



**Judicial Council of California**  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE  
*Chief Justice of California*  
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

WILLIAM C. VICKREY  
*Administrative Director of the Courts*

RONALD G. OVERHOLT  
*Chief Deputy Director*

December 7, 2009

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

Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt  
Secretary of the Senate  
State Capitol, Room 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

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

Re: Annual Report of Special Funds' Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2008–2009, required under Government Code Section 77209

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

Under the reporting requirements set forth in Government Code section 77209 (j), regarding use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund, and in the Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act, Item 0450-101-0932 – Trial Court Funding, pertaining to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, the Judicial Council respectfully submits the Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2008–2009.

December 7, 2009

Page 2

Funding provided by the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund represents an essential component of the judicial branch budget. These funding sources are the foundation for essential statewide services, ongoing technology programs and infrastructure initiatives, and education and development programs, and provide the critical funding necessary to support 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 have access to a fair system of open and equal justice.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Mr. Stephen Nash, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts Finance Division, at (415) 865-7584 or by e-mail at [stephen.nash@jud.ca.gov](mailto:stephen.nash@jud.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



William C. Vickrey  
Administrative Director of the Courts

SN/ KP

Attachments

cc: Ronald G. Overholt, AOC Chief Deputy Director  
Brian Brown, Consultant, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review  
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republic Caucus  
Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Assembly Committee on Budget  
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Caucus  
Drew Soderborg, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office  
Jennifer Osborn, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance

# **Report to the Judicial Council and the Legislature**

## **Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures For Fiscal Year 2008–2009**

**Pursuant to reporting requirements set forth in the  
*Government Code Section 77209(j)*  
(Trial Court Improvement Fund)  
And**

***Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act*  
(Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund)**

**December 7, 2009**

**Administrative Office of the Courts  
William C. Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts**

**Report to the Judicial Council and the Legislature:  
Annual Report of Special Funds Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2008–2009  
December 7, 2009**

**Introduction**

The Judicial Council (council) utilizes the Trial Court Improvement Fund (Improvement Fund) to improve court management and efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. Government Code (GC) section 77209(g), authorizes the council to administer monies deposited in the Improvement Fund and allows the council, “with appropriate guidelines,” to delegate administration of the fund to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). In accordance with GC section 77209(g), the council has approved internal guidelines to provide management and staff with general policies and procedures for allocating funds from the Improvement Fund and tracking expenditures on an annual basis.

The Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund), established by GC section 77213 as part of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (Stats. 1997, ch. 850), supports statewide initiatives for ensuring the highest quality of justice in all of California’s trial courts. The Modernization Fund is designated to fund projects that promote improved access to, efficiency of, and effectiveness in the trial courts.

**Annual Report**

In accordance with GC section 77209(j), the council is required to annually report to the Legislature on the expenditures from the Improvement Fund. In addition, language in the Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act (Item 0450-101-0932, Trial Court Funding) requested an annual reporting to the Legislature of expenditures from the Modernization Fund. In accordance with the statutory requirement and legislative intent expressed in the Supplemental Report, the council submits this report to the Legislature.

**Funding Sources and Restrictions** (refer to Attachments A and B)

The Improvement Fund (Attachment A, page 1) has a variety of funding sources, including annual deposits from the 50/50 excess fees and fines split revenue, 2% automation fund, interest from the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF), sale of documents and royalties from publications of jury instructions, other miscellaneous revenues, and a transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). GC section 77209(b) places specific restrictions upon the use of the transfer from TCTF – at least one-half of this amount shall be set aside as a reserve that shall not be allocated prior to March 15 of each fiscal year unless allocated to a court(s) for urgent needs.

The Modernization Fund (Attachment B, page 1) is appropriated annually in the state Budget Act. GC section 77213 prescribes the primary purposes for the fund, including improved technology that promotes efficiency and access to justice.

For fiscal year (FY) 2008–2009, expenditures and encumbrances from the special funds were made in the following categories:

***Improvement Fund*** (refer to Attachment A, page 2)

• Ongoing Statewide Programs	103,899,162
• Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	13,429,695
• Emergency Funding	<u>1,625,681</u>
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances:	<u>\$118,954,538</u>

***Modernization Fund*** (refer to Attachment B, page 1)

• Statewide Technology Projects	\$24,687,888
• Education and Developmental Programs	2,692,526
• Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	<u>8,449,553</u>
Total Expenditures and Encumbrance:	<u>\$35,829,967</u>

**Fiscal Year 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**

***Improvement Fund*** (refer to Attachment A, page 2)

In FY 2008–2009, the council expended \$118.954 million from the Improvement Fund. Most of the projects funded by the Improvement Fund represent ongoing efforts or initiatives that support programs that most trial courts would not otherwise be able to provide or perform. Since the passage of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997, the state has been responsible for funding trial court operations. Consistent with this change, the AOC has been responsible for developing and implementing a statewide infrastructure to provide services that were previously provided by the counties. The following three categories represent critical efforts of statewide importance as well as direct support for the trial courts provided from the Improvement Fund:

Category 1: Ongoing Statewide Programs: \$103.899 million (refer to Attachment A, page 3)

To improve trial court administration, increase meaningful access to justice, and enhance the provision of justice throughout the state, the council continued support for the following ongoing statewide programs and multi-year initiatives, including:

➤ *Trial Court Security Grants*

The allocated funds were expended to complete various projects for the courts such as installation of video surveillance and/or access systems in thirteen courts, weapons screening equipment in five courts, and security enhancements made to two courts. The allocated funds were also expended to develop and deliver the mechanism and training necessary for the courts to complete their own Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP). The grant funding enabled the Office of Emergency

Response and Security (ERS) to utilize existing statewide master agreements for the purchase of weapons screening equipment and for the installation of duress alarms, video surveillance, and access systems in the courts.

➤ *Litigation Management Program*

The allocated funds were expended to pay the costs of defense, including fees for attorneys from the Attorney General's Office and private counsel, and to pay the costs of settlements and judgments of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals. GC section 811.9 requires the council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state's trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and employees. In order to fulfill this responsibility, the council established the Litigation Management Program to pay for defense and indemnification as required by the statute. A portion of the unexpended allocation will be carried over to the next fiscal year in order to cover pending obligations and contingent liabilities.

➤ *Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) Defense Insurance Program*

The allocated funds were expended to provide efficiently administered, cost effective, and uniform insurance for all State of California justices, judges, and subordinate judicial officers. The CJP Defense Insurance program was approved by the council as a comprehensive loss prevention program in 1999. The program is for the purposes of: 1) covering defense costs in proceedings related to CJP complaints; 2) protecting judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties; and 3) lowering the risk of conduct that could develop into increased complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.

➤ *Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter*

The allocated funds were expended to cover the annual subscription cost for this publication. The Judicial Conduct Reporter is a quarterly newsletter published by the American Judicature Society that reports on recent opinions and other issues involving judicial ethics and discipline. It is distributed to all judicial officers as a part of the Administrative Office of the Courts' ethics education program, which was implemented as a means of risk management when the council initiated the CJP insurance program.

➤ *Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program (TCTAP)*

The allocated funds were expended to pay attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas including business transactions, labor and employment, finance and taxation, and real estate. The council established the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program (TCTAP) in July 2001 as a means by which the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) could provide transactional legal assistance to the trial courts through outside counsel selected and managed

by the OGC. Subsequently, the council broadened authorized uses of TCTAP funds to include any legal services required by the trial courts relating to their operations.

➤ *Self-Represented Litigants – Strategic Planning*

The allocated funds were expended to provide statewide conferences and other training sessions for self-help centers to develop plans to provide more comprehensive services to litigants. A family law conference was held to focus on the needs of low and moderate income family law litigants and to develop strategies for assisting the large numbers of self-represented litigants in family law. A statewide conference was held to provide educational information in other areas of law such as small claims, landlord/tenant and guardianships, as well as sharing many best practices for service delivery being developed throughout the state including the use of technology. Additionally funds were made available to local courts to implement their action plans including strategies for demonstrating the cost-effectiveness of self-help assistance, developing materials targeted at underserved populations, and providing local training opportunities. The AOC's website was expanded to include information from the conferences as well as brochures, videos, and other informational materials for self-represented litigants. These materials are available online to be shared or adapted by all courts.

➤ *Family Law Interpreter Program for Domestic Violence Cases*

The allocated funds were expended to make a distribution to forty-three courts to provide services in court hearings, Family Court Services mediation proceedings, Family Law Facilitator sessions, and court-sponsored self-help settings. Participating courts used the funds to cover the costs of providing certified or registered interpreters (which includes per diem or salary, benefits, and mileage), Language Line Services, and to pay for interpreter coordinator services. The project also ensured that revisions to domestic violence related court forms and information sheets were translated into Chinese, Korean, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Feedback from participating courts indicated that the program was extremely helpful in improving access to the State's justice system, enhancing safety for domestic violence victims and children, and improving court efficiency.

➤ *Self Help Centers*

The allocated funds were expended to establish or expand self-help assistance to every county in the State of California. The distribution to the courts was based upon the population of the county as other trial court funding provided a base level for each court. Eighty percent of the funding was to be used for staffing to increase the amount of services available in self-help centers. All courts have now implemented self-help assistance and are serving over 480,000 litigants each year in the areas of family law, domestic violence, guardianship, landlord/tenant, and

other civil matters. Resources developed by local programs are shared with other self-help centers throughout the state.

