



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: December 11, 2015

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015	Action Required
	Date of Report
	November 30, 2015
Submitted by	Contact
Judicial Council Staff	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director	steven.chang@jud.ca.gov
Finance	

Executive Summary

The Judicial Council staff recommends that the Judicial Council approve the *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015*, as required by Government Code section 77209(i), to be sent to the Legislature.

Recommendation

The Judicial Council staff recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015*; and
2. Direct the Judicial Council staff to submit the report to the Legislature.

Previous Council Action

Government Code section 77209 was amended by Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) reflecting the creation of a successor fund—the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund—to the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. Previous reports on the Trial Court Improvement Fund have

been required and submitted pursuant to Government Code section 77209 since fiscal year (FY) 2002–2003.

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.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Since this report is required by the above referenced section of the Government Code, no alternatives were considered. This report is not required to circulate for public comment.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Submission of this mandated report to the Legislature does not involve any implementation requirements, costs, or operational impacts for the trial courts.

Attachments

1. *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015*



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, Litigation Management Committee

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

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

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
Hon. Brian John Back
Hon. Richard Bloom
Mr. Mark G. Bonino
Hon. James R. Brandlin
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. David De Alba
Hon. Emilie H. Elias
Mr. James P. Fox
Ms. Donna D. Melby
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole
Hon. David Rosenberg
Hon. Dean T. Stout
Hon. Martin J. Tangeman

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Daniel J. Buckley
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Hon. David E. Gunn
Hon. Morris D. Jacobson
Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Mr. Frank A. McGuire
Hon. Marsha G. Slough
Ms. Mary Beth Todd
Hon. Charles D. Wachob
Hon. Joan P. Weber

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

December 16, 2015

Hon. Mark Leno, Chair
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
State Capitol, Room 5019
Sacramento, California 95814

and

Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
1020 N Street, Room 553
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Shirley N. Weber, Chair
Assembly Committee on Budget
State Capitol, Room 6026
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015*, as required under Government Code section 77209(i)

Dear Senator Leno and Assembly Member Weber:

The Judicial Council respectfully submits the attached *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015* under the reporting requirements stated in Government Code section 77209(i).

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an important component of the judicial branch budget, supporting statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report 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.

Hon. Mark Leno Hon.
Shirley N. Weber
December 16, 2015
Page 2

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Finance, at 916-263-1397.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council of California

MH/cw
Attachments

cc: Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel

Danny Alvarez, Secretary of the Senate

E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León

Fredericka McGee, Special Assistant to Assembly Speaker Toni G. Atkins

Anita Lee, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office

Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office

Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee

Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee

Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office

Marvin Deon, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee

Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office

Jolie Onodera, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee

Chuck Nicol, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee

Benjamin Palmer, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee

Mike Petersen, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office

Leora Gershenzon, Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee

Paul Dress, Consultant, Assembly Republican Policy Office

Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

Peter Allen, Senior Manager, Communications, Judicial Council

Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council

Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Finance, Judicial Council

Lucy Fogarty, Senior Manager, Judicial Council

Steven Chang, Manager, Finance, Judicial Council

Madelynn McClain, Supervising Budget Analyst, Judicial Council

Hon. Mark Leno Hon.
Shirley N. Weber
December 16, 2015
Page 3

Andi Liebenbaum, Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst, 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, Litigation Management Committee

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

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

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
Hon. Brian John Back
Hon. Richard Bloom
Mr. Mark G. Bonino
Hon. James R. Brandlin
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. David De Alba
Hon. Emilie H. Elias
Mr. James P. Fox
Ms. Donna D. Melby
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole
Hon. David Rosenberg
Hon. Dean T. Stout
Hon. Martin J. Tangeman

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Daniel J. Buckley
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Hon. David E. Gunn
Hon. Morris D. Jacobson
Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Mr. Frank A. McGuire
Hon. Marsha G. Slough
Ms. Mary Beth Todd
Hon. Charles D. Wachob
Hon. Joan P. Weber

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

Report Title: *Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015*

Statutory Citation: Assembly Bill 1700 (Stats. 2001, ch. 824)
Code Section: Gov. Code, § 77209(i)

Date of Report: December 16, 2015

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Government Code section 77209(i) regarding the use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

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

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is an important component of the judicial branch budget, supporting statewide services for the trial courts, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and educational and development programs, as well as innovative and model programs, pilot projects, and other special projects. The programs and initiatives detailed in this report 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.

In fiscal year 2014–2015, ending June 30, 2015, \$63.6 million was expended or encumbered from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for various programs and projects, including information technology services, legal services, education programs, and families and children programs.

The full report is available at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-7955.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Mr. Martin Hoshino
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council of California*

Mr. Curt Soderlund
Chief Administrative Officer

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

FINANCE

Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic
Director

Mr. Catrayel N. Wood
*Senior Budget Analyst /
Primary Author of Report*



Annual Report of State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014–2015

DECEMBER 2015



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Recommendations Regarding the IMF

Government Code section 77209 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 does not have recommendations at this time.

