

The Judicial Council of California is the constitutionally created policymaking body of the California courts. The council meets at least six times a year for business meetings that are open to the public and audiocast live via the California Courts website. What follows is a formatted and unedited transcript of the last meeting. The official record of each meeting, the meeting minutes, are usually approved by the council at the next business meeting. Much more information about this meeting, the work of the Judicial Council, and the role of the state court system is available on the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov.

>> Please stand by for real-time captions.

>> Judicial Council of California Thursday July 18, public meeting now in session. As you know this is the first day of a two day meeting and we plan to adjourn this afternoon at approximately 5 PM and begin again public business starting tomorrow 9:30 AM to address the remainder of our agenda items. I believe as I heard the phone or if not yet soon councilmember Andrea while enrollment is joining us by phone, are you there, Andrea? I expect her to be soon so if you hear her, that will be her and but before we hear from our first presentation and begin our regular business meeting agenda, I would like to take a moment to address two important points and the first is the California state budget 2019-20 and I would like to address it because it was a great project frankly on top of the second great budget and it is important that we be aware that we are often mostly talking about budgets when they have negative effects but it is been suggested to me that the California state budget is part of a three act play so in January we have the proposal, in May we have the revision, and in June we have the enacted. And to become more effective in this three act play, we in the branch instituted a collaborative, inclusive and transparent democratic process to allocate both reductions, which thankfully we have not seen in a while and enhancement to the branches portion of the state budget. In the last six fiscal years \$1.3 billion in new General Fund has been added to the judicial branch budget mainly in rightly so for the trial courts to increase access to justice for the people who use our courts. Council and our advisory committees work together, diligently, deliberately and decisively to create and define and refine our funding methodologies to help inform these principles of the budget. And as you may know all of this is predicated on our Trial Court Funding Act. So, in January 2014, we moved away from the year-to-year budget asking we created a three-year blueprint on judicial branch funding. We emphasized four core elements in our blueprint for funding. So, the first and foremost as always has to be is implementing equal justice or equal access to justice using the 3D formula, physical, remote and equal access. Closing the trial court funding gap. Providing critically needed judgeships and modernizing court technologies and together think we have made great progress on these four core elements and many others but every blueprint needs an architect with a good eye for detail and in October 2014 yes, I had to ask him five years ago Martin Hoshino our principal architect of our budget blueprint made the budgetary challenges for the judicial branch priority number 1 and if you see we have seen a shift for all of our discussion of items in our alignment of our agenda items around our budget and our bit values Martin has worked the budget every year and he served as counsel and not just during our three act play, June, January to June cycle but you're around as you know and I know we were supposed to be in a meeting earlier this week and he was already talking budget in the capital. He spoke with old friends in the capital and he made

you once and he provided facts to support our figures and he responded to questions and he dealt with objections any crafted solutions for us. Our budget needs and asks has strong justifications and the facts and figures to back them up now. We now play a greater role in the development and identification of our budget needs particularly in the first act of our play in January, the proposal. He has taken us into an era of data-driven advocacy and decision-making and demands that for all of our ask so world matter what the budgets are brought up always acknowledge the teamwork in the dedication and perseverance of judicial officers and court executive officers and staff and Judicial Council staff and attorneys, the justices and partners who tenaciously every year advocate for adequate funding for justice. And in doing so again this year I think you are both here in this courtroom and in courthouses that may be listening and in offices throughout the state, thank you for all of your efforts. It may seem effortless and seamless, but these budgets are the result of hard work, lots of conversations and building trust and we do this because it is on behalf of the people who use our courts and seek justice and I want to thank you, Martin, for your tireless work on the 2019-20 state budget. I now want to address my second point before we hear from our panel. That is the cycle of service to the Judicial Council of California. September 15 is a date that resonates with all of us because that is when all of us at some point or another started on the Judicial Council including me beginning in 2008. It is a date when the appointments of new or returning council members to their terms become effective. And as new council members terms become effective it also means on the other flipside of the coin that some council members service concludes. So, I want to publicly acknowledge the service of five outgoing members of council in addition to other private acknowledgments and expressions of gratitude. Not all folks are present here today and I will start with Judge Paul Bacigalupo, outgoing president of the California Judges Association, from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Ms. Kimberly Flener, executive officer, Superior Court of Butte County. Judge Scott Gordon from the Superior Court of Los Angeles, who is not only leaving us but retiring from the bench after 42 years of public service, congratulations and thank you for your service to the people of Los Angeles, California, court and council. Ms. Audra Ibarra, who became Judge Ibarra during her tenure as a State Bar member representative on council and I had the pleasure of participating in her investiture ceremony and Justice Miller, Court of Appeal for the Fourth Appellate District of Riverside and Presiding Judge Gary Nadler, Superior Court of Sonoma County. And Judge Ken So, Superior Court of San Diego County. All of these folks were willing to take on what amounts to a full second job. And to improve statewide judicial administration and ultimately to be responsible for equal access to justice for all Californians. And it is the interactions between the justices, judges, commissioners, court executives, and attorneys from diverse backgrounds that helps enrich our deliberations that we have in this boardroom statewide and informs our discussions and refined policies that we are duty-bound, oath bound to oversee. Council members will later have an opportunity to personally acknowledge our departing members tonight and also provide them with the ever present copies of the Federalist Papers to read in your spare time which remind us all I think of the importance of a constitutional democracy and the importance of every word of the oath that we swear to support independent both constitutions. So just as we have members leaving we also have members joining or rejoining as part of our cycle. We will be joined by 10 newly appointed members in September who are taking up a voting position or

