



San Joaquin County SUPERIOR COURT

Long-Range Strategic Plan

December 2000



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The court thanks all Planning Team members for their continuing dedicated efforts and personal sacrifices in assisting in the development and implementation of this plan.

The court extends a special thanks to Kathy Ewing and the volunteers of the Mediation Center of San Joaquin. Their facilitation skills and commitment to the community were instrumental in the success of our focus group sessions.

Special thanks are also extended to Professor John Phillips of the University of the Pacific. His help was essential to the establishment of our new and continuing relationship with the Southeast Asian communities. His assistance in securing rooms suitable for many of our focus group sessions at the University is also appreciated.

Further thanks is extended to University of the Pacific. The generous provision of facilities and services to us is indicative of the University's commitment to the community. The University has shown itself, time and time again, to be a valuable member of our community. We look forward to a continuing partnership with the University as we serve the people of San Joaquin County.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Overview of San Joaquin County

Vision and Mission

Strategic Issues, Goals, & Policy Directions

Administration / Management / Labor

Case and Calendar Management

Court Planning

Customer Service

Disabled Access & Accommodation

Facilities

Interpreters & Improved Access for Non-English Speakers

Jury Duty

Juvenile Justice

Public Education

Race / Culture / Gender / Economic Bias

Technology

Appendices

Appendix A - 1999 Community-Focused Court
Planning Team Roster

Appendix B - 1999 Community-Focused Court
Planning Team Subcommittees

Appendix C - Conducting Focus Group Sessions

Appendix D - *The Pulse of the Community: San
Joaquin County Superior Court Public Report 2000*

Appendix E - Outcomes to Date: Planning &
Implementation Efforts

Appendix F - Current Planning Team Roster

Appendix G - Planning Team Subcommittees

Appendix H - Population Growth in San Joaquin County

Appendix I - San Joaquin County Ethnic Populations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In San Joaquin County, as in the rest of the state, community-focused court planning is an on-going process. This plan is just the beginning of a perpetual work in progress. Our planning team and the San Joaquin County Superior Court are committed to making the process work now and in the future for the betterment of our local justice system and for the benefit of the community the system serves.

I. THE 1999 PLANNING TEAM

In May of 1998, the San Joaquin County Superior Court sent a six-person team to attend the first of three statewide meetings sponsored by the Judicial Council on Community Focused Planning.¹ The Planning Team was expanded, and regular monthly meetings of the team began in February of 1999.² Additional members were added to the team during the Spring of 1999³, and in April of 1999, the chair was assumed by Judge William J. Murray, Jr.

On June 17 -18 of 1999 several of the planning team members attended the statewide community focus conference held in San Diego. There, we learned two things about the composition of our planning team. On the positive side, it appeared from our observations and from discussions with representatives from the other teams that we had more bench officers directly participating in the community-focused planning process. Further, the number of judges involved appeared to be a much higher percentage of our bench. On the other hand, it was clear we did not have the level of public representation that we observed in the other teams. At that point in time, we only had two members of the public on the planning team.

Our next local meeting after the San Diego conference was on July 15, 1999. At that meeting, our planning team voted to expand our membership. Between July and mid-August of 1999 we added 14 participants, 11 from the public. Shortly thereafter, an additional representative from the County and two additional court administrative personnel joined the team. By December 15, 1999, the planning team consisted of 11 bench officers, 5 court administrative personnel, 3 members of county government, 2

¹ The members of the San Joaquin County contingent who attended the Long Beach conference in May of 1998 were Assistant Presiding Judge Terrence Van Oss, Judge Anthony Lucaccini, Court Executive Officer Jeanne Millsaps, Deputy County Counsel David Wooten, San Joaquin County Bar Association Board Member Gina Johnston, and a member of the public, Joseph Larranaga.

²Listed alphabetically, the expanded team consisted of Commissioner Robin Appel, Judge Robert Baysinger, Judicial Secretary Terry Costa, Judge Stephen Demetras, San Joaquin County Bar Association Board Member Public Member Gina Johnston, Joseph Larranaga, Judge Anthony Lucaccini, Superior Court Chief Executive Officer Jeanne Millsaps, Judge William Murray, Superior Court Presiding Judge Thomas Teaford, Assistant Presiding Judge Terrence Van Oss, Judge Richard Vlavianos, and Deputy County Counsel David Wooten.

³Former Presiding Juvenile Court Judge Thomas Harrington and Superior Court Deputy Court Executive Officer Annette Kirby.

members representing the County Bar and 10 members of the public at large.⁴

On July 28, 1999, the expanded planning team met and team members were assigned to four subcommittees. Those subcommittees were: 1) The Focus Group Subcommittee, 2) The Survey Subcommittee, 3) The Publications Subcommittee, and 4) The Youth and Education Subcommittee.⁵

II. THE PLANNING PROCESS

In April of 1999, for the first time, grant funds from the Judicial Council became available to hire a consultant to assist us in putting together our plan. Because our court lacked dedicated monies to hire our own consultant and because the grant monies were not substantial enough to allow us to do so, the San Joaquin County Superior Court entered into a joint funding agreement with Stanislaus and Merced counties to hire the consultant. Our grant consultant was Heidi Kolbe of The Kolbe Company in Sacramento.

Over the next several months, four separate opinion survey forms were created by the consultant and the executive officers of Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Merced, San Joaquin, Solano, and Stanislaus counties. The surveys targeted: 1) the general public, 2) court users, 3) court employees, and 4) jurors. Thereafter, the forms were redesigned to be tabulated in a scantron machine. These forms were completed in August and early September of 1999.

Prior to learning of the San Diego meeting, the planning team had decided to conduct a single countywide community forum and tentatively scheduled it for mid-July. We postponed our plans after learning of the San Diego meeting. At our July 1999 meetings, our team decided to conduct multiple focus groups with different groups of stakeholders instead of a single community forum. In August, the Focus Group Subcommittee identified specific groups and began to schedule focus group meetings with these stakeholders. By meeting with these groups during this initial phase of our community-focused court planning program, we established important relationships and started a dialogue which has been ongoing. We recognized that this benefit could not be as easily achieved by holding a countywide community forum. Each focus group meeting was held either at a place designated by the focus group participants or on the campus of the University of Pacific.

A. Focus Group Meetings

⁴See Appendix A.

⁵See Appendix B for the committee assignments as of December 15, 1999.

We met with 12 different groups. The groups and meeting dates are listed in the margin.⁶ Because of problems associated with the first meeting with the Cambodian community, we met with them twice. With the exception of those who attended the first Cambodian focus group and the law enforcement focus group, each attendee filled out the general public survey form at the beginning of each meeting.⁷ Those who attended the law enforcement focus group filled out the court user survey. In meetings consisting of larger groups, the attendees were then divided into separate break-out focus groups. The focus groups were asked the following questions:

- C What are your expectations of the courts?
- C What do you like about the courts?
- C What don't you like about the courts and what do the courts need to improve?
- C What trends do you think the courts should know about that might affect how your community does business with the courts in the next five years?
- C What information about the courts would you like?

With the exception of the focus group sessions with the Latino community, each focus group session was facilitated by volunteers from the Mediation Center of San Joaquin. Designated Planning Team members attended each of the meetings.⁸

The third focus group meeting was sponsored by the Council for the Spanish Speaking. They provided the facilitators for each of five separate break-out groups as well as lunch. A joint press release was sent out publicizing this meeting, and the media attended.

B. Public Surveys

1. General Public Surveys

⁶1) August 9, 1999 - Disabled Community; 2) August 16, 1999 - Cambodian Community; 3) August 20, 1999 - Latino Community; 4) August 23, 1999 - Religious Community; 5) August 30, 1999 - African-American Community; 6) September 13, 1999 - Law Enforcement Community; 7) September 21, 1999 - Vietnamese Community; 8) October 5, 1999 - Neighborhood Associations and Community Based Organizations; 9) October 19, 1999 - Filipino Community; 10) October 21, 1999 - Second meeting with Cambodian Community; 11) October 26, 1999 - Former Jurors; 12) October 28, 1999 - Hmong Community; 13) November 2, 1999 - Business Community.

⁷Because of language barriers, the attendees at the first of two meetings with the Cambodian community were not asked to fill out the questionnaire.

⁸Additional information on how we conducted our focus group sessions can be found in Appendix C.

As noted above, the attendees at all but two of the focus group sessions were asked to fill out the general public survey form. The survey results from each focus group were tabulated and reported both separately and as a combined group along with those distributed as described below.

For a four week period between September 13 and October 8, 1999, the general public questionnaires were distributed to jurors summoned to serve in the Stockton branch. Potential jurors were invited to complete the surveys in the Jury Assembly room before they were assigned to a courtroom. The results of these surveys were tabulated and reported separately as well as in combination with all other general public surveys.

For a three week period between September 27 and October 15, 1999, the general public questionnaires were distributed at clerk counters at each of our branches. We had planned to keep these surveys at the counters for a longer period of time, but for much of September and October of 1999, there had been the threat of a labor action by employees in our clerks offices and other county employees in their bargaining unit.

A total of 820 general public survey questionnaires were analyzed.

2. Court User Survey

The court user survey was intended for those stakeholders who use the courts on a regular basis. Copies of this questionnaire went out with the September issue of "Across the Bar," the publication of the San Joaquin County Bar Association. A copy was also posted on the Superior Court website. Additionally, these questionnaires were distributed to the attorneys and staff in the offices of the District Attorney and the Public Defender. From September 13 to October 8, 1999, these questionnaires were also distributed to regular court users who frequent clerk's office counters at each of our branches.

A total of 146 court user questionnaires were analyzed.

3. Former Juror Survey

For a three-week period between September 13 and October 8, 1999, these questionnaires were mailed to jurors who served in trials along with the judge's thank-you letter. Additionally, 995 questionnaires were mailed to former jurors who served in trials which took place from June 1, 1999 to September 10, 1999.

For a three-week period between October 12 and October 29, 1999, the juror questionnaires were distributed to summoned jurors in the Jury Assembly Room in the Stockton Branch. Prospective jurors were asked to fill them out before being sent to a courtroom.

A total of 247 juror survey questionnaires were collected and analyzed.

4. Court Employee Survey

The distribution of this survey questionnaire was postponed because of the aforementioned labor issues. It was not distributed until February and March of 2000, when the Court's CEO and the planning team chair met with all court staff in a series of meetings. These meetings were held to explain our community-focused court planning efforts to staff.

84 court employees returned completed survey questionnaires.

5. Additional Survey Analysis

On November 5, 1999 representatives from those counties that used the survey forms met with consultant Heidi Kolbe and a consultant with expertise in analysis of such surveys. We learned of a computer program, WINKS, which we later used to cross-tabulate our data.

On that same day, we discovered discrepancies in the surveys filled out by two of the focus groups. These discrepancies are more fully explained in our public comment report discussed below. However, because of time constraints and our attempts to correct these discrepancies, we did not complete our analysis of the surveys prior to submission of the December 15, 1999 draft plan.

Survey data was cross-tabulated and thoroughly analyzed in March and April of 2000.

C. Public Report

The Planning Team committed to publishing a public report containing a summary of the comments from the focus group sessions and results of the surveys. We felt it was important to publish the public's comments for several reasons. First, we thought it was important to show our focus group participants and the community that we actually heard their comments and that many of our planning efforts are in direct response to their perceived needs and desires. Second, we thought the report would provide our community with information about how different segments of our community actually view their local justice system. Third, we believed it was important to document our public comment gathering process so that our community will better understand our on-going program of community-focused planning. Finally, we thought it was important to document the comments and survey data for reference by members of the other two branches of government and for future reference by our court.

Attached is a copy of that report, *The Pulse of the Community: San Joaquin County Superior Court Public Report 2000*.⁹ The report has been mailed to each focus group participant and to others we have added to our mailing list. It has also been mailed to our state legislators, the county

⁹See Appendix D.

supervisors, the mayors of each city in the county, and to the agencies about whom the public commented. Copies were also made available to the Bar Association. Each judicial officer on our court received a copy as well as administrative personnel in our clerk's office.

D. Strategic Issues, Goals, and Policy Directions

All of the public comment received during the focus group sessions was categorized and set forth in a document which was distributed to the Planning Team members. The Planning Team Members were tasked with the responsibility of reviewing those comments and identifying issues, goals, and strategies. At a retreat on Saturday, November 6, 1999, the Planning Team discussed their review of the public comment. Preliminary results from the Juror and Court User surveys were also discussed.