Resources, Expenditures, and Fund Balance Overview

In fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015, the IMF was supported by a variety of funding sources, including the 50/50 excess fees, fines, and forfeitures split revenue under Government Code (GC) section 77205(a), the 2 percent automation fund under GC section 68090.8(b), interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund, royalties from publication of jury instructions under GC section 77209(h), and a transfer from the State General Fund. Including prior year adjustments and a transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund, the total available resources was \$72.9 million (see Attachment 1).

As of June 30, 2015, from allocations approved by the council for FY 2014–2015, \$63.6 million was expended and encumbered for various programs and projects, such as trial court security grants, self-help centers, education programs for judicial officers and trial court personnel, the litigation management program, complex civil litigation program, enhanced collections, information technology, and Phoenix financial services, all of which were managed by the Judicial Council staff (see Attachment 2). Of the \$63.6 million expended and encumbered, \$50.3 million was related to local assistance (distributions to trial courts or payments to vendors in support of trial courts), and \$13.3 million was related to administrative support provided by Judicial Council of California (JCC) 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 \$8.9 million (see Attachment 3).

Use of IMF Resources for Trial Courts during FY 2014–2015

For FY 2014–2015 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.

Families and Children Programs

Self-Represented Litigants – Statewide Support

\$104,412 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 4 million users view the Judicial Branch online California Courts Self-Help Center. The website has over 4,000 pages of content in English, also available in Spanish, as well as hundreds of links to other free legal resources. The self-help site provides local courts with information that they can use to research, translate, and post local court information on their own. In 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 to them at one single location.

This allocation also 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 statewide availability of locally-developed content.

The allocation supported professional educational content for self-help center staff on legal updates, and 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.

Domestic Violence – Family Law Interpreter Program (Translation)

\$21,765 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the translation of domestic violence forms and instructions into Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese, and to make them available to all courts.

Self-Help Centers

\$5,000,587 was distributed directly 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 would increase court's other costs. When self-help staff are decreased, the number and complexity of questions and issues at the public counter increases substantially, thereby increasing line lengths and wait times. Likewise, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerks' offices.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally 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. When the court provides one-

on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to 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 not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help.

Interactive Software – Self-Represented Electronic Forms

\$59,706 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 “Turbo-Tax” model, litigants enter information only once; the program automatically fills in the information on the rest of the form. This saves substantial time, and assists self-represented litigants in preparing understandable and legible pleadings. Self-help centers report that these programs can significantly enhance their efficiency and effectiveness. The time of clerks and judicial officers is similarly saved by having legible and fully completed documents.

Educational Programs

\$91,521 was expended and/or encumbered to support the biannual Beyond the Bench Conference. Conference content included legal updates, emerging issues, and best practices, and met continuing education requirements for attorneys, court administrators, mental health professionals, and probation officers.

The allocation also funded regional trainings, distance learning webinars, and videoconference programs, as well as a statewide program held in conjunction with CJER’s Family Law Institute. The statewide program included joint educational sessions for judicial officers, child custody mediators, recommending counselors, evaluators, and management staff. The statewide program also provided mandated training specifically designed for child custody mediators and recommending counselors hired within 6 months of the program, and provided continuing education for Family Court Services management staff.

Publications

\$20,000 was expended and/or encumbered to support the California Dependency Online Guide (CalDOG). The number of court professionals using CalDOG continues to grow. CalDOG provides subscribers with a bi-monthly email summary of new cases and other current information. Resources on the website include 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 AB 12/212

training, handouts from recent Beyond the Bench conferences and other events; and articles, brochures, videos, reference charts, and publications.

Education Programs

Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers

New Judge Education and Primary Assignment Orientation Courses

The allocation was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other program-related rentals, as well as participant materials production expenses for the New Judge Orientation, B.E. Witkin Judicial College, and Primary Assignment and Overview Courses.

All newly elected and appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers are required by Rule of Court 10.462 (c)(1) to complete new judge education offered by CJER by attending the New Judge Orientation Program within 6 months of taking the oath of office, attending an orientation course in their primary assignment within one year of taking the oath of office, and attending 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 comprise the new judge education required under Rule 10.162(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.

1. New Judge Orientation Program

\$102,195 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the week-long New Judge Orientation (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 by the Commission on Judicial Performance), fairness, and courtroom control in this highly interactive program, as well as learning about the judicial branch, Judicial Council, and the courts. The concept at NJO is to give the new judge the opportunity, as they begin their careers, 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 number of programs required depends on the number of judicial appointments in a given year. There are four highly experienced faculty members for the entire week.