being reappointed, replacing an outgoing council member or filling in advisory position. And then we are here today for orientation and we thank you, the Judicial Council members and staff that facilitated that briefing, we welcome to the Judicial Council with no work yet. But soon for reappointed members our good work continues, presiding taught about the present court of Tehama County, touched the Linacre alliance Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Justice Carin Fujisaki, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, San Francisco, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Tehama County, Presiding Judge Joyce Henrik, incoming chair of the Judicial Council Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and from the Superior Court of Humboldt County. Mr. Maxwell, district attorney and State Bar appointee. Judge David Rubin, Superior Court of San Diego County. Judge Tanimoto Shuman, retired, incoming president of the California Judges Association and formerly from the Superior Court of Orange County. Justice Marcia Slough, Court of Appeal Fourth Appellate District Riverside, and Assistant Presiding Judge Erik Taylor, Superior Court of Los Angeles County. I thank you all for your service now and in the future, and thank you to all who submitted nominations who volunteered for these positions.

>> But before I can conclude I must single out two reporting councilmembers who are basically charter members of my first Judicial Council as Chief Justice and Chair in January 2011, and I note you remember 2011, I do. The state was deep in the chokehold of what seemed to be a never ending recession. Leadership in 2011 was not for the fainthearted. But Justice Miller and Judge Ken So not knowing each other or if so not very well, certainly not knowing me, for that matter, stepped up and stepped forward ready to do whatever it took to stabilize the branch and to calm people's nerves and to bring people together and to craft a more democratic solution to a lot of our issues facing the branch that continue the solutions to exist today. They were here from the beginning of my tenure and they have contributed so much to the administration of justice and fairness in California. Doug and Ken. As I indicated when they initially joined council, because they were on council before I was, at least Ken and I join together in 2008 but that had been on council before, but they joined the council as a representative of the Judicial Council Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee from their home courts, Riverside for the and San Diego for Ken. Went on to serve council as justice and judge and then currently as chairs of two of our critical internal committees, Doug on Executive and Planning and Ken on Policy Coordination and Liaison. They have been strong advocates for equal access to justice and thankfully they've been with me through the bad times that we would say to each other, things are really bad, but I am glad I am with you throughout this. And they have pulled a laboring or or two or many and they're here thankfully to witness the good times too, and they've invested numerous hours in strategy and inclusion of other voices and representing other voices, visiting courts, visiting judges, allaying fears, controlling, convincing, being mentors and role models an unwavering commitment to access to justice and I am truly grateful for your service and I want you to know that you are on notice that it goes without saying that forever in my heart always in a text and I note you are staying on as advisory members, but I have to say I could not have done this job without you both.

At this point it is public record, I open it up to anyone who has anything to say before we move on to our important discussion.

>> Don't say anything, David.

>> [Applause]

>> I am saving it.

>> [Indiscernible - low volume]

>> Okay, given that we will now turn our attention to the discussion agenda item it is an action item 19-081 and I would invite Judge Lorna A. Alksne, chair of Judicial Council's Workload Assessment Advisory Committee to introduce her panel. Ms. Greenway and Ms. Rose-Goodwin.

>> I will say something about Judge Tran, come back to San Diego and get some work done.