➤ Online Training

The allocated funds were expended to purchase a variety of online courses that are provided to the trial courts as a part of the AOC's distance education efforts. Due to the geographic diversity of the state, the council provides funding to increase the quantity of educational material available online. In addition, the training courses provided access to online libraries containing numerous on-demand software and professional development courses for court staff and judges. The allocated funds were also expended for licenses for online media hosting, course development, and content management.

➤ Branchwide Strategic Planning

The allocated funds were expended to support activities in three major areas: 1) Judicial Council Branchwide Operational Planning – to coordinate and conduct the council's annual planning meeting, which considered the implications of California's fiscal difficulties on council policymaking and ongoing branchwide efforts toward the improvement of California's courts and the administration of justice; 2) Public Trust and Confidence/Procedural Fairness – to continue deployment of a statewide initiative on procedural fairness that was launched by the Chief Justice in September 2007. The AOC is working to create a model approach that helps achieve procedural fairness in the high-volume courts to ensure that cases are processed for a diverse public in a manner conducive to a sense of fairness; and 3) 2009 Pocket Directory of California Judicial Leaders – to publish and distribute the Directory to court leaders, members of the council and chairs of its committees, and justice partners. The directory demonstrates the co-equal status of the judicial branch with the executive and legislative branches by providing a directory similar to the directories of those branches, and provides transparency about the leaders of the branch and their activities.

➤ California Courts – Connecting with Constituencies

The allocated funds were expended to provide outreach and education to Californians about the judicial system utilizing two approaches: 1) Trial Court Web Site Redesign Resources – new web site design templates, color palettes, a downloadable toolkit, and a style guide to assist the courts with redesigning their Web sites were created. The objectives of this effort were to increase the usability of trial court web sites and enhance the courts' ability to serve the public online; and 2) Teacher Training Institutes – reach out to a vital court constituency: K-12 teachers. The AOC entered into an inter-branch agreement with California State University, San Marcos to organize the California on My Honor Civics Institutes for Teachers. The institutes provided professional development to teachers who



collaboratively created tools to educate the public about the judicial branch by working with specially trained teacher leaders.

➤ *Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers*

The allocated funds were expended to provide the Judicial Officers' Assistance Program (JOAP) to the judges, commissioners, referees, and assigned judges in the Superior Courts. The base JOAP services include personal consultation services via online or a toll free number in dealing with a wide range of personal, family, and financial matters. The allocated funds were also used to provide: a) eight training seminars on topics such as coping with difficult behaviors, elder care, managing people, organizational change management, productivity, resilience; b) three training seminars on issues such as employee motivation, managing stress, managing staff; c) Critical Incident Stress Management – counselors provided an immediate response to counter emotional distress caused by catastrophic or traumatic events; and d) supplementary program management services, such as participant utilization reports and customer evaluations.

➤ *Trial Court Benefits Program – Legal Advice*

The allocated funds were expended to maintain two contracts with outside counsel for legal advice. One for the review of general benefits for the Superior Courts of California, and another for issues related specifically to the Benefits Program for the trial courts. The Benefits Program has received assistance through their contract with termination-related matters. During this reporting period, the firm provided legal counsel on general benefits related matters to the following courts: Alameda, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Kings, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Placer, Riverside, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, Solano, Stanislaus, and Tulare.

### **Ongoing Statewide Technology Infrastructure – Local Assistance**

Progress has been made on the statewide administrative and technology initiatives that support the objectives set forth by the council in its Strategic and Operational Plans, and as approved by the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC). A total of \$99.006 million was expended in support of these initiatives. Of that total \$76.069 million was from the Improvement Fund (refer to Attachment A, Addendum 1), and \$22.937 million was from the Modernization Fund (refer to Attachment B, Page 2). The funding in FY 2008–2009 was expended on the following:

➤ *California Court Case Management System (CCMS)*

CCMS is a statewide initiative to develop and deploy a unified case management system for all 58 superior courts. The project is being managed by Administrative Office of the Court's Southern Regional Office, with the participation of more than 200 court representatives from more than 25 counties, the Information

Services Division (IS Division), and the Center for Families, Children, and the Courts.

CCMS utilizes the technology and the functionality developed for an interim civil system, incorporates the criminal and traffic functionality developed for an interim application, and has developed new functionality for family law, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile dependency. Additional areas of functionality in CCMS include court interpreter and court reporter management. CCMS has four distinct components: a core product, an internet portal, a statewide data warehouse, and data exchanges.

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended for:

#### CCMS Development

- Accepted the Final Functional Design Deliverable and began development for the core application;
- Completed the design and began development of the extended components including data exchanges, portals, and the statewide reporting data warehouse;
- Designed 127 data exchanges using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM);
- Designed and implemented the CCMS stress test, training, and product acceptance test infrastructure at the California Court Technology Center (CCTC); and
- Designed CCMS security, including the transition to the new Oracle Access Manager security products.

#### CCMS Deployment

- Continued work on the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the deployment phase;
- Selected a vendor and negotiated the deployment contract terms and conditions; and
- Identified and modeled deployment environments with AOC network & security architecture and shared services to ensure efficient and cost effective deployment strategy.

#### ➤ Case Management System – Criminal & Traffic

Fresno Superior Court implemented this interim criminal and traffic case management system in July 2006. During FY 2008–2009, funding supported the following maintenance and operations areas for the application:

- Hardware and software maintenance;

- Infrastructure support and hosting services at vendor data center;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the CCTC;
- Help desk support for end users; and
- New releases of the product to address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

In addition, funding supported the transition of maintenance and support from Deloitte Consulting to the AOC. By assuming internal responsibility for supporting the application, the total savings over the projected useful life of the system is estimated at \$4.98 million.

➤ Case Management System – Civil

The interim application for civil, small claims, probate, and mental health is in production in the Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties. During FY 2008–2009, funding supported:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at vendor data center;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for testing, training, and production environments at CCTC;
- Vendor help desk support for end users; and
- New releases of the product to address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

New releases of the application provided enhancements in the areas of functionality for alternative dispute resolution, updates to forms, fines, and fees, and electronic transfer of case information to the county appellate panel. The maintenance and support teams also completed design and began development for future enhancements of courtroom functionality, large case processing, and clerk review of electronically filed documents. Also, the application was upgraded, bringing all components of the system up to the most current version of technology in the development and production environments. This resulted in improved product performance.

➤ Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

The Phoenix Financial System is a statewide system that enables courts to maintain control over expenditures, providing timely information about fiscal needs while complying with policies, procedures, regulations, and standardized processes. The current configuration includes General Ledger, Cost Accounting, Materials Management, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Project Accounting, and Trust Accounting. As of July 2009, all 58 courts were on the

Phoenix Financial System. In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to further the progress of the overall project, ensuring that each milestone was reached as scheduled. Expenses included support staff, contractors, software licenses, hardware maintenance, and training.

The Phoenix Human Resources System is a statewide human resources management system that will leverage technology for human resources administration and in-house payroll processing, develop a customer service call center, standardize processes and procedures, collect data at the source, provide central administrative processing, and provide Manager Self Service (MSS) and Employee Self Service (ESS) functions to the employees of the courts. Six courts (Lake, Riverside, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, and Stanislaus) went live on the system, and the projected date for deployment to all 58 courts is in FY 2014–2015. In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to support the implementation and planning efforts associated with a statewide offering of human resources and payroll functions that use the same SAP operating platform that supports the Phoenix Financial System.

In conjunction with the AOC Information Services Division, the Phoenix Project built a more robust hardware environment enabling and supporting future growth and functionality. This environment was the foundation for the full system software upgrade for all Phoenix environments. These improvements and design enhancements completed successfully, resulting in increased user-friendly functionality and support for additional trial court business processing and capacity. This also includes data exchange interfaces to banks and the courts.

The project completed safeguard and quality control projects such as the SECUDE technical implementation, which increases the security around court data as it travels from the courts to the CCTC, and the Disaster Recovery Exercise which executes a recovery plan should a program disaster occur in the production systems. Lastly, the program established a methodology for system configuration and deployment that includes in-depth testing and detailed planning of complex technical milestones. Expenses included support staff, contractors, software licenses, hardware maintenance, and training.

➤ *Interim Case Management System (ICMS)*

Five vendors of case management systems in use in California courts have been certified as meeting both state and local functional requirements as defined by the courts. Courts further out in the deployment schedule for CCMS are being migrated to the California version of these certified products to ensure stability of critical court operations during this transition period. In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to complete the implementation in 14 of 15 courts that are planned to use the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Efforts

related to data cleanup and data conversion in these 14 courts and the interfaces with justice partners will greatly facilitate the transition of these courts to CCMS.

➤ California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) Re-host

In FY 2008–2009, the AOC transitioned from Siemens IT Solutions (SIS) to Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) as the new provider of services for the CCTC. The transition resulted in a dual data center architecture (a key component of our new Disaster Recovery program), as well as in significant cost savings to the branch. Amidst all the transition activities, the AOC continued to provide uninterrupted services to the courts.