2. B.E Witkin Judicial College

\$174,003 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the two-week Judicial College that offers new judges and subordinate judicial officers 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, including mental health and the courts, self-represented litigants, and domestic violence. The college class is divided into seminar groups which meet frequently during the college 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. This also allows participants to bring sensitive issues with them which 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 the past, participation has ranged from approximately fifty-five to one hundred and forty judges and subordinate judicial officers.

3. Primary Assignment Orientation and Overview Courses

\$325,499 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses that provides new judges and subordinate judicial officers with an intense immersion in their primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, traffic, probate) with a heavy emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, as well as classroom exercises designed to test their skills in the assignment. The courses are typically offered at one of three venues throughout the year, but some of the courses are offered multiple times throughout the year. These courses are also available to experienced judges who are moving into a new assignment for the very first time in their career and to judges returning to an assignment after a period of time.

In addition to the PAO courses, CJER offers advanced courses for experienced judges who are moving into new assignments which are substantively more complex than those covered by the PAO above (e.g., felony sentencing, homicide trials, and capital cases). These programs are designed for experienced judges who are expected by the education rule to take a course in their new primary assignment or to fulfill other statutory or case-law-based education requirements. There are also a number of courses developed by CFCC dealing specifically with domestic violence issues that CJER supports by augmenting the grant funds used for the programs and offering the programs at CJER venues. The funds are used to pay for participant meal costs that the grants cannot fund. By attending the domestic violence programming, judges and subordinate judicial officers also meet the provisions of California Rules of Court, Rule 10.464 which sets forth the education requirements and expectations for judges and subordinate judicial officers on domestic violence issues. Planned courses can accommodate approximately 680 participants per year.

All of 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 all of the major bench assignments, the Assigned Judges Program relies heavily on the PAO to provide its judges with the education and training they need to be able to take on assignments which these retired judges may never have had during their active careers. These 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 various courts do the work of judging. This ensures 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 ensures access to justice.

The structure of NJO as well as the college also provides two staggered opportunities for new judges to develop relationships that last throughout a judicial officer's career. Many of the NJO exercises require new judges to reveal themselves in a very personal way. Bringing the newly assigned judges together also allows them to ask the faculty questions and discuss issues with them as well as with their colleagues. Uniformity in judicial practice and procedure is promoted by the sharing of ideas and best practices. The benefits to the individual judge, who is able to feel confident in his or her practice on the bench, and to courts, most of whom are unable to provide a systematic training program for judges, are great. Moreover, providing 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

\$36,435 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Presiding Judge/Court Executive Officer Court Management Program and Supervising Judges Program that offered educational opportunities for trial court judicial leadership.

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 operations of the court. These programs enable judges to fulfill continuing education hours and expectations under rules 10.462 (c) (2) and 10.462 (c) (2) (a-c).

Continuing Judicial Education – Statewide Judicial Institutes

\$122,114 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging and group meals for judges and subordinate judicial officers participating at the Family Law, Juvenile Law, Civil Law, and Cow

County Institute programs. Additional costs covered include materials production, meeting room rental and AV equipment rental.

CJER offers institutes in all of the major trial court bench assignments (civil, criminal, family, juvenile, 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 the assignment also benefit from attending. These two-day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and other current material. Participants frequently comment that the learning environment is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues, because it provides 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 achieve education hours towards the continuing education expectations and requirements of California Rules of Court. Attendance numbers at the institutes range from 70 to 140 attendees. 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 which are not covered in sufficient detail at the Primary Assignment Orientations. In addition, there are many course offerings on advanced topics as well as courses on recent developments in the law. The primary benefit to the courts, and the branch as a whole, is that statewide programming for experienced judges provides uniformity in the administration of justice and the opportunity for judicial officers to learn from their more experienced peers. Additionally, some sessions may be videotaped by staff and posted online, where they are available to all judicial officers. In FY 2014–2015, the Education Plan developed by the CJER Governing Committee included the Institutes for Family Law, Juvenile Law, Civil Law, and Cow County judges (judges in small, often rural courts who hear all assignments).

Continuing Judicial Education – Advanced Education for Experienced Judges

\$35,215 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses.

CJER develops and provides a small number of advanced courses for experienced judges. These are continuing education courses designed to address advanced judging issues, and include such topics as Advanced Capital Case Issues, Complex Civil Litigation, and Civil and Criminal Evidence. CJER also supports the delivery of specialized courses in domestic violence and sexual assault offered by the Center for Families, Children and the Courts. CJER funds participant meal costs that CFCC's grant money cannot fund. As with the New Judge Orientation and Primary Assignment Orientation courses, these are statewide programs providing judges and subordinate judicial officers from all over the state the opportunity to work

with and learn from their colleagues and exchange techniques and strategies. This enhances cohesiveness of the bench, as well as the fair and consistent administration of justice statewide. Planned courses can typically accommodate approximately 210 participants per year.

Continuing Judicial Education – Regional and Local Education Courses

\$3,152 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant business meals and materials production expenses.