>> I needed him up here for a while . Some I know you did but we are happy to have him back I am the chair of the judicial, the WAAC committee and today thank you Chief and members of the council for hearing our presentation. What is up for consideration today is the 2018 judicial workload study specifically the caseweights which are used as part of the formula to assess judicial need in the California trial courts. And if you know or do not know the last time we did this was in 2011 and 2011 had National Center for State Courts doing it and this was the first time that we did internally with Judicial Council staff. And some the study was coordinated by our staff and we had a very diverse number of courts and participated. 19 courts and over 900 different judicial officers that participated and essentially marked time about what they were doing during the day. The key component of our study is this time study, it was done over a four-week period of time last October and what was remarkable was that we had 90% participation, so courts just did not say yes, we will participate. They actually participated. So I want to thank the participating courts and statistics is not really something I can explain very well so I will turn it over to them but I want to thank the participant courts for their time and if you could imagine back and asking your trial courts can you participate for four weeks and judge as you will have to keep time like you did when you were lawyers, it is not an easy sell and purchase bidding courts really stepped up and participated and we needed their participation. We appreciate the courts willingness to give their time. I also want to thank Leah and Kristin, they've worked timeless hours, educating us on this committee and it is not easy. I have been on the committee for long time and sometimes when you talk about statistics and data panel, clusters, we will do it this way, and the median and the average and the mean, all the judges had start to get a little bit confused. They have done a yeoman's job to keep us moving and explain it to us. And I also want to thank the members of our committee that have shown up and have been educated on statistics. I will turn it over now to Kristin.

>> Thank you, judge and thank you Chief, members of the council. So, I am here to provide a high-level overview of the study and then highlight some of the key components of the study. The judicial workload study seeks to measure the amount of time California judicial officer spent on case related activities and then use that information to assess judicial need in the trial courts. The workload study in general relies on three basic components, the first component is filings and that is our main driver. We use a three-year average of filings in these workload studies. By using a three-year average, we are able to soften any big swings in the data from

year-to-year. The second component is case weights. These provide the estimate of judicial time to process a case from filing to post-disposition. The caseweights are basically what result from the time study and I will talk about the case weights in a little more detail in a moment. And then the third component is the work year value, the judge work year value. This quantifies the amount of time a judicial officer has available for case related work in a year and that value is expressed in minutes. So those are the three main components that go into the workload studies and together these components allow us to estimate that judicial need in the trial courts. As I mentioned the case weight is one of those key components. What is a case weight ? A case weight is the amount of time in minutes needed to process a case from filing through disposition and then including post-disposition work. The case weights allow us to look at workload beyond total filings. So, for example, courts might have the same number of total filings, but one court might have more felony filings than infractions or more unlimited civil compared to small claims. The case weights allow us to estimate resource need in the courts based on a court's case. So, a lot of times the studies are called weighted caseload study so all we're doing is weighting the different workloads to assess what workload that is harder, longer than others.

>> And then overall the workload study captures and reflects current practice and how resources are allocated in the California trial courts. When determining when best to do these studies, we take special consideration to ensure that the study data is kind of typical workload, which is there ever typical workload but really what we are trying to do is avoid vacation holiday time so as we mentioned we did the study in the fall of 2018, which we thought was fairly representative of typical workload.

>> All right. But I will say that as with any study the 2018 time frame did include a number of new initiatives and reforms since the last study in 2011. Specifically, in the area of criminal justice. Discredit your workload for the courts and that workload will be reflected in the case weights that are produced so I think this also provides a really good example as to why we do update the studies periodically. We expect case weights to change. We expect them to reflect current workload. But by updating the study periodically we capture those changes. We can also adjust workload trends change and adjust over time or correct over time. And that I would just say in closing when conducting the workload studies, we always strive to improve and refine the methodology, and tailor the studies to California. As was mentioned previously the 2018 update included 19 courts and over 900 judicial officers and that is quite remarkable. We are really proud of that in this present the largest participation we have had in conducting the judicial workload study. Additionally, we included more smaller courts that we had in previous workload studies. This was done to ensure that the workload study represents all courts in California. But also, to explore the possibility of performing additional analysis by grouping courts in clusters and looking at it in different ways. So that is all I have kind of for the overview and if there are any questions we will take those now.

>> Thank you.

>> Yes, Ken

>> The committee really needs to be commended for a monumental task and going California centric, because before this, we really relied a lot on what was going on throughout the country as opposed to just relying on what happens in California. And as I understand it, and I will address this to Leah or Kristin, these results were expected in the fall, is that fair?

>> Yes.

>> Initially?

>> Yes.

>> So, you're here a little early so from a technical point of view, would you benefit from a little more time and refining any analysis that you might have?

>> Talking with Leah and Kristin the thing that we did not focus on maybe was looking at the way we clustered the large courts in the small court and so if we would've had more time we could've analyzed that.

>> So, Mr. Schiano or anyone, does anybody know if there is any harm in deferring this to the next meeting in September, to allow you to refine this on a little bit away?