➤ Wide Area Network (WAN) Upgrades

The 58 trial courts did not have a standard telecommunications infrastructure in place when the decision was made for the State to assume responsibility for funding the Trial Courts. In order to facilitate an environment for information sharing between courts and justice partners, there had to be a defined standard that all trial courts would use as the basis for their network upgrade. This initiative provides the fundamental infrastructure for effective and efficient telecommunications including data transfer, video delivery and Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) between the AOC, CCTC, trial courts, public and justice partners. There are five courts in the northern and central regions that have not participated in this program, Alpine, Mariposa, Sutter, Tuolumne and Mono and three courts in the southern region, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego. This project is focused on providing funding for these courts. In FY 2008–2009, Tuolumne LAN/WAN project was completed in December 2008, while the Sutter Superior Court Inter-Branch Agreement was fully executed in June 2009.

➤ E-Exchange

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to pay for travel and technical consulting services related to several joint application design sessions, specifically related to CCMS V3 e-filing, CCMS V4 e-filing and e-service functional requirements. Additional work was done to upgrade the Second Generation Electronic Filing Specifications (2GEFS) Filing and Policy Schemas and create new “plug-in” schemas. In 2002, the California AOC initiated the Second Generation Electronic Filing Specifications (2GEFS) project to simplify the processes for constructing and implementing e-filing systems in the state's trial courts. Additionally, in preparation for CCMS V3 product acceptance testing, the E-Filing Test Suite and EFM were upgraded to the new 2GEFS Schemas. The E-Filing team provided test support services by developing test scenarios and scripts, testing court policies, supporting court users during testing, performing stress and functional testing, and triaging e-filing defects. At the end of the fiscal year, the product acceptance testing for CCMS V3 e-filing was successfully completed and the team began developing test scenarios for CCMS V4.

➤ CA Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

The California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) project will create a statewide protective order repository that will provide more complete, accessible information on restraining and protective orders. Access to protective orders through CCPOR will ultimately be available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week (24/7) in all court jurisdictions and venues. Two key components of CCPOR are the ability to enter and upload protective order data into the system and to search and retrieve that data—including electronic images of court orders. Viewing these electronic images is particularly valuable as it allows users to see special conditions and notes added by judges that are not available through the DOJ California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). In addition, information about court orders that is keyed into CCPOR will be extracted and automatically imported into CARPOS. In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to:

- Document and refine functional requirements with pilot courts;
- Develop technical architecture design;
- Select application development and scanning solution vendors;
- Demonstrate CCPOR functionality at Domestic Violence Task Force meetings in Sacramento and Burbank;
- Collaborate with CCMS team on data exchange and integration requirements; and
- Add CCPOR information to AOC Serranus & www2 websites to share progress and plans with interested courts

➤ Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)

ETMS provides application enhancement for software testing process and improving applications quality management. The major activities in FY 2008–2009 included working with our selected vendor, Alexan, to install, configure and train AOC staff in the use of the ETMS tool suite. Multiple application groups have been trained, including Phoenix, Computer Aided Facilities Management, Data Integration, CCMS V2 and the Appellate Court Case Management System groups. A defect tracking repository from Deloitte was converted and migrated to the ETMS suite as part of ISD's effort to reduce costs by assuming support of CCMS V2 from Deloitte as well.

➤ California Court Technology Center (CCTC)

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to continue providing courts with centralized and comprehensive information technology support services. The major accomplished activities in FY 2008–2009 include: continued services by CCTC including Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Active Directory, Disaster Recovery, Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS), Computer-

Aided Facilities Management (CAFM), Integration Services Backbone (ISB), and Local Court Desktop/Remote Server Support. CCTC continued to host the Phoenix Financial and Human Resources/Payroll system for fifty seven and six courts, respectively. Three case management systems providing direct services to 12 courts also continued to operate out of CCTC: Sustain; CCMS-Criminal and Traffic; and CCMS-Civil/Small Claims/Probate/Mental Health.

➤ Data Integration

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to continue the Data Integration (DI) program and work with the trial courts to develop a statewide approach in data exchange standards and the Integration Services Backbone (ISB). In conjunction with the CCMS-V4 project, development continued on 125 interfaces servicing all case types that are being developed to support courts as they transition to CCMS. Joint Application Design sessions or focus group sessions were conducted to identify data requirements and high-level business processes for each exchange as part of the development of CCMS-V4. Efforts were undertaken to design and build a series of common services for the ISB which would be used to build the data exchanges identified through the CCMS-V4 focus group sessions. These services are reusable functional components which are common to most information exchanges, such as encryption/decryption, routing, duplicate detection, replay, response correction, logging, and auditing.

➤ Telecommunications Support

The ongoing goal of the court telecommunications program is to develop and maintain a network infrastructure aligned with the emerging needs of the enterprise applications such as Phoenix and CCMS. To that end, FY 2008–2009 allocated funds were expended to work with 45 courts on refreshing network equipment. The technology refresh program provides funding to courts to replace equipment that has reached "end of support" and therefore can no longer be maintained. It also provides funding to maintain a high level of network reliability in acknowledgement of the increased reliance on internal and external connectivity with the CCTC, state and local justice partners and among court locations. Program funds provide the foundation for other forms of communication the court requires such as Voice over IP, building automation systems, security cameras, electronic signage and energy management systems and thus provides a cost savings to the court as these other systems are implemented. Lastly, the funding supports the critical focus on information security by providing twenty fours a day, seven days a week monitoring of the systems for electronic intrusions and data corruption.

➤ Enterprise Policy/Planning Operations

The AOC is currently managing the delivery of a number of technology initiatives. Enterprise Policy and Planning ensures that the comprehensive technological

needs of the branch will be met in an efficient manner. In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to develop and maintain branch-wide technology and planning commitments including Enterprise Technology Architecture (ETA). This program provides a roadmap for how all the various technology initiatives fit together from a business and technology perspective. The major activities in FY 2008–2009 included: actively researching, developing, and reviewing software architecture plans for the CCMS, assisting with design of Common Services for the Integration Services Backbone, continuing work on five-year estimates for hardware requirements for the CCTC, interfacing between application development teams and our Branch level software partners including Oracle and Adobe, developing a new Enterprise Architecture governance and decision review process for the Branch, and providing support to the local courts with ETA related issues and solution design.

### **Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure – Support**

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to pay for the statewide administrative infrastructure AOC staff costs (\$10.125 million) and additional initiatives that support courts in various areas (\$3.442 million), consistent with specific appropriations in the state budget. Of the total \$11.816 million was from the Improvement Fund (refer to Attachment A, Addendum 1), and \$1.751 million was from the Modernization Fund (refer to Attachment B, Page 2). The funding was expended on the following:

- *Statewide Technology Infrastructure – Support*  
Support for the statewide technology infrastructure demands continuous dedication of AOC staff, temporary staff and outside private consultants. The AOC continues to make great strides towards completion of these initiatives, which includes design, development, implementation and deployment, and continuous maintenance to the many projects.
  
- *Additional Initiatives*
  - *California Law Enforcement Telecommunication Network (CLETS)*  
CLETS Access, as provided via the California Department of Justice, was enabled during FY 2006–2007 through the CCTC by the implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services. Staffing support at the AOC for the program was maintained to continue the appropriate level of support for the project. One new court was added to CLETS during FY 2008–2009, bringing the total number of supported courts to five. These courts are using the statewide network to access and update various California and federal databases, including the DOJ California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS).



- *Trial Court Reengineering*

In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to continue the AOC’s Northern/Central Regional Office (NCRO) Reengineering and Process Improvement Unit. The Reengineering Unit (RU) Team was formally established in December 2007, and focuses on reengineering the business processes and systems of the trial courts to achieve improvement in business performance. The Reengineering Unit is comprised of a Re-engineering Manager and Senior Court Services Analyst who work with trial courts at the Court’s request to participate in this program. The Reengineering Unit travels to the trial courts to observe the trial courts workflow and business processes, to meet and collaborate with the Court Judicial Officers, executive management, management team, and line staff to identify and recommend efficient and streamlined processes. The Reengineering Unit has been actively assisting courts throughout the State with primary emphasis on Northern/Central Regional Courts. Reengineering efforts have included: analysis and preparation of recommendations for civil business process activities in Amador Superior Court; family law business processes in Fresno Superior Court; analysis of traffic operations in Plumas/Sierra Regional Court House in anticipation of the new regional courthouse to be opened in the last quarter of calendar year 2009; and reengineering training sessions held in Orange County Superior Court and in Baltimore, Maryland for the National Center for State Courts, Court Solutions Conference.

- *Enhanced Collections*

The Enhanced Collections Unit (ECU) continued the successful implementation of Penal Code section 1463.010 by providing professional assistance to statewide court and county collaborative collections programs with establishing performance measures, benchmarks, and best practices as adopted by the Judicial Council on August 15, 2008. The Judicial Council will send its first annual report to the legislature on the performance of each collection program on December 31, 2009.

ECU provided ongoing professional and technical support to all court and county collection programs, as well as justice partners (including the California State Bar), to enhance the performance and effectiveness of the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt statewide. Enhancements include participation in the Franchise Tax Board’s Court-Ordered Debt program, written memorandum of understanding agreements between collaborative courts and counties, and joint participation agreements with collection vendors with statewide collections master agreements. Additionally, the updated 2009 Sentencing Fines and Fees Assistant database was posted on the two collections websites, one available in Serranus and an external site accessible to all users. The ECU

continues to assist courts and counties with the selection of one or more collection vendors.

