of the program, and anticipated costs must be listed on the Budget Detail Worksheets. Eligible uses of funds include:

- Salary and benefits
- Equipment (computers, office equipment)

- Instructional material and supplies
- Office supplies
- Travel
- Training
- Consultants/contractors
- Any other expenses directly related to the project not listed herein, as properly budgeted and approved by the Judicial Council program manager.

The court must follow applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including but not limited to the *Judicial Branch Contracting Manual* and *Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual*, as applicable.

4.5 Ineligible Grant Expenditures

Any expenditures not directly related to the program are ineligible for grant funding. Ineligible uses of funds include, but are not limited to:

- Supplanting existing funding[3]
- Routine replacement of office equipment, furnishings, or technology
- Any technology maintenance costs that extend beyond the end of the grant award period
- Facilities

Exceptions to the expenditure requirements listed above may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Exception requests must be submitted in writing and approved in writing, in advance, by the Judicial Council program manager.

4.6 Contractual Relationships and Right to Audit

The Judicial Council will enter into an Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA) with individual courts or a multicourt collaborative for the administration and disbursement of grant funds.

The court must maintain all financial records, supporting documents, and all other records relating to performance under the IBA for a period in accordance with state law and/or the *Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual*. The court must permit the authorized representative of the Judicial Council or its designee to inspect or audit at any reasonable time, including at the time of reconciliation, any records relating to the IBA.

[3] Court Innovations Grant Program funds are not to be used to replace or take the place of existing court funding, or any existing expense, including staff costs incurred for performing existing duties.

The court will be required to submit quarterly reports, as described in Section 5.2. Judicial Council staff will be responsible for auditing quarterly and annual expenses against eligible and ineligible expenses. The court must resolve any outstanding issues before subsequent fiscal year funds will be released.

It is expected that some projects may encounter unexpected challenges or opportunities that require a change in plans, including changes in timing or resource allocation. As these are innovation grants, courts are not strictly bound by their original budget and timeline. In the event a court decides to modify its approach or Budget Detail Worksheet, this should be brought to the attention of the Judicial Council in the next quarterly reports, as described in Section 5.2 and Attachments D and E.

The court agrees that any part of the award remaining unexpended beyond the grant period must be returned to the Judicial Council within 60 days after project completion. If the court does not return the funds within a timely matter, or if expenditures are deemed ineligible, the Judicial Council may transfer the funds from the appellate court to the Judicial Council, or withhold a like amount from the trial court's annual court funding allocation.

5.0 PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

5.1 Program Training

The Judicial Council may conduct informational meetings related to each of the three grant categories.[4] Grant funds may be used for travel expenses for attendance at meetings.

5.2 Grant Administration Reporting and Tracking

Quarterly Grant Administration Reports: Award recipients must submit quarterly grant administration reports that summarize grant-related activities. Reports are due no later than 30 days following the end of each fiscal year quarter. A template will be provided for the following reports:

- *Quarterly Progress Report* (Attachment D): Includes progress toward goals and objectives, program achievements and challenges, collaboration with justice system and other local partners, and changes to key staff or procedures. Also includes measurable outcomes as identified by the court in the program proposal (see **Program Evaluation and Data Collection**, Section 5.3).

[4] The Judicial Council may use the funds designated as administrative funds in Provision 20 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2016 to conduct program training.

- *Quarterly Request to Revise Budget Detail Worksheet* (Attachment E): If a grant recipient (1) has moved funds from one or more budget line item in the Budget Detail Worksheet to another during the past quarter, (2) desires to move funds from one or more budget line item to another in the future, or (3) desires to move funds from one annual period to another, it must submit this document to the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will then decide whether to accept or reject each request.

Fiscal Tracking: Award recipients agree to track, account for, and report on all expenditures related to the Program separately from all other expenditures. Program funds may be used in conjunction with other funding as necessary to complete projects; however, tracking and reporting of expenditures specific to the grant funds must be separate.

Final Report: Award recipients must submit a final report due to the Judicial Council 60 days after completion. This report should itemize how grant funds were spent; describe what was accomplished, including the receipt of any products or services delivered by consultants; and offer advice to other courts that might seek to replicate the project. The IBA will provide additional information and details on the required elements of the final report.

Supporting Documentation: Award recipients agree to maintain supporting documentation (e.g., timesheets, invoices, contracts, etc.) used to compile reports, and to provide copies of this supporting documentation to the Judicial Council or its designee, as requested.