>> If I understand where you are going, judge, so the notion is to buy a little more time. My instincts are that we would not have a problem. There are two components in the first one being funding related to that. That sits on a separate line in the council will deal with that friendly and I don't think that is an issue. The other thing to note is when the negotiation happen for those position and those resources. Full years amount of funding was not provided so it is really only 10 months of funding and that actually pushes and sings the timeline up a little better. And actually, the funders, the other two branches of government were asking questions about the study and when it will be updated because they were aware of that and they were expecting and thinking that the information would be available in terms of where judges would go as a result of this study and they were expecting that that would be in the fall of 2019 so again the work is here a little bit early. Maybe that added to some of the pressure to hurry and get to the council today. But at the end of the day I think the expectations, bottom line here, and the people that worked with us and the other two branches on this, that there is not going to be an issue. The second part of it is, is the pace at which the government might want to make appointments and so where the judges goes is derivative of the actual result of the study. That could be a problem or an issue but that is something that we have already had conversations with the judicial appointing secretary as a start to ramp up on it and I think if we committed to just continuing to work it through with them that there is not going to be an issue. Now I will say on the flipside of that if you start going beyond September in the next meeting I think will go into November, then schedules probably become a problem an expectation start to separate between in terms of the timeline and hope that is helpful.

>> Yes, it is.

>> Justice Hill?

>> First, I like to commend you for all of your work and really it was a terrific job. I chaired what was the first iteration of your committee back in 1988 and was called the Court Profiles

Committee, it took us about two years and it we met often, and it was really, really tough work and our branch has been at this for about 21 years refining it. As we go along it takes time, it takes effort and what you have done I think has been extremely well documented, well done, and it sounds like a little bit of time might be helpful. And so, I would just move that we defer it if it is agreeable with you, deferred to September to allow you that opportunity to get some additional information and we will see you in September if motion passes.

>> I would make that motion.

>> Judge Nadler, second.

>> As council is aware, even though there is a motion with the first and second, it is still for game for discussion. Not seeing any hands raised, all in favor of moving this action item or deferring it for further information, to September of this year, please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any abstentions or no. Then the motion carries and we will defer this, and before we do I do want to thank Judge Oxley and also Ms. Greenaway and Ms. Rose-Goodwin for your work and for helping us understand it in the it is one thing to put it together which I have no concept of and I just respected and I know how hard you work at it but also to make it as understandable as it is for us, I greatly respect and appreciate that and thank you very much and we will see you again.

>> Thank you.

>> Our next action item is 19-109, Trial Court Budget Workload Formula Allocations, and we welcome Judge Jonathan Conklin, chair of the Judicial Council Trial Budget Advisory Committee and again Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Budget Services.

>> Thank you all in the report as set forth for you and includes the two recommendations I come to you essentially via the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, so this has been through numerous levels of discussion and review. This is sort of parrots off prior discussion and talks about the funding methodology for the courts and how that funding is analogy is related to workload. So essentially what happens is you take your funding allocations, and you want to make sure they are aligned with the workload and the money that comes into the court is that aligned with work that the court does with that money and that is what this recommendation simply hopes to efficiently and effectively further. That is the allocation of funding. To cut right to it because I know time is at issue and I want to give Leah a chance to make any comments as well, there is an aspect of transparency here related to civil assessments. Handles civil assessments at times are accounted for in the workload measure and we want to make sure that it is transparent and therefore apparent as to how those civil assessments relate to funding. And so, to summarize the committee recommends that the revenue sources, that represent the workload measure and the resource assessment study, and which is the foundation of the workload model should be part of the workload formula. We want to make sure that the civil assessments, the net of civil assessments collected by the court which candidly are a funding source for the court, are reflected exactly in the funding methodology way so again we are just trying to be transparent the two recommendations are set

forth in I would just read them, so everybody is aware that is to adjust each courts workload allocation, to include the net of civil assessments. The civil assessments come in, net of the MOEs, maintenance of effort that offset those civil assessments. Based upon the prior fiscal year and then in a more technical aspect, includes specific general ledger accounts that the committee recommends including as part of the workload formula effective with the fiscal year 2019-20 and I will turn it to Leah to make any more sense of this.

>> I have nothing more to add. You covered all the points. We will take any questions if there are any.

>> I will come and all I did was take the work that Leah did and tell you what she did.

>> [Laughter]

>> Good job.

>> Any questions we can answer?

>> Judge hot?

>> When you say net civil assessments I was talking with another council member and I was just curious about this, does that net include or does that net out the cost of collecting the civil assessments? Or is that just net of what gets paid or kept or whatever for the county maintenance effort?

>> I believe it is done both, yes, both.

>> Thank you.

>> So, the answer is yes.

>> Thank you .

>> Not seeing any hands raised are there further discussions or observations to entertain a motion on the two recommendations on this item?