The ECU assisted the AOC's Office of General Counsel with the implementation research and presentations of Senate Bill 1407 (Stats 2008, ch. 311) as it relates to the collection and distribution of criminal and traffic fees, assessments, and penalties, as well as helped prepare the educational materials for fiscal and IT staff regarding the implementation of the bill. Upon request, the ECU assisted Oregon's judicial branch, the North Carolina Office of the State Auditor, and the National Center for State Courts by providing information about California's collection programs, related legislation, and best practices and procedures.

- *Internal Audits*  
Allocated funds were expended to support six staff positions, consistent with prior-year funding.
- *Regional Office Assistance Group (ROAG)*  
Allocated funds were expended for attorneys and staff working primarily in the three regional offices, whose mission is to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the trial and appellate courts and serve as liaison, clearinghouse, advocate, consultant, and service provider to the trial courts.
- *Treasury-Cash Management*  
Allocated funds were expended on one senior accountant and one staff accountant, including their travel and rent costs. These staff are engaged in the accounting and distribution of the Uniform Civil Fees (UCF) collected by the trial courts, including receiving the monthly UCF collection reporting from all 58 trial courts, entering this reporting in a financial systems application which calculates the statutory distributions, and executing the monthly cash distributions when due to the State and local agency recipients.

Category 2: Trial Court Projects and Model Programs: \$13.430 million (refer to Attachment A, page 4)

Funding was provided for various ongoing, limited-term, and one-time projects that support trial court operations as well as improve court management and efficiency, case processing, and timeliness of trials. The projects and programs include the following:

- *Settlement Support Services for Unrepresented Litigants*  
The allocated funds were expended to conduct pilot projects to help continue efforts to improve the administration of justice throughout the state. This pilot program is intended to address recommendations in the 2005 study "Trust and Confidence in the California Courts", a survey of the public and attorneys, by

helping self-represented litigants, and particularly those with limited English proficiency, to be aware of the availability and potential benefits of mediation and settlement programs and to understand the legal issues and possible outcomes in their cases, so that they can make informed choices during these processes. During this reporting period, five courts were awarded grants to establish and conduct pilot projects or to participate in the collaborative development of multi-lingual videos and printed materials to help self-represented litigants participate in mediation and settlement programs.

➤ Legal Services for P3 Agreement

The allocated funds were expended to engage legal services that included interpretation of applicable law, tax-exempt financing structures, legislative and agency requirements, procurement documents, proposer inquiries, services agreements, environmental and planning requirements, financing plans, and business terms and conditions. SB 77 (Stats. 2007) and SB 82 (Stats. 2007) established a framework by which the separate branches of state government may evaluate the potential benefits of delivering the project via a public-private partnership (also referred to as “performance-based infrastructure.”) In its continuing efforts to implement its mandate to improve the administration of justice throughout the state, the council has identified replacing the current courthouse in Long Beach as one of its highest priorities. The complexity of the proposed financing structure required hiring highly specialized outside counsel to assist in project structuring, preparing solicitation documents, and negotiating with investment banks or other sophisticated financial partners involved with the project. As a result, Bingham, McCutchen, LLP, was chosen as the local firm providing assistance with Project issues requiring expertise in California real estate law and environmental regulation.

➤ E-Access Working Group Meetings

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the costs of two working group meetings on electronic access to the courts. The purpose of the group is to consider issues relating to various types of electronic access and to make recommendations as to what fees, if any, should be charged for such access. These issues have been of significant concern to the public, the Legislature, and the courts. In light of the current fiscal crisis, fee issues have taken on additional significance. A report will be prepared for the Administrative Director containing the working group’s analysis and its recommendations concerning electronic access to court records, fees for such access, and related matters.

➤ Small Civil Cases Working Group Meeting

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the costs of one in-person meeting and a videoconference. The working group discussed how the following systems compared: the South Carolina Summary Jury Trial Program, the system used by

the New York justice system, and the Arizona short trial program. During this reporting period, the working group has not reached a conclusion to make certain recommendations. Therefore, the group will meet again for more discussion and information sharing.

➤ *Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the costs of two regional meetings to obtain input and guidance from the trial courts on implementation of some of the controversial practices, and an outside consultant who was retained to develop bench aids/resource materials for judicial officers in areas of emergency protective orders, restraining orders issued under the DVPA and mandatory terms of probation for criminal protective orders. The task force has spent a significant amount of time developing a rule of courts establishing protocols for firearms relinquishment procedures. The proposed rule is being reviewed by the Criminal Law Advisory Committee and is expected to be presented to the council at its December business meeting. The task force has requested approval to rollover the remaining funds. The task force will continue its efforts to support outstanding implementation activities, such as additional rules of court, revised or new forms, a court forum, technical assistance to local courts, and distance learning events.

➤ *Snapshot 2008*

The allocated funds were expended to support the projects related to statistical measurement of family court and custody mediation, trial court workload study, and the implementation of the family law resource guidelines. The purposes and objectives of these projects and studies were to collect and analyze workload data from family courts, relevant data on the costs and impact of implementing the recommendations of the projects. The allocated funds were also expended on a parallel project that the outside researchers are contracted to collect data in family courts to pilot the family law statistical reports created for the CCMS data warehouse.

➤ *Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the consultant costs of an 18 month project. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Law Judges (NCJFCJ) worked with select courts to create and implement plans to improve the court user experience of youth, parents, and victims involved in delinquency matters. The specific areas they addressed involve the users' comprehension of the juvenile court process and their own case and their communication in the courtroom. After interviewing professional stakeholders and court users to identify issues, the NCJFCJ engaged a multidisciplinary team to write strategic plans, a portion of which was implemented during the study period. The expectation is that at the end of this project, the AOC will report to the courts several evidence-based

practices for their consideration. The participating courts are Fresno, Sacramento, San Diego, and Santa Cruz.

➤ *Consultant for Statewide Technology Initiatives*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for an independent consultant to assist with a number of statewide technology initiatives including: the California Case Management System (CCMS), an enterprise document management solution for the branch, electronic formats for Judicial Council and local forms, e-Business including electronic filing of court cases, and review of policies and legislation that impact the judicial branch infrastructure initiatives. During this reporting period, some of the accomplished areas are: 1) conducted several SmartForms presentations to various committees; 2) worked with the OGC on research of legal issues related to releasing criminal data from court databases to federal justice agencies; 3) assisted with development of the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR); 4) worked with the CCMS data exchange team to insure compliance with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM); 5) reviewed and provided input on the Judicial Council forms design components for CCMS; and 6) provided input on the design and development of the CCMS e-Filing functionality and standardization of configuration rules.

➤ *Commission for Impartial Courts*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the costs of 12 committee and task force meetings, one two-day joint plenary session, and one public forum. The 88-member Commission for Impartial Courts (CIC) was formed in September 2007 with the overall charge to study and recommend ways to ensure judicial impartiality and accountability for the benefit of all Californians. The CIC is composed of a steering committee, chaired by Associate Justice Ming W. Chin of the California Supreme Court, and four task forces: Public Information and Education, Judicial Candidate Campaign Conduct, Judicial Campaign Finance, and Judicial Selection and Retention. The CIC presented its interim report to the council in August 2008 and will present its final report in December 2009.

➤ *Audit Contract*

The allocated funds were expended to supplement an internal audit program that was approved by the council in FY 2001–2002. The audit program includes two components: 1) internal resource – internal audit Services (IAS) unit within the Finance Division of the AOC; 2) external resource – outside consulting and auditing firms to supplement the IAS staff. IAS 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.

- *Distribution to Trial Courts (pursuant to GC 77205(a)(2))*  
The allocated funds were expended to make a one-time distribution to the trial courts. In accordance with GC 77205(a) and California Rules of Court 10.105, the council must annually allocate up to 80 percent of the 50/50 excess split revenue deposited into the Improvement Fund that exceeds the amount deposited in FY 2002–2003 to the trial courts located in the counties from which the excess revenues were collected to fulfill one-time obligations and to address cash flow issues. During this reporting period, thirty-five (35) trial courts qualified to receive a distribution of excess revenues from FY 2007–2008 excess split revenue.
  
- *Conservatorship and Guardianship Program (Distribution to the Trial Courts)*  
The allocated funds were expended to make a one-time distribution to the trial courts for the purpose of enhancing the services that are currently being implemented by trial courts consistent with the requirements of the Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006. The Act created new statutory requirements for conservatorship case processing that have increased workload in the courts. The allocation was based upon the most recently submitted conservatorship data from the trial courts that used each court’s salary and benefit data to estimate the cost of workload associated with the Act. The TCIF funding represented 46.52 percent of the updated proposed funding that was initially included in the Governor’s FY 2008–2009 proposal (\$18.27 million).
  
- *Workers’ Compensation Reserve*  
The allocated funds were expended to pay the claim settlements to the County of Riverside and the County of Santa Barbara. The allocated funds were also expended to pay for the services of a consultant for tail claim data validation and liability calculations. The AOC has been resolving the outstanding liabilities with the various counties for the January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2003 court workers’ compensation liabilities. The Workers Compensation Reserve funds were established to pay tail claim costs which are the subject of negotiations with various counties. During this reporting period, five (5) runoff liabilities are pending with the Counties of Fresno, Marin, Sacramento, San Francisco, and San Mateo. Another five (5) pending liabilities are under negotiation with the Counties of Contra Costa, Orange, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Ventura.
  