5.3 Program Evaluation and Data Collection

Grant recipients agree to adhere to quarterly data collection and reporting requirements as outlined by the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will provide data collection tools, reporting templates, and instructions for submitting data. Judicial Council staff will provide data collection technical assistance and will work with funded projects to ensure that data can be collected and reported to the Judicial Council.

6.0 TIMELINE FOR REQUEST FOR APPLICATION

6.1 Summary of Key Events

All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the Judicial Council. Dates and deadlines within the RFA may be modified by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee with the one exception that the grant application may not be due sooner than October 31, 2016.

EVENT	DATE
Draft Request for Applications Provided to Judicial Council for Review and Approval	August 25–26, 2016
Release Request for Applications	September 1, 2016
Deadline for Questions for Applicant Teleconferences	September 15, 2016
Applicant Teleconferences	September 20, 2016
Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply	September 26, 2016
Grant Application Due	October 31, 2016
Judicial Branch Budget Committee Review	November 2016─ March 2017
Presentation to Judicial Council	~~April~~ **March** 2017
Notice of Intent to Award	~~April 28~~**March 30**, 2017
Negotiation and Execution of Intra-Branch Agreement	~~April 28~~**March 30**, 2017─ June 1, 2017
Intra-Branch Agreement Start Date	June 1, 2017
Intra-Branch Agreement End Date	June 30, 2020

6.2 Grant Applicant Teleconferences

Judicial Council staff will host applicant teleconferences for courts interested in applying for this grant. The purpose of the applicant teleconferences is to provide an opportunity for courts to ask specific questions regarding the grant application, grant program requirements, and terms and conditions for funding.

The applicant teleconferences are scheduled for September 20, 2016. Interested applicants should RSVP by e-mail to InnovationsGrants@jud.ca.gov for a teleconference.

To ensure a fair process, applicants (including interested justice system partners and co-applicants) should submit their questions in advance by e-mail to InnovationsGrants@jud.ca.gov. Questions must be received by 5:00 p.m. on September 15, 2016. Requests for clarification or guidance should indicate the RFA page number and section, and state the question clearly. Judicial Council staff will consolidate or paraphrase questions for efficiency and clarity. Questions and answers will be posted to *www.courts.ca.gov/InnovationsGrants.htm* within one week following the conference call and may be updated, as needed.

7.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

Proposals should provide information that satisfies the requirements outlined in this RFA. Expensive bindings, color displays, etc., are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the RFA's instructions and requirements, and completeness and clarity of content.

The applicant must submit one (1) original of the proposal in a sealed envelope. For Superior Courts of California, the application cover page (Attachment A) must be signed by the presiding judge or court executive officer. For California Appellate Courts, the application cover page must be signed by the Chief Justice, administrative presiding justice, or clerk/administrator. The original proposal must be submitted to the Judicial Council of California Special Projects Office. The applicant must write the RFA title on the outside of the sealed envelope.

The applicant must submit an electronic version of the entire proposal by e-mail to InnovationsGrants@jud.ca.gov.

Proposals must be delivered by October 31, 2016, no later than 5:00 p.m., to:

Judicial Council of California
Special Projects Office
Attn: Laura Brown, Administrative Coordinator
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95833-4329

Late proposals will not be accepted.

8.0 PROPOSAL CONTENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

The following information must be included in the proposal and must cover a grant period not to exceed June 30, 2020. A proposal lacking any of the following information may be deemed non-responsive.

The proposal package consists of four parts:

(1) Application Cover Page/Court Contact Information (Attachment A)

Provide lead court name, address, and telephone number in addition to the name, title, and e-mail address of the individual who will act as the court Project Manager for purposes of this RFA.

(2) Project Abstract

Maximum 1 page, 12 point, Times New Roman, double-spaced.
Clearly state the grant category (i.e., collaborative courts, self-help, family and juvenile courts, and other) for which the court is applying, the total dollar amount requested, and a brief description of the proposed use of funds.

(3) Project Narrative

Maximum 15 pages, 12 point, Times New Roman, double-spaced.
The project narrative should address the requirements of this RFA and include the components described in Sections 8.1.1–8.2.4 below.

(4) Cost Proposal (Attachments B and C)

The cost proposal is not included in the project narrative's 15-page limit.
The cost proposal should provide high-level and detailed budget information regarding the proposed program.

Any proposal that does not include all four components will be considered incomplete and will be excluded from consideration.