The retreat was facilitated by our consultant, Heidi Kolbe. Fifteen of the Planning Team members attended. A list of strategic issues was compiled by the Planning Team for recommendation to the Superior Court bench.

Thereafter, a Plan Drafting Committee was constituted and began to draft the Long-Range Strategic Plan.¹⁰ A summary of the Planning Team recommendations was prepared and distributed to the bench. On November 29, 1999, a special bench meeting was held, and the group unanimously adopted each recommendation in concept form. Thereafter, a draft of the plan was completed and distributed to the bench. At the regular bench meeting on December 13, 1999, the bench approved the draft Long-Range Strategic Plan for submission to the Judicial Council on December 15, 1999.

During 2000, while working to evaluate and implement plan goals and strategies, additional issues were added as well as additional goals and policy directives. The San Joaquin County bench approved this current version of our Long-Range Strategic Plan on December 4, 2000.

The strategic issues addressed in this plan are divided into the following alphabetically listed key result areas:

ⒸAdministration / Management / Labor

ⒸCase and Calendar Management

ⒸCourt Planning

ⒸCustomer Service

ⒸDisabled Access and Accommodation

¹⁰This committee consisted of Judge Murray, Judge Demetras, Chief Executive Officer Jeanne Millsaps, and Deputy Court Executive Officer Annette Kirby.

- CFacilities
- CInterpreters and Improved Access for Non-English Speakers
- CJury Duty
- CJuvenile Justice
- CPublic Education
- CRace / Culture / Gender / Economics
- CTechnology

E. Potential Amendments to Our Strategic Plan

We have made amendments to the draft long-range strategic plan submitted on December 15, 1999. Consistent with the California Judicial Branch Strategic Management Handbook distributed at the October 11, 2000 statewide workshop, “Strategies” are now referred to as “Policy Directions.” Also consistent with the Handbook, we have deleted “Desired Outcomes” from the long-range strategic plan. Those will be listed in the Operational Plan to be submitted in November of 2001. However, because we are proud of the progress we have made to date, we have set forth our outcomes to date in Appendix E.

Additional issues, goals, and strategies continue to become apparent as events and trends unfold and as we work on the evaluation and implementation of plan goals and policy directions. We have made amendments to our December 15, 1999 Draft Plan reflecting this dynamic, and we will continue to make amendments to the Plan when appropriate.

Two very important amendments include issue statements, goals, and policy directions for facilities and court administration/management/labor issues. As noted later in more detail, many of the goals and strategies we set forth in our December 15, 1999 draft plan are tied to facilities. Additionally, our current facilities are inadequate even for our current functions. Consequently, we have included a separate issue statement which recognizes the need for expanded and remodeled facilities. Also, as we move from county supervision to local court management, labor and administrative issues related to that transition must be addressed.

There continues to be no significance to our numbering system, and there is no intent to suggest priority by that system. The key result areas are listed alphabetically. Priority-wise, the issues surrounding facilities are most paramount, and when those issues are resolved we will be able to implement many significant changes on behalf of the San Joaquin County community.

F. Current and Future Planning Efforts

The Court has committed to continuing the Community-Focused Planning Team as a permanent citizen/court advisory board. In this way, we will be able to stay connected to our community, remain accountable for plans set forth in this Long-Range Strategic Plan, and plan future programs, court operations, and court facilities with the concerns of our community in mind.

In 2000, the new Assistant Presiding Judge, the new Presiding Juvenile Judge, two new county members, an additional County Bar member, two members representing the City of Stockton, and one members of the public joined the planning team. The team now consists of 12 bench officers, 5 court administrative personnel, 4 members representing county government, 2 members representing city government, 3 members representing the County Bar Association, and 10 members of the public.¹¹ Two additional members from county government will join the team in January of 2001.

To guide its activities, the planning team recommended a mission statement to the court. The Court adopted the mission statement unanimously with only a minor revision.

The mission of the Community-Focused Planning Team shall be to:

- C Serve as a court and community advisory body for the Superior Court.
- C Provide community input for the evaluation and/or implementation for the planning goals and strategies outlined in the Superior Court's Long-Range Strategic Plan.
- C Assist the Superior Court in its community-related programs.

The Planning Team is currently organized into three subcommittees. Those subcommittees are 1) The Community Liaison Subcommittee; 2) The Youth and Education Subcommittee; and 3) The Publications Subcommittee.¹²

The Court's Executive Committee, chaired by the Presiding Judge, has assumed the long-range planning function. With the assistance of court staff, this group will develop goals and policy directions that might not be apparent to the public, such as newly added goals and policy directives related to facilities and court administration/management/labor issues. Further, this group is tasked with the responsibility of monitoring the evaluation and implementation of policy directions outlined in the plan and development of the Operational and Annual Plans required by the Judicial Council.

III. NEW PUBLIC OUTREACH AND ACCESS PROGRAMS

¹¹See Appendix F.

¹²See Appendix G.

From the beginning of our local community-focused planning efforts in February of 1999, we began to plan and implement a number of new outreach programs without any additional funding. These efforts took place even while those involved were also engaged in the strategic planning process.

Our new outreach programs fall into the following areas:

• Youth and Education

• Jury Service Improvements and Information

• Public Education and Information

• Race~Culture~Gender~Economic Bias

Outcomes to date and updates concerning our various programs are reported in Appendix E.

OVERVIEW OF SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

I. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

Three main demographic issues impact the San Joaquin County Courts: fast population growth, low income levels, and population diversity.

A. Population

San Joaquin County encompasses about 1,440 square miles in the heart of California's central valley, and is the home to a population of 554,400 people according the Department of Finance.¹³ Its population makes San Joaquin County the 15th largest county in the state. It is the home of the oldest inland seaport in California, making it accessible both by land and water. Because of its central location and freeway system, the county is conveniently close to the Bay Area, the Sierra Nevada, and the state capitol. The County is a leading agricultural producer, but is undergoing a transformation to a more industrial and service economy.

While San Joaquin County is 15th in overall population, it was 8th in the percentage of monies it lost in the property tax shift of 1992. To date, because of the property tax shift and other adverse state actions, San Joaquin County has lost a cumulative total of \$367.5 million. This has had a dramatic effect in the provision of justice system services and the condition of facilities. The county only recouped \$148.9 million of the tax shift through the ½ cent sales tax dedicated to law enforcement. Of course, the courts received none of those monies and the Probation Department, an arm of the court, continues to be underfunded.

The County's population continues to increase. Last year, population in the County increased by 1.37% or 7,500 people, and the County ranked 15th in total population percentage increase. In future years it is predicted that the County's population will increase by 14,000 per year according to the County's General Plan. By the year 2005, it is expected to grow to 686,000, and by 2010, the County's population is expected to grow to 750,000.¹⁴ By 2040, the population of the county is expected to be 1,750,000.

Currently, the population is concentrated in its seven cities: Stockton, Tracy, Manteca, Lodi, Escalon, Ripon and Lathrop.¹⁵ The population of the County's incorporated cities and their ranking among California's other cities can be seen below. Tracy in the South portion of the County is experiencing the greatest growth as it feels the first wave of out-migration from the Bay Area. By 2020, its is predicted that

¹³This population total is a 1998 estimate reported in the Department of Finance 1999 report. Unless otherwise noted, all population estimates are based on the Department of Finance records.

¹⁴See Appendix H.

¹⁵A number of unincorporated communities also serve as important residential, employment, and agricultural centers. These communities include Banta, French Camp, Linden, Lockeford, Morada, Thornton, and Woodbridge. The county jail and county hospital are located in French Camp.

Tracy’s population will be nearly five times the present population of only 50,300. Plans for a new town, Mountain House, to be built northwest of Tracy on the San Joaquin County / Alameda County border continue to go forward. When built out, it is predicted that Mountain House will have a population of between 40,000 to 45,000 people.

This fast population growth strains the ability of public agencies, courts included, to provide needed or mandated services.

Population of Incorporated Cities

<u>City</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>California Ranking</u>
Stockton	243,7000	12 th
Lodi	56,900	124 th
Tracy	50,300	141 st
Manteca	48,050	149 th
Ripon	10,000	341 st
Lathrop	9,525	345 th
Escalon	5,725	400 th

Many of the County’s newest residents have moved from the Bay Area but continue to work there. It has been estimated in a study jointly underwritten by the San Joaquin County Council of Governments and the San Joaquin County Partnership that 38,000 people currently commute to the Bay Area every day from the valley. 71.2% of these people reside in San Joaquin County. 35.6% of these people reside in Tracy.

B. Personal Income

San Joaquin County has consistently had higher rates of poverty and unemployment than the State as a whole. The county’s high unemployment rate fluctuates between 10% and 13% compared with a statewide average of 8%. In addition, family incomes on average are lower and poverty levels higher in San Joaquin County. Per capita income in the Central Valley has historically been almost 20% lower than that of the state. This is due in part to an agriculturally based economy. In 1996, the Valley had a higher share of farm jobs than the state as a whole and according to a 1993 U.S. Department of Labor report, median annual earnings for farm workers fall between \$5,000 and \$7,500. Currently, there are over 44,000 people on public assistance in San Joaquin County.

C. Ethnic and Economic Diversity

The County’s ethnic composition continues to change as new immigrants move into the area. Immigration patterns have resulted in an ethnically diverse population in the County. First and second

generation European immigrants came to Stockton during the Gold Rush in the 1800's. In the late 1800's many Chinese came to the county to work on the transcontinental railroad and to build the levees in the delta. Sikhs came from northwestern India around 1900 to work in the Delta farmlands. In the 1930's Stockton had the largest population of Filipinos outside of the Phillipines. Approximately 30,000 Southeast Asians have moved to the County since the end of the Vietnam war in 1987. The County also has large ethnic populations of Hispanics, Blacks, Japanese, Jews, and Native Americans.¹⁶

English is not the first language or is not spoken by many members of the ethnic communities in the County, and the demand for interpreter services is high. Our ethnic and cultural diversity also requires sensitivity to legal and cultural differences when dealing with unassimilated members of the ethnic communities. For example, in most Southeast Asian cultures, younger people show deference to their elders by keeping their heads bowed. In the United States, such a posture is often interpreted as consciousness of guilt. Other customs that cause conflict include those related to prearranged marriages, especially of persons too young to get married in this country but not in their country of origin, or court-ordered medical attention that in some cultures would be deemed unwarranted interference in a private matter. Many disputes which are addressed in our criminal, family law and civil courts are disputes which had historically been addressed by clan or village leaders in their country of origin. Fear and distrust of the government are culturally embedded emotions.

The latest migration is from the urban Bay Area into the Central Valley. This is not an ethnic migration, but for the most part one of higher education and technical skills. Although such migration is desirable, it also raises expectations of service levels that should be available in the community and challenges our court to meet these expectations with nontraditional solutions such as expanded hours.

II. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT OVERVIEW

The Superior Court of California County of San Joaquin serves the citizens of San Joaquin County through the operation of twenty-nine court departments. It offers services in the San Joaquin County Courthouse in Stockton, the Juvenile Justice Center in French Camp, and at courthouse locations in Lodi, Manteca and Tracy. The court has an administration and staff of approximately 270 that supports twenty-five judges, three commissioners, a half-time juvenile court referee, and a half-time juvenile traffic hearing officer. Appendix J shows the types of hearings offered at each location and lists the number of judicial officers sitting there.

The courts in San Joaquin County, like all of California's trial courts in this era of transition, are in the infancy of a new court structure. The Court was officially coordinated both judicially and administratively in May of 1997 with the swearing in of one presiding judge and appointment of one court executive officer. Beginning January 1998, the Court implemented its integrated countywide calendar. The

¹⁶See Appendix I.

most significant changes were four direct integrated civil calendars and the integrated misdemeanor/felony trial assignment calendar. On June 8, six days following the passage of proposition 220, the judges of San Joaquin County voted unanimously to unify the superior and municipal courts into a single superior court.

Judicial coordination has had a positive impact on San Joaquin County and has led to a decreased backlog in criminal and civil trials and fewer continuances. However, it has not addressed all areas of growth. As stated in our 1999 judgeship needs study, we could not systematically address the 42% increase in our 14601 misdemeanors and 24% increase in non-traffic misdemeanors. We have had to set special calendars for these increases and have addressed this area only by establishing an enhanced small claims Judge Pro Tem Program. Coordination has also not been able to address the growing number of pending special circumstance cases, nor the increase in numbers and violence in the juvenile delinquency area. The court has been recommended for one new judgeship for the last four years. While we are scheduled to receive a new judgeship effective January 1, 2000, we have operated without this needed position and our service to the community has suffered as a result.