Statewide budget reductions over the past few years have necessitated that CJER develop and expand both local and regional programs because they offer a far less expensive alternative to statewide programming while preserving the quality of education. The content and courses that lend themselves to both regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees and are taught by experienced CJER judicial faculty.

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

Manager and Supervisor Training

\$34,438 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other program related rentals, as well as participant materials production expenses and trial court participant lodging for the Core 40 Courses but not the Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses, for which the courts pick up the cost of participant lodging.

1. CORE 40

The CORE 40 course is an intensive one-week program for new and experienced trial court supervisors and managers. It contains valuable and practical information that can be used to improve leadership skills that result in the overall improvement in performance of staff. Classes are limited to 28 participants who are selected from applications received online. Topics include group development, employment law, and performance management, and experienced court personnel serve as the faculty.

2. Institute for Court Management (ICM)

ICM courses lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts in a number of national curriculum areas related to court management. The courses serve a dual purpose: (a) to provide relevant education courses for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Managers, and (b) to provide this education locally at a significantly reduced cost to courts and participants as compared to the national programs. This program grew out of a multi-state consortium formed in 2008 between the California Judicial Council 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 to send their staff to NCSC headquarters in Williamsburg, Virginia, the cost for which was prohibitive for most courts. CJER's ability to offer these courses at the regional offices using California faculty has allowed all courts – small, medium, and large – 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, over 90 court leaders have achieved the Certified Court Manager or Certified Court Executive certification from ICM, and there have been approximately 950 course participants who have taken one or more courses. The ICM courses are taught and held within California, making attendance affordable and convenient.

Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel

Court Personnel Institutes

\$66,826 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant lodging and business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI) and Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute (TCJAI).

Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI)

The week-long Court Clerk Training Institute (CCTI) offers courtroom and court legal process clerks education in each substantive area of the court (civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, juvenile). The institute provides training in Rules of Court, changes in the law, customer service, and other aspects of performance that impact court operations “behind the scenes”.

CCTI has a special relationship with the smaller courts, although all 58 courts have accessed this education for their staff. Smaller courts do not typically have training departments and rely 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. In addition to legal process and procedure, classes stress statewide consistency, ethical performance, and efficient use of public funds.

Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute (TCJAI)

This multi-day biennial statewide education program is designed to meet the educational needs of trial court judicial attorneys. This program includes education in dealing with the issues currently dominating in the trial courts, such as criminal realignment, anti-SLAPP litigation, elder abuse, and so forth in addition to the traditional areas of civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate. Courses dealing with ethics 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 program typically serves nearly 200 trial court attorneys. It should also be noted that trial court attorneys, unlike other government employed attorneys, are not exempt from the MCLE requirements of the California State Bar and as such, this education program provides an essential education venue for them. This program is biennial and was not offered in fiscal year 2014-15.

Regional and Local Court Staff Courses

\$7,789 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for trial court participant business meals, meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses for the Regional and Local Court Staff Courses and Core Leadership and Training Skills.

1. Regional and Local Court Staff Courses

Regional and local court staff courses allow CJER to provide high-quality education to trial court personnel at a greatly reduced cost and with greatly enhanced convenience to the courts. The courses and programs included in both the regional and local programming are considered and identified by the Governing Committee's curriculum committees, and are 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 preventing sexual harassment.

2. Core Leadership and Training Skills Course

This course is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this two-day course teaches participants skills that contribute to effective leadership, discusses challenges to leading friends and former peers, and 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 Expenses – Statewide Education Programs

\$297,780 was expended and/or encumbered to cover lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty and an honoraria for a small number of paid faculty teaching at 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 share 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 not likely to be able to offer their services for statewide benefit if their expenses are not paid for by CJER.

Faculty Development Expenses

\$24,425 was expended and/or encumbered to cover the cost of lodging, group meals, and travel for trial court participants at train the trainee 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 New Judge Orientation and Judicial College programs. It may also have been used for meeting room rental, AV equipment and other such program related rentals, and participant materials production expenses.

Current CJER faculty development programs include such programs as a) critical course and/or program specific faculty development (e.g. New Judge Orientation, the B.E. Witkin Judicial College, and Institute of Court Management); b) Design Workshops for new or updated courses in development such as, regional one-day and orientation/institute courses; c) advanced faculty development courses (offered this year as webinars) which allow faculty to work on more complex faculty skills; and d) short lunchtime webinars for advanced faculty on discrete faculty development topics. As a result 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.

Curriculum Committees and Education Plan Development Expenses

\$160 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for business meal costs of judges and court staff that serve on the committees involved in curriculum development work.