Proposals will be evaluated on a 300-point scale

Proposals will be evaluated based on the attributes and scoring criteria listed in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 below. If an item listed below is not applicable to the program, briefly explain why it does not apply. For all of the areas that follow please be concise and specific.

8.1 Project Attributes—200 points

8.1.1 Program Need (50 points)

What current need will be met or problem solved by providing funding for this project? Specifically, address the following:

- The current need or problem to be addressed by the proposal, including contributing factors and data when possible.
- Previous or current efforts to address the identified problem in this or other courts, including effectiveness and limitations of these efforts.

8.1.2 Benefits (50 points)

What benefits will be derived through the implementation of this project?

- Identify the benefits of the project to both the courts and the general population it serves.

A combined total of 100 points are available for items 8.1.3–8.1.8

Applicants should address those areas below that are applicable to the grant proposal.

8.1.3 Accessibility

How will this proposal promote accessibility (i.e. greater access to court resources and a more user friendly court system) for the public?

8.1.4 Innovation

What makes this proposal innovative?

- Is this proposal a new idea? If a similar program is already being used by other courts, what makes your program innovative?

- If used by other courts, identify the courts and any differences to this proposal.

8.1.5 Modernization

How will this proposal provide modernization to the court?

- Include information on the focus of modernization and how the proposal will move from the current condition to a more modern state.

8.1.6 Efficiency

How will this proposal result in efficiencies in savings of time, materials, and resources while ensuring that access to justice is not diminished?

- Describe the efficiencies that are being envisioned (e.g. reduction in wait times, time savings for staff, etc.).
- If fiscal savings are expected through efficiencies (directly or indirectly), specifically identify how these savings will be redeployed to improve access in this or another area of the court.

8.1.7 Replicability

How can this proposal be replicated in other courts?

- Identify if replication is available in all courts or recommended only in similar or like-size courts.
- Describe any issues which would prohibit other courts from implementation of this proposal.
- Discuss whether replication by other courts would require start-up costs, or if awarding of funds for this proposal would lend itself to direct implementation without cost to other courts in the future.
- Discuss mechanisms for future replication and discuss any willingness to offer other courts technical assistance.

8.1.8 Sustainability

How will you ensure that the project funded by this program will continue after expenditure of the grant award?

- Describe information on ongoing cost expectations and where funding would come from post-grant funding.

8.2 Project Management—100 points

8.2.1 Project and Implementation Plan (15 points)

Provide a Project and Implementation Plan that includes:

- A timeline for the proposed project.
- Detailed information on project activities, and major milestones.

8.2.2 Program Management Capability (15 points)

Provide names of all individuals who will be involved in project management, oversight, and decision making processes.

- Describe applicant's experience and capability to conduct the project, experience of other individuals who will be involved, and the history of conducting and managing similar projects of all who will be involved.
- List justice system partners who may be involved in the project but not included as part of the overall management/staffing plan, and their roles, responsibilities, and qualifications.

8.2.3 Program Evaluation (defined success) and Outcomes (20 points)

How will you define success for the proposed project? How will you measure the success of the project if funding is provided?

- Define success in terms of this proposal.
- Identify the goals and measurable objectives that will be implemented with the grant funds.

Outcome Measurements

For applicable program attributes noted below, provide a description of:

- How **innovation** will be measured and what data will be reported.
- How **modernization** will be measured and what data will be reported.
- How **efficiency** will be measured and what data will be reported.
- How **replicability** will be measured and what data will be reported.
- How **sustainability** will be measured and what data will be reported.
- How **accessibility** will be measured and what data will be reported.

Describe your ability to collect data for the project attributes noted above, including any current data collection practices related to the project proposed.

- Identify possible data sources and explain the plan for collaborating with justice system partners to collect and report required data.
- Include anticipated challenges related to collecting data as well as data quality issues.
- Describe methods for assuring data quality and maintaining data confidentiality.

8.2.4 Cost Proposal (50 points)

The proposed budget will be evaluated based on reasonableness and cost-effectiveness in relation to the goals of the project.

Proposed Costs

On the Budget Summary Worksheet (Attachment B), provide high-level budgetary information regarding your proposed project to be paid for with grant funds. Using the Budget Detail Worksheets template (Attachment C), include a detailed line item budget showing the costs of the proposed project to be paid for with grant funding.

Cost estimates must be provided for each of the following:

- June 1, 2017–June 30, 2017 Budget;
- July 1, 2017–June 30, 2018 Budget;
- July 1, 2018–June 30, 2019 Budget; and
- July 1, 2019–June 30, 2020 Budget.