- *Trial Court Healthcare Reserve*  
The allocated funds were expended to pay off medical claims that were incurred prior to midnight, December 31, 2008. The allocated funds were also expended to pay for the benefits consultant with specific deliverables, such as: 1) renewal of insured benefits for the trial court benefits program; 2) renewal, modification, and amendment of flexible spending account plan; 3) actuarial services, including rate setting for the self funded plan, reserve estimates, predictive risk analyses, quarterly review of plan performance, and financial forecasts; 4) strategic

consulting, including health and productivity review based on predictive risk analysis, absence management (disability and time-off review), quarterly training on benefits trends and compliance assistance; 5) quarterly review of legislation impacting the benefits programs; and 6) development of a disengagement strategy of the self insured plan.

➤ *Trial Court Benefits Program – Third Party Administrator*

The allocated funds were expended to maintain a service contract with a third-party administrator (TPA) who served as the benefits administrator for the benefits program. The services provided by the TPA were: maintaining enrollment and eligibility information of the plan participants, collecting requisite premiums from the trial courts, and dispersing premium to individual benefit providers. The TPA also addressed the compliance requirements as dictated by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA).

➤ *New South Justice Center Courthouse Project*

The allocated funds were expended to continue a service contract with the Court Construction Management Representative (CCMR). The activities engaged by the CCMR were: communicating and coordinating with the county, the court and AOC project manager, reviewing design on the bridging documents, verifying cost estimates, working with the architect, AOC and the court on the schedules, working on variety of agreements with the court, the county and AOC, and producing monthly reports to inform the status of the project. However, this project was cancelled due to irreconcilable differences between the court/AOC and the County of Orange regarding the projects direction and cost structure. The contractor was notified to stop work on this project.

Category 3: Emergency Funding: \$1.626 million (refer to Attachment A, page 5)

Funding was provided to two trial courts as one-time deficiency funding and distribution advance loan to meet unanticipated critical financial obligation and needs. The emergency funding allocations include the following:

➤ *Deficiency Funding to Glenn County Superior Court*

The allocated funds were expended to provide a one-time deficiency funding to the Glenn County Superior Court. During this reporting period, the court submitted a written request to the AOC as soon as the urgent financial needs were determined. The allocation was to address court's projected shortfall and deficient finances that largely resulted from misinterpretation by court management of the availability of uncommitted court resources. The shortfall projection was prepared by Glenn court staff in conjunction with AOC Trial Court Administrative Services Division staff. AOC Finance Division staff reviewed the estimate and concurred with the shortfall projection.

- *Distribution Advance to Glenn County Superior Court*  
The allocated funds were expended to make a distribution advance on allocated funding to the Glenn County Superior Court. The distribution advance was to meet the court's second payroll of May 2009 and to pay other obligations on a timely basis. The cash flow problem was mainly a result of a projected year-end deficit with the immediate cause that the court was not going to receive reimbursements from various AOC-managed grants until late June 2009 or after. AOC Finance Division staff reviewed the estimate and concurred with the estimated shortfall amount.
  
- *Deficiency Funding to Placer County Superior Court*  
The allocated funds were expended to provide a one-time deficiency funding to the Placer County Superior Court. During this reporting period, the court submitted a written request to the AOC as soon as the projected current year shortfall was determined. The allocation was to address the shortfall that largely resulted from cost increases due to negotiated salary and benefits changes and increased security staffing and related changes. To address the cost drivers on a longer term basis, various systemic actions were undertaken to preserve the funds and to reduce the costs. The shortfall projection was prepared by Placer court staff in conjunction with AOC Trial Court Administrative Services Division staff. AOC Finance Division staff reviewed the estimate and concurred with the shortfall projection.
  
- *Distribution Advance to Placer County Superior Court*  
The allocated funds were expended to make a distribution advance on allocated funding to the Placer County Superior Court. While the deficiency funding addressed the shortfall in 2008–2009 fiscal year, it left the court without any resources to begin the 2009–2010 fiscal year. The distribution advance represented the approximate cost of one pay period. AOC Finance Division staff reviewed the estimate and concurred with the estimated shortfall amount.

***Modernization Fund*** (refer to Attachment B, page 1)

In FY 2008–2009, the council expended \$35.830 million from the Modernization Fund. Funding provided by the Modernization Fund provides the primary support for critical technology projects (e.g., court technology staff, case management systems, data integration, and jury management systems), mandated and non-mandated education for judicial officers (e.g., orientation for new judges and continuing judicial studies), education for court administration and staff (e.g., court faculty program, and distance learning), and key local assistance initiatives (e.g., alternative dispute resolution, complex civil litigation programs, and remote interpreting services). A description of these projects follows:



Category 1: Statewide Technology Projects: \$24.688 million (refer to Attachment B, page 2)

The Modernization Fund allocation of \$24.688 million for statewide technology projects funded various inter-related technology initiatives, including:

### **Statewide Technology Infrastructure – Local Assistance**

- California Court Case Management System (CCMS)  
In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the CCMS project. (Refer to the California Court Case Management System item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)
- Phoenix Financial System  
In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the Phoenix Financial System. (Refer to the Phoenix Financial System item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)
- Phoenix Human Resources System  
In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the Phoenix Human Resources System. (Refer to the Phoenix Human Resources System item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)
- Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)  
In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the ICMS project. (Refer to the Interim Case Management Systems item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)
- California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) Re-host  
In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the CCTC Re-host project. (Refer to the Interim Case Management Systems item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)
- Jury Management Systems  
In FY 2008–2009, allocated funds were expended to support upgrades to the most current version of vendor software. Several courts also upgraded their web access and integrated voice response modules.
- State Partners  
Early on in the CCMS project, it was recognized that a critical success factor for the project was the ability of the state and local justice partners to understand the branch strategy, identify the scope of the changes, obtain the resources, and to develop and test the Web service adaptors. During the course of the last fiscal year, the branch developed a formal Justice Partner Communication Plan that was

reviewed and approved by court technology governance bodies. The plan has two tracks, a General and a Direct Track. As part of the General Track, a Justice Partner Web site was developed, presentations at partner association meetings commenced, and a vendor strategy has been developed. In support of the Direct Track, meetings have been held in person with the court staff and their justice partners to help them complete the activities noted above always at the direction of the court executive or court CIO. Additionally, Direct Track activities have been focused on early adopters and the approximately 20 courts that already have extensive integration. Discussions are also taking place with federal agencies such as Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Department of Justice to determine how to integrate with their systems. To further assist the partners in all of their activities additional documentation has been provided or is planned. The Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD), as well as a Local Integration Assessment Methodology (LIAM) were prepared and posted to the Justice Partner Web site.

➤ *California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)*

In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the CCPOR project. (Refer to the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)

➤ *JBSIS Reconstructions*

The TIBCO JBSIS Web Portal project will allow all California courts to submit manual JBSIS data from their existing case management systems to the JBSIS data warehouse. In FY 2008–2009, the majority of all development and testing work was completed and deployed into the CCTC staging environment, with deployment into the CCTC production environment scheduled for early FY 2009–2010. In conjunction with the completion of development work, the JBSIS team continued actively planning for on-boarding of courts to the new system.

➤ *Uniform Civil Fees*

In July 2005, the Legislature through Government Code section 68085.1(b) required that the 58 trial courts submit a Schedule of AB 145 Fees, Report of Remitted Civil Fees by Code Section at the end of each month to the AOC, effective January 1, 2006. Under GC 68085.1, the AOC is responsible for the reporting and remittance of Uniform Civil Fee (UCF) cash collections. Accordingly, the Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) was developed to support the centralized reporting and distribution of UCF cash collections. The total cash collected by the courts averages \$45 to \$50 million each month. A failure to distribute fees to the appropriate entities within 45 days after the end of the month would result in the state assessing penalties of nearly \$20,000 per day that the distribution is late. UCFS is used to calculate correct distribution of 116

categories of fees collected by the superior courts. The fees are distributed to up to 22 different funds or entities, such as the Trial Court Trust Fund's Children's Waiting Room program or a county's law library. The distributions vary, based on the court, the fee, and the fund or entity receiving the funds. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. Calculations are used by the Finance Division to distribute the funds via funds transfer to various entities.

Work in FY 2008–2009 included updating distributions as legislated by the State and local governments with major changes in July and January. Minor changes were also supported throughout the year. In addition, a function allowing users to input and validate simple distribution changes into the system without programming involvement was developed. This function will enable the user to make many of the changes that are mandated by local governments, but not more complex changes legislated by the State.

➤ Security Program

In FY 2008–2009, progress was made in the development of policy in the areas of data and network security, disaster recovery, and continuity of business operation. The major activities included: engaging an organization to assist in development of the branchwide security policy framework and forming a committee comprised of trial court, appellate court, and AOC representatives to develop a policy framework that can also be applied to the courts, AOC and CCTC. The first draft has been developed and is currently under review by the committee.