Distance Learning

Distance Education – Satellite Broadcast

\$134,408 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for transmission of statewide educational satellite broadcasts 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 education by 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 continuing 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 is delivered via the educational satellite broadcast network. The satellite network serves as the core delivery method for staff and manager/supervisor education, providing a comprehensive and timely statewide mechanism to high-quality staff education that is, for many courts, the only source of staff education. Many of the broadcasts are also recorded and available online or as DVDs to serve as resources for local training throughout the year. Training that is required statewide, including sexual harassment prevention training, is delivered regularly by satellite broadcast, and time sensitive training has been provided for judges on a number of occasions in response to new legislation such as mental health records or criminal justice realignment legislation.

Education is delivered via satellite to court staff and includes such topics as:

- Updates to the ADA
- The jury process
- Felony and misdemeanor appeals
- Certifying copies
- Customer service

Education is delivered via satellite for court managers and supervisors and includes such topics as:

- Handling disasters
- Coaching and communication
- Technology management
- Change Management
- Stress Management
- Preventing and Responding Sexual Harassment

Education is delivered via satellite for presiding judges and court executive officers and includes such topics as:

- ADA issues for Court Leaders
- Court Security
- Ethical Excellence

Education delivered via satellite for trial court judicial officers includes such topics as:

- Assembly Bill 939 Family Law Proceedings Overview
- Judicial Canons Updates
- How a child enters the Juvenile Dependency system

Distance Education – Online Video, Webinars, and Videoconferences

\$6,088 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for storage, encoding, and transmission of trial court statewide educational video products delivered online, for captioning of videos and broadcasts if needed, and for some webinar-based education costs.

A natural evolution of the Satellite Broadcast initiative has been the development of online instructional videos, videoconferences, and webinars. These three lines of educational products leverage the distance learning technologies employed by the Judicial Council over the past ten 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, which was originally created for the purpose of developing and transmitting broadcasts, is now used frequently to create instructional videos which are immediately uploaded to the judicial and administrative web sites. Funding was needed to enable streaming of judicial education videos to mobile devices like iPads as well as desktop computers, and to improve video quality to a standard that users have come to expect.

Special Services for Court Operations

Trial Court Performance and Accountability

\$1,106 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for meeting expenses of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC), a standing Judicial Council advisory committee consists of court administrators and judges from fifteen courts, which is charged with, among other things, updating the court staff and judicial workload models. In FY 14-15, WAAC members oversaw updates to the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model, updates to the methodology used to prioritize new judgeships that may be authorized and funded by the Legislature, updates to subordinate judicial officer conversions using more recent workload data, and the submission of two mandated legislative reports.

JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)

\$347,550 was expended and/or encumbered to support the California JusticeCorps program, an AmeriCorps national service program.

The JusticeCorps program trains and places college students at court-based self-help centers to assist self-represented litigants. Working under the supervision of attorneys or other court staff, JusticeCorps members help litigants by identifying appropriate forms, helping litigants complete and file the forms properly, and providing information and referrals to related services.

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

\$178,623 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters and interpreter candidates, providing ethics training for newly enrolled interpreters, and statewide expansion of technological solutions for American Sign Language interpretation. Court Interpreter Program funds were also expended for activities and resources required for the Judicial Council approved Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan and the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP).

Certification of Court Interpreters

- Cost of retaining the services of Prometric, Inc. which include: administration of court interpreter certification and registration exams (written and oral exams administered to approximately 2,000 candidates per year); selection and training of exam raters; selection training and management of exam proctors; capture and report demographic data on exam takers; staff and maintain a centralized call and e-mail response center; design new test instruments; develop, maintain, and update existing exam instruments; and, maintain a web presence with information regarding all relevant information regarding administration of exams.
- National Center for State Courts (NCSC) annual membership fee providing access to a national association focused on language accessibility. Membership benefits include: access to NCSC court interpreter test instruments, which 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.
- Costs for the production of court interpreter badges (for approximately 250-300 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 following organizations: California Healthcare Interpreters Association; National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators; and, Interpret America. These events are publicized nationally and each event attracts hundreds of attendees.
- Training of potential future certified court interpreters. Co-sponsorships include the training of legal interpreting trainers in American Sign Language (ASL). Workshops were organized and presented by the Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education (MARIE) Center at the University of Northern Colorado. Participants have already conducted three initial workshops in California to dozens of potential court interpreters.
- Three 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 35-40 interpreters. Costs include instructor fees, and if required, cost of meeting facilities.

Technological Solutions for Language Accessibility

- Maintaining centralized equipment and the existing infrastructure for video remote technology resources to leverage interpreter resources where American Sign Language interpreters are needed throughout the state, including training on the use of video remote interpreting, and service/maintenance support for direct use by fourteen courts.

Court Interpreter Advisory Panel and Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan

- Costs associated with the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel's (CIAP) annual in person meeting held in June 2018. The meeting provided an opportunity for members to address and comprehensively review specific projects, goals and objectives specific to the committee's 2015 Annual Agenda objectives, which included key recommendations, specific to CIAP as referenced in the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.
- Costs associated with the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan (JWG), which included all members of CIAP in person meeting held in October 2014. In line with the Judicial Council approved Court Interpreters Advisory Panel's Annual Agenda, the JWG, engaged in substantive work during fiscal year 2014-2015. The goal of the JWG was to develop the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*. The plan was subsequently adopted and approved by the Judicial Council in January 2015. The Chief Justice, in response to the recommendations made in the plan, appointed the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force, which is chaired by Associate Supreme Court Justice, Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar.