Please remember that all expenses must be paid—not just encumbered—by June 30, 2020.

The Budget Detail Worksheets include the following four main budget categories:

- Personnel Services: List each position by title and name of employee (if known), show the monthly salary rate, the percentage of time (hours spent divided by total hours worked) to be devoted to the project or number of months the employee will be needed for the project. A full benefit breakdown should also be included for the same time base and number of months.
- Operating Expenses: Include travel expenses, equipment, supplies, and other costs. It should consist of actual costs paid by the court.
- Consultants/Contractors: Include a breakdown of type and cost of services to be provided and estimated time on the project.

- Indirect Costs: Identified as those costs that cannot be directly assigned to a particular activity but are necessary to the operation of the organization and the performance of the project. The costs of operating and maintaining facilities, accounting services, and administrative salaries are examples of indirect costs. In order to qualify to be reimbursed for indirect costs, the program must comply with the following:
    - Court staff salaries and benefits funded by this grant must appear in the Personnel Services cost category on the budget sheet;
    - The indirect cost rate of no more than 20% of the court staff salaries and benefits funded by this grant may be reimbursed if the court has a current Judicial Council–approved indirect cost rate on file; and
    - Partner agency and subcontractor indirect costs are not allowed.

    Calculating indirect costs: Add the court employee salary and benefits funded through this grant and multiply that total by the Judicial Council–approved indirect cost rate or 20% (whichever is lower). This is the maximum amount that will be reimbursed to the court.

Proposed budgets must be complete and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allowable, and necessary for project activities).

Budget Justification

Provide a budget narrative and include a full explanation of all budget line items, a brief description of the factors and reasons for the funds requested, how the budget costs will cover the entire grant period, the reasonableness of the budget request, and an explanation of the cost/value effectiveness of the proposed project.

- Include in the discussion the total proposed budget in relation to the need, innovation, sustainability, modernization, and efficiency of the proposal during the grant period, and the potential replicability in the future.
- Applicants should describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and goals of the project.
- The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated costs, and how those costs are relevant to the completion of the proposed project.
- The narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheets.

9.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee will evaluate the proposals on a 300-point scale using the criteria set forth in the tables below. Applicants may be asked to respond to questions from Judicial Branch Budget Committee members and/or Judicial Council staff to clarify elements set forth in their proposals.

Table 1.0—Project Attributes

CRITERION	RFA SECTION	MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS
Program Need	8.1.1	50
Benefits	8.1.2	50
Accessibility	8.1.3	A combined total of 100 points are available for these six criteria
Innovation	8.1.4	
Modernization	8.1.5	
Efficiency	8.1.6	
Replicability	8.1.7	
Sustainability	8.1.8	
		200

Table 2.0—Project Management

CRITERION	RFA SECTION	MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS
Project and Implementation Plan	8.2.1	15
Program Management Capability	8.2.2	15
Program Evaluation and Outcomes	8.2.3	20
Cost Proposal	8.2.4	50
Total Project Management		**100**

Notices of intent to award will be posted to *www.courts.ca.gov/InnovationsGrants.htm* by April 28, 2017.

ATTACHMENT A: APPLICATION COVER PAGE/COURT CONTACT INFORMATION

APPLICATION COVER PAGE
COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM

The purpose of the Court Innovations Grant Program is to promote innovation, modernization, and efficiency for court programs.

A. Name of Applicant Court: _____

B. Name of Court's Project Manager: _____

Address: _____
Phone: _____
E-mail: _____

C. Name of other court(s) participating in applying court's use of funds:

_____

D. Grant category applied for:

☐ Collaborative Courts

☐ Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts

☐ Other Efficiencies Across all Types of Courts

E. Amount of funds applied for: _____

_____ _____
Judicial Officer Signature Date

_____ _____
Court Administrator Signature Date

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Grant applications are due by 5:00 p.m. on October 31, 2016.
✓Application must be signed by: Chief Justice, administrative presiding justice, presiding judge, clerk/administrator, or CEO.
✓Submit an electronic version of the entire proposal to InnovationsGrants@jud.ca.gov.
✓Submit one (1) original of the proposal in a sealed envelope.
✓Write the RFA title on the outside of the sealed envelope.