>> I will move adoption of the recommendations.

>> Second.

>> Nikki Mr. Kelly and thank you the judges, thank you. All in favor of accepting and passing these two recommendations, please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any no? Any abstentions? The recommendations pass, and I want to thank you Judge Conklin and thank you Ms. Rose-Goodwin because the transparency is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Chief, Leah, thank you so much.

>> Our next agenda item, not an action item. This is our Court Innovations Grant Program in action. The Superior Court of Butte County remote videoconferencing technology, the project presentation, and we welcome Judge David Rubin, chair of JBBC, Ms. Kimberly Flener, court

executive officer, Superior Court of Butte County. Ms. Wendy Trafton, SHARP program and grant manager, Superior Court of Butte County, and Ms. Maria Hernandez Zaragoza, lead legal assistant, Superior Court of Butte County. Thank you and we look forward to your presentation. Judge Rubin?

>> Thank you Chief and thank you members of the council for allowing me to address you and present to you another one of our innovation grant achievements. It is appropriate that we use Butte County project as this is first of all our last meeting of this particular formulation of the council and sadly it is Ms. Flener's last meeting, so this is her court and particularly pleased to be able to present this project to you. For those of the people listening and for those of you who might be in the audience who are incoming new members, the innovations grant program is actually a product of the 2016 Budget Act and created a \$25 million innovation grant fund, which is divided into three parts. And we have been able to and out almost \$25 million in the first year we have seen this projects come to fruition amateur and as amateurs we are trying to present to the council just a sampling of what is out there. And there actually 49 active projects and you cannot see all of them. We tried to pick some of the best ones. The innovations grant program is about innovations, modernization, improvements, collecting existing technology and redeploying it in a novel way, and we're going to see a project that started out as kind of a Butte centric and has been extended to many courts in helping to create and then you way to create an of community across a very large, very diverse branch. So rather than take away their thunder and split the presentation, let me turn it over now to our presenters, I know one of them. Ms. Flener, court executive officer, Superior Court of Butte County, and Wendy Trafton, the Sharp program and grant manager [Indiscernible - low volume] hear more about SHARP and Ms. Maria Hernandez Zaragoza, lead legal assistant, and is always Singleton will be handling the sick -- part and thank you.

>> Thank you, Judge Rubin, appreciate having an opportunity to present while still in the council. I been asking them for about a year so thank you for indulging me.

>> Everyone is a critic.

>> [Laughter]

>> So, our first slide started with an idea that idea originally came about in the early 2000s with our original SHARP self-help model program, which was a tri-county collaborative program with Butte, Glenn and Tehama courts. Ultimately, we expanded that to the four courts including Lake County, and with that we provide services remotely to those outlying counties sharing resources, trying to assist, be a like I said technology, remote workshops where those courts and those self-help centers can all connect via videoconferencing, which has evolved over time. Through that, process, Melanie Snider who is here, former facilitator managing attorney, now she works for the Judicial Council, CFCC, had a vision to expand and when the innovations grant opportunity came about she jumped on it and said hey, this would be a great opportunity for us to expand this model amongst additional courts. When you were several in need and I did want to mention back in the day when we had the Kleps awards our SHARP program did receive one of those Kleps awards in 2007, I believe. So, model, we knew it could work with

additional funding and resources, we were able to expand that. And I will turn it over to the two that are now primarily involved in that. Wendy?

>> We named the project SHARP Tech Connect, but what I really want you to think about what this project is, community, as has been stated. We are building this community and partners throughout our courts and innovation is abundant within our courts. What is lacking or maybe not liking or where are the opportunity for growth, is how do we better connect together? How do we work together knowing that innovation is there for us to connect? These are our original 13 partners. They came on board when they applied for the grant originally, so I spent a lot of time in my car traveling to and abundant or lots of relationships throughout all of these courts just to kind of see what they're doing and one of the things of building those relationships is that I was not going to go and say this is what we do in Butte and this is what you should do. Which is set down beside together with our collaborative teams on site to come up with something that was going to work for their court with their local needs in mind. That is how we started that process.

