



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 November 16–17, 2017

Title

Judicial Council Report to the Legislature:
State Trial Court Improvement and
Modernization Fund Expenditures for 2016–17

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

November 17, 2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

October 31, 2017

Recommended by

Judicial Council staff
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director
Budget Services

Contact

Donna Newman, 916-263-7498
donna.newman@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Judicial Council staff recommend approval of the *Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for 2016–17* for transmittal to the Legislature. Government Code section 77209(i) requires the Judicial Council to report annually to the Legislature on the use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and include any appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation

Judicial Council staff recommend that the Judicial Council, effective November 17, 2017:

1. Approve the attached report; and
2. Direct Judicial Council staff to submit the report to the Legislature.

The text of the report is included as Attachment A.

Previous Council Action

Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats 2012, ch. 41), creating the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as the successor fund of the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Previous reports on the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund have been required and submitted under Government Code section 77209 since fiscal year 2002–03. These reports are posted on the California Courts website on the Legislative Reports web page, at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

Rationale for Recommendation

Government Code section 77209(i) requires that the Judicial Council annually report to the Legislature regarding use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. Transmitting this report to the Legislature fulfills that requirement.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Because this report is mandated by law, no alternatives were considered and it did not circulate for comment. There are no policy implications related to submitting this report to the Legislature.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Submission of this mandated report to the Legislature requires no implementation or costs by and has no operational impacts on the trial courts.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for 2016–17*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-
SAKAUYE
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER
*Chair, Executive and Planning
Committee*

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
*Chair, Judicial Branch Budget
Committee
Chair, Litigation Management
Committee*

HON. KENNETH K. SO
*Chair, Policy Coordination and
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
*Chair, Rules and Projects
Committee*

HON. MARGARET SLOUGH
Chair, Technology Committee

*Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. James M. Humes
Ms. Audra Ibarra
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Gretchen Nelson*

ADVISORY MEMBERS
*Mr. Jake Chatters
Ms. Kimberly Flener
Hon. Scott M. Gordon
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas
Hon. Shama Hakim Mesiwala
Hon. Stuart M. Rice
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann*

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
*Administrative Director,
Judicial Council*

October 31, 2017

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol, Room 3021
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Daniel Alvarez
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 400
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Expenditures for 2016–17*, as required under Government Code Section
77209(i)

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine, Mr. Alvarez, and Mr. Wilson:

Attached is the Judicial Council report on expenditures from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, required under Government Code section 77209(i).

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an important component of the Judicial Branch budget. It supports statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs. Additionally, it funds innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects.

In 2016–17, \$70.795 million was expended or encumbered from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various programs and projects. Those programs and initiatives highlight many of the

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Mr. Daniel Alvarez
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
October 31, 2017
Page 2

judicial branch's efforts to ensure that all Californians are treated in a fair and just manner and have equal access to the courts.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Budget Services Director, at 916-263-1397 or Zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

MH/ZT/dn
Attachment

cc: Jessica Devencenzi, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León

Alf Brandt, Senior Counsel, Office of Speaker Anthony Rendon
Anita Lee, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office
Rebecca Kirk, Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Shaun Naidu, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Mike Petersen, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Jazmin Hicks, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Pedro Reyes, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Paul Dress, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk
Peter Allen, Director, Public Affairs, Judicial Council
Cory T. Jaspersen, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine

Mr. Daniel Alvarez

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson

October 31, 2017

Page 3

Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council

Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council

Angela Guzman, Budget Manager, Budget Services, Judicial Council

Laura Speed, Supervising Attorney, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

Yvette Casillas-Sarcos, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-
SAKAUYE
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER
*Chair, Executive and Planning
Committee*

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
*Chair, Judicial Branch Budget
Committee
Chair, Litigation Management
Committee*

HON. KENNETH K. SO
*Chair, Policy Coordination and
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
*Chair, Rules and Projects
Committee*

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Technology Committee
Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Brian John Back
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie
Hon. Daniel J. Buckley
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Hon. James M. Humes
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Ms. Audra Ibarra
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons
Ms. Donna D. Melby
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole
Hon. Dean T. Stout

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Mr. Jake Chatters
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Ms. Kimberly Flener
Hon. Scott M. Gordon
Hon. David E. Gunn

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
*Administrative Director,
Judicial Council*

Report title: *Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization
Fund Expenditures for 2016–17*

Statutory citation: Assembly Bill 1700 (Stats. 2001, ch. 824, § 35) as
amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41)

Code section: Government Code, § 77209(i)

Date of report: October 25, 2017

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in
accordance with Government Code section 77209(i).

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements
of Government Code section 9795.

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an
important component of the judicial branch budget. It supports statewide
services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and
infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs.
Additionally, it funds innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and
other special projects.

In 2016–17, \$70.795 million was expended or encumbered from the State
Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various programs
and projects. Those programs and initiatives highlight many of the
judicial branch’s efforts to ensure that all Californians are treated in a fair
and just manner and have equal access to the courts.

The full report can be accessed here: www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-7966.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye

*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Martin Hoshino

*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

John Wordlaw

Chief Administrative Officer

BUDGET SERVICES

Zlatko Theodorovic

Director

Angela Guzman

Manager

Donna Newman

Primary Author of Report



Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for 2016–17

NOVEMBER 2017



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION
BUDGET SERVICES

Recommendations Regarding the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

Government Code section 77209(i) requires the Judicial Council to make “appropriate recommendations” to the Legislature concerning the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) in the annual report. The Council has no recommendations this fiscal year.

Resources, Expenditures, and Fund Balance Overview

In 2016–17, the IMF was supported by a variety of funding sources, including the 50/50 excess fees, fines, and forfeitures split revenue under Government Code section 77205(a), the 2 percent automation fund under Government Code section 68090.8(b), interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund, royalties from publication of jury instructions under Government Code section 77209(h), and a transfer from the state General Fund. Including prior-year adjustments and transfers to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the total available resources were \$80.095 million (see Attachment 1).