Trial Court Security Grants

\$1,199,507 was expended and/or encumbered to use for trial court security enhancement projects. Statewide master agreements were used for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of video surveillance, access, and duress alarm systems in trial court facilities. Other security enhancement projects included ballistic window glazing and tinting for judge's chambers, and fencing for secured judicial officer parking. Funds were also used for the purchase of evacuation devices for the Los Angeles Court. The first group of devices was purchased in FY 2012–2013 as a pilot project to determine the effectiveness of evacuation devices in high-rise facilities. Positive feedback from both court and sheriff staff in the Los Angeles Court supported the purchase of additional equipment. This was the second of three purchases, the last of which was scheduled to be funded in FY 2014–2015. In addition, funds were used to provide training to trial courts on the preparation and maintenance of their continuity-of-operations plans.

Legal Services

Litigation Management Program

\$4,006,838 was expended and/or encumbered to pay the costs of defense—including fees for private counsel—and to pay settlements of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals. GC 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.

Judicial Performance Defense Insurance

\$920,794 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the portion of the CJP defense master insurance policy that covers claims by superior court judges and subordinate judicial officers. The Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) Defense Insurance program was approved by the 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.

Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program

\$451,000 was expended and/or encumbered to pay attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas, including business transactions, labor and employment negotiations, finance and taxation matters, and real estate. The additional area in which legal assistance was provided reflects council actions to expand the scope of the program. The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program in July 2001 as a means by which the Office of the General Counsel (now the Legal Services Office) could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed by the LSO.

Jury System Improvement Projects

\$12,447 was expended and/or encumbered to: (1) support the meeting expenses of the Judicial Council’s Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions, and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official CACI and CALCRIM publications. The Jury System Improvement Projects are supported by royalty revenue from the publication of the Judicial Council’s civil (CACI) and criminal (CALCRIM) jury instructions. The Judicial Council’s Advisory Committees on Civil and Criminal Jury Instructions prepare new and revised instructions and propose their adoption to the council. On approval, the instructions are then copyrighted and licensed to commercial publishers. The publishers pay royalties to the council based on sales of the instructions.

Complex Civil Litigation Program

\$3,941,326 was expended and/or encumbered to provide support for the Complex Civil Litigation Program, which began as a pilot program in January 2000 to improve the management of complex civil cases. In August 2003, the council made the program permanent. During this reporting period, all funds went directly to courts to support the operation of 17 courtrooms or departments exclusively handling complex cases in the Superior Courts of California, Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties.

Regional Office Assistance Group

\$1,342,842 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for six attorneys, one administrative coordinator and one secretary working primarily at three locations to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial courts and 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.

Audit Services

\$570,572 was expended and/or encumbered for five staff auditor positions in the Audit Service unit, which conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts once every 3 or 4 years encompassing these primary areas, such as court administration, cash control, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations .

Fiscal Services

Budget-Focused Training and Meetings

\$50,507 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 in support of branch budget advocacy efforts, as well as to support budget training for trial court staff, including annual training on various fiscal related schedules.

Treasury Services – Cash Management

\$228,383 was expended and/or encumbered for this 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 when due to state and local agency recipients, and completing the financial accounting for the function. Staff performed other cash management and treasury duties as needed for the trial courts.

Trial Court Procurement

\$100,888 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for phone services and rent allocation for one position in Business Services that provided procurement and contract related services at a statewide level to save trial courts resources by not having to perform the same services.

Human Resources Services

Human Resources – Court Investigation

\$68,451 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for invoices related to court investigations stemming from courts' personnel issues. The firms investigated five matters at four courts. Due to the sensitive and often complex nature of these investigations, some matters took a number of months, ranging from one to four months, to complete.

Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums

\$30,551 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 expenses incurred by trial court employees, who attended the event as either participants or faculty. Trial court participation figures are as follows:

	# of Participants	# of Courts Represented
Labor Relations Forum		
Northern California	53	29
Southern California	22	8
Labor Relations Academy I		
Northern California	17	13
Southern California	32	8
Labor Relations Academy II		
Northern California	58	30
Southern California	27	11

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, which includes a basic introduction to labor relations and provides participants with the experience of engaging with others in a bargaining role-playing exercise. Academy II is a two-day program, where 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 discussion of issues.

Information Technology Services

Telecommunication Support

\$11,701,285 was expended and/or encumbered to provide a program for the trial courts to develop and support a standardized level of local network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local court systems and enterprise applications such as Phoenix, and hosted case management systems via shared services at the California Courts Technology Center, which eases deployment, provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources. Activities that were funded included network maintenance, which provides the trial courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure; and network security services, which maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three managed security services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention; vulnerability scanning; and web browser security and network technology training for court IT staff.