>> We are really excited and want to thank Judge Rubin and the judicial branch committee because we are able to secure additional funding to reach out to 10 courts, so in the last three or four months, before we actually's record formal partnerships, I did little more drivetime had meetings with each of those courts and really wanted to see that they were committed to participating, kind of had an understanding of the deliverables and yes, it work we can do this and let us get on board. Happily, to my surprise they all said yes, of the time I left. So, Kim would get a little text, I did another one, yes, we are doing good work out here, so these are our new partners. One of the other things I want to share is that we really wanted to be strategic about this project. We wanted to look at the initiatives that are already helping within the judicial branch, and we listened to your Judicial Council meetings and paid attention and Maria and I would come in and what are they doing, and we need to pay attention to what is going on, because in a sense we can be a voice at the site level for many of the things you're trying to work on as well. The Language Access Plan is important to us and looking at that updated Tactical Plan for Technology and the Futures Commission report. And then the foundational pieces of the Guidelines for Self-Help Centers are kind of our driving documents but also informed the work that we're doing. Also, in our community are partnerships with Judicial Council with Ursula and Sherry, our analyst and Bonnie have seen and Melanie Snider, it is really the communities beyond the courts, it is also with their partner said Judicial Council were helping make this happen.

>> To those documents we actually worked on a self-assessment tool that took the recommendations from those reports, that had anything to do with self-help and we kind of put them in a planning template that let self-help centers look at their programs and kind of get an idea of, hey, these things are happening within language access. Are we doing these things? The recommendations within the report, just hiding of it is not an about Asian piece but where we had and how do we come strategic but the work we are doing?

>> So, this was our charge with a grant and this is what we are the pieces that we said we were going to do and some of them have morphed and change a little bit based on hey, we learned

this and that is not going to work at all, but that is kind of the piece that goes along with innovation. So, there is videoconferencing, that was one of the pieces we were working on, what that looks like for us is workshops that we are doing, often times Maria is teaching in Butte and she has participants from up to 10 other counties with litigants in their self-help centers joining our workshop. So, we are serving this broad network of people live virtually via videoconferencing. Broadband access, I think when you are in a larger city or more urban areas it is hard to fathom that meaning of our communities and the time your area still do not have access to quality broadband. So, there were many courts, essentially six courts that we had to augment their broadband within their self-help centers just to be able to get them online to connect. So, the difference between the courts, I just want to keep charging for, hey, there are still friends that need internet out there. Technology infrastructure, our self-help centers, we were putting in self-help computer lab so if they did not have computer technology at home and they can come home for in and use of computers in excess or programs via remote legal services, so we really have been working with Judicial Council and a lot of help interactive programs which other document assembly programs which is kind of question pays programs where the litigants type in their information and auto-populate the forms for them. That was one of the things we were not sure how big that was going to be, and it ended up being one of our greatest successes of our project thus far, and we're really excited about that. The legal workshops I just mentioned, and ultimately the why, why are we doing this? Better prepared litigants. They are better prepared coming to the filing. They are better prepared going into the courtroom. The entire ecosystem starts to show.

>> So, these other workshops that we have developed. So, this is something we are very excited about and will what this binder contains is workshop modules for 10 different areas that you can see in front of you, we do six of these workshops like each week, so we have staff in our Butte Center that are teaching these and any other courts can participate remotely in each of those workshops.

>> And then when we were designing the workshops, my background is in education, so I'm relatively new to the judicial branch and so the things that I was interested in was the curriculum, we are going to teach and do these workshops where is the stuff so it was not that folks are not doing workshops before but they all had different ways of how they were doing it so we wanted to build a curriculum of starting spot for courts to have so they can use this and adapted at a further local court. Andragogy is a theory of how adults learn so that is something how we were embedding to our workshop so think about them coming into the courthouse and using neuroscience and stress of who is coming in, our audience, the principles of wayfinding and customer service, and then that empathy piece of we are capturing and self-help centers. Folks at the most vulnerable moments of their life and went to have just this huge responsibility to make sure we have care and concern not only about doing a thoughtful job with the materials we are preparing but doing it in a graceful way. Okay, so we have two audiences and the first one is traditional pen and paper audience of those of the litigants I come to the office and they say, I have never used a computer and I am not to start right now. And then basically when we were developing these workshops, we were thinking about how people learn so we were taking into consideration the different learning styles. So, for those people that learn or adult learners,

we explained the forms and we explained what the forms were asking for and why, and those are people who are visual and they actually get to see the form on the screen and the people that are tactile, the actually get to complete the form right then and there.