As of June 30, 2017, from allocations approved by the council for 2016–17, \$70.795 million was expended and/or encumbered for various programs and projects such as trial court security grants, self-help centers, education programs for judicial officers and trial court personnel, litigation management programs, complex civil litigation programs, enhanced collections, information technology, and Phoenix Financial System, all of which were managed by Judicial Council staff (see Attachment 2). Of the \$70.795 million expended and/or encumbered, \$65.452 million was related to local assistance (distributions to trial courts or payments to vendors in support of trial courts), and \$5.343 million was related to administrative support provided by staff.

Given the resources that were available for the fiscal year and the resulting expenditures and encumbrances, the fund ended the year with a positive balance of \$9.301 million (see Attachment 3).

Use of IMF Resources for Trial Courts During 2016–17

The council approved allocations of funding from IMF resources for various programs and projects that seek to improve trial court administration; increase access to justice and the provision of justice throughout the state; and improve court management, efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. A description of how each project and program used its allocation of funding is included below.

Audit Services

Audit Services spent and encumbered a total of \$142,104 for the salary, benefits, and support costs for one auditor position during 2016–17. Audit Services performs recurring audits of the state’s 58 trial courts to assess their compliance with the Judicial Council’s policies and procedures. These audits include reviewing various aspects of court operations, including evaluating the effectiveness of cash controls, reviewing court procurement activity, and assessing court compliance with the Judicial Council’s significant grant programs.

Branch Accounting and Procurement

Judicial Council Court-Ordered Debt Task Force

A total of \$6,464 was expended and/or encumbered to cover the travel and meal expenses associated with the activities of the Judicial Council’s Court-Ordered Debt Task Force members, as well as the costs associated with the biannual statewide revenue distribution training conducted in partnership with the State Controller’s Office. The task force was established under Penal Code section 1463.02, and its composition requires the inclusion of state, county, and city representatives. The objectives of the task force are to evaluate the effectiveness of the criminal and traffic-related court-ordered fines and fees structure and attempt to simplify the administration of this system for the benefit of citizens and criminal justice partners.

Phoenix System—Financial and Human Resource Systems

A total of \$4,074,426 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the Phoenix System. Exactly \$1,655,744 was in the Branch Accounting and Procurement budget for the main consultant contract, including a staff person to maintain statewide contracts for the trial courts. There was \$2,418,682 in the Information Technology (IT) budget for Phoenix-related tech center costs, and Phoenix-specific IT consultant costs.

The Phoenix System was established in response to a Judicial Council directive for statewide fiscal accountability and human resources support as part of the council’s strategic plan. The program’s purpose is to provide daily, centralized administrative support to the trial courts, including accounting and financial services, trust accounting services, purchasing services, a centralized treasury system, human capital management services, and core business analysis, training, and support. Program staff design, test, deploy, maintain, and manage the Phoenix System, which enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations.

The judicial branch benefits from an integrated, staff-administered program promoting statewide consistency in court administrative practices. The financial component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in all 58 courts and allows for uniform processing, accounting, and reporting. The human capital management component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in 12 courts to date, with another in progress, providing human resources management and payroll services.

Budget Services

Statewide Support Operations

A total of \$721,344 was expended and/or encumbered to support meetings of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and associated subcommittees that deal with trial court funding policies and issues. The allocation was also used to support budget-related meetings and conference calls regarding judicial branch budget advocacy, as well as to support budget training for trial court staff, including annual training on various fiscal-related schedules.

Treasury Services—Cash Management

A total of \$216,064 was expended and/or encumbered for the Treasury Services—Cash Management program. The allocation was used for the compensation, operating expenses, and equipment costs for two accounting staff. Staff are engaged in the accounting and distribution of all uniform civil fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts. Responsibilities include receiving cash deposits and monthly collection reporting of UCF for all 58 trial courts, entering UCF reporting into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions due state and local agency recipients, and completing the appropriate financial accounting. Staff performed other cash management and treasury duties as needed for the trial courts.

Trial Court Performance Measures Study

A total of \$27,911 was expended and/or encumbered for travel costs for members of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee to convene for an in-person meeting to review potential updates to the Resource Assessment Study model and to reimburse travel costs of court staff who convened for statewide focus group sessions to review proposed updates to the Resource Assessment Study model case weights.

Trial Court Procurement

A total of \$43,784 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for one position that provided procurement and contract-related services at a statewide level. This efficient use of resources resulted in improved access and lower costs for courts that used this service.

Education Programs

Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers

New Judge Education

The allocation for judicial education was \$693,000, of which \$515,574 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging, business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other program-related rentals, and participant materials production

for the New Judge Orientation (NJO) program, B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California, and Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses.

All newly elected and appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers are required by rule 10.462(c)(1) of the California Rules of Court to complete new judge education offered by the Judicial Council's Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) by attending the New Judge Orientation program within six months of taking the oath of office, an orientation course in their primary assignment within one year of taking the oath of office, and the B. E. Witkin Judicial College within two years of taking the oath of office. By rule of court, CJER is the sole provider for these audiences. These three programs, which constitute the new judge education required under rule 10.462(c)(1), have been determined by the CJER Governing Committee to be essential for new judges and subordinate judicial officers and are specifically designed for that audience. The content of each program has been developed by the various curriculum committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee.