Full integration of superior and municipal court staff as mandated by State court coordination requirements began in 1997 and has actually been achieved in San Joaquin County. A Superior Court Classification Study was adopted late last year by the Court and the County Board of Supervisors. The study addressed classification, organization and compensation of all post-Proposition 220 superior court staff. It substantiated a strong administrative and management structure to assist the Court in developing a team responsive to the new countywide court, and established a middle management team of court managers and courtroom operations coordinators responsible for overall management of one or more divisions, branches or operational functions of the Court. The study also established a legal process supervisor position overseeing the activities of the new legal process clerk series in support of court operations. The titles and specifications closely follow those in the Trial Court Model Classification Manual developed by the Administrative Office of the Court and approved by the Judicial Council. The new organization structure allows the Court to deploy human resources where they are most needed to accomplish the court's mission. It creates a better use of court personnel and greater career opportunity for employees operating in a broader pool with a broader scope of work.

Due to funding constraints in the past, the Court has not been able to fully utilize technology to improve delivery of service and access to court information. Although we used technology to allow a leaner staff to cope with growing workloads, we have not had enough court technology staff and funds to implement innovative projects such as public access to electronic court records and using imaging, integrated with case management, to store and retrieve case files. With a more steady stream of funding available, we look forward to implementing our strategic court technology plan and thereby achieving our goal "to improve public service and the administration of justice through effective use of current and emerging technology."

Facility problems continue to hamper the court's ability to do good business. The main courthouse in downtown Stockton, built in 1962, has run out of space for additional courtrooms and lacks a sufficient

number of courtrooms to centralize some hearings. More importantly, it lacks necessary security for the types of cases currently impacting the court. Simply refurbishing old courtrooms has become a long tedious process, leaving some courtroom seating held together by duct tape. Space problems also exist in the outlying courts. The Manteca and Tracy courts, built around 1972, have long outgrown their needs, and have had to use relocatables for courtroom and office space since 1988. Inadequate space at all locations of the San Joaquin County Superior Court is an impediment to offering necessary services in the best interest of efficiency and customer service.

The San Joaquin County Superior Court has also gone through tremendous fiscal changes. The Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 moved the courts into state funding and did away with the bifurcated system under which courts were subjected to two separate budget processes, one at the county and another at the state level. Effective January 1, 1998, the act consolidated trial court funding at the state level and required the state to fund all future growth in court operations costs. The courts' current budget for fiscal year 2000/2001 is 23.7 million. Thanks to state funding, the Court has added much needed staff, improved records storage facilities, increased technology capabilities, and will provide better security to the outlying courts.

The San Joaquin Superior Court offers several specialty courts and service programs available to its customers. The adult Drug Court has graduated 325 individuals with only an 11% recidivism rate, and has been in effect since 1995. The newer Juvenile Drug Court, which has been in effect since August of 1998, has graduated 28 individuals. We hope to continue our Drug Court in a way that is consistent with Proposition 36 if that measure is implemented. The Domestic Violence court works with the District Attorney and Probation Departments to attend to the special needs of domestic violence cases. A Mental Health Court entitled "SAFR House" is the newest treatment court begun last year. Defendants are diagnosed at booking for long term treatment.

The San Joaquin County Superior Court also offers a family law pro per clinic directed by the Family Law Facilitator, which is open every day and will have served well over 7000 individuals in the 2000 calendar year. The family law mediators now offer an orientation available twice a month to orient people on what to expect in child custody cases. With financial support from the Court, the San Joaquin County Mediation Center provides special services for on-the-spot resolutions in our small claims and civil restraining order courts, and is available for civil case referral.

In 1994, the County hired a consultant, Alan Kalmanoff of the Institute for Law and Policy Planning, to study our local criminal justice system and make suggestions for the improvement of the system. In 1995, the consultant made 88 separate recommendations. The most important recommendation focused on achieving coordination by local criminal justice agencies. As a result, representatives of each local agency involved in the criminal justice system, including the Court, formed the Law and Justice Operations Group. This committee meets once per month to address criminal justice planning in a collaborative setting.

The court continues to identify issues in its newly created structure, and knows that it will continue

to modify and refine its calendars and offices. Community-Focused Planning will be a valuable tool to the court for future assessment of needs and service to the community.

III. SIGNIFICANT EMERGING TRENDS

The trends identified herein are a product of the responses received during 13 focus group meetings at which members of the public were invited to comment, as well as the observations of the Court. These trends are viewed as having the highest priority and magnitude.

Trend: GROWING POPULATION IN NUMBERS, EXPANSE AND DIVERSITY, POTENTIAL NEW LITIGATION

Implications:

The expected growth in general population is, perhaps, the most significant trend with which we will be challenged. Continued increases in the ethnic and non-English speaking populations will increase our need for court interpreters and multi-lingual sources of information. Enhanced cultural training for judges and court personnel will help us serve the community. There is much to learn in this regard. For example, male and female focus group participants in each of the Southeast Asian communities told us that children and women are using the justice system as leverage in dealing with their families; i.e., falsifying domestic violence allegations within a marriage and the younger generation is disrespecting or abusing their parents, often using superior knowledge about the justice system and English against them. Immigrants are not striving to attain citizenship, which directly impacts the court's jury source lists for jury summoning and works against the requirement of maintaining a representative cross section of the community in jury pools. The education component of the court's community outreach program is essential to instruct our diverse cultures in the importance of the legal process and provide information to court personnel concerning these cultures.

The growth in the southern area of San Joaquin County will have dramatic implications. People working in Bay Area cities are purchasing homes in the town of Tracy where housing is more affordable, which brings a larger commuter population to the county. The development of Mountain House, a new town planned for the south county, will result in even greater population increases. These factors will create a tremendous burden for the court's branch offices and courtrooms in Tracy. Facilities and services will need to be expanded to accommodate the growth. More court staff and judicial positions will be required to keep pace with the need for increased public access to the courts.

According to the study commissioned by the San Joaquin County Council of Governments, the average annual salaries of the 38,000 Bay Area commuters who reside in San Joaquin County, Stanislaus, and Sacramento Counties is \$59,600.00. 43% of those who responded to the survey held management

level positions.

According to that same study, it can be expected that high tech jobs will follow high tech workers to San Joaquin County. Nine out of ten of those who commute would give up their hours on the freeway if they could find similar jobs in San Joaquin County according to a survey conducted in connection with the study. It is predicted that business parks which will appeal to high technology and research and development companies will be built to accommodate these businesses. This trend has already begun. The voters in the City of Tracy recently approved Measure A, which would build a residential community known as Tracy Hills along with a technology park designed to attract high tech jobs. Of course, it can be expected that these new businesses may be involved in litigation we have not previously had in our courts.

The voters in the City of Lathrop recently voted to approve Measure D, which would build a community of 8,500 homes known as Califa City. This community, because of its location, will impact both the Tracy and Manteca branches. As part of this same project, plans for a large multi-theme amusement park in the City of Lathrop continue to go forward. In addition to our delta waters, this will attract significant numbers of people to San Joaquin County. We can expect to have increased criminal and civil case filings once the park opens.

Trend: MORE WIDESPREAD USE OF TECHNOLOGY

Implications:

With the technology world growing at a very rapid rate, especially in the areas of communications, hardware, software programs, Internet and Web page use, the court must keep up with user demand and public expectations in this area. The public and members of the Bar will expect court information, procedures, calendars and the ability to pay fines and fees via the Internet or through Interactive Voice Recognition (IVR) capabilities by telephone. Judges must keep pace with the latest technological applications in legal research. With outreach efforts in the forefront, the use of the Internet and television is vital to educate the public about the court system. Increased financial and physical resources will be needed and the impact to the court budget will be significant. The court will need the financial ability to hire and retain quality staff persons to install and maintain its systems as we cannot currently compete with the private sector in this area.

Trend: INCREASE IN MORE SERIOUS CRIME COMMITTED BY YOUTH

Implications:

In this county, there has been an increase in the rate of serious crimes committed by youth under the age of 18. This causes an increased burden on the court and society. Higher volume of cases and more

severe sentencing of juveniles will lead to the need for more judicial officers and staff to handle juvenile matters, and heavily impact the population of an already overcrowded juvenile hall facility. The impact of Proposition 21 in San Joaquin County is still unclear.

Many youth of today tend to have a tremendous disrespect for law enforcement and courts as a whole. More education is needed to inform youth at an early age about the courts and the laws which govern society so that they have a better understanding of the justice system as a citizen and member of their community. The Court needs to create an active and continual outreach program targeted at youth in the way of program presentations at schools, youth mentoring and court visits. At the same time, the court needs to work with local authorities in their efforts to enforce truancy laws.

Judicial officers need to stay actively involved with local law and justice and private agencies who can provide them with resources for youth such as counseling, behavior modification, addiction programs, family reunification, etc. Judicial innovation in these areas by the Court will produce sound programing, but funding may be necessary to implement this programing.

There will be an increasing strain on the criminal courts, jail and prison systems, as youth offenders age and become adult criminal offenders. As these offenders become parents, there will be increasing strain on our family law and juvenile dependency courts.

Trend: ALTERNATIVES TO COURT AND INCARCERATION

Implications:

The courts encourage parties to seek alternative methods to settling a lawsuit or neighborhood dispute. A strong connection to local agencies who provide alternative dispute resolution services should be maintained by the Court. Informational brochures from those agencies need to be made available at court offices for court users.

The courts should collaborate with other criminal justice agencies as well as public and private sector entities to increase programs for alternatives to incarceration such as community service, substance abuse programs and alternative work projects in appropriate cases. This is particularly true since jail overcrowding often results in the release of many of these lower level offenders to the streets.

There is a lack of jobs and housing for people who have undergone alternative treatment programs for drug abuse. To keep these persons from re-offending, it is important to provide jobs to build self-esteem and better housing located in areas not known for drug use. The Court should be involved with local community efforts, including city and county officials, to work toward more jobs and better housing for those persons wishing to end their addiction to drugs.

Trend: INCREASE IN LITIGANTS PROCEEDING WITHOUT LEGAL

REPRESENTATION

Implications:

Throughout the country, the number of people attempting to represent themselves *in propria persona* (pro pers) has increased dramatically during the past five years, and this increase is expected to continue. While the numbers vary from county to county in California, the number of persons filing cases in family law matters without the assistance of attorneys is estimated to be 65 percent statewide and as high as 90 percent in some counties. For FY 1999-2000, 72% of all divorces, legal separations, and nullities in San Joaquin County Superior Court had at least one a pro per party. A poor economy in this county has a direct impact on these figures. Due to lack of understanding and knowledge of the justice system, these litigants require extensive staff support. There are few legal aid alternatives available to these litigants in San Joaquin County.

Trend: INCREASING NUMBER OF DISABLED PERSONS BECOMING MORE INDEPENDENT AND MORE MOBILE

Implications:

The Court will need to provide appropriate accommodations pursuant to ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards for disabled persons using court services (e.g. wheelchair access, assistive listening devices, sign interpreters, real-time computer transcription, etc.). As need increases, court personnel and attaches will have to be trained to deal with these special needs. Some physical modifications may need to be made to court offices and courtrooms to provide better access. More technological devices will need to be purchased to keep with growing demand.

Educational materials informing the disabled about specific accommodations and services available to them when using the court and its services will need to be distributed through local county agencies.

The Court should seek cooperation with the cities to insure adequate parking and transportation facilities near the court buildings in the County.

VISION AND MISSION

Through the collaborative efforts of our community-focused planning program, the Court has developed the following vision and mission statements.

I. VISION STATEMENT

The vision of the San Joaquin County Superior Court includes the following core values:

- C Fairness - Impartiality
- C Administrative Consistency
- C Internal and External Teamwork
- C Flexible and Responsive to Changing Needs
- C Fiscal Awareness - Reality Based
- C Astute and Zealous in Pursuit of Funds to Meet Community Expectations

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Superior Court is to dispense fair and impartial justice in an effective, efficient, and fiscally responsible method which is responsive to the needs of the public. The court provides judicial services for the public to assure:

- C Maximum access to the courts by the public.
- C Quality of service that promotes confidence and generates support from inside and outside the justice system.
- C Interpretation and enforcement of the law in a way that provides due process, fair treatment, and individual justice.

**STRATEGIC ISSUES, GOALS,
& POLICY DIRECTIONS**

Administration / Management / Labor

Long-Range Issue 1. Transition of employees from county administration to trial court employee status pursuant to AB2140 the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act.

Issue Description: Effective January 1, 2001, county employees in Superior Court will become trial court employees. This transition from county administration brings with it a number of new challenges and responsibilities for the Court.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 1.1 Ensure the successful transition of employees from county administration to local court management consistent with the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act.