>> Then we also had to take into consideration that when people come to the courthouse, they do not want to be there. They are there because they have to come there, and they are stressed, and they are frustrated because they do not understand the system and they do not understand the terminology. An example of that is in the forms there is a section that says attorney for, so if we have them in pro per, says printing in pro per, and it is in pro per because I'm not an attorney, so instead of in pro per, we have them write self-represented so they can understand what they are doing. And then we also have Melanie Snider, my former manager and supervising attorney, also thought about the idea of doing videoconferencing workshops. We were doing guardianship, especially the guardianship workshop, and it takes at least three, 3.5 hour workshops and sometimes people were not showing up, so she had a great idea of using videoconferencing. That way we can use one person, use exactly the same amount of time but we were helping a wider number of litigants. For example, if we were having five people at the Butte County office or Chico office but that we had five people in Tehama County and five people in Glenn County and five people in Lake, and then now that we are doing our innovation program, we are also able to serve our innovations partners. Humboldt County and Nevada County are joining our workshops on a weekly basis too. We also have an internal videoconferencing line. And that videoconferencing line allows us to have supervising attorney available at all of our sites. We basically have four sites so with that internally we are able to communicate with each other, staff, and our supervising attorney. So, for example, if I am at the Chico office and someone at the Glenn office does not remember the name or the number of the form to do child-support wage garnishment, they just find it on the computer and then hey, do you remember what the form number is for child wage garnishment quick, so we can help each other that way. The other service that we provide is remote delivery services within our county and for regional partners and now our SHARP tech counties. For example, yesterday I had the opportunity to do an individual appointment with one of our remote county litigants. So, technology and videoconferencing has allowed us to provide those services and make services available for people that will probably not be able to get that service or if they did it would not be the same quality of the service. This is what we see. Videoconferencing also allows us to provide language access. So, like I mentioned earlier, Glenn County is primarily a Hispanic population. So, a lot of people come to our Glenn County or Butte County. So, for instance, if one day a Spanish speaker shows up to our Tehama County office, and we don't have a Spanish-speaking person available there, they stand in front of the computer and anyone from the other offices is able to assist the Spanish speaker right then and there, where scheduling an appointment, if that is what they need.

>> Our second audience is the tech savvy audience. That is, we access the audience by using Life Help Interactive, which is a document assembly program that Wendy was referring to earlier. And that is the program that Judicial Council has been promoting, so we took advantage of that and we started using that and implementing it because we found out that a lot of single parents are not able to get their legal paperwork done because sometimes they don't have

childcare, they cannot arrange for childcare, or they are unable to take time off work because it is just one income. So, the benefit of having the document assembly program is so they can do it from anywhere. They can do it at home, they can do it at work during their lunch break, they get can do it tonight when the kids are sleeping, it is available 24/7 to our SHARP courts website. And basically, it is very, very helpful. We have a specific example where in Lake County office a litigant came to get help with the guardianship. While she was waiting, she found out about the document assembly program. She started answering the questionnaire and then by the time the legal assistant called her, she was done with a questionnaire, so the legal assistant was able to print the forms, review the forms, and send the litigant to file her paperwork that same day rather than having to schedule an appointment for her and having her come back.

>> She was on her smart phone, but she was waiting.

>> Yes.

>> And then I'm going to show you a video of how our workshops look like. It is live, so I am able to interact with the litigants and address their questions right then and there.

>> [Video Played.]

>> The information you need to modify while requesting a custody visitation order. You need a copy of your current custody and visitation order and if you do not have a, you will need to know exactly what is in the current order. You also will request for order packet, which includes all the necessary forms to modify your custody and visitation orders. The forms that we will be completing today is form FL-300, which is a request for order, and form FL-311, which is child custody and visitation application attachment and this form is where you will be telling the court what is that custody and visitation orders that you are asking for. Then first form in your packet should be form FL-300 and because you are representing yourself in lieu of having an attorney you will be printing your name, your address, city and state and sip code and your phone number and the caption of the form and then right next to attorney for, right next to name, I will have you print self-represented, once you are done with that.

>> [Video Ended.]

>> That gives you an idea of the recording of her workup, but what that usually looks like is you see other faces potentially, if you choose to have them up there or not, and it is live time interaction and they can answer in raise your hand and answer questions and it gives you an idea of kind of what it looks like as a participant coming into the project.

>> The other thing that we are quite excited about, so these are three examples of other ways that remote service is happening. So, the first picture on the left is in Imperial County and that is in Winterhaven, and they've actually put one of the monitors up in the front so folks can come in there and then they can use videoconferencing software to tap into the employees that are in El Centro because there is not a designated self-help center at that space of taking come in and get the assistance there and they can do the Live Help Interactive on that. The other two sites, also excited because these computers are at community partners. They are not actually at the courthouses. So, the one in the middle is in Covelo in Mendocino County, and the last one

is one of my favorites, into Koba which is in the middle of Death Valley, four hours away from the courthouse. So, if you will think of remote in California, that is it and it was very warm that day as well.

>> But I think that is when you can see the tangibility of the difference we can make by community partnerships to providing greater access to justice for people that it is eight hours just to get to the courthouse and back.