- ***New Judge Orientation program.*** A total of \$73,893 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for seven iterations of the weeklong NJO program that is designed to assist new judges and subordinate judicial officers in making the transition from attorney advocates to judicial officers and includes the subject areas of judicial ethics, fairness, and trial management. Program participants focus on ethics, including demeanor (demeanor issues are the number one cause of discipline of judges by the Commission on Judicial Performance); fairness; and courtroom control in this highly interactive program. They also learn about the judicial branch and the Judicial Council. The concept at NJO is to give new judges the opportunity, as they begin their new positions, to focus on the core of what it means to be a judge and to come away with a commitment to maintaining high standards in their work. The specific number of courses required during a year depends on the number of judicial officers appointed, elected, or hired (in the case of subordinate judicial officers) in each year. A standard course includes four highly experienced faculty members and serves 12 participants. In 2016, seven classes were held with 84 judicial officers completing the program. Over the past 25 years, there have been as many as twelve and as few as two courses offered during a fiscal year.
- ***B. E. Witkin Judicial College.*** A total of \$215,226 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the two-week judicial college that provides new judges and subordinate judicial officers with a broader educational experience than the orientation courses while still emphasizing their current position as new bench officers. Extensive courses in evidence and other basic civil and criminal courses are offered, as well as a multitude of relevant elective courses on topics including mental health and the courts, self-represented litigants, and domestic violence. The college class is divided into seminar groups that meet frequently during the two weeks to provide participants an opportunity to discuss the courses and answer questions that arise during the program. The college design is premised on the belief that working professionals learn best from each other. The small-group design of the college, as well as the presence of trained seminar leaders, is a means

to encourage this type of learning. It also allows participants to raise sensitive issues that they might be reluctant to raise at their local courts. The statewide program provides an early opportunity for new judges to see a variety of approaches within different courts. The number of judicial college participants varies based on the number of judicial appointments. In 2016–17, 88 attended. In the past, participation has ranged from approximately 55 to 140 judges and subordinate judicial officers.

- ***Primary Assignment Orientation courses.*** A total of \$226,455 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the PAO courses that provide new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion into their primary assignment (e.g., civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, or traffic), with a heavy emphasis on, detailed procedures and protocols, and classroom exercises designed to test skills in the assignment. The courses are typically offered at one of three venues throughout the year, and some of the courses are offered multiple times. Some are also available to experienced judges who are moving into a new assignment and to judges returning to an assignment after an assignment in another department.

All the PAO courses are taught by judicial faculty who have been specifically trained for this education program and who are acknowledged experts in these assignments. Because these programs focus deeply on the major bench assignments, the Assigned Judges Program relies heavily on the PAO courses to provide its judges with the education and training they need to be able to take assignments that many retired judges never had during their active careers. PAO courses are statewide programs, offered throughout the year, that provide judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state the opportunity to network with their colleagues and learn the different ways that various courts do the work of judging. This collaboration encourages the cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair administration of justice statewide. Educating judges to understand the rules and issues of ethics and fairness enhances public confidence in the judiciary and promotes access to justice.

In addition to the PAO courses, CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments that are substantively more complex and nuanced (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, and capital cases). These programs are designed for experienced judges who are required to take a course in their new primary assignment or to fulfill other statutory or case law–based education requirements. CJER also offers courses dealing specifically with domestic violence issues. These courses are funded by a grant and augmented by a small amount of IMF money. The IMF money is used to pay for participant meal costs that the grant cannot. By attending the domestic violence programming, judges and subordinate judicial officers also meet the provisions of California Rules of Court, rule 10.464, which states the education requirements and expectations for judges and subordinate judicial officers on domestic violence issues. The PAO and experienced-judge primary assignment courses can accommodate approximately 600 participants per year.

Together, the three educational offerings provide staggered opportunities for new judges to develop relationships that can last throughout their careers. Many of the NJO exercises require new judges to share deeply and personally. Bringing the newly assigned judges together allows them not only to ask the faculty questions but also to discuss issues with both faculty and colleagues. Uniformity in judicial practice and procedure is promoted by the sharing of ideas and best practices. The benefits to the individual judges, who gain confidence in their practice on the bench, and to the courts, most of which are unable to provide a systematic training program for judges, are great. Moreover, ensuring a well-educated judiciary enhances the administration of justice, increases the public's confidence in the judicial branch, and promotes support for the branch.

Continuing Judicial Education

- ***Leadership Training.*** A total of \$45,475 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for participant lodging, business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials production for the Presiding Judge/Court Executive Officer Management Institute and the Supervising Judges Institute.

These programs offer participants a chance to learn management techniques, strategies, and best practices designed for the unique environment of the courts. The ability to bring court leaders together to focus on the specific and special nature of their responsibilities is essential to the smooth, efficient, and fair operation of the courts. These programs enable judges to fulfill continuing education hours and expectations under rule 10.462(c)(2) of the California Rules of Court.

- ***Statewide Judicial Institutes.*** In 2016–17, the CJER Governing Committee developed an education plan that included the Family Law Institute, Juvenile Law Institute, and Cow County Judges Institute (for judges in small, often rural courts who hear all assignments). A total of \$58,717 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging and group meals for judges and subordinate judicial officers participating in those programs. Additional covered costs included materials production, meeting room rental, and audiovisual equipment rental.

CJER offers institutes in all the major trial court bench assignments (civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate), as well as specific programs for appellate justices, rural court judges, appellate court attorneys, and trial court attorneys. The bench assignment institutes are designed primarily for experienced judicial officers, but judges new to an assignment also benefit from attending. These two-day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and best practices. Participants frequently comment that the learning environment is greatly enhanced because they meet with colleagues from throughout the state and have an opportunity to learn about different strategies for dealing with the many challenges faced by judges in the same assignment or by the specific audiences attending the institute. By attending

these programs, judges and subordinate judicial officers satisfy education hours toward the continuing education expectations and requirements of the California Rules of Court. Attendance numbers at the various institutes range from 50 to 140. In 2016, 54 people participated in the Cow County Judges Institute, 107 in the Juvenile Law Institute, and 90 in the Family Law Institute

Essential content is identified by curriculum committees appointed by the CJER Governing Committee and then more specifically developed by workgroups. This content can include in-depth coverage of common, yet complex, issues that are not covered in sufficient detail at the PAO programs. In addition, many course offerings cover advanced topics as well as recent developments in the law. The primary benefit to the courts—and to the judicial branch as a whole—is that statewide programming for experienced judges encourages uniformity in the administration of justice and provides an opportunity for judicial officers to learn from their more experienced peers. Some sessions may be videotaped by staff and posted online, where they are available to all judicial officers.

- ***Advanced Education for Experienced Judges.*** CJER develops and provides a small number of advanced courses for experienced judges. These continuing education courses were designed to address advanced judging issues and include such courses as Complex Civil Litigation, Civil and Criminal Evidence, Experienced Probate Law, and Experienced Family Law, as well as specialized courses in handling domestic violence and sexual assault cases. A total of \$22,457 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other program-related rentals, and participant materials production. CJER pays for participant meal costs that grant money cannot for participants in the domestic violence courses.