Policy

Directions:

- 1.1(a)** Develop a Personnel System that would include all policies needed for our own local personnel structure.
- 1.1(b)** Implement all Personnel Plan Policies including those where “meet and confer” obligations are present.
- 1.1(c)** Continue to pursue adequate funding that would enable the court to establish and expand its’ administrative services especially in the area of human resources and labor relations.
- 1.1(d)** Continue to pursue funding to address negotiated salary increases and pay equity adjustments not previously addressed through the reclassification process.

Goal 1.2 Provide for a comprehensive education and training program for all court personnel that promotes professional growth, development and employee well-being.

Policy

Directions:

- 1.2(a)** Continue to seek adequate funding that would enable the court to hire training and support staff.

1.2(b)

Create a comprehensive training program that would provide the court with court specific, on-site and on-going training.

Long Range Issue 2. Strengthening of fiduciary responsibilities and transition of county services to the court.

Issue Description: Administrative, management, and fiduciary responsibilities related to the transition from county administration to court administration will bring new challenges. Currently, the county supplies a number of services to the courts including personnel, payroll, purchasing and procurement, building security, labor negotiations, risk management, and others. The court is required to either negotiate with the county for mutually agreed services, add staff and systems to accomplish services in-house, or contract with outside providers where appropriate.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 2.1 Ensure the successful transition of those services previously provided by the county to the court or outside provider.

Policy

Directions:

- 2.1(a)** Conduct a thorough analysis to determine which services can be provided to the court more efficiently.
- 2.1(b)** Negotiate the continuation of certain county provided services with the County through a Memorandum of Understanding.
- 2.1(c)** Continue to pursue adequate funding that would enable the court to establish and implement a contracting and procurement department.
- 2.1(d)** Establish and implement contracting and procurement procedures.
- 2.1(e)** Continue to seek funding to support additional staffing to strengthen financial planning and establishing internal controls.

Goal 2.2 Strengthen the fiduciary responsibilities and internal control procedures related to budgeting and financing of the court.

Policy

Directions:

2.2(a) Continue to seek funding to support additional staffing to strengthen financial planning and budgeting.

2.2(b) Secure funding to hire a budget analyst that would be assigned to develop a grant management program that should include grant writing and financial monitoring of grants.

2.2(c) Work with the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Judicial Council to secure financial resources to support court programs.

2.2(d) Continue to explore alternative sources of funding to support court programs.

Case and Calendar Management

Long Range Issue 3. Police Officer Overtime /Witness Inconvenience

Issue Description: The Stockton Branch has no formal procedure for resolving felony cases before the date of the preliminary hearing. Similarly, the Manteca Branch has no formalized procedure, and schedules only a limited number of pre-preliminary conferences prior to the date of the preliminary hearing. Consequently, many cases settle on the date of the preliminary hearing. When this happens, law enforcement officers and civilian witnesses appear pursuant to subpoena and are not needed to testify. Police agencies doing business at these branches incur significant overtime costs as a result of these appearances. For example, for the first six months of 1999, the Stockton Police Department incurred overtime expenses amounting to \$105,437.00 to pay for officers subpoenaed for preliminary hearings who appeared but did not testify. Similar costs have been incurred by the Stockton Police Department for years. The Manteca Police Department reported incurring significant overtime costs for the same reason. While the Manteca officers do not necessarily appear at the courthouse, they are on-call on days or times they would not otherwise be on duty. Civilian witnesses are inconvenienced as well. The Lodi and Tracy branches have avoided these problems by effectively employing a procedure to resolve cases prior to the date of the preliminary hearing. Courts in other counties have established similar procedures. The former Stockton Municipal Court had conducted pre-preliminary hearing conferences some time ago, but these conferences were terminated because of attorney scheduling conflicts, discovery delays, delays in conveying offers, and insufficient opportunity for conferencing between attorneys and defendants. This issue was revisited as a result of the Kalmanoff report, but this was before the Municipal and Superior courts merged into one court.

Unless a pre-preliminary hearing settlement procedure or some other procedure designed to address this problem is established in the Stockton and Manteca branches, the police agencies will continue to incur overtime costs and civilian witnesses will continue to be inconvenienced.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 3.1 Eliminate the need for officers and civilians to appear unnecessarily or be on-call for preliminary hearings in felony cases in Stockton and Manteca consistent with the efficient operation of the court.

Policy

Directions:

3.1(a)

Establish a task force with the responsibility of 1) Evaluating the pre-preliminary hearing settlement, on-call, and like procedures employed in other courts around the state that are similar to the Stockton and Manteca branches; 2) Evaluating the reasons why the Stockton and Manteca branches have opted in the past to not establish a formal pre-preliminary hearing settlement procedure or some other procedure to keep down officer overtime expenses; 3) Evaluating the use of video-teleconferencing to facilitate client interviews by attorneys and defendants housed at the jail. The task force should consist of court representatives, representatives from the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Lawyer Referral Service, the police agencies, and the County Administrator's Office.

Long Range Issue 4. Small Claims and Traffic Calendars - Pro Tem Judges

Issue Description: In 1997, the Judicial Council’s Judgeship Needs Study determined that this Court should have an additional judgeship. There have been dramatic increases in the filing of Suspended License cases and other non-traffic misdemeanors. We had experienced a backlog of small claim cases. The court has addressed these increases by setting special calendars for these cases and establishing an enhanced small claims Judge Pro Tem Program.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 4.1 Maintain a formal Judge Pro Tem Program for small claims cases which ensures that attorneys sitting as Pro Tem Judges are properly trained and scheduled to ensure the orderly administration of justice in small claims matters.

Policy

Directions:

- 4.1(a)** Recruit a pool of qualified attorneys to sit as Judges Pro Tem in small claims cases.
- 4.1(b)** Require that all attorneys who participate in this program receive adequate training in presiding over small claims matters and judicial ethics. Provide periodic training updates.
- 4.1(c)** Schedule Judges Pro Tem on a rotational basis to ensure problem free calendaring of small claims matters.
- 4.1(d)** Work to ensure that Judges Pro Tem come from backgrounds that represent our diverse population in this county.
- 4.1(e)** Utilize the services of the Mediation Center of San Joaquin County to facilitate case settlement in small claims cases.
- 4.1(f)** If after study, it is determined that our community will be better served by expanding the evening small claims calendar or holding small claims on weekends, recruit and schedule qualified judges pro tem to preside over these matters.
- 4.1(g)** Evaluate expanding the program to include training attorneys to sit as judges pro tem in traffic matters. Create and provide that training if it is deemed appropriate to expand the program.

Long Range Issue 5. Address Case Calendaring and Management from the Perspective of Customer Service and Perceptions of Fairness

Issue Description: Because of the uneven distribution of work and the backlog of criminal cases in all of the courts before consolidation, the emphasis in case calendaring and individual calendar management had been on expeditiously handling cases. The focus was on speed and convenience for court personnel and not customer service. Unfortunately, this calendaring philosophy did not take the concerns of court users into account. Further, the manner of conducting certain calendars left members of the public with the impression that judges running these calendars were less than fair, that they favored cases handled by private attorneys over those handled by the Public Defender, and that they gave some cases insufficient attention. Members of the public have further complained that certain calendars move too fast and they are discouraged from addressing the court. Last minute splits of traffic and small claims calendars to multiple or different departments causes public confusion and inconvenience and leave court users with the perception that the court is disorganized. Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy court users expect a continuation of local customs and practice when judges substitute for judges who normally sit in those branches.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 5.1 Adopt a philosophy of criminal case and calendar management that takes into consideration the perceptions of litigants and does not sacrifice customer service concerns for speed or the convenience of court personnel.

Policy

Directions:

- 5.1(a)** Train judicial officers in techniques designed to enhance the perception of fairness.
- 5.1(b)** Encourage judges to examine their own courtroom procedures for fairness perceptions.
- 5.1(c)** Develop a self-evaluation checklist to help judges assess how well they are doing.
- 5.1(d)** Evaluate the procedures employed to manage individual court calendars with customer service and court user concerns in mind.

- 5.1(e)** Permit litigants in arraignment courts to address the court when appropriate and more fully explain and address their questions and concerns.
- 5.1(h)** Examine case calendaring from a customer and user perspective, such as staggering trials in traffic court to eliminate time wasted by officers, witnesses, and litigants.
- 5.1(i)** Consider establishing uniform courtroom procedures that promote consistency of treatment of litigants and court users.
- 5.1(j)** Consult with court users regarding calendaring issues and the implications on their offices before finalizing yearly calendars.
- 5.1(k)** Minimize last minute calendar splits in the Stockton Branch. Explain to the involved parties why those splits take place when such splits are deemed appropriate.
- 5.1(l)** Alert judges who substitute in outlying branch courts to local customs and practices and standardize those practices countywide when possible.

Long Range Issue 6. Specialized Criminal and Family Law Case Management

Issue Description: The Superior Court has both a drug court and domestic violence court program. The public perceives these programs as effective and positive methods by which to handle the cases calendared in those courts and has indicated their desire to see these programs continue and expand. The county is plagued by clandestine methamphetamine laboratories. Consequently, that drug is readily available and its use is on the rise.

Substance abuse is often at the root of juvenile dependency and parenting issues. The drug court philosophy can be employed in these cases as well as in criminal cases. Indeed, many drug court defendants have juvenile dependency matters running parallel to their criminal matters.

In 1999, the court, Probation Department, and Mental Health Department collaborated to establish the beginnings of a mental health court called SAFR house.

Truancy remains a significant problem. Our youth obviously cannot learn while they are missing from school. Many truant students engage in criminal activity and other negative conduct during periods of truancy. Our court, in conjunction with the District Attorney's Office has collaborated to set up a special calendar to enforce Education Code provisions related to the parents of these truant students . No such court calendar exists to directly address truant students. More serious forms of delinquency currently occupy the calendars at our Juvenile Justice Facility in French Camp.

Many parents who have child support responsibilities are unemployed and have difficulties securing employment. The court can collaborate with San Joaquin County WorkNet, County Human Services, and other agencies and organizations to place these parents in jobs or job training programs.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 6.1 Continue the drug court and domestic violence court programs and expand those programs in ways that are beneficial to the parties involved and the community in general.

Policy

Direction: 6.1(a) Evaluate drug and domestic violence court programs in other

counties to determine whether there are elements of those programs which would benefit San Joaquin County.

- 6.1(b)** Seek available funding to maintain or expand existing programs.
- 6.1(c)** Involve the community in planning for these courts and publicly report on progress.
- 6.1(d)** Expand drug court to include parents in juvenile dependency matters.

Goal 6.2 Develop a mental health court that addresses, from a treatment perspective, lower level offenders who are involved in criminal behavior primarily because of mental health issues.

Policy

Directions:

- 6.2(a)** Continue the current collaboration with the Probation Department and the mental health community to develop the mental health court to its fullest potential. Inform attorneys and all Superior Court judges about the sentencing alternatives and program requirements for the program.
- 6.2(b)** Seek all available funding for this program.

Goal 6.3 Establish a truancy calendar.

Policy

Directions:

- 6.3(a)** Clear an afternoon calendar of a Superior Court judge assigned to the Stockton Branch one day per month to handle misdemeanor and infraction matters related to truancy by the most serious offenders in the city of Stockton.
- 6.3(b)** Collaborate with the Stockton Unified School District, the District Attorney's Office, the Stockton City Attorney's Office, and the Public defender's Office in planning and implementing this calendar.

Goal 6.4 Facilitate the employment of unemployed parents who have child support responsibilities.

Policy

Directions:

- 6.4(a)** Establish an Employment Efforts calendar in a family court

department to monitor the efforts of parents who have child support responsibilities to obtain employment and/or increase their education level. Order these parents to participate in appropriate training programs, literacy programs, and job referral programs. Collaborate with WorkNet, County Human Services, and Dads Make a Difference to place these parents in appropriate job training programs.

Long Range Issue 7. Family Law Center

Issue Description: Court matters involving families and youth are a significant portion of the court workload. Many of the parties in these cases represent themselves. Often the parties have criminal cases and juvenile dependency cases which run parallel to pending family law matters. Separate family law calendars, staff and judicial resources should be pulled together in a central location. Separate Family Law Courts or Family Law Centers have been successful in other counties.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 7.1 Most family law matters will be heard together in one central facility.