>> This is just a snapshot of our website that we developed with the project, couple of the pieces that we are really excited on there is a Workshops tab, so you can sign up for our workshops online and get an email, and this is when your workshop is. We are still kind of seeing how many people signed up, and most of them are still over the phone, but every couple of days a new one gets on and we do, yes, a collective cheer in the office that we got another one. The other is on here is Online Resources tab and that is the tab that links to all of the help and interactive programs that we refer to those document assembly programs. We also posted one video that we drafted where Maria gives a little bit of the education component about divorce and this is the divorce process, and these are the pieces of it before they start filling out those papers. And the other thing where they are doing the document assembly programs is we always asked them to come into the self-help center where they are at to have a final review before they submit their paperwork.

>> This is a little harder to see there. So, I might reference my notes. Some of the program highlights of the technology infrastructure as we deployed 80 computers and 12 courts and this is in the first two years in the new courts coming on in that bucket just yet, and we have seven dedicated workshop spaces. For the Law Help Interactive the statistics we've been getting or the users, it has gone up 3067% and domestic violence restraining orders and petitions being bundled and guardianships have gone up 183%. We just got data a couple of days ago that show the last court order, which was much more sick can jump then this even, collectively they are using that, and we are really excited about that. Six courts are regularly participating in those live workshops being for the courts are videoconferencing within their own counties. So, they can take this curriculum now and use that however it works for their county or cross reports. We developed the 10 workshop modules. Three other workshops have been drafted. We have deployed computers across other partner agencies. And then what Maria was talking about with the or which I think is just really important is that those 4 to 5 courts we have connected on a daily basis is that immediate language access for those courts. It is a significant assistance for our program to be able to find somebody that can assist immediately with that. And I think there's a big opportunity for that application elsewhere.

>> The website we talked about most all of these and then six courts have augmented their broadband so those are kind of the highlights of where we are at by the end of next year, it will be fun to say, hey, this is what else we have done.

>> All 22.

>> All 22 courts. So, I think, really in closing you have charged us with this Access 3D, this physical piece. And we are building the self-help centers and these computer labs. We are

thinking about the physical size or space. We are thinking about wayfinding and getting people through the courts. We are looking at remote services. We are doing, really trying to push that initiative, and if you call us to do and we are doing it, and then we are fortunate we are in the self-help already so equal access is her passion, so these are the pieces that we are working on, we are excited to continue to work on them. And we're always open to collaborate. Let us collaborate going forward.

>> Thank you for the invitation to present to date.

>> I want to jump in.

>> [Applause]

>> I have to say I am inspired and I think this is amazing and the passion, but how you run this into 22 courts, and all I can think of is what a godsend it must be for people who come to court and have no idea but to find that there are different ways of access for them, for those who want to do it on their smart phone, and for others who just cannot but they know that their needs are being met and that is the other equal access, not just remote, but also the equal access to it all. It is amazing what you can do. Can I ask how much it cost for you to set this up? This is truly groundbreaking.

>> The first award was \$500,000.

>> 500?

>> \$500,000.

>> That was stingy.

>> Will it was David, so never sure.

>> Do you know approximately how many people you have been able to serve?

>> I do not have that number. We do have the number that are participating in the workshops, so I could easily get that number for you.

>> The quarterly reports are all published as well, I'm sure Marcella can get that.

>> I think the upside for the courts is the courts are now receiving better prepared self-represented litigants and are able to be more effective and that is another great thing, is a benefit to everyone.

>> Terrific.

>> Yes?

>> I think it is great to hear this and I just happen to be headed up to Klamath next week for a conference and I just went to wonder if we reached out at all to tribal courts and maybe connect with the State Court-Tribal Court Forum as being a location, for as I know some of them are remote, to see if they could or you could actually add them as a partner? Just thinking about that.

>> Great idea.

>> It is just a great, great program.

>> Chief, just from a personal perspective, we were one of the first courts that were viewed in the SHARP program and I want to thank Melanie and Wendy and her team and certainly Kim who has been at the forefront of this. I can tell you one of those courts that does everything, I have seen better prepared family law litigants across the board because they will come up and I will be like, while, let us pretty interesting and they said we came to SHARP before we came here, judge. We are lucky because we actually have SHARP in our new courthouse, but I know from our admin working with you guys, that this has been really, really, really effective for helping people in what amounts to where we are from Modoc all the way to Humboldt and back to Nevada, you're talking about 25% of California as far as geography. And you look at it for mapping you say they are not that far away, so until you drive a, therefore way so that has really been, nice job, you guys.

>> Thank you, thank you so much for sharing this with us and I feel your passion and we are excited. Thank you.

>> [Applause]

>> This concludes our business meeting for today. We will reconvene to finish the remainder of our agenda tomorrow at 9:30 AM. We are in recess.

>> [Event Concluded]