As with the NJO and PAO courses, these are statewide programs providing judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state with the opportunity to work with and learn from their colleagues and exchange techniques and strategies. This approach enhances cohesiveness of the bench and promotes the fair and consistent administration of justice statewide. Courses typically accommodate some 165 participants per year.

- ***Regional and Local Education Courses.*** In addition to its statewide judicial education programs, CJER has developed local and regional programs because they provide a less expensive alternative while preserving the quality of education. The content and courses that lent themselves to both regional and local programming were considered and identified by the CJER Governing Committee's curriculum committees and taught by experienced CJER judicial faculty. A total of \$1,400 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant business meals and materials production.

Essential and Other Education for Court Executives, Managers, and Supervisors

Manager and Supervisor Training

A total of \$16,155 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other program-related rentals, and participant materials production. Although the IMF funds some of the expenses, the courts fund participant lodging for the Core 40 and Institute for Court Management courses.

- **Core 40.** The Core 40 course is an intensive one-week program for new and experienced trial court staff supervisors and managers. It contains valuable and practical information that can be used to improve leadership skills, which results in the overall improvement in staff performance. Classes are limited to 28 participants who are selected from applications received online. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management. Experienced court personnel serve as the faculty.
- **Institute for Court Management (ICM) Courses.** ICM courses lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in many national curriculum areas related to court management. The courses provide relevant education for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Management—and locally, at a cost to courts and participants significantly lower than that of national programs. This program grew out of a multistate consortium formed in 2008 by the California Judicial Council, the ICM, and six other states interested in enhancing the existing ICM certification program and preparing court leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to effectively manage the courts. This effort resulted in the ability of CJER to provide education and certification for court managers and supervisors. In the past, the courts had to pay ICM to bring these courses to their location or send staff to NCSC headquarters in Williamsburg, Virginia, the cost for which was prohibitive for most courts. CJER's ability to offer these courses in California using California faculty has allowed all courts to reap the benefits of this program.

The initial capital investment has yielded extremely positive results in advancing judicial branch education for court leaders. Since June 2009, more than 147 court leaders have achieved either the Certified Court Manager or Certified Court Executive certification from ICM. Approximately 2,233 people have participated in the course in total, and of those participants 688 have taken at least one ICM course toward certification.

Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel

Court Personnel Institutes

A total of \$81,052 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging, business meals, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other such program-related

rentals, and participant materials production for the Court Clerk Training Institute. The biennial Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute was not offered in 2016–17.

- ***Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI)***. This weeklong institute offers courtroom and court legal process clerks education in each substantive area of the court (appeals, civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile), including training in rules of court, changes in the law, customer service, and other aspects of performance that affect court operations behind the scenes. In addition to legal process and procedure, classes stress statewide consistency, ethical performance, and efficient use of public funds. All 58 courts have accessed this education for their staff: smaller courts, which typically do not have training departments, rely more heavily on CJER to provide a statewide perspective on the duties and responsibilities of courtroom and counter staff; the larger courts often provide faculty for this program. CCTI has been an essential education program for courts for more than 25 years and continues to prepare court staff for the essential functions of their jobs, consistent with the law and statewide practices.
- ***Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute***. This multiday, biennial, statewide education program is designed to meet the educational needs of trial court judicial attorneys. It is the only statewide training program offered by the Judicial Council that is designed specifically for this audience. This program typically comprises 12 different courses dealing with the issues currently dominating the trial courts, such as criminal realignment, anti-SLAPP (strategic lawsuit against public participation) litigation, elder abuse, and more, in addition to ongoing training in civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate. Courses dealing with ethics, bias, substance abuse, and related topics are also included. Trial court attorneys from across the state attend this program. This institute provides much needed education, especially for the smaller courts that do not have local education for this critical audience. This two-and-a-half-day program is offered every other year and typically serves nearly 200 trial court attorneys, who, unlike other government-employed attorneys, are not exempt from the minimum continuing legal education requirements of the California State Bar. Hence, this education program provides an essential education opportunity for them.

Regional and Local Court Staff Courses

A total of \$2,417 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meals of trial court participants, meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials for the Regional and Local Court Staff Courses and Core Leadership and Training Skills Course.

- ***Regional and Local Court Staff Courses***. These courses allow CJER to provide high-quality education to trial court personnel at a greatly reduced cost and with significant convenience to the courts. The courses included in both the regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee’s curriculum committees and taught by experienced CJER faculty. Courses cover a wide array of

topics—including human resources, traffic court, and case processing in the major court assignments of civil, criminal, probate, family, and juvenile—as well as broad topics relevant to all court staff, such as identifying and preventing workplace sexual harassment.

- ***Core Leadership and Training Skills Course.*** This course is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this three-day course teaches participants skills that contribute to effective leadership, discusses the challenges to leading colleagues and former peers, identifies strategies to meet those challenges, and identifies approaches to building successful and effective work relationships at all levels of the organization.

Faculty and Curriculum Development

Trial Court Faculty—Statewide Education Programs

A total of \$254,580 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty and honoraria for a small number of paid faculty teaching trial court education courses and programs. The amount needed directly correlates with the amount of statewide, regional, and local trial court programs and products developed and provided. Enabling expert judges, court executives, managers, and staff to impart their knowledge and experience by teaching their peers is the core mechanism by which CJER leverages otherwise local resources for the good of all California courts. All courts benefit from this resource, and all Californians who rely on the courts benefit from an educated judiciary. Faculty members who are asked to serve as volunteers are unlikely to be able to offer their services for statewide benefit if their expenses are not paid by CJER.

Faculty Development

A total of \$24,282 was expended and/or encumbered to cover the costs of lodging, group meals, and travel for trial court participants at “train the trainer” programs, course design workshops, and faculty development programs, some of which are foundational for new faculty and some of which are designed to support specific courses or programs, including the NJO and Judicial College programs. Funds also are used for meeting room rental, audiovisual equipment and other such program-related rentals, and participant materials.