Policy

- Directions:**
- 7.1(a)** Form a Family Law Center Task force from the community of users
 - 7.1(b)** Study and plan for the administrative consolidation of family law calendars, including judicial and staff support
 - 7.1(c)** Study and plan for the location and lease/construction and funding of a Family Law Center
 - 7.1(d)** Study and plan for the coordination of other juvenile dependency and criminal cases in the Family Law Center Court

Goal 7.2 All unrepresented parties will have access to assistance in civil and family law matters

Policy

- Directions :**
- 7.2(a)** Study and plan for the operation of a Self-Help Center. The court will consult with the ethnic communities and community based organizations, like the “Community Partnership for Families of San Joaquin County.”
 - 7.2(b)** Explore funding sources, such as the Tobacco Tax Initiative funds
 - 7.2(c)** Continue to develop and disseminate multi-lingual informational materials, forms packets, and videos to assist the public.

Long Range Issue 8. Night Court / Saturday Court Calendars

Issue Description: The county’s population continues to increase with the influx of people moving from the San Francisco Bay Area to the Central Valley in search of less expensive housing. Most of these new residents maintain their employment in the Bay Area and commute to those jobs. Given the court’s hours, many of these residents must miss an entire day of work to do business in the various branches. Additionally, there are many who are employed within the county who work hours that prevent them from doing business with the court without taking significant time off from work. Members of the public have expressed a desire to make appearances in traffic and small claims matters on week nights and Saturdays. Code of Civil Procedure section 116.250 provides that each division of a superior court with seven or more judicial officers shall conduct at least one small claims night session or Saturday session each month. One session per month is conducted in the Stockton branch. However, the number of cases scheduled for that calendar are intentionally limited, and the availability of that calendar is not advertised. At one time, the former Stockton Municipal Court, held two small claims night sessions per month. The second session was discontinued because the pro tem who handled that calendar became unavailable.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 8.1 Provide opportunities for those who have small claims and traffic matters to appear before the court at times other than traditional business hours.

Policy

Directions:

- 8.1(a)** Evaluate the need and potential use of weekday evening court or Saturday court for traffic and small claims matters in each of the branches.
- 8.1(b)** Establish weekday evening or Saturday calendars for traffic and small claims matters in those branches where the number of potential litigants who would appear at such times warrants such calendars.
- 8.1(c)** If additional judgeships are not provided to San Joaquin County Superior Court to cover these calendars, seek and obtain legislation establishing commissionerships or expand the current

pro tem program to cover these calendars. Also, seek additional funds to provide for support staff.

Long Range Issue 9. Alternative Dispute Resolution

Issue Description: Parties in small claims and civil harassment proceedings are encouraged to seek methods of alternative dispute resolution to settle their disputes. Alternative Dispute Resolution fees collected pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 470.3 are currently awarded pursuant to a local grant to the Mediation Center of San Joaquin. On most occasions, representatives of the Mediation Center are available at the calendar call of small claims and civil harassment cases to attempt to settle these disputes without litigation. Many times the parties are more satisfied with this form of resolution than a judicial decision. The community views alternative dispute resolution positively.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 9.1 Continue and enhance the use of alternative forms of dispute resolution in small claims and civil harassment proceedings.

Policy

Directions:

- 9.1(a)** Develop and maintain a strong connection to any local agencies that provide alternative dispute resolution services.
- 9.1(b)** Distribute informational brochures published by local alternative dispute resolution agencies at all clerks counters servicing small claims and civil harassment matters.
- 9.1(c)** Obtain all available funding to support alternative dispute resolution services for small claims and civil harassment matters.
- 9.1(d)** Support the enhancement of resources and staff in local agencies that can be effective in encouraging parties to utilize alternative dispute resolution.
- 9.1(e)** Expand the use of San Joaquin Mediation Center volunteers to small claims and civil harassment cases in the Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy branches.

Court Planning

Long Range Issue 10. Community / Court Advisory Board

Issue Description: The San Joaquin County Superior Court is committed to continuing its collaboration with the community. Community members keep the court connected to the community and can provide critical input concerning ongoing planning and implementation efforts. The court should have a permanent community/court advisory board.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 10.1 Establish a permanent community/court advisory board which can maintain the court's connection to the community, monitor plans set forth in this long-range strategic plan, and make recommendations in the future regarding the planning of court programs, court operations, and court facilities.

Policy

Directions:

- 10.1(a)** Evaluate other citizen/court advisory boards in courts around the country.
- 10.1(b)** Develop an advisory board scheme and organizational structure to meet the needs of this court.
- 10.1(c)** Develop a mission statement for the permanent advisory board.
- 10.1(d)** Recommend an advisory board scheme and mission statement to the bench for their adoption. Maintain flexibility in structure, composition, and membership during the infancy of this board.

Long Range Issue 11. Internal Planning

Issue Description: As professionals in the justice system, bench officers and court administrative staff have the expertise to implement the community-focused planning goals and develop policies and priorities, and oversee the drafting of the court’s operation plans, annual reports, single issue tactical plans, and long-range strategic plans. Also, issues related to our operation which are not readily apparent to the community, such as fiscal, facilities, and traditional personnel and staffing matters will have to be addressed by court professionals for the benefit of the community. The bench has a number of standing committees, but does not have a long-range planning committee.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 11.1 Establish a mechanism for advancing local long-range planning goals and the development and implementation of the long-range strategic plan, the operational plan, the annual reports, and the single issue tactical plans required by the Judicial Council.

Policy

Directions:

- 11.1(a)** Vest long-range planning responsibilities in the Superior Court Executive Committee.
- 11.1(b)** See that Executive Committee members are acquainted with the Judicial Council’s long-range planning philosophy and the concepts and components of the various required plans.
- 11.1(c)** Establish a regular long-range planning meeting schedule for the Executive Committee separate from the committee’s regular meetings.
- 11.1(d)** Establish a mechanism of Executive Committee oversight and review of the progress of those assigned to implement and evaluate goals and policy directives outlined in the court’s long-range strategic plan.
- 11.1(e)** Retain a consultant to provide technical assistance to the Executive Committee and to other court personnel involved in planning activities.

11.1(f) Set regular dates for reporting progress and concerns to the entire bench.

Customer Service

Long Range Issue 12. Self-Help Center

Issue Description: San Joaquin County has a high percentage of people who appear in court who are not represented by attorneys. Many individuals have language and cultural barriers as well as educational needs. In this county, there are few resources for these litigants to tap. Some courts around the country have established self-help centers to assist these litigants. Locally, a collaborative effort between the court and different community-based agencies and ethnic groups will be needed to establish and staff an effective center.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 12.1 All unrepresented parties will have access to assistance in civil and family law matters.

Policy

Directions:

- 12.1(a)** Study and plan for the operation of a Self-Help Center by reviewing and visiting existing centers in other jurisdictions, consulting with ethnic communities within this county, and collaborating with existing communitybased organizations, like the “Community Partnership for Families of San Joaquin County.”
- 12.1(b)** Seek and obtain funding from all available sources.
- 12.1(c)** Publish informational materials for the center, including materials in the languages spoken by the people in our community.
- 12.1(d)** Coordinate and integrate the Self-Help Center with the existing Family Law Facilitator and Pro Per Clinic programs and with the future Family Law Center.

Long Range Issue 13. Enhancing Customer Accessibility

Issue Description: Accessibility to the court begins at the courthouse. Multiple barriers exist that make navigating the system difficult for the public in general and more difficult for non-English speaking customers and users.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 13.1 Improve general public accessibility to necessary information at the courthouse.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 13.1(a)** Review courthouse signage for clarity and consistency. Make recommendations for change.
 - 13.1(b)** Review daily calendar posting for ways to improve. Consider placing video monitors in public area with daily calendar information.
 - 13.1(c)** Study the viability and cost of expanding the Clerk’s Office hours to accommodate the work schedule of customers and users.

Goal 13.2 Improve the dissemination of information to court customers.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 13.2(a)** Study and plan for the operation of the courthouse information booth staffed by well informed, customer service oriented staff.
 - 13.2(b)** Revise existing phone trees to provide more useful information and expand services.

Long Range Issue 14. Telephone Book Information

Issue Description: Many people refer to the telephone book for information. Expansion of space and information in the phonebook concerning the courts would enhance the public's access to information concerning their local justice system and access to that system.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 14.1 Devote a page in local telephone books concerning the local justice system.

Policy

Directions:

- 14.1(a)** Discuss the concept with the publishers of telephone books used locally.
- 14.1(b)** Develop a page for publication in local phone books. Include the court web page address.

Long Range Issue 15. Children at the Courthouse

Issue Description: It is apparent from simple observation of the hallways of the courthouse that children are frequently present, most often through no choice of their own. They are brought to court by parents and caretakers while the adults conduct their own court proceedings. Children are sometimes the object of the court proceedings in custody or dependency proceedings. Occasionally, they are witnesses when the question of their best interest is at issue or when they have been victimized by others. What they learn and what attitudes they form from such experiences have been topics that the court system has traditionally ignored, though some child advocacy steps have been taken in certain types of proceedings.

Our 1999 surveys concentrated on the narrow issue of whether child care availability would enhance the jury service of adult caregivers for the most part. Somewhat surprisingly, most responded negatively. In spite of those results, child care issues remain. Broader questions were not asked and remain unanswered: What could be done to minimize the trauma imposed by the court system on children observers and participants? What educational components could be put in place to turn the courthouse visit into a positive experience, or at least a neutral one? Other more focused questions should be given consideration and resources need to be identified that may be brought to bear on solutions. Facilities concerns for child care and staff impact will be primary considerations, both of which involve major financial considerations.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 15.1 Lessen the negative impact on children attending court.

Policy

Directions: **15.1(a)** Form a Task force conversant with current child advocacy thinking, broadly representative of the community and with the objective of identifying, evaluating and reporting on:

- solutions and programs in place in other jurisdictions
- local community resources that may be the subject of collaborative efforts
- facilities needs
- staff support needs

- any necessary systemic changes in court rules or procedure

Disabled Access and Accommodation

Long Range Issue 16. Enhancing Disabled Access and Accommodation

Issue Description: Multiple barriers exist that make navigating the system difficult for people with disabilities. As more members of the disabled community learn to become more mobile and independent, the Court can expect that there will be more disabled persons seeking and utilizing court services. There is no one person in our local justice system assigned to be available to answer questions from the disabled about access issues. Many businesses and governmental agencies make such a person available to the disabled community. Each local court system should have such a person available to assist persons with disabilities.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 16.1 Improve access to disabled customers and users.

Policy

Directions:

- 16.1(a)** Review courthouse facilities and procedures for physical access problems and compliance with existing ADA laws. Assess costs of coming into compliance and support all necessary funding efforts. Consult with the disabled community when planning remodels and new facilities.
- 16.1(b)** Consider providing informational materials in Braille and large print. Study how the use of closed-captioning would improve accessibility and evaluate costs.
- 16.1(c)** Assign and train a staff person to be a liaison with the disabled community. Seek funding for this position and training expenses.
- 16.1(d)** Study the availability of disabled parking at the courthouse facilities. Seek more parking as needed by assigning more of the existing spaces to the disabled.
- 16.1(e)** Review the court/county emergency evacuation plans for the courthouse facilities for provision of the needs of the disabled.

Facilities

Long Range Issue 17.

Provision of adequate physical facilities to accommodate expected population, additional judicial officers, caseload growth and other desirable goals outlined in the Long-Range Strategic Plan.

Issue Description:

Facilities funding is the greatest immediate issue for the Superior Court. Many of the goals and policy directions in this long-range strategic plan point to needs that cannot be met without facilities improvements. These include the proposed Family Law Center, Self-Help Center, jury facility improvements, disabled access issues, and telecommunications infrastructure improvements. Additionally, our current facilities are inadequate for many current court functions.

The Facilities Task Force, created by the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997, has proceeded on schedule. However, the process has effectively stopped the Court and County from planning needed court facilities and remodeling. The county is legitimately reluctant to commit financial resources to expensive capital projects without a better estimate of the financial fallout of the Task Force recommendations and any legislation that ultimately may be passed.

With the appointment of a new judge authorized by SB1857, this court will have 30 courtrooms and 30 judicial officers. There will then be no additional courtrooms for the pro tempore cases currently being heard four days per week. Additionally, there are no rooms which can be used by retired or visiting judges who assist with backlog or calendar bumps.

Only one of the 30 courtrooms is ADA compliant. That courtroom is compliant only because it has been recently remodeled. The county has made significant progress with regard to the public areas of the courthouses, but disabled access to courtrooms is sorely lacking. Removal of those physical barriers should be a priority.