Proposals must be delivered by October 31, 2016, no later than 5:00 p.m., to:

Judicial Council of California
Special Projects Office
Attn: Laura Brown, Administrative Coordinator
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95833-4329

Court _____ Attachment B

BUDGET SUMMARY: ESTIMATE FOR PROPSED PROJECT PERIOD

Funds available for thirty-seven month period from 6/01/2017 – 6/30/2020

Identify the Full Period for Proposed Program

[ ] - [ ]

BUDGET CATEGORY	**Total**
PERSONNEL SERVICES: *salary and benefits*	
EQUIPMENT	
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS & SUPPLIES	
OFFICE SUPPLIES	
TRAVEL	
TRAINING	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS	
CONTRACTORS & CONSULTANTS	
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	
INDIRECT COST RATE %	
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS FOR PROPOSED PROJECT PERIOD	

Court_____
Contact Name _____
Contact Number _____

COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM
Cost Proposal and Narrative/Justification Program Budget
COVER SHEET

(MM/DD/YYYY) - (MM/DD/YYYY)
(identify full period for proposed program)

Total Budget **(include all totals and indirect cost percentage for all fiscal years)** **$**

SUMMARY OF TOTAL BUDGET FOR ALL FISCAL YEARS

A. PERSONNEL SERVICES	**Total $**
B. OPERATING EXPENSES	**Total $**
C. CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS	**Total $**
D. INDIRECT COST RATE	**Total $**

**Complete the detailed *Budget Detail Worksheet* for each Fiscal Year, or portion thereof. Fill in as many sheets as you need to identify all expenses and all fiscal years.

A. PERSONNEL SERVICES (salary and benefits) **Total $**

SALARY

Name/Position	Computation (Salary per month X number of months needed X percentage FTE)	Cost
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
	Total	**$**

BENEFITS

Name/Position	Medical %	Dental %	Retirement %	Life Insurance %	Social Sec/ Medicare %	Other (please describe) %	Total Benefit Rate %	Cost
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
								$
							Total	$

B. OPERATING EXPENSES — Total $

EQUIPMENT (computers, office equipment)

Item	Computation/Explanation	Cost
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
	Total	$

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES

Item	Purpose	Computation/Explanation	Cost
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
		Total	$

OFFICE SUPPLIES

Item	Computation/Explanation	Cost
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
	Total	$

TRAVEL - (Include location, number of travelers, hotel, meals, transportation, etc. Include costs for travel to Judicial Council as per RFA Section TBD)

Purpose of Travel	Item	Computation/Explanation	Cost
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
		Total	**$**

TRAINING - (Include training description, and duration)

Name/course #	Type of Training (description)	Location	Duration	Cost
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
				$
			Total	**$**

OTHER – (any other expenses directly related to the project not listed already)

Description	Computation/Explanation	Cost
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
		$
	Total	**$**

C. CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS **Total $**

Consultant/Contractors	Services Provided	Cost Breakdown of Service	Cost
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$
		Total	**$**

D. INDIRECT COST RATE **Total $**

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION/NARRATIVE

Include a full explanation of all budget line items, a brief description of the factors and reasons for the funds requested, how the budget costs will cover the entire grant period, the reasonableness of the budget request, and an explanation of the cost/value effectiveness of the proposed program.

- Include in the discussion the total proposed budget in relation to the need, innovation, sustainability, modernization, and efficiency of the proposal during the grant period, and the potential replicability in the future.
- Applicants should describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives, and goals of the project.
- The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated costs, and how those costs are relevant to the completion of the proposed project.
- The narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheets.

1. Personnel Services (Salary and Benefits) - (The space below is limited to 750 words. Multiple pages may be used.)

2. Operating Expenses (The space below is limited to 800 words. Multiple pages may be used.)

- EQUIPMENT (computers, office equipment)
- INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES
- OFFICE SUPPLIES
- TRAVEL
- TRAINING
- OTHER – (any other expenses directly related to the project not listed already)

3. CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTOR (The space below is limited to 1,000 words. Multiple pages may be used.)

COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM
QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Please complete this *Quarterly Progress Report* regarding the status of your program funded by the Court Innovations Grant Program. You may want to refer to your *Project and Implementation Plan*, *Intra-Branch Agreement* (IBA), and *Budget Detail Worksheet* when completing this report to see what activities are expected within specific timeframes. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact your grant manager at the Judicial Council.