➤ Wireless Standards

The 58 trial courts have an immediate need to provide Internet access in their jury assembly rooms and have been investigating solutions to solve this need. In order to leverage the courts' existing infrastructure and ensure that the wireless technology used poses no additional security risk to the courts' network, the wireless standards project will augment LAN/WAN network standards to include wireless connectivity. In all, the AOC completed wireless network installation projects in 16 courts: Alameda, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Fresno, Imperial, Kings, Monterey, Napa, Placer, Riverside, San Benito, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Solano.

➤ VOIP Pilot and Standards

As the trial courts continue to separate from their counties, one area of this separation is taking ownership of a court voice communications system. Voice communications has moved away from the traditional phone switch to a voice-over-internet protocol (VoIP) system where voice travels over network data lines and not over separate "twisted pair" phone lines. The courts have invested heavily in the upgrade of the network systems to a standardized IP based data network

within the courts. The long term vision of this network architecture was that it would support other IP based communication services, one of which is the VoIP network. Standardization of the data network has made it significantly easier for courts to utilize the shared services environment at the CCTC and to implement the statewide applications such as Phoenix and CCMS. This standardization has the potential for providing a consistent user experience to the judicial system as well as saving the branch money due to volume discounts and the leveraging of resources. Although the AOC created a standard for the courts' data networks, at this point in time, there is no standard the courts can use for voice communication. The courts have begun to explore and start to implement the use of this technology and we already see the divergent path of systems and user experience. This project will create a VoIP standard the courts can utilize. In FY 2008–2009, pilot implementations for the San Francisco Superior Court and the Santa Ana Appellate Court were completed.

➤ California Courts Technology Center

In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported the court technology center. (Refer to the California Courts Technology Center item in the Improvement Fund section for details.)

➤ Data Integration

In FY 2008–2009, both Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund resources supported data integration. (Refer to the Data Integration item in the Improvement Fund section of this report for details.)

## **Statewide Technology Infrastructure – Support**

Support for the statewide technology infrastructure demands continuous dedication of AOC staff, temporary staff and outside private consultants. The AOC continues to make great strides towards completion of these initiatives, which includes design, development, implementation and deployment, and continuous maintenance to the many projects.

### Category 2: Educational and Developmental Programs: \$2.693 million (refer to Attachment B, page 3)

The council's strategic plan identifies education of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and non-judicial court staff as a significant means to advance the mission and goals of the judiciary in the areas of access, fairness, diversity, and ethics. With the increasing complexity of the law and court procedures, delivery of justice to the people of California requires judges and court personnel to be equipped with knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable them to administer the justice system in a fair, effective manner that fosters public confidence. The allocations for education programs and statewide meetings fall into five general categories: Mandated State Education Programs for Judges (e.g., orientation for new judges, family law assignment education), Non-Mandated Education

Programs for Judges (e.g., continuing judicial studies program, probate and mental health institute, overview courses), Education and Training Programs related to Court Administration (e.g., technical assistance to local courts, train the trainers, trial court faculty), Education Programs for Court Staff (e.g., court clerk training institute, distance learning, human resources staff training), and Other Educational and Developmental Programs (e.g., teen courts and beyond bench, trial court outreach).

The education programs and projects are listed on Attachment B, page 3, and the funding enabled judges and subordinate judicial officers to participate in mandated and assignment-related educational programs as well as trial court staff to attend various training programs. Education and development funding from the Modernization Fund currently covers the costs of lodging and group meals for participants attending statewide education programs and conferences as well as mandatory education programs for judges and non-mandatory education programs for judges, court executives, and other court staff. The funding also covers the development and transmission of broadcast programs.

Category 3: Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs: \$8.449 million (refer to Attachment B, page 4)

The provision of justice in the courts can be enhanced by improving access, efficiency, and effectiveness. In FY 2008–2009, the council allocated funding from the Modernization Fund to support innovative programs that enhanced the provision of justice. The projects and programs include the following:

➤ Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

The allocated funds were expended to continue the Civil Mediation and Settlement Program project. This project is designed to expand the mediation and settlement programs for civil cases in the trial courts. The project helps courts meet the goal of section 10.70(a) of the Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations. It also implements the council's February 2004 directive that AOC staff work with the trial courts to: 1) assess their needs and available resources for developing, implementing, maintaining, and improving mediation and other settlement programs for civil cases; and 2) where existing resources are not sufficient, develop plans for obtaining the necessary resources. During this reporting period, two types of grants were awarded to trial courts: 1) one planning grant to conduct an assessment on plan mediation or settlement program; and 2) nineteen implementation grants to implement a new mediation or settlement program or improve or expand an existing one. A portion of the Modernization Fund budget for ADR projects was also used to enhance the capability of the CCMS to administer cases assigned to trial court ADR programs.

- *Complex Civil Litigation Program*  
The allocated funds were expended to provide support for the Complex Civil Litigation Program, which began as a pilot program in January 2000. During this reporting period, the program involved 18 departments in the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties. In August 2003, the council approved making this a permanent program and it is tasked with improving the management of complex civil cases.
- *Plain Language and Foreign Language*  
The allocated funds were expended to translate various Judicial Council forms into foreign languages and plain English. These translations are intended to assist self-represented litigants and persons with limited English language proficiency. The forms translated into foreign languages during the fiscal year were for domestic violence prevention, unlawful detainer, and traffic. The forms prepared as plain language format during the fiscal year were for fee waiver and small claims. Numerous protective order forms in plain language will be revised and many of those will need to be translated into foreign languages.
- *Self-Help Videos for the Website*  
The allocated funds were expended to pay the costs of the server for videos for the public on issues such as how to prepare for court and how mediation works. Training sessions from the self-help conferences were posted to allow staff and judicial officers who were unable to participate in the workshops to view the courses on-line.
- *Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms (Interactive Software)*  
The allocated funds were expended to develop “plain language” forms and translation of commonly used forms. Additionally, funds were used to support a national document assembly server that will enable litigants to complete their forms on-line at no charge. Developed in collaboration with legal services programs, these interactive programs can be used in every county to help litigants complete pleadings in workshop settings more quickly and accurately.
- *California Drug Court Cost Analysis*  
The allocated funds were expended to support implementation of the drug court cost study in local courts statewide through the development and implementation of a web-based Drug Court Cost Self Evaluation Tool (DC-CSET). The tool made it possible for courts to quantify costs and benefits of drug court programs. Funds were also used to hire consultants to analyze the data submitted by the courts. Nearly a third of adult drug courts in the state participated in the project and received individual cost analyses. Trial courts have reported that the results of this cost study have been used to successfully advocate for funding locally. A final report of statewide results is in preparation. Funds were also used to modify the

DUI courts and to create statewide comparison group offenders who did not go through drug court in order to accurately track the outcomes related to drug court participation.

➤ *Court Appointed Counsel Performance Database*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for licensing fees that allowed for continued use of the court appointed counsel case management system, which was used by approximately 450 attorneys, who had been required to manually track and report data to the AOC on a quarterly basis, participating in the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding and Training (DRAFT) program. Because of the volume, and the cumbersome nature of manual data, the data was not analyzed and reported back to attorneys and the courts on a regular basis so as to ensure that cases were being handled in accordance with workload and performance standards. The development and continued use of the Court Appointed Counsel Performance Database has enabled quality data analysis, resulted in a more expeditious data reporting process for attorneys, and has been instrumental in quantitatively measuring the relationship of attorney performance to child welfare outcomes.

➤ *Collaborative Justice*

The allocated funds were expended to support the Youth Summit that was held in June 2009 at California State University, Long Beach. The Summit was attended by approximately 180 youth, judges, and peer court staff. The theme was “Unity in Diversity – Youth Courts Empowering Teens to Make a Difference.” The Los Angeles County Sheriff Department brought their Stop Hate and Respect Everyone (SHARE) vehicle and all youth were able to view the program that develops leadership around tolerance and the appreciation of diversity among humanity with the ultimate reduction in hate crimes. The funds were also used to support other workshops such as drug and alcohol violations, diverting suspension and increasing graduation rates, working with special needs clients, alternative sentencing for hate crimes and incidents, power and privilege and getting the most out of the police report. The event concluded with a trip to the Museum of Tolerance and the Simon Wiesenthal Center.

➤ *Family Law Resource Guidelines*

The allocated funds were expended to pay the costs for publishing a volume that provides models of resource allocation and administration that promote effective practices on family case processing at all stages. The Family Law Resource Guideline Project is a three-year project that was initiated to address the need for additional resources in California family law courts. An eight member drafting team with leading judicial officers and a court executive made policy decisions for the project and reviewed all drafts of the volume. The drafting team was supported by nine groups of subject matter experts from the courts working on

content in such topics as assistance to self-represented litigants, differentiated case management and early comprehensive settlement, custody mediation and other social services, domestic violence, and AB1058 issues. During this reporting period, there were over 70 court participants from 24 courts that included judges, commissioners, family law facilitators, family court services mediators, and court operations managers and staff.

➤ *Blue Ribbon Commission Summit*

The allocated funds were expended to bring judicial officers and court staff as part of multidisciplinary county teams to a statewide summit sponsored by the California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care. Approximately 400 attendees from 50 counties worked on prioritizing the commission recommendations and planning for ongoing local collaboration. Allocated funds were used for travel, lodging and meals for judicial officers and court staff. Defining comprehensive performance measures for juvenile court continued to fulfill the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges were selected to carry out the project to draft performance measures for delinquency cases, including delinquency and dependency crossover cases.