Administrative space needs are also crucial. Funding is now in place for a Director of Family Court Services, additional family mediators, an investigator, a research manager and a Records Manager, none of whom have office space.

The Facilities Task Force preliminary study has found our existing facilities to be lacking in several respects. The study identified 43,633 square feet of courtroom space as follows: 38% deficient, 28% marginal, 35%

adequate. 9 of our existing courtrooms have been rated as only “marginal.” 11 of our courtrooms have been rated as “deficient.” Less than 50% of the current courtrooms meet the criteria for in-custody use, on even a partial basis. The Tracy modular courtroom, one of the courtrooms rated “deficient,” had been shut down as uninhabitable between May 4, 2000 and October 3, 2000 because of mold problems. In the Stockton Branch, there are no interview rooms available for use by court users. The Task Force planners have noted that the Jury Assembly Room in the Stockton Branch is only 13,180 square feet, which is 9,470 square feet smaller than is needed for current needs. Additionally, they have projected an increase in judicial positions from the current 30 to 45 by 2020. There are no existing courtrooms for these new judicial positions.

If the court is to be best positioned to implement the most critical components of the Facilities Task Force report, it is imperative that a countywide feasibility study be conducted. Priorities could then be phased according to the information provided from the study.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 17.1 Master plan for the design and construction of physical facilities for the San Joaquin County Courts.

Policy

Directions:

- 17.1(a)** Identify and secure a funding source sufficient to cover the cost of a master plan for physical facilities for San Joaquin County Superior Court.
- 17.1(b)** Develop and issue a Request for Proposal for the master planning for physical facilities for San Joaquin County Superior Court.
- 17.1(c)** Hire an appropriate master plan contractor.
- 17.1(d)** The plan should include interim solutions to address immediate facility needs as well as long-range needs.

Goal 17.2 Assemble a Court Facilities team to evaluate and implement the master facilities plan.

Policy

Directions:

- 17.2(a)** Secure bench officer commitment to serve throughout the design and construction phase.

- 17.2(b)** Decide on construction priorities consistent with available funding and critical needs.

Long Range Issue 18. Arraignment Court at the Jail / Video Arraignment

Issue Description: Defendants are currently transported for their initial arraignment from the San Joaquin County Jail in French Camp to the branch court in the district where the alleged crime was committed. The transportation of these defendants to and from court is costly and time consuming. There can be cost savings achieved by having a court near or at the jail or employing existing video technology to conduct arraignments simultaneously in the branch court and in a courtroom-like facility at the jail complex. A limited pilot program was conducted in the former Tracy Municipal Court courthouse before consolidation of the courts. No such pilot program was run in Stockton courthouse. The overwhelming majority of cases involving the transportation of in-custody defendants are filed in the Stockton branch. Technological advances have taken place since the Tracy Municipal Court pilot program.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 18.1 Eliminate the cost and time consumption related to the transportation of in-custody defendants for arraignment proceedings from the San Joaquin County Jail to the branch courts in Manteca, Stockton, and Tracy.

Policy

Directions:

18.1(a) Study and evaluate whether to build an arraignment court complex near the San Joaquin County Jail facility in French Camp which would be architecturally separate but physically connected to the jail to facilitate movement of in-custody defendants. Compare costs in facilities, staff and equipment needs to current and projected future transportation costs and to a video arraignment alternative.

18.1(b) As an alternative to an arraignment court complex, examine the possibility of establishing a video arraignment court physically connected to the jail in French Camp for criminal matters at the Stockton Branch. Compare costs in facilities, staff and equipment needs to current and projected future transportation costs.

18.1(c) As an alternative to an arraignment court complex, examine the possibility of establishing a video arraignment court physically connected to the jail in French Camp for criminal matters at the

Manteca and Tracy Branches. Compare costs in facilities, staff and equipment needs to current and projected future transportation costs.

18.1(d) In evaluating video arraignments, establish a task force consisting of personnel from the courts, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Lawyer Referral Service, the Sheriff's Office, and the County Administrator's Office to conduct the above evaluation and develop a plan consistent with their evaluation and the above goal. The evaluation should include a review of similar programs established in other California counties.

18.1(e) Publicly explain the evaluation, recommendations, and any future plans developed by the task force.

Interpreters and Improved Access for Non-English Speakers

Long Range Issue 19. Translation of Proceedings for Non-English Speaking Criminal Defendants in Arraignment Courts.

Issue Description: Interpreters expressed concern about their ability to quickly and accurately translate the tape recorded arraignment speeches and written rights waiver forms. They indicated that it is much easier to read a script or form that is already translated than it is to translate a speech or form from English to their language. They further indicated that, in many instances, the arraignment proceedings for individual cases move too quickly for them to accurately translate for the defendant. They expressed reluctance to ask the court to slow down or repeat because they perceive that judges react negatively to such requests. Further, there is a perception held by interpreters and members of the community that Non-English speaking defendants are discouraged from asking for clarification when concepts are not understood. Some members of the community expressed concern about the competence of some interpreters.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 19.1 Facilitate the accurate translation of English to all languages spoken by Non-English criminal defendants so that the entire proceeding is fully understood.

Policy

Directions:

- 19.1(a)** Translate arraignment scripts to other languages in writing so that those scripts can be read in the Defendant's language rather than translated to that language.
- 19.1(b)** Translate rights forms to other languages in writing so that those scripts can be read in the Defendant's language rather than translated to that language.
- 19.1(c)** Slow down the proceedings involving non-English speaking criminal defendants assisted by interpreters.
- 19.1(d)** Allow interpreters to clarify their understanding of the court by fostering an environment where interpreters can ask the court to slow down or repeat.
- 19.1(e)** Encourage Non-English speaking criminal defendants to seek clarification from the court concerning concepts that are not

understood.

- 19.1(f)** Continue the cooperative relationship with community groups representing Non-English speaking communities to foster discussion about translation issues when they surface and develop a mechanism where these concerns can be raised.

Long Range Issue 20. Training and Recruiting Southeast Asian Interpreters

Issue Description: There are not enough registered interpreters in the Southeast Asian languages. The available interpreters must be scheduled in advance. More often than not, there is no interpreter available to translate for first arraignments involving Southeast Asian defendants, and a second date must be set when an interpreter can be scheduled. Not infrequently, there are family relationships between the interpreter and some party or a witness in the case which make conflict-free translation problematic. There are no local training programs available which focus on qualifying Southeast Asian interpreters to handle matters in court. However, there are people in the community who have expressed a desire to become registered or certified interpreters for court proceedings. Many Southeast Asian youth who represent second generations to immigrant families could also find court interpretation a rewarding career. Furthermore, interpreters currently working with the court have no local training available to enhance their skills. At least one trainer from the Santa Clara County area indicated his firm's availability to train Vietnamese interpreters during one of our focus group sessions. While the long run trend will be that the percentage of Southeast Asians who speak English will increase, there will always be a need for qualified, quality interpreters for these languages. In the past, San Joaquin County Superior Court budgetary requests for funding local training of Southeast Asian interpreters have been denied.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 20.1 Establish a formalized method of training residents of San Joaquin County to become registered or certified court interpreters for the Southeast Asian languages and enhance the training of those who are currently registered.

Policy

- Directions:**
- 20.1(a)** Seek and obtain funding to pay for local programs to train new interpreters and enhance the training of interpreters currently working for the courts.
 - 20.1(b)** Seek and retain qualified individuals or firms to provide training.
 - 20.1(c)** Advertise the availability of training programs and career opportunities in the Southeast Asian communities and in local

schools.

Long Range Issue 21. English Translation for Customers Seeking Clerk’s Office Services

Issue Description: The court ability to provide good customer service is increasingly challenged by the linguistic diversity of its customers. Linguistic barriers often deter court customers from even seeking the service they need or desire. Many court customers who contact the court by phone, who visit the court information booth, or visit clerk’s officer counters do not speak English and need translation services. While the court has a sufficient number of Spanish speaking clerk staff to assist customers who speak only Spanish, there are no counter-staff available to speak any of the languages spoken by many of our other customers.

The court currently utilizes the services of Language Line Services for translation of some court matters. This service provides immediate telephone access to interpreters who speak 140 different languages. Their interpreters are available 7 days per week, 24 hours per day.

Goal 21. 1 Provide translation services to all non-English speakers who need to do business with the Clerk’s Office.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 21. 1(a)** Expand the utilization of Language Lines Services to ever clerks counter.
 - 21. 1(b)** Revise existing phone trees to accommodate multi-lingual access and information.

Goal 21. 2 Improve access to non-English speaking customers and users who visit the Stockton Branch.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 21. 2(a)** Staff information booth with a staff persons who speaks both English and Spanish.
 - 21.2(b)** Expand the utilization of Language Lines Services to the information booth in the lobby of the Stockton Branch.

Jury Duty

Long Range Issue 22. Jury Parking - Stockton Branch

Issue Description: Although many counties do not provide any parking or funds for parking to people summoned for jury service, the prospective jurors in this county have been provided both parking and free transportation on our local transit system. On any day of the week, there are as many as 300 parking spaces reserved for jurors serving in the Stockton Branch. The County pays for this parking.

However, on some days the available parking in Stockton is insufficient to accommodate the number of jurors who actually appear for jury service. Overflow parking is a distance from the Stockton courthouse and many jurors are uncomfortable with the area of the city where this parking is located and where they must walk in order to get to and from the courthouse. Downtown Guides employed by the City of Stockton are available to escort jurors. Bailiffs are sometimes asked to walk jurors to their vehicles at the end of the day, particularly during the late fall and winter months when it gets dark early. It is anticipated that the comfort level of people not accustomed to downtown Stockton will increase as plans to revitalize the downtown area become a reality. In the short-term, however, the problems related to parking persist. To some potential jurors, the issues related to parking discourage them from fulfilling their obligation to appear for jury service.

On days where there is a large jury call in Stockton, jurors serving in pending trials often find it difficult to find parking. Summoned jurors are told to appear at 8:30 A.M. Jurors sitting in pending trials are typically asked to be in court at 9, 9:30, or 10 A.M., depending on the trial judge's morning calendar and the availability of the attorneys. By the time seated jurors arrive, the available parking is often taken. Delays in finding parking often result in the delay of the morning trial session.

Typically, there is a large jury call on Tuesdays. Until 2000, the civil grand jury also met on Tuesdays. The grand jurors occupied 19 parking spaces that would otherwise be used by prospective petit jurors.

There had been no parking provided for jurors who have disabilities in the immediate area of the courthouse. The closest reserved parking for these jurors is two blocks away.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 22. 1 Provide free parking to all people who appear for jury service.

Policy

Directions:

- 22. 1(a)** Work with the Central Parking District to obtain additional parking reserved for jurors.
- 22. 1(b)** As long as the amount of available parking is limited, provide reserved parking for seated jurors.
- 22. 1(c)** Determine whether jurors would utilize a shuttle service from parking areas to the courthouse and provide such a service if a needs assessment indicates it is warranted.
- 22. 1(d)** Seek and obtain funds to pay for additional parking for jurors and a shuttle service.
- 22. 1(e)** Encourage or require civil grand jurors to meet on a day other than the days when there are typically large jury calls.

Goal 22. 2 Provide parking for jurors with disabilities in the immediate vicinity of the courthouse.

Policy

Directions:

- 22. 2(a)** Negotiate with the Central Parking District for reserved parking across the street or adjacent to the courthouse for jurors with disabilities.

Long Range Issue 23. Jury Assembly Facilities and Restrooms

Issue Description: Nearly 29,000 people actually appeared for jury service in San Joaquin County in 1999. The majority of those summoned were summoned to serve at the Stockton Branch. The court has a jury assembly room which is approximately 3,200 square feet. It is designed to hold 202 people. It is not unusual to have many more people than that appear at any one time. When this happens, jurors must be sent to vacant courtrooms, if there are any, or they must wait in the hall or nearby coffee room.

The Stockton Jury Assembly Room was last remodeled in 1985. Arms on the furniture are pulling apart and the upholstery is worn and stained. Ceiling tiles are stained with water marks and the walls are in need of paint. The public has complained about the facility.

The public restrooms just outside of the Jury Assembly Room leave much to be desired. The public has consistently complained about them for some time.

Both the Jury Assembly Room and the restrooms are facilities owned by the county and not the courts.

Many of the courtrooms in the Stockton Branch have no designated juror room for their seated jurors. Consequently, jurors, witnesses, litigants family, and attorneys often mingle amongst each other in the hallway prior to court sessions. Jurors have complained about being exposed to this co-mingling as well as the lack of seating in the hallways. Because there is no perimeter access for most of our courtrooms, criminal defendants who are in custody must be walked to and from courtrooms in these same hallways.

The Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy Branches do not have any jury assembly room. Jurors summoned to those courthouses must assemble in the small lobbies or outside of the courthouse. There are few places to sit, and jurors who have to wait outside sometimes do so in inclement weather.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 23.1 Increase the size of the jury assembly room in Stockton.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 23.1(a)** Explore with the County the expansion of the Stockton Branch Jury Assembly Room into the area that is now the County Duplicating Department.
 - 23.1(b)** Obtain alternate space in the building for an overflow Jury Assembly Room

Goal 23.2 Make improvements to the Stockton Branch Jury Assembly Room which will make it a more comfortable facility in the short-term.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 23.2(a)** Paint the existing walls
 - 23.2(b)** Replace stained ceiling tiles
 - 23.2(c)** Replace the furniture
 - 23.2(d)** Add more public telephones
 - 23.2(e)** Install modems for jurors' lap top computers
 - 23.2(f)** Obtain a variety of reading materials from staff and other people who might donate old magazines, books, etc.
 - 23.2(g)** Find suitable art or pictures to hang on the walls.
 - 23.2(h)** Remodel or otherwise improve restroom facilities for jurors.
 - 23.2(i)** Install and subscribe to appropriate Direct TV programing.

Goal 23.3 Provide jury assembly facilities at the Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy Branches.

Policy

- Directions:***
- 23.3(a)** Encourage the County Facilities Committee to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the creation of jury assembly rooms for each of the branch courts.

23.3(b) Begin discussions and negotiate with the County as to the location, construction and amenities needed to accommodate jurors at the branch courts.

23.3(c) Seek alternatives such as leasing existing properties for use as assembly rooms for the branch courts in the event the County is not willing to assist in the construction of new facilities.

Goal 23.4 Provide places in the Stockton Branch for seated jurors to wait prior to court sessions where they do not come into contact with witnesses, litigants, criminal defendants, family of litigants, and attorneys.

Policy

Directions:

23.4(a) A special Jury Facilities Committee made up of persons assigned to the Court’s Jury Service and Facilities Committees will evaluate whether there are alternatives for providing a place for sworn jurors to assemble before court sessions so that they do not have contact with witnesses, litigants, criminal defendants, attorneys, etc.

23.4(b) Begin discussions with the County Facilities Committee on the creation of additional jury deliberation rooms or other suitable space at the Stockton Branch, which can be used as waiting rooms for jurors during breaks and before court.

23.4(c) Explore the possibility of building or establishing “juror only” seating in the hallways in the Stockton branch.

Long Range Issue 24. Food and Beverages - Stockton Branch

Issue Description: Food and beverages are provided in a snack bar adjacent to the Jury Assembly Room in Stockton. It is run by the County Department of Aging. It opens at 7:30 A.M., but closes at 2:00 P.M. While the snack bar has improved, the public desires a better selection of foods and beverages. Also, they would like it to be open at least through the point in the afternoon when the trial courts take their afternoon breaks.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 24.1 Provide a wider selection of foods and beverages.

Policy

- Directions:*
- 24.1(a)** Conduct a survey of jurors to determine what foods and beverages they would like to be available.
 - 24.1(b)** Bring the survey results to the attention of the Department of Aging and encourage expansion of the menu.

Goal 24.2 Expand the hours of service for the snack bar to 3:30 P.M.

Policy

- Directions:*
- 24.2(a)** Conduct a survey of jurors to determine whether jurors and other individuals in the courthouse would patronize the snack bar up to 3:30 P.M.
 - 24.2(b)** Bring the survey results to the attention of the Department of Aging and encourage expansion of the hours of service. If suitable changes are not made, explain to the public the efforts made to encourage those changes and the reasons why changes are not forthcoming.

Long Range Issue 25. Evaluation and Monitoring of Jury Service in San Joaquin County

Issue Description: The bench of the Superior Court has a number of standing committees on which judges, commissioners, and administrative staff serve. However, did not have a Jury Committee prior to 2000. The majority of the public has their only direct contact with the justice system when summoned for jury duty. Consequently, for many people, this is the only opportunity they have for first-hand observations of the courts in operation. There is a need for regular evaluation of this experience. There is a further need to ensure fulfillment of this civic obligation, coordinate public education and outreach efforts, suggest and implement local reforms, and monitor the court's compliance with the law and future statewide jury reforms.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 25.1 Establish a Superior Court Jury Committee for the purpose of evaluating and monitoring jury service in each of the branches and developing policies, procedures, and rules related to jury service in San Joaquin County.

Policy

Directions:

- 25.1(a)** The committee should consist of judicial officers, Jury Commissioner staff, and at least one member of the public and one member of the business community.
- 25.1(b)** The committee should conduct and evaluate regular exit surveys of jurors. The committee should also evaluate comment cards filled out by those appearing for jury service.
- 25.1(c)** The committee should evaluate juror compliance and jury summons procedures to ensure the fair cross-section requirement.
- 25.1(d)** The committee should discuss and suggest local procedures to implement appropriate reforms and assure uniformity and consistency where possible, such as granting hardship excuses, granting deferrals, and keeping alternates on-call during deliberations.
- 25.1(e)** The committee should discuss and suggest procedures which might effectively reduce waiting time for jurors where possible, such as developing uniformity concerning the timing of juror calls

for individual cases.

25.1(f) The committee should review its local rules and local rules in other California courts concerning jury service and determine whether to amend current rules and/or establish additional local rules for this court pertaining to jury service. The committee should be responsible for the amendment or establishment of future rules pertaining to jury service.

25.1(g) The committee should provide input on public outreach and education programs concerning jury duty.

Long Range Issue 26. Juror Compensation

Issue Description: Prior to July 2000, compensation for California’s citizens was the lowest in the nation. In July 2000, the amount of compensation was increased from \$5.00 per day to \$15.00 per day, beginning the second day of service. No change was made to the mileage reimbursement of 15 cents per mile. The law establishing the mandatory minimum \$5.00 per day was enacted in 1957, and the law enacting the 15 cents per mile mileage reimbursement was enacted in 1951. Jury service is a civic obligation to be sure, but there is no reason Californians should not receive compensation that is more like that provided by sister states or the federal government for jury service. Federal jurors are paid \$40.00 per day. New York jurors are also paid \$40.00 per day. 22% of the Juror Survey participants indicated they were not compensated by their employers. For the most part, this survey reached only those who actually served as jurors.

Long-Range Goals, and Policy Directions

Goal 26.1 Encourage the Legislature to enact jury reform measures that address the issue of compensation for jury service and encourage the governor to sign such legislation.

Policy

Directions:

- 26.1(a)** Inform the public about the various reforms suggested by the Blue Ribbon Commission concerning jury compensation.
- 26.1(b)** Conduct a survey of summoned jurors in San Joaquin County to document concerns orally expressed by focus groups and people previously summoned for jury service.
- 26.1(c)** Meet with local businesses to provide them with information concerning jury service and jury service reform in California , to inform them about the necessity for adequate compensation for jury service, and encourage them to contact their state legislators concerning juror compensation. Invite state legislators and county supervisors to this meeting.
- 26.1(d)** Meet with local legislators and convey the sentiments of their constituents concerning compensation for jury service.

Long Range Issue 27. Obtaining Compliance with the Jury Service Obligation

Issue Description: According to Code of Civil Procedure section 191 and California Rule of Court 860(a), jury service is an obligation of citizenship. Nevertheless, many refuse to acknowledge their civic obligation. Members of the community have complained about those who ignore their civic obligation. When members of the community fail to appear for jury service, it impairs the court’s ability to obtain a fair cross-section of the community in the pool of persons available to serve as jurors. Because many fail to appear, the court must summon many more people than are actually needed. Occasionally trials are delayed because insufficient numbers appear as required. Many who actually appear for jury service are summoned just because others refuse to perform their civic obligation. Comments made by focus group participants indicate that the public wants the court to do something about those who fail to respond when summoned. The following comment is typical. “The jury system makes it too easy to avoid jury service - Avoidance of jury service should be tightened” California Rule of Court 860(a) provides that, “The court and its staff shall employ all necessary means to fulfill this important civic responsibility.”

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 27.1 Employ appropriate means to ensure that people summoned for jury service perform their civic responsibility.

Policy

Directions:

- 27.1(a)** Continue to implement a jury service compliance program which focuses on compliance and not punishment.
- 27.1(b)** Discuss with the County the retention of fines to fund implementation of the compliance program and informational materials concerning jury service.
- 27.1(c)** Encourage legislators to enact legislation providing for the retention of contempt fines by the courts to fund compliance programs.
- 27.1(d)** Work with community based organizations and the ethnic communities to increase compliance in the ethnic communities and responses by all who are summoned, including those who are not

eligible to serve.

Long Range Issue 28. Public Education About Jury Duty

Issue Description: While many people refuse to acknowledge their civic obligation, other simply do not understand their obligation and the importance of jury service. Many think their appearance is a waste of time. 42% of the General Public survey participants had no opinion to the statement, “Jurors are an important part of our legal system.” On the other hand, those who actually served found their service to be rewarding.

A better understanding of jury service and the importance of fulfilling the jury service obligation will help enhance jury summons yields. Nearly every focus group identified jury service as a subject about which the public wants more information. Comments like the following are typical: “We’d probably get a lot of jurors if they knew what jury service was all about - education is needed.” “People find loophole and a way to get out of jury duty because they do not feel civic duty.”

The implementation of the One-Day / One-Trial Rule went largely unnoticed. Many are unaware of this reform and of the reform efforts of the Judicial Council. It is unrealistic to expect that state legislators and the governor will be motivated to increase jury service fees when their constituents do not value their jury service obligation.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 28.1 Educate the public about their jury service obligation, the importance of their jury service, and Judicial Council reforms.

Policy

Directions:

- 28.1(a)** Develop and publically disseminate educational pamphlets for the general public on jury service. The pamphlet should include common questions and answers to those questions.
- 28.1(b)** Develop and publically disseminate an educational pamphlet for employers. The pamphlet should include common questions employers have when their employee is summoned for jury service and answers to those questions.
- 28.1(c)** Continue to provide live jury panel orientations by judges and answer questions posed by the prospective jurors.

- 28.1(d)** Continue to implement a jury service compliance program which focuses educating delinquent jurors about their civic obligation and the importance of jury service in addition to compliance. Develop appropriate written materials for this purpose.
- 28.1(e)** Create a jury summons insert which will motivate people to appear for jury service and which contains key information about jury service, such as One Day - One Trial, suitable for mailing with the jury summons. Fund the printing and mailing costs.
- 28.1(f)** Develop a presentation for civic groups and community based organizations designed to provided information about the importance of jury service and jury service reforms.
- 28.1(g)** Revamp the page on the Court's web site concerning jury service.
- 28.1(h)** Write newspaper commentaries for publication in local newspapers concerning jury service information.

Juvenile Justice

Long Range Issue 29. Juvenile Justice - Delinquency Prevention

Issue Description: Many wards who are in the Juvenile Hall and who are committed to the California Youth Authority could have been diverted from criminal behavior with effective early intervention. Currently, the court does not have the resources to focus on incorrigible youth over whom the court has jurisdiction pursuant to Welfare and Institutions section 601. Both delinquent and incorrigible youth could benefit from early exposure to what awaits them in the future if they fail to change their behavior.

Many youth who come within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court are illiterate or are reading below grade level. Substandard reading skills inhibit youth from being productive and employable adults. Participation in a reading program can be imposed as a condition of probation.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 29.1 Expose delinquent and incorrigible youth to the negative aspects of continued delinquent behavior.

Policy

Directions:

- 29.1(a)** Develop and implement a Scared Straight program in collaboration with the Probation Department and the California Youth Authority. Utilize wards in the CYA Victim-Offender Reconciliation program as peer advisors who could show marginally delinquent and incorrigible youth the reality of where they are headed by continued antisocial behavior.
- 29.1(b)** Have rehabilitated youth participate as classroom speakers in classroom presentations, including the Juvenile Law and You presentation.
- 29.1(c)** Develop a videotape to be played in the lobby of the Juvenile Justice agency concerning juvenile justice procedures, Scared Straight-type information, and information for parents to help empower them in their efforts to control their children.

Goal 29.2 Elevate the reading level of youth who come within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court if they are reading below grade level.

Policy

Directions:

29.2(a)

Develop a reading program where local educators volunteer to tutor youth who come within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court in reading or utilize existing volunteer groups. Impose participation in these programs as a condition of probation.