Statewide Planning and Development Support

\$5,024,661 was expended and/or encumbered to provide the trial courts access to a variety of Oracle products (e.g., Oracle Enterprise Database, Real Application Clusters, Oracle Security Suite, Oracle Advanced Security, Diagnostic Packs, Oracle WebLogic Application Server) without cost to the courts. Because Oracle discounts are based on volume, the Branchwide License Agreement (BWLA) is able to deliver significant savings over individual court purchases.

EPP provides Enterprise Architecture support which develops standards, provides consultation, and performs research on emerging technologies for the branch. These services result in improved quality of service and reduced risk through standard processes and tools.

Each Judicial Council application is reviewed by someone from the enterprise architecture team for architectural compliance to ensure the tools and design used are compliant with existing standards.

Additionally, Enterprise Policy and Planning funds the Innotas Program Portfolio Management, which help JCC IT manage its project portfolio. Program Portfolio Management is an IT best practice.

Interim Case Management Systems

\$1,008,796 was expended and/or encumbered to provide program management support to 13 courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Eight of the 13 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. Five locally hosted SJE courts use ICMS program resources for legislative updates and SJE support as needed. The program supports SJE interfaces to the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Justice, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information System, as well as custom interfaces with Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collections program, interactive voice / interactive web response processing, issuance of warrants, traffic collections, failure-to-appear / failure-to-pay collections, and web portal interfaces.

Data Integration

\$3,210,167 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, be they courts, law enforcement agencies, the department of justice and others. Without the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB), the current systems for sharing protective orders, for example, would not function.

Statistics for July, August and September show 105,000 requests/responses flowing through the ISB for the California Courts Protective Order Registry system (CCPOR), alone. These requests flow between the Courts, JCC and the California Department of Justice. There are similar statistics for CCMS v3's use of the ISB for Document Management System Indexing, credit card transactions, and for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), where the ISB is used to gather monthly aggregate statistics which are, in part, used in the Workload Allocation Funding Model (WAFM) and in determining the need for judges.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)

\$10,075,251 was expended and/or encumbered to provide ongoing technology center hosting or shared services to the trial courts, as well as a full disaster recovery program. Applications hosted at the CCTC include Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Computer-Aided Facilities Management, 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 nine courts). Three case management systems (CMSs) operate out of CCTC: Sustain (SJE); the criminal and traffic CMS (V2); and civil, small claims, mental health and probate CMS (V3). Some courts leverage the third party contract to also receive full IT services for their local court including desktop support, helpdesk, file server management, and email.

California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services

\$297,407 was expended and/or encumbered to provide support for the program, ongoing maintenance, to refresh servers and upgrade software applications. Eight superior courts use the CLETS access program, with one additional court in the deployment phase and a second court in the process of applying to the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ) for access. CLETS access, as provided by the CA DOJ, was enabled during FY 2006–2007 through the California

Courts Technology Center, with the implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services. The Judicial Council CLETS Access program (JCC CLETS) IMF funding has been eliminated as of the end of fiscal year 2014-2015. All 8 (eight) JCC CLETS courts have opted out of the program. Critical components of the JCC CLETS services (infrastructure) will be preserved to maintain the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) functionality.

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

\$194,797 was expended and/or encumbered to provide a statewide protective order repository that provides complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders to the 43 counties currently participating, with read-only access to 13 tribal courts and 35 Orange County Superior Court judicial officers and their clerks. The allocation was used to cover the hosting costs of the CCPOR application at the California Courts Technology Center, maintain the application code, and provide user support to the court and local law enforcement agency users of the system. During this fiscal period with Federal NCHIP19 grant funds administered by the California Department of Justice, the Judicial Council Information Technology team successfully deployed CCPOR to eleven courts and their respective law enforcement agencies. Staff expenditures for this program are from the Improvement Modernization Fund but were not included in the total expenditure amount above.

Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)

\$444,772 was expended and/or encumbered to support the use of ETMS (IBM Rational testing suite) for applications, including maintenance for the civil, small claims, mental health, and probate case management system (V3) and the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). The ETMS records and tracks progress for software enhancement requests, defects and 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.

Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)

\$352,323 was expended and/or encumbered to: provide ongoing application support and maintenance; server hardware upgrades; 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 \$52 million distributed per month. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. There are over 200 fee types collected by each court, distributed to 31 different entities (e.g. Trial Court Trust Fund, County, Equal Access Fund, Law Library, etc.), requiring 65,938 corresponding distribution rules that are maintained by UCFS.

Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services

\$119,615 was expended and/or encumbered to maintain staffing for the program. This program promotes the Judicial Council's objectives for court e-services and e-filing initiatives by supporting the planning and implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all 58 California superior courts and local and state justice/integration partners. This program also provides representation for the judicial branch at key partner justice forums. Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services continues to participate in local, state and national task forces and committees regarding information sharing, disposition reporting, and e-filing standards and systems, including e-filing document management and self-represented litigant access to electronic filing.

Adobe Livecycle Reader Services Extension

\$133,700 was expended to continue the ongoing software maintenance for Adobe Forms. There are nearly one thousand state-wide forms and over two thousand local forms that are used in the trial courts. A PDF form can be "fillable" but it can also be savable for later updates with this Adobe license agreement. Other than the ability to save the form for later updates, the other innovations are data validation, auto-population of data fields, XML tagging of data fields, file embedding and E-Filing.

Trial Court Administrative Services

Phoenix Program – Financial and Human Resources Management Systems

\$10,960,409 was expended and/or encumbered to pay for the program. Of this amount, \$2.8 million was used for required licensing, hardware, maintenance and operations (M&O), technology center support costs, and end-user training in direct support of the trial courts. Staff in the Phoenix Program's Enterprise Resource Planning Unit and Shared Services Center was supported by the remaining \$8.1 million.

The Phoenix Program was established in response to the Judicial Council's 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 services 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 branch benefits from an integrated, state-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 process, accounting, and reporting.

The human capital management component of the Phoenix System has been implemented in 11 courts to date, providing human resources management and payroll services.

Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force

\$12,407 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 bi-annual statewide revenue distribution training conducted in partnership with the State Controller's Office. The task force was established in conjunction with Penal Code section 1463.02 and its composition requires inclusion of state, county, and city representatives. The task force's objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of the criminal and traffic-related fine/fee structure and attempt to simplify the administration of this system for the benefit of the citizens and the criminal justice participants.

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

FY 2014-15

Resources

Description	Amount
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 26,207,006
Prior Year Adjustments	2,880,385
Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	29,087,391
Revenues and Transfers	
50/50 Excess Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Split	23,702,658
2% Automation Fund	14,730,023
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	100,734
Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	532,783
Miscellaneous Revenue and Adjustments	30,233
Transfer from State General Fund	38,709,000
Subtotal, Revenues and Transfers	43,814,431
Total Resources	\$ 72,901,822

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
FY 2014-15 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project**

Description	Amount
<i>Families and Children Programs</i>	
Self-Represented Litigants - Statewide Support	104,412
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	21,765
Self-Help Centers	5,000,587
Interactive Software - Self-Reprinted Electronic Forms	59,706
Educational Programs	91,521
Publications	20,000
<i>Education Programs</i>	
Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	102,195
B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	174,003
Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	325,499
Leadership Training	36,435
Judicial Institutes	122,114
Advance Education for Experienced Judges	35,215
Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	3,152
Manager and Supervisor Training	34,438
Court Personnel Institutes	66,826
Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	7,789
Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	297,780
Faculty Development	24,425
Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	160
Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	134,408
Distance Education - Online Video, Webinars and Videoconferences	6,088
<i>Special Services for Court Operations</i>	
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	1,106
JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	347,550
Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education)	178,623
Trial Court Security Grants	1,199,507
<i>Legal Services</i>	
Litigation Management Program	4,006,838
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	920,794
Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000
Jury System Improvement Projects	12,447
Complex Civil Litigation Program	3,941,326
Regional Office Assistance Group ¹	1,342,842

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
FY 2014-15 Expenditures and Encumbrances by Program and Project**

Description	Amount
<i>Audit Services</i>	
Audit Services ¹	570,572
<i>Fiscal Services</i>	
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	50,507
Treasury Services - Cash Management ¹	228,383
Trial Court Procurement ¹	100,888
<i>Human Resources Services</i>	
Human Resources - Court Investigation	68,451
Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	30,551
<i>Information Technology Services</i>	
Telecommunications Support	11,701,285
Statewide Planning and Development Support ²	5,024,661
Interim Case Management Systems	1,008,796
Data Integration ²	3,210,167
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) ²	10,075,251
California Law Enforcement Telecomm System (CLETS) Services ²	297,407
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) - ROM ²	194,797
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	444,772
Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) ²	352,323
Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services ²	119,615
Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	133,700
<i>Trial Court Administrative Services</i>	
Phoenix Program - Financial Management System ²	10,960,409
Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	12,407
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	\$ 63,643,334

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.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
FY 2014-15
Fund Condition Summary**

Description	Amount
Total Resources	\$ 72,901,822
Program/Project Area	
Families and Children Programs	5,297,991
Education Programs	1,370,527
Special Services for Court Operations	1,726,786
Legal Services	10,663,090
Audit Services	570,572
Fiscal Services	379,778
Human Resources Services	99,002
Information Technology Services	32,562,773
Trial Court Administrative Services	10,972,816
Subtotal, Expenditures and Encumbrances	63,643,334
Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services	301,618
Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata	63,944,952
Fund Balance	\$ 8,956,870