Current CJER faculty development programs include (1) critical course and/or program-specific faculty development (e.g., NJO, the B. E. Witkin Judicial College, and the Institute for Court Management); (2) design workshops for new or updated courses under development, such as regional one-day and orientation/institute courses; (3) advanced faculty development courses that allow faculty to work on more complex faculty skills; and (4) short lunchtime webinars for advanced faculty on discrete faculty-development topics. Because of the Faculty Development Fundamentals course provided in previous years, many new courses have been developed by the participants, and those courses are now offered statewide under the local court training initiative.

Distance Learning

Distance Education—Satellite Broadcast

A total of \$19,030 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for statewide satellite broadcast transmission of educational materials for trial court audiences, new satellite downlink site installation work in trial court facilities, and maintenance and repair work and fees associated with existing trial court satellite downlink sites.

The development of alternative methods for delivery of education was established by the CJER Governing Committee as a strategic goal in the mid-1990s. The intent of the Governing Committee was to meet an increasing need for the education of judges, managers, and staff by establishing cost-effective delivery mechanisms that were an alternative to traditional statewide programs and written publications. Staff was directed to identify or research new technologies to increase education for judges, enable new educational services for court staff and manager audiences, and provide mechanisms for cost-effective delivery of education even during tight budgetary times.

CJER has met the goal of providing distance education to all judicial branch audiences, and much of it was delivered until recently via the educational satellite broadcast network. During 2016–17, the satellite network was discontinued, and the courses previously delivered by satellite are now being delivered online. The satellite network served as the core delivery method for staff and manager/supervisor education, providing a comprehensive and timely statewide mechanism to provide access to high-quality staff education that is, for many courts, the only source of staff education. Many of the broadcasts were also recorded and available online or as DVDs to serve as resources for local training throughout the year. They will now be delivered exclusively online. Training that is required statewide—including sexual harassment prevention training—is now delivered as a webcast.

Distance Education—Online Video, Webinars, and Videoconferences

A total of \$5,224 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the storage, encoding, and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products delivered online; for the captioning of videos and broadcasts, if needed; and for some webinar and podcast education.

A natural evolution of the satellite broadcast initiative has been the development of online instructional videos, videoconferences, webinars, and podcasts. These educational products leverage the distance-learning technologies employed by the Judicial Council over the past 10 years and enable CJER to develop multiple product lines to meet the educational needs of virtually every judicial branch audience it serves. The broadcast video production studio is now used frequently to create instructional videos that are immediately uploaded to CJER's website. Funding was used to enable streaming of audio podcasts and judicial education videos to mobile devices such as iPads in addition to desktop computers, and to ensure video quality at a level that users expect.

Programs for Families and Children

Domestic Violence Forms Translation

A total of \$17,000 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the translation of new and updated domestic violence forms and instructions into Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese, and to make them available on the California Courts Online Self-Help Center and to all courts.

Juvenile Law Practice Resources

A total of \$20,000 was expended and/or encumbered to support the California Dependency Online Guide (CalDOG). The number of juvenile court judicial officers, research attorneys, and court-appointed dependency counsel using CalDOG continues to grow. Average monthly web visits grew significantly in 2016–17, from 3,169 to 5,008, an increase of 58 percent. CalDOG provides subscribers with a bimonthly e-mail summary of new case law, research publications, and notifications of educational events and other programs. Resources on the website include the following:

- A comprehensive case law page with summaries and case text for California dependency and related state and federal cases;
- Distance-learning courses, including for-credit online courses that meet the eight-hour training requirement for new dependency attorneys;
- Educational content, such as the curriculum and materials for continuum of care reform and ethics;
- Handouts from recent Beyond the Bench conferences and other events; and
- Articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, and publications.

Self-Help Centers

A total of \$4,980,194 was distributed to the courts for public self-help center programs and operations. All 58 trial courts receive funding for their self-help centers.

Reducing self-help services has increased courts' other costs. With fewer self-help staff, the number and complexity of questions and issues at the public counter increase substantially, thereby increasing line lengths and wait times. In addition, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and cleanup work in the clerks' offices—and in courtrooms.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is effective and carries measurable short- and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. If the self-help center also aids self-represented

litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent. Demand for self-help services is strong. Courts indicate that they are unable to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need for \$66 million in additional funds to fully support self-help services.

Self-Help Document Assembly Programs

A total of \$58,975 was expended and/or encumbered to develop document assembly software programs that simplify the process of completing Judicial Council forms and other pleadings. Using a “TurboTax” model, litigants enter information only once; the program automatically fills in that information on the rest of the form, saving substantial time and assisting self-represented litigants in preparing understandable and legible pleadings. Self-help centers report that these programs significantly enhance their efficiency and effectiveness. Moreover, clerks and judicial officers save time by having legible and fully completed documents and better prepared litigants.

Statewide Multidisciplinary Education

A total of \$67,000 was expended to support the biannual Family Law Education Programs conference and the Youth Court Summit. The 2017 Family Law Education Programs conference, Real Challenges/Real Life: Empowering Families, brought together more than 500 judicial officers, court administrators, supervised visitation providers, juvenile dependency mediators, family court services managers and supervisors, family court mediators, child custody recommending counselors, investigators, evaluators, dependency counsel, and probate investigators. Conference content included legal updates, emerging issues, and best practices, while meeting continuing education requirements for attendees. The 2017 Youth Court Summit, Community Partnerships: Putting the Pieces Together, brought together nearly 250 youth, judicial officers, attorneys, probation officers, teachers, law enforcement officers, counselors, and community leaders involved in youth courts, providing information on truancy prevention, civics education, implicit bias, bullying, substance abuse, and best practices.

Self Help Videos for Website

A total of \$4,900 was expended to support development of videos for self-help center staff and volunteers on the ethics of providing court-based self-help assistance. These videos will be part of a series of online training programs to provide timely education for new self-help center staff and volunteers and minimize transportation costs.

Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs

A total of \$99,561 was expended and/or encumbered to support statewide services available to court self-help centers in all of California’s 58 trial courts. Every year, over 64 million users view the judicial branch’s California Courts Online Self-Help Center. The website has more than 4,000 pages of content in English and Spanish, as well as hundreds of links to other free legal resources. It provides local courts with information that they can use to research, translate, and post local court information on their own. At a time when many courts have suffered staff

reductions, the site enables California’s courts to provide information and avoid duplicative work by making a wide range of resources available at a single location.

The allocation supported updates to instructional materials and forms used by self-help centers and the public, as well as translations for the self-help website, updates to outdated content on videos, editing to make them more web-friendly, and capacity to make locally developed content available statewide.

This allocation also supported professional educational content for self-help center staff on legal updates and best practices in self-help services. It contributed to the maintenance of an extensive bank of shared resources for self-help and legal services programs, such as sample instructions, translations, and other materials.

Human Resources Services

Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums

A total of \$34,072 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for conference room and lodging costs associated with the labor relations academies and forums. Funds were primarily used to pay for lodging for trial court employees who attended the event as either participants or faculty.

Trial court participation figures follow:

	Number of Participants	Number of Courts Represented
<i>Labor Relations Forum</i>		
Northern California	88	30
Southern California	31	8
<i>Labor Relations Academy I</i>		
Northern California	19	12
Southern California	14	8
<i>Labor Relations Academy II</i>		
Northern California	75	36
Southern California	19	9

The academies and forums are offered to court professionals who support or directly participate in labor relations and negotiations. Academy I is a two-day program and includes a basic introduction to labor relations. It provides participants with the experience of engaging with others in a bargaining role-playing exercise. Academy II is a two-day program in which participants discuss current topics and trends, strategies for resolving complex labor issues, and best-practice recommendations from subject-matter experts in labor relations. The one-day

forum serves as an interactive platform for problem solving, information sharing, education, and group discussion of issues.

Information Technology Services

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

A total of \$586,724 was expended and/or encumbered to fund a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders—including images of those orders—to the 43 counties currently participating, plus limited access to 13 tribal courts and 20 judicial officers and their clerks in the Superior Court of Orange County. The allocation covered the hosting costs of the CCPOR application at the California Courts Technology Center, a complete CCPOR hardware refresh and software stack upgrade, application maintenance and enhancements, mandatory legislative changes, and daily operational support to the courts and their local law enforcement agency partners who are users of the system.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)

A total of \$7,637,259 was expended and/or encumbered to provide (1) ongoing technology center hosting for participating courts, (2) shared services to the trial courts, and (3) a full disaster-recovery program. Applications hosted at the CCTC include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, the Integration Services Backbone, and local court desktop/remote server support. The CCTC continued to host the Phoenix Financial System (serving all 58 courts) and the Phoenix Human Resources/Payroll System (serving 12 courts). Additionally, two case management systems operate out of the CCTC: The Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) system and the civil, small claims, mental health, and probate system (V3). Some courts leverage the third-party contracts to receive full IT services for their courts, including desktop support, help desk services, file server management, and e-mail.

A total of \$736,500 was expended and/or encumbered for the Placer Court Hosting Center project. This funding was used to procure equipment and services to transition the hosting of a case management system and “managed court” services from the California Court Technology Center for seven superior courts (Lake, Modoc, Placer, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, and Trinity) to the Placer Court.

A total of \$399,111 was expended and/or encumbered for the Humboldt SJE Hosting Transition project. The funding was used to procure equipment and services to create a locally hosted environment for Humboldt’s case management system, moving away from being hosted at the California Courts Technology Center.

Case Management Systems—Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health (V3)

A total of \$17,233,475 was expended and/or encumbered for CMS V3. Of that figure, \$4,833,475 directly funds V3 product releases, including court enhancement requests, judicial branch requirements, and biannual legislative changes; infrastructure support and hosting services for all environments, including development, testing, training, staging, and production; and daily court user support.

The civil, small claims, probate, and mental health interim case management system processes 25 percent of all civil cases statewide. V3 functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queue, payment, and financial processing. Each V3 court configures its instance to support its staff, operations, and case management. This model allows for a single deployment and common version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate installations.

E-filing has been successfully deployed at the Orange County and San Diego County courts, saving time and resources. The Superior Court of Sacramento County has deployed e-filing for its Employment Development Department cases. Sacramento County and Ventura County courts integrate V3 with public kiosks. E-filing and public kiosks are recognized as providing public and justice partners with increased ease of use and efficiencies.

The budget change proposal for Civil CMS (V3) replacement has encumbered \$12,400,000 to fund V3 courts to replace V3. The decision of the Judicial Council in April 2015 was to eliminate funding V3 from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund by July 2019. The Judicial Council and the V3 courts requested and received funding over three years to replace V3 at each court. Funds are allocated to the courts via intrabranched agreements based on disbursement milestones for software vendor contracts, consulting, equipment, and temporary project staff.

Data Integration

A total of \$2,571,931 was expended and/or encumbered to continue work with trial courts to provide system interfaces between Judicial Council systems and the computer systems of our justice partners, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and the Department of Justice. Without the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB), the current systems for sharing protective orders, for example, would not function.

During the last three months of 2016–17, approximately 3,700 protective orders went through the CCPOR. These requests flow between the courts, the Judicial Council of California, and the California Department of Justice. During that same period, more than 17,000 dispositions were reported to the California Department of Justice from the Superior Court of San Joaquin County alone. Statistics are similar for V3's use of the ISB for document management system indexing, credit card transactions, and the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). JBSIS

uses the ISB to gather monthly aggregate statistics for use in the annual *Court Statistics Report* and the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), which, among other things, determines the need for judges.

Interim Case Management Systems

A total of \$650,429 was expended and/or encumbered to provide program management support to 10 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition case management system. Nine of the 10 SJE courts are hosted and supported from the CCTC. The allocation was used to provide maintenance and operations support, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management. One locally hosted SJE court uses Interim Case Management Systems program resources for legislative updates and SJE support as needed. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Department of Justice, and JBSIS, as well as custom interfaces with the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collections program, interactive voice/interactive web response processing, issuance of warrants, court-ordered debt collections, and failure-to-appear/failure-to-pay collections.