➤ *Presiding Judges and Court Executives Meetings*

The allocated funds were expended to facilitate nine face-to-face meetings that provided a forum for the presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executives, assistant court executives, and other court leaders to discuss and consider both local and statewide court administration issues affecting trial court operations. The initiatives supported by the committees included: 1) vexatious litigant statute CCP 391.7; 2) rule to allow video or telephonic oral argument in appellate proceedings; 3) Institute for Court Management (ICM) consortium courses; 4) joint working group on jury administration; and 5) working groups on reviewing practices for allocating and tracking judicial leave, PJ/CEO rules and roles analysis, and alternatives for document management.

➤ *Kleps Award Program*

The allocated funds were expended to award and publicize the council's biannual Ralph N. Kleps Award that honors and celebrates innovative contributions of courts to the administration of justice. Kleps Award nominees and recipients represent creative solutions to problems faced by many courts throughout the state. Funds were used to pay for the travel costs of two in-person award committee meetings and site visits. The benefit of the Kleps award program, and the reason these meetings and visits were held and awards were given out, was really to demonstrate that the judicial branch is not only making a commitment to innovation, but values it, encourages it, and recognizes those programs and the local courts that are making these improvements. During this reporting period,



eight courts were recognized for innovative contributions to the administration of justice: Amador, Imperial, Monterey, San Mateo, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Santa Clara, and Second District Court of Appeal.

➤ *Jury Management and Improvement Initiatives*

The allocated funds were expended to promote efficiencies and improvements of jurors and the quality of justice in a variety of ways including: 1) improving the juror experience – supported juror appreciation week and purchased digital-to-analog converter boxes for televisions located in requesting courts’ jury assembly rooms; 2) increasing efficiency and modernization of jury administration and management – drafted legislation to be Judicial Council-sponsored legislation forwarded by Senator Tom Harman as SB 319, completed the Joint Working Group on Jury Administration (JWGJA)’s Failure to Appear Toolkit, and purchased Adobe Acrobat Professional software for jury divisions of the 58 superior courts; and 3) education of the public and the courts – supported public speaking engagement at the Jury and Education Management Forum, and produced a set of educational jury outreach brochures for trial courts and the AOC to inform the public and business owners about the importance of jury service.

➤ *Courts Review Magazine*

The allocated funds were expended to publish the Courts Review Magazine (CRM), a branchwide quarterly periodical. CRM reports on initiatives and issues facing state courts and serves as a forum for court leaders and branch stakeholders. The magazine was mailed to all judges and court executives in California, as well as chief justices and administrative directors in all 50 states. CRM continued to be the flagship publication for the California Judicial Branch, supporting key branch projects, such as the Phoenix Financial and Human Resources System and the California Courts Case Management System, through feature articles; promoting upcoming events and programs through display ads; and with the flexibility to incorporate detailed messaging as with the Summit of Judicial Leaders.

➤ *Developing Promising Practices*

The allocated funds were expended to support two programs: 1) the California Justice Corps Program – members assisted court-based attorneys in serving the public by helping to triage cases, providing information and referral, identifying and completing legal forms, and assisting in day of court hearings. Members also recruited, trained, and placed 258 undergraduate university students in court-based legal access self-help centers in Los Angeles, San Diego, and four Bay Area counties; 2) California on My Honor, Civics Institute for Teachers – the AOC entered into an inter-branch agreement with California State University, San Marcos to organize the program. The institutes provided professional development to teachers who collaboratively created tools to educate the public about the judicial branch by working with specially trained teacher leaders.

Teachers were taught to create effective civic education projects for their Kindergarten through 12th grade students. The 46 teachers that participated taught these projects to an estimated 3800 students in the fall of 2008 and attended a final institute meeting in October 2008 at the AOC. There, teachers examined student work, refined their projects, and further solidified as a professional learning community in civic education.

➤ *Trial Court Performance and Accountability*

The allocated funds were expended to advance the goals of the council as follows: 1) Workload Assessment and Resource Allocation – continued the development of measures of performance and accountability in the trial courts as an outgrowth of the council's adoption of the Resource Allocation Study (RAS) model and in support of SB 56 (Government Code § 77001.5); 2) Criminal Case flow Management – on-site technical assistance in criminal caseflow management was provided to the San Francisco, El Dorado, San Luis Obispo, and Humboldt County Superior Courts, and project continued to provide assistance to the Riverside justice system partners in the tracking and modification of the new criminal caseflow structure; 3) Procedural Justice and Effective Court Practices in Small Claims Cases – the study built upon the qualitative research already completed to develop, launch, and complete phone interviews with a stratified random sample of over 900 English and Spanish speaking small claims litigants. The interviews were conducted in three different jurisdictions including Alameda, Sacramento, and San Francisco superior courts. The comments emerging from these conversations will be reviewed and incorporated into a final report that is scheduled for release in 2010.

➤ *High Priority Media Relations Projects*

The allocated funds were expended to cover the costs for two Bench-Bar-Media Committee in-person meetings at the AOC's San Francisco office. The committee was appointed by California's Chief Justice and charged with developing recommendations to enhance communications and working relationships among court representatives, the press, and attorneys. During the meetings, numerous issues were addressed including greater access to court proceedings and records, cameras and other electronic devices in the courts, education of court employees and the bench on media issues, education of the press on court functions, and managing high-profile cases. The committee is scheduled to conclude its work in August 2010.

➤ *Branch Online Communications*

The allocated funds were expended to pay consultant costs for completing the second phase of the Judicial Branch Web Redesign Project. A new graphical design system has been created for all AOC-maintained Web sites (California Courts, Serranus, Center for Families, Children and the Courts, Education Portal,

COMET) and a new information architecture has been created that consolidates all the content and information from the sites mentioned above into one new "super-site." The second phase of work was to migrate the contents of the web sites to the newly designed website and implement the new Web Content Management System (WCMS). Once the WCMS is operational, a large migration initiative will take place to move all existing content into the new system.

➤ *Court Interpreters Program – Testing, Development and Implementation*

The allocated funds were expended to support the legislatively mandated program and to cover the related costs for these activities: 1) 2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study – a once-every-five-years study of language needs and interpreter use within the state trial courts is legislatively mandated; 2) Test Administration for Court Interpreter Certification and Registration – contracted with a vendor to administer the court interpreter certification and registration exams; 3) National Center for State Courts Consortium Study – to determine if the National Center for State Courts Consortium exams met the standards adopted by the council and if the exams could be adopted by California; 4) Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) meeting – the CIAP is a council mandated advisory committee created to assist the council in designating languages for court interpreter certification, adopting and publishing guidelines, standards, and procedures to determine which certification entities should be approved; 5) Court Interpreter Ethics and Orientation Workshops – mandatory activities for court interpreters to complete the interpreter certification and registration process, and six ethics workshops and one orientation were conducted with 150 participants throughout the state; and 6) Court Interpreter Test Preparation Workshop – a court interpreter test preparation workshop for newly certified languages including Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Mandarin, and Russian.

➤ *Judicial Council Orientation and Planning Meeting (Trial Court Participants)*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for the travel expenses for trial court members of the council to attend a three-day branchwide planning meeting. The meeting addressed branchwide priorities such as: 1) trial court funding and reductions; 2) revised a variety of rules of court and forms for the purpose of the continuous improvement of the administration of justice; 3) adopted interim procedures to regulate the administration of court-funded local judicial benefits that are authorized by Senate Bill No. 11 to further the accountability of public trust and confidence in the court system in light of the extraordinarily severe fiscal condition of the state and the council's responsibility over the fiscal management of the trial court; 4) adopted the revised Collections Reporting Template, Collections Performance Measures and Benchmarks, and Collections Best Practices for use by the joint superior court and county collection programs, enabling the council to meet newly enacted legislative mandates regarding collections; 5) approved publication of revisions and additions to civil and

criminal plain language jury instructions; 6) approved updates to the Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan and the prioritization methodology, and selecting all bond-funded (SB 1407) projects; 7) approved the annual report to the Legislature on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice; and 8) approved revisions to the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules for all non-parking Vehicle Code infractions pursuant to statutory mandate.

➤ *Interpreter Recruitment Campaign*

The allocated funds were expended to pay for strategically focused activities to expand court interpreter recruitment efforts into new geographic areas and languages. The activities included: 1) the provision of recruitment materials to individual trial courts so they could implement their own recruitment efforts; 2) targeted advertising throughout the state with multiple media outlets both in mainstream and foreign language media; and 3) training events. The Court Interpreters Program (CIP) engaged in a two-pronged approach to recruitment efforts by targeting individuals most likely to pass the certification exams in languages most needed by the trial courts, and by continuing branding efforts to build public awareness of court interpreting as a profession.

**Conclusion**

During the past decade, the judicial branch has undergone dramatic and fundamental structural changes, including the switch from county funding to state funding of the trial courts along with subsequent improvements in branch's budget process, the unification of 220 municipal and superior courts into 58 court systems—one in each county. All these changes have been encouraged and embraced as part of the judicial branch's focus on creating a strong judicial branch that is better equipped to comprehensively deliver justice to all Californians.