IBA No.: ►		Date Report Prepared: ►	/ / (MM/DD/YYYY)
Relevant Fiscal Year Quarter: ►	☐ 1st (FY 2017-18) ☐ 2nd (FY 2017-18) ☐ 3rd (FY 2017-18) ☐ 4th (FY2017-18) ☐ 1st (FY 2018-19) ☐ 2nd (FY 2018-19) ☐ 3rd (FY 2018-19) ☐ 4th (FY 2018-19) ☐ 1st (FY 2019-20) ☐ 2nd (FY 2019-20) ☐ 3rd (FY 2019-20) ☐ 4th (FY 2019-20)		
Contact Information for Person Completing this Form: ▼			
Name: ►			
E-mail Address: ►			
Telephone Number: ►			
Please provide the following information: ▼			
1. Program activities occurring during the relevant quarter and how they progressed your program's goals and objectives: ▼			

2. Any significant changes, challenges, or problems that developed, and how they were or will be addressed (e.g., any changes to staff working on the program, changes to procedures, and changes to the *Project and Implementation Plan*)**: ▼**
3. Measurable outcomes to date, as identified in your program proposal and/or IBA, and any potential savings to date: ▼

4. The status of any relevant collaborations with the justice system and other local or state partners: ▼
5. Program activities scheduled for the next quarter, and how they will progress your program's goals and objectives: ▼
6. Any potential departures from the *Project and Implementation Plan*, IBA, and *Budget Detail Worksheet* occurring in the next quarter: ▼
7. Any additional information that your IBA requires you to provide: ▼

ATTACHMENT E: QUARTERLY REQUEST TO REVISE BUDGET DETAIL WORKSHEET

COURT INNOVATIONS GRANT PROGRAM
QUARTERLY REQUEST TO REVISE BUDGET DETAIL WORKSHEET

This *Quarterly Request to Revise Budget Detail Worksheet* should be completed on a quarterly basis if one of the following occurs regarding Court Innovations Grant Program funds: (1) your court desires to move funds from one fiscal year to another fiscal year; (2) in the last quarter, your court used funds from one or more budget categories for other category purposes; or (3) your court desires to move funds from one or more budget categories to other budget categories for future expenditure purposes. Please provide the requested information for the budget categories affected by your revisions on the following worksheets. If no change is being requested, you do not need to complete this form.

Request to Move Funds from One Fiscal Year to Another Fiscal Year
(Only Complete Worksheet for Budget Categories Affected)

Budget Category	Funds Being Moved	Fiscal Year (Pre-Revision)	Fiscal Year (Post-Revision)	Reason for Revision
SALARIES				
BENEFITS				
EQUIPMENT				
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS				
OFFICE SUPPLIES				
TRAVEL				
TRAINING				
CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS				
INDIRECT COSTS				
OTHER COSTS:				

Request to Move Funds from One Budget Category to Another Budget Category
(Only Complete Worksheet for Budget Categories Affected)

Budget Category	Total Budgeted (Pre-Revision)	Total Budgeted (Post-Revision)	Relevant Fiscal Year	Reason for Revision
SALARIES				
BENEFITS				
EQUIPMENT				
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS				
OFFICE SUPPLIES				
TRAVEL				
TRAINING				
CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS				
INDIRECT COSTS				
OTHER COSTS:				

The Judicial Council will decide whether to accept or reject this *Request to Revise Budget Detail Worksheet.* As stated in the *Request for Applications*, the Judicial Council anticipates that projects may encounter unexpected challenges or opportunities that require a change in plans, including changes in timing or resource allocation. The Judicial Council therefore created this form to allow courts to update their budgets. After it receives this form, the Judicial Council will notify your court whether it accepts the requested revisions. If it does not, the Judicial Council will work with your court to help provide flexibility while also ensuring that funds are properly allocated and spent. Should you have any questions regarding budget revisions, please do not hesitate to contact your grant manager at the Judicial Council.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

Regarding:	ADDENDUM #2
RFA Title:	Court Innovations Grant Program
Due Date and Time:	October 31, 2016, 5:00 PM

Addendum #2
RFA Title: Court Innovations Grant Program

This Addendum 2 hereby modifies the RFA as follow:

1. Deletions in the RFA are shown in strikeout font (~~strikeout font~~); insertions are shown in bold underlined font (**bold underlined font**).

2. Section 6.1 on Page 8 of the Summary of Key Events in the RFA, Line 9, column 2 shall read: ~~April 28~~ **March 30**, 2017

3. Section 6.1 on Page 8 of the Summary of Key Events in the RFA, Line 10, column 2 shall read: ~~April 28~~ **March 30**, 2017— June 1, 2017

[END OF ADDENDUM 2]