Jury Management Systems

A total of \$454,703 was expended and/or encumbered in jury grants to courts to provide some level of funding to 18 of 23 requested jury projects submitted by nine different trial courts.

Statewide Planning and Development Support

In 2016–17, the branch wide license agreement with Oracle was renegotiated to reduce ongoing maintenance expenses by approximately \$3.12 million over five years. These estimated savings consider the \$2.24 million used this year to purchase new Oracle software as part of the revised agreement. A total of \$4,038,869 was expended and/or encumbered to provide the trial courts cost-free access to a variety of Oracle products (e.g., Oracle Database Enterprise Edition, Oracle Real Application Clusters, Oracle Advanced Security, Oracle Diagnostic Pack, Oracle WebLogic Server). Because Oracle discounts are based on volume, the branch wide license agreement can deliver significant savings over individual court purchases.

This program also provides enterprise architecture support, which develops standards, provides consultation, and performs research on emerging technologies for the judicial branch. These services result in improved quality of service and reduced risk through standard processes and tools.

Each Judicial Council software application is reviewed by a member of the enterprise architecture team for architectural compliance to ensure that the tools and design in use are compliant with existing standards.

Additionally, this program funds the Innotas Project Portfolio Management tool, which helps the Judicial Council's Information Technology office manage its project portfolio. Program portfolio management is an IT best practice.

Telecommunications Support

A total of \$17,558,785 was expended and/or encumbered to provide a program for the trial courts to develop, maintain, and support a standardized level of local and wide area network infrastructure. This infrastructure provides a foundation for the deployment and operation of both local court and enterprise IT services and applications, including those based at the California Courts Technology Center. The program allows the judicial branch to leverage economies of scale, obtain operational efficiencies, and maintain adherence to established system and design standards. Items that were funded include the replacement of network components that have reached the end of their service life; the provision of a comprehensive set of network security services consisting of a managed firewall, intrusion detection, and prevention; vulnerability scanning; web browser security services; the provision of maintenance and support coverage, which provides courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure; and network technology training for court IT staff.

Uniform Civil Fees System

A total of \$349,030 was expended and/or encumbered to provide ongoing application support and maintenance and application software upgrades of the Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS). This program supports the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 superior courts, with an average of \$47 million distributed per month. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. More than 215 fee types are collected by each court and distributed to 28 different entities (e.g., Trial Court Trust Fund, the counties, Equal Access Fund, Law Library, etc.), requiring 65,665 corresponding distribution rules that are maintained by UCFS.

In addition, \$144,303 was expended and/or encumbered for the operating expenses of Testing Tools. The allocation was used to support the use of ETMS (Hewlett-Packard's Performance Center and other tools) for applications, including maintenance for the civil, small claims, mental health, and probate case management system (V3) and the CCPOR. The ETMS records and tracks progress for software enhancement requests and defects that arise when software is not working the way the user or the development was intended. The ETMS is used to improve the quality management of the applications. These tools ensure that mission-critical applications are delivered with a consistent high quality, maximizing function and minimizing defects.

Legal Services

Judicial Performance Defense Insurance

A total of \$1,008,821 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the portion of the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) defense master insurance policy that covers claims by superior court judges and subordinate judicial officers. The CJP Defense Insurance program was approved by the Judicial Council as a comprehensive loss-prevention program in 1999. The program (1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints; (2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of

their judicial duties; and (3) lowers the risk of conduct that could lead to complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.

Jury System Improvement Projects

A total of \$12,697 was expended and/or encumbered to (1) support the meeting expenses of the Judicial Council's Civil Jury Instructions Advisory Committee and Criminal Jury Instructions Advisory Committee, and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official civil and criminal jury instruction publications, *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions* (CACI) and *Judicial Council of California Criminal Jury Instructions* (CALCRIM). The advisory committees prepare new and revised instructions at least twice a year and propose their adoption to the Judicial Council. On approval, the instructions are then copyrighted and licensed to commercial publishers. The publishers pay royalties to the Judicial Council based on sales of the instructions, and the Judicial Council's jury system improvement projects are supported by the royalty revenue from the publication of CACI and CALCRIM.

Litigation Management Program

A total of \$4,425,985 was expended and/or encumbered to pay the costs of defense—including fees for counsel and related costs—and to pay settlements of government claims and lawsuits brought against covered entities and individuals. Government Code section 811.9 requires the Judicial Council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state's trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and court employees.

Regional Office Assistance Group

A total of \$669,938 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for four attorneys (which fell to two over the course of the fiscal year) and one administrative specialist working in Burbank (until that office's closure) and then Sacramento to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial courts and to serve as liaisons, consultants, clearinghouses, advocates, and direct legal services providers to the trial courts in the areas of transactions, legal opinions, and labor and employment.

Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program

A total of \$650,682 was expended and/or encumbered to pay attorney fees and related expenses to outside counsel representing trial courts primarily in labor arbitrations and proceedings before the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB). The Judicial Council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program in July 2001 as a means by which the Legal Services office could provide legal assistance to the trial courts on transactional matters through outside counsel selected and managed by the office. The Judicial Council later expanded the scope of the program to include outside counsel fees and expenses to provide legal assistance to the trial courts in other nonlitigation areas, such as labor arbitrations and PERB proceedings.

Special Services for Court Operations

Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)

A total of \$105,134 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the recruitment of new interpreters as well as to help support the interpreter testing program and ethics training for newly enrolled certified and registered interpreters. These funds were also expended for activities and resources required for the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP).