Funding from the Improvement and Modernization Funds continues to represent a vital component of the judicial branch budget to ensure equal access to fair and consistent justice across the state.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2008–2009  
Resources**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>\$ 80,050,994</b>
Prior Year Adjustments	1,698,741
Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	<u>81,749,735</u>
<b>REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>	
50/50 Excess Fines and Forfeitures Split Revenue <sup>1</sup>	57,843,774
2% Automation Fund Revenue	17,893,248
Interest from Surplus Money Investment Fund	2,757,317
Sales of Document/Royalties from Publications of Jury Instructions	362,951
Miscellaneous Revenue	532
One Percent (1%) Transfer from the Trial Court Trust Fund	26,215,710
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund (AB 1806, GC 77202(a)(B)(iii))	<u>(31,563,000)</u>
<b>Total Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>73,510,532</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 155,260,267</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per Government Code section 77205(b), the revenues required to be deposited to the Improvement Fund are due 45 days after the end of the fiscal year.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2008–2009  
Summary of Fund Balance**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>\$ 155,260,267</b>
 <b>Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	
Ongoing Statewide Programs	103,899,162
Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	13,429,695
Emergency Funding	1,625,681
	<hr/>
<b>Subtotal Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>118,954,538</b>
 Pro-rata, Statewide General Administrative Services	 694,856
	<hr/>
<b>Total Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Pro-Rata</b>	<b>119,649,394</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Total Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 35,610,873</b>

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances  
Category I - Ongoing Statewide Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Trial Court Security Grants	2,951,441
Litigation Management Program	3,729,345
Commission on Judicial Performance Defense Insurance Program	761,395
Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	21,610
Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program	764,127
Self-Represented Litigants - Strategic Planning	303,339
Family Law Interpreter Program for Domestic Violence Cases	1,749,999
Self-Help Centers	4,999,998
Online Training	17,005
Branchwide Strategic Planning	168,115
California Courts - Connecting with Constituencies	324,220
Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	73,456
Trial Court Benefits Program - Legal Advice	150,000
Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Initiatives - Local Assistance <sup>1</sup>	76,069,222
Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Initiatives - Support <sup>1</sup>	11,815,890
<b>Total Ongoing Statewide Programs</b>	<b>\$ 103,899,162</b>

<sup>1</sup> See Addendum 1 for the list of projects.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund  
FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**

**Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Projects and Support**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
California Court Case Management System (CCMS)	29,296,391
Phoenix Project (Includes Financial and Human Resources Systems)	8,718,811
Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)	2,319,976
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Re-Hosting	5,659,381
Wide Area Network Upgrades	337,154
E-Exchange	616,818
CA Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	624,390
Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	190,021
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Ongoing Operations	3,595,455
Data Integration	3,081,840
Telecommunications Support	12,685,130
Enterprise Policy/Planning Operations	8,943,854
<b>Subtotal Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects</b>	<b>76,069,221</b>
<b>Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Support<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>11,815,890</b>
<b>Total Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Projects and Support</b>	<b>\$ 87,885,111</b>

<sup>1</sup> As specified by the provisions of GC 68085(a)(2)(A), the amount available from the Improvement Fund that can be used for statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives support is 20% of the amounts deposited into the Improvement Fund pursuant to GC 77205(a).



**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Category II - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Settlement Support Services for Unrepresented Litigants	330,000
Legal Services for P3 Agreement	300,000
E-Access Working Group Meetings	7,223
Small Civil Cases Working Group Meetings	2,621
Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force	79,672
Snapshot 2008	226,806
Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment	98,796
Consultant for Statewide Technology Initiatives	94,376
Commission for Impartial Courts	77,367
Audit Contract	750,000
Distribution to Trial Courts [pursuant to GC 77205(a)(2)] <sup>1</sup>	639,857
Conservatorship and Guardianship (Distribution to the Courts)	8,500,000
Workers Compensation Reserve	996,977
Trial Court Healthcare Reserve	397,000
Trial Court Benefits Program - Third Party Administrator	500,000
New South Justice Center Courthouse Project	429,000
<b>Total Trial Court Projects and Model Programs</b>	<b>\$ 13,429,695</b>

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to GC 77205(a), the amount above the FY 2002–2003 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue level is to be allocated between the trial court(s) that collected amounts above the FY 2002–2003 level, other trial courts as provided in GC 68085(a)(1) [that is, to the TCTF], and retained in the Improvement Fund. The amounts distributed are one-time funds that will vary in amount from year-to-year. For this reporting period, the adjusted FY 2002–2003 base level was \$62.434 million.

**Trial Court Improvement Fund**  
**FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Category III - Emergency Funding**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Deficiency Funding to Glenn County Superior Court	39,364
Distribution Advance to Glenn County Superior Court	381,000
Deficiency Funding to Placer County Superior Court	555,317
Distribution Advance to Placer County Superior Court	650,000
<b>Total Emergency Funding</b>	<b>\$ 1,625,681</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**

**FY 2008–2009**

**Summary of Expenditures and Encumbrances**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>\$ 44,676,000</b>
<b>Expenditures and Encumbrances by Category</b>	
Statewide Technology Projects	24,687,888
Education and Developmental Programs	2,692,526
Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	8,449,553
<b>Total Expenditures and Encumbrances</b>	<b>\$ 35,829,967</b>
<b>Appropriation Savings</b>	<b>\$ 8,846,033</b>

35,829,967.23

8,846,032.77

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Category I - Statewide Administrative and Technology - Projects and Support**

Description	Amount
California Court Case Management System (CCMS)	13,428,745
Phoenix Project (Includes Financial and Human Resources Systems)	1,191,443
Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS)	1,545,450
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Re-Hosting	4,045
Jury Management	454,836
State Partners	4,168
California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	1,060
JBSIS Reconstructions	109,891
Uniform Civil Fees	486,311
Security Program	69,450
Wireless Standards	222,380
VOIP Standards and Pilot	81,485
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) - Ongoing Operations	4,201,748
Data Integration	1,136,172
<b>Subtotal Statewide Technology Infrastructure - Projects</b>	<b>22,937,184</b>
<b>Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Support<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1,750,704</b>
<b>Total Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Projects and Support</b>	<b>\$ 24,687,888</b>

<sup>1</sup> As specified by Provision 3 of Item 0250-102-0556 in the 2008 Budget Act, up to \$5,967,000 was available to fund positions and activities for the development and deployment of the Phoenix Project to implement a statewide human resources system to support trial court operations.

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**  
**FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances**  
**Category II - Educational and Developmental Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Orientation for New Court Judges	131,458
Family Law Assignment Education	53,023
Juvenile Law Assignment Education	36,079
<b><i>Subtotal, Mandated State Education Program</i></b>	<b>220,560</b>
Summer Continuing Judicial Studies Program	87,708
Fall Continuing Judicial Studies Program	106,802
Criminal Law and Procedure Institute	20,498
Cow County Judges Institute	18,989
Statewide Fairness Conference	44,142
Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program (CJSP)	170,344
Probate and Mental Health Institute	32,327
Civil Law and Procedure Institute	22,018
Overview Courses	127,745
Probate and Conservatorship Institute	34,114
<b><i>Subtotal, Non-Mandated Education Programs</i></b>	<b>664,687</b>
Court Management Course (Fall CJSP)	49,743
Technical Assistance to Local Courts	102,490
Train the Trainers - Faculty Development	127,391
Training Coordinators Conference	7,320
Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs)	434,081
Full Summit of Judicial Leaders	39,948
Court Management Curriculum	33,333
Western States Court Leadership Academy	65,014
<b><i>Subtotal, Programs Related to Court Administration</i></b>	<b>859,320</b>
Mid-level Management Conferences	43,311
Court Clerk Training Institute	299,818
Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)	226,423
Court Staff Training	3,981
Trial Judicial Attorney Institute	48,257
HR Staff Training	34,495
<b><i>Subtotal, Programs for Trial Court Staff</i></b>	<b>656,285</b>
CFCC Programs (Teen Courts and Beyond the Bench)	82,595
CFCC Publications	135,820
Trial Court Outreach - Visits to Council/AOC	31,195
New Judicial Officer Regional Meeting for Branch Policy	6,345
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	20,315
CA Judicial Branch HR Conference	15,404
<b><i>Subtotal, Other Educational and Developmental Programs</i></b>	<b>291,674</b>
<b>Total Education and Developmental Programs</b>	<b>\$ 2,692,526</b>

**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund  
 FY 2008–2009 Expenditures and Encumbrances  
 Category III - Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alternative Dispute Resolution	1,177,880
Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,126,010
Plain-Language and Foreign language	75,000
Self-Help Videos for the Website	5,850
Self-represented Litigant Electronic Form (Interactive Software)	59,900
California Drug Court Cost Analysis	213,825
Court Appointed Counsel Performance Database	187,871
Collaborative Justice	46,596
Family Law Resource Guidelines	198,635
Blue Ribbon Commission Summit	141,604
Presiding Judges and Court Executives Meetings	204,517
Kleps Award Program	45,791
Jury Management and Improvement Initiatives	267,322
Courts Review Magazine	55,772
Developing Promising Practices	371,800
Trial Court Performance and Accountability	279,328
High Priority Media Relations Projects	6,653
Branch Online Communications	300,000
Court Interpreters' Program - Testing Development and Implementation	598,926
Judicial Council Orientation and Planning Meeting (Trial Court Participants)	47,926
Interpreter Recruitment Campaign	38,347
<b>Total Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects</b>	<b>\$ 8,449,553</b>