Certification/Registration of Court Interpreters

- ***Third-party exam administrator services.*** Although court interpreter testing candidates pay market-rate exam fees, and those fees are one financial source used to pay the costs of operating the testing program, there are additional costs. Prometric, Inc., the third-party exam administrator for the court interpreter testing program, provides the following services: administering court interpreter certification and registration exams (approximately 2,000 written and oral exams per year); selecting and training exam raters; selecting, training, and managing exam proctors; capturing and reporting demographic data about exam takers; staffing and maintaining a centralized call and e-mail response center; designing new test instruments; developing, maintaining, and updating existing exam instruments; and maintaining a web presence with all relevant information regarding the administration of exams.
- ***National Center for State Courts annual language access fee.*** This fee is used for access to NCSC court interpreter test instruments that are shared by other member states, providing consistency in testing standards nationwide. Other benefits include access to certification test raters and development and upgrades of test instruments.
- ***Name badges.*** Costs to produce court interpreter badges are covered for approximately 100 to 125 newly certified or registered interpreters per year.

Outreach and Education

- ***Outreach and recruitment of potential future certified and registered court interpreters.*** Funds expended include registration and sponsorship fees for events and conferences offered by the California Healthcare Interpreting Association, and the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators. These events are widely publicized, and each event attracts hundreds of attendees.
- ***Training of potential future certified court interpreters.*** The funds support training of American Sign Language interpreters in legal interpreting topics, to build their skills and interest in the profession.
- ***Ethics workshops for newly enrolled certified and registered court interpreters.*** The ethics workshops are required for all newly enrolled interpreters to satisfy their

continuing education requirements and are held in San Francisco and Burbank. Each workshop is attended by 35 to 40 interpreters. Although interpreters pay a fee to participate, some additional costs are not covered by those fees, and these funds cover those remaining costs.

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel

- ***Costs associated with CIAP's annual in-person meeting.*** The meeting provided an opportunity for members to address and comprehensively review specific projects, goals, and objectives outlined in the committee's 2017 Annual Agenda including key recommendations from the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts referred to CIAP.

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

FY 2016-17

Resources

Description	Amount
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 6,956,091
Prior Year Adjustments	3,528,435
Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	10,484,526
Revenues and Transfers	
<i>Revenues</i>	
50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Split	14,579,683
2% Automation Fund	11,373,099
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	415,663
Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	607,672
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	7,833
<i>Transfers</i>	
Transfer from State General Fund	56,618,000
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (Gov. Code, § 77209 (j))	(13,397,000)
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (2015 Budget Act)	(594,000)
Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers	69,610,950
Total Resources	\$ 80,095,476

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
2016-17 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project**

Description	Total
<i>Audit Services</i>	\$ 142,104
Audit Services ¹	142,104
<i>Branch Accounting and Procurement</i>	\$ 1,662,208
Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6,464
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services ^{2,3}	1,655,744
<i>Budget Services</i>	\$ 1,009,103
Statewide Support Operations	721,344
Treasury Services - Cash Management ¹	216,064
Trial Court Performance Measures Study	27,911
Trial Court Procurement ¹	43,784
<i>Education Programs</i>	\$ 1,046,362
Orientation for New Trial Court Judges ⁵	73,893
B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA ⁵	215,226
Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews ⁵	226,455
Leadership Training	45,475
Judicial Institutes	58,717
Advance Education for Experienced Judges	22,457
Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	1,400
Manager and Supervisor Training	16,155
Court Personnel Institutes	81,052
Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	2,417
Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	254,580
Faculty Development	24,282
Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	19,030
Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars and Videoconferences	5,224
<i>Families and Children Programs</i>	\$ 5,247,630
Domestic Violence Forms Translation	17,000
Juvenile Law Practice Resources	20,000
Self-Help Centers	4,980,194
Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	58,975
CFCC Education Programs	67,000
Self Help Videos for Website	4,900
Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	99,561

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
2016-17 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project (cont'd)

Description	Amount
<i>Human Resources Services</i>	\$ 34,072
Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	34,072
<i>Information Technology Services</i>	\$ 54,779,801
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) - ROM ²	586,724
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) ²	7,637,259
Placer Court Hosting Center	736,500
Humboldt SJF Hosting Transition	399,111
Case Management Systems, V3, Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health ²	17,233,475
Data Integration ^{2,4}	2,200,600
TSG-CJN Shared Infrastructure ^{3,4}	100,766
ISB Support ⁴	320,948
Interim Case Management	650,429
Jury Management Systems	454,703
Statewide Planning and Development Support	4,038,869
Telecommunications Support/Telecom BCP	17,558,785
Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) ¹	349,030
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Mangement Suite	144,303
Phoenix Project ³	508,807
ERP - Court Acctng and Reptng System (CARS) ³	1,859,493
<i>Legal Services</i>	\$ 6,768,123
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	1,008,821
Jury System Improvement Projects	12,697
Litigation Management Program	4,425,985
Regional Office Assistance Group ¹	669,938
Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	650,682
<i>Special Services for Court Operations</i>	\$ 105,134
Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education)	105,134
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	\$ 70,794,538

¹ All expenditure is for administrative support services provided by Judicial Council staff.

² Expenditures include the costs for local assistance and administrative support services provided by Judicial Council staff.

³ Expenditures of \$2,418,682 for the Phoenix System are from Information Technology. One half (\$50,383) of TSG-CJF Shared Infrastructure expenditures are included in the Phoenix Program, plus ERP-Court Acctng and Reporting System (\$1,859,493) and Phoenix Project (\$508,807).

⁴ Expenditures of \$2,571,931 are discussed in the Data Integration section of the report. One half (\$50,383) of TSG-CJF Shared Infrastructure expenditures are included in Phoenix Program and the other half in Data Integration.

⁵ Expenditures of \$515,574 are discussed in the New Judge Education section of the report. New Judge Orientation (\$73,893), B. E. Witkin Judicial College (\$215,226), and Primary Assignment Orientation (\$226,455).

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

FY 2016-17

Fund Condition Summary

Description	Amount
Total Resources	\$ 80,095,476
Program/Project Area	
Audit Services	142,104
Branch Accounting and Procurement	1,662,208
Budget Services	1,009,103
Education Programs	1,046,362
Families and Children Programs	5,247,630
Human Resources Services	34,072
Information Technology Services	54,779,801
Legal Services	6,768,123
Special Services for Court Operations	105,134
Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata	\$ 70,794,538
Fund Balance	\$ 9,300,938