Long Range Issue 30. Location and Time of Court Proceedings For Juvenile Traffic Hearings

Issue Description: Hearings for minors charged with traffic offenses had been conducted at our Juvenile Justice Center in French Camp. This had been inconvenient for the minors, their parents, and police officers who had to travel to the Juvenile Justice Center in French Camp from Lodi, Manteca, Stockton, Tracy, and the unincorporated areas of the county. Additionally, Juvenile Traffic Hearing Officers who presided over these matters did not have the same opportunity to keep abreast with local issues and concerns as if these matters were handled in the local branch courts. Before the budgetary crisis related to the property tax shift in 1993, juvenile hearing officers who handled these matters rode a circuit to each of the then Municipal Courts. As a result of that budgetary crisis, the former Municipal Courts in the county refused to continue staffing juvenile traffic matters since juvenile matters were jurisdictionally the responsibility of the Superior Court. Consequently, the former Superior Court, which was only housed in the Stockton courthouse and the Juvenile Justice Center in French Camp, assumed responsibility for these juvenile traffic hearings and calendared these matters at the Juvenile Justice Center.

Unless the current By moving the calendaring of these cases, parents and officers will no longer continue to be inconvenienced by having to travel to French Camp to attend Juvenile Traffic court during the day. Now that the courts have consolidated into one court and there are no longer the same budgetary or jurisdictional concerns, this procedure has been revisited.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 30.1 Hear juvenile traffic matters at a time and place that is convenient for minors and their parents.

Policy

Directions: **30.1(a)** Now that these calendars have been moved to our Lodi, Manteca, Stockton, and Tracy branches, evaluate the effectiveness and impact of calendaring juvenile traffic matters in these courthouses. Continue to monitor cost implications.

30.1(b) Evaluate the calendaring of juvenile traffic matters on week nights after normal work hours or during the weekend. Study cost

implications.

Public Education

Long Range Issue 31. Educating the Public About their Justice System

Issue Description: The community expressed a desire to have a better understanding about their justice system. The justice system has not done a very good job of providing the public with general information about the system or with specific information about local programs and operations. The public is left with impressions of the justice system gained through media accounts of certain cases and television shows like “The Practice” and “Judge Judy.” As a result, there are many misconceptions about the justice system. Some of these misconceptions fuel a growing lack of confidence in the system.

The education of youth presents a separate challenge. The public education system has not focused on civics as they had in the past. Demographers predict an increase in the population of youth, and an increase in crimes committed by youth. This will add to an already increasing rate of violent juvenile crime. As we move forward into the new millennium, it is important to give our youth positive impressions about the justice system and train our youth to be good citizens. Months before we began the public comment phase of our community-focused planning program, we intuitively realized that we must focus our efforts in this area, and we began to sow the seeds of our “Courtroom to the Schoolroom” project.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 31.1 Educate youth and provide them with positive experiences and impressions of the justice system.

Policy

Directions:

- 31.1(a)** Continue and expand the Speaker Program component of the Courtroom to Schoolroom project.
- 31.1(b)** Continue and expand the Courthouse Tours component of the Courtroom to Schoolroom project.
- 31.1(c)** Continue, refine and expand the First Impressions component of the Courtroom to Schoolroom project.
- 31.1(d)** Continue to refine and expand the Summer Youth Mentoring and

Senior Projects program.

- 31.1(e)** Continue participation in the county-wide mock trial competition.
- 31.1(f)** Continue and expand participation in career days at public and private schools.
- 31.1(g)** Seek and obtain all available grant money to fund the above programs. Work with school districts to secure grant money from educational sources as well as other sources, such as the San Joaquin County Bar Association Foundation.
- 31.1(h)** Form partnerships with each school district in the county to facilitate communication with the schools, to ensure their participation in the Courtroom to Schoolroom programs, and to ensure the court's participation in any programs they may conduct when appropriate and consistent with the court's other judicial duties.
- 31.1(i)** Assist school districts in their efforts to obtain private funding for field trip transportation costs within the bounds of the California Code of Judicial Ethics.

Goal 31.2 Provide educational opportunities to the general public about their justice system.

Policy

Directions:

- 31.2(a)** Conduct regular seminars for community groups on the list of topics compiled during our focus group sessions. Seminars for immigrant groups should focus on cultural fears of the justice system.
- 31.2(b)** Write commentaries on topics compiled during our focus group sessions for publication in local newspapers and distribute brochures containing these commentaries to all focus group participants and other community groups.
- 31.2(c)** Publish a booklet in which all court programs and community outreach efforts are outlined.
- 31.2(d)** Publish a public report outlining public comment received during

the public comment gathering phase of our community-focused court planning program.

- 31.2(e)** Publish an annual public report in which the operations of the courts are described, the judicial assignments are outlined, relevant statistical information is discussed, and outreach activities are updated.
- 31.2(f)** At least four times per year, publish updates in the form of newsletters indicating progress on community-focused planning goals and mail them to focus group participants and anyone else added to the community-focus mailing list.
- 31.2(g)** Explore the possibility of producing television programming or videotaped programming on various justice system topics with the local cable television provider.
- 31.2(h)** Continue to expand the information on the court's web site. Include links to the above mentioned publications.
- 31.2(i)** When needed, develop and publically disseminate educational pamphlets, brochures, booklets, or flyers concerning topics of interest and concern.

Long Range Issue 32. Media / Court Relations

Issue Description: The majority of information the public currently gets about the courts comes from the media. To fulfill both missions, both the courts and media should have an interest in ensuring that those who report to the public about justice system issues have sufficient knowledge of the justice system to give the public accurate reports. At one time, the courts, the bar and local media met on a regular basis to discuss issues related to reporting to the public, but this liaison committee disbanded for reasons that nobody can remember.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 32.1 Establish a mechanism where the bench, bar, and local media can meet on a regular basis concerning issues of mutual concern and education of media personnel.

Policy

Directions:

32.1(a) Have quarterly or semi-annual meetings with representatives from the bench, bar, and local media.

32.1(b) Provide training and orientation opportunities for media personnel touching on general topics related to the justice system and topics relating to our local justice system.

Long Range Issue 33. Public Relations and Providing Public Information

Issue Description: In fulfilling its community focus obligations and plans, the court has taken on many new responsibilities and functions. Court staff and judges are currently working overtime to perform many of these functions. There is a need to have a single staff person responsible for outreach aspects of these programs, including scheduling Courtroom to Schoolroom activities and other speaking programs, acting as a liaison with community groups along with judges, drafting and distributing court public information publications, and orienting personnel newly assigned to the justice system, and seeking grant or funding opportunities for court outreach programs.

In the past, the Court has missed opportunities to provide the media with positive information about the local justice system. Consequently, the community has not been informed about this positive information and opportunities to enhance the public’s confidence in the system have been missed. No one staff person has had responsibility to provide the media with such information.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 33.1 Provide information to the public concerning court operations, statistical data, current events, and outreach activities through the media.

Policy

- Directions:**
- 33.1(a)** Issue press releases to the media to disseminate information to the public.
 - 33.1(b)** Without commenting on pending cases, provide information to the media concerning the procedures of the court.

Goal 33.2 Establish the position of Court Public Relations Officer and provide clerical and budgetary support for the position.

Policy

- Directions:**
- 33.2(a)** Continue to seek funding from the Judicial Council for the position of Public Relations Officer and clerical support.
 - 33.2(b)** In the short-term, shift funds allocated for the current budgets and

utilize grant monies from the Judicial Council to pay for a Public Relations Officer hired on a contractual basis.

Race / Culture / Gender / Economic Bias

Long Range Issue **34.** Court and Community Relations

Issue Description: From time to time many members of the ethnic and immigrant communities and persons with disabilities have questions about the justice system. These questions may be general questions about the system as well as questions specific to our local system. Because of language, cultural, and other barriers they have not always been successful in obtaining needed information in the past. Also, members of these communities have not had a vehicle by which they could call to the court's attention issues and concerns from their communities. Members of these communities have indicated a desire to act as liaisons between the courts and their communities and to serve as a general informational reference for members of their communities. Other agencies, such as the Stockton Police Department, have established leadership programs which have fulfilled similar purposes.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 34.1 Establish a court/community liaison and leadership program to provide ethnic, immigrant and disabled communities with individuals within their community who could serve as an informational reference and liaison with the courts.

Policy

Direction:

- 34.1(a)** Continue implementation of the Court and Community Leadership and Liaison Program (CCLL) involving members of the ethnic, immigrant, and disabled communities. Allow community based organizations representing these communities to select the participants.

- 34.1(b)** Continue to hold the CCLL Academy and provide information on general topics related to the justice system and topics specific to the local justice system. Bring in individuals working in other justice system agencies to serve as panelists with judicial officers who will serve as instructors.

- 34.1(c)** With Academy participant input, evaluate the classes and instructor presentations made to the first Academy class. Determine if there are other topics of interest to Academy participants.

- 34.1(d)** Consult with the Academy participants and their communities about programs which could be presented to their communities and the best way to present those programs.
- 34.1(e)** Have regular quarterly meetings with those who attend and complete the Academy to address problems or concerns in their communities.
- 34.1(f)** Use the Academy and other Court and Community Leadership and Liaison meetings as a means to connect the involved communities to other justice system.

Long Range Issue 35. Racial / Cultural / Gender / Sensitivity Training

Issue Description: Many members of the community are of the belief that there is race and gender bias and a lack of cultural sensitivity in the justice system. According to their perceptions, both judicial officers and clerk staff possess these biases and lack of sensitivity. As a consequence, they lack trust and confidence in the justice system. San Joaquin County is ethnically and culturally diverse. Many court users are members of ethnic groups. A sizable portion of the population are first and second generation immigrants. Many do not speak English. Members of the public correctly observe that many businesses and governmental agencies provide mandatory race, cultural, and gender training for their employees as a means of assuring good customer service. Members of the local Cambodian, Hmong, Lao, and Vietnamese communities have volunteered to provide cultural sensitivity training related to their cultures.

When the Judicial Council mandated that all judges take the training program, “Fairness in the California Courts”, the judges and commissioners of this court were among the first in the state to schedule and take that training. Many California Judicial Education and Research (CJER) training programs include components that focus on diversity and fairness. In October of 1999, this court sponsored a County Bar training session on gender bias in the legal profession. Each judicial officer donated \$10 to contribute to this sponsorship. A judicial officer took the lead in producing this program.

Yet, because our diversity requires sensitivity to a number of issues, we can do more in the area of racial, cultural, gender, and economic status sensitivity training.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 35.1 Establish a race, cultural, and gender sensitivity training program for judges and staff.

Policy

Directions: **35.1(a)** Utilizing available professional and community resources, make available additional race, cultural, and gender sensitivity training for judicial officers.

- 35.1(b)** Judicial officers shall continue to participate in mandatory race, cultural, and gender sensitivity training required by the Judicial Council.
- 35.1(c)** Utilizing available professional and community resources, provide additional race, cultural, and gender sensitivity training for staff.
- 35.1(d)** Produce a video tape for the training of judicial officers and court staff statewide on cultural issues pertaining to the Southeast Asian Cultures. Collaborate with local Southeast Asian communities, the University of Pacific, and Alameda County Superior Court in producing this video tape.
- 35.1(e)** Continue to collaborate with the County Bar Association in the production of local training programs on the elimination of bias in the legal profession.

Technology

Long Range Issue 36. Use of Technology

Issue Description: Advances in technology have made possible greater efficiency in court record-keeping and procedures. Although such uses of technology indirectly affect customer service, more attention should be paid to applying the technology advances, such as the Internet, specifically and directly to the improvement of customer service. Additionally, technology can be used proactively in the education outreach efforts of the court.

In the past, underfunding limited the court's ability to use innovative technology solutions to improve delivery of service and access to court information. With state assumption of trial court funding, the court may finally be able to pursue the projects that it had to defer because funds were not available. However, new challenges have arisen as a result of trial court funding.

The trial courts are no longer to be viewed as autonomous local entities, but rather as components of a statewide judicial system. In January 2000, the Judicial Council adopted a Tactical Plan for Court Technology to provide a framework not only to obtain funding for statewide technology initiatives but also to move the trial courts forward toward more coordinated and integrated technology solutions to their business needs.

Long-Range Goals and Policy Directions

Goal 36.1 Use technology to improve the administration of justice, and to share data with other courts and the court's local, state and federal partners in the justice system.

Policy

Directions:

- 36.1(a)** Implement an infrastructure to support the computing and telecommunications requirements of the court.
- 36.1(b)** Hire and retain qualified staff to implement and maintain current and proposed technology systems.
- 36.1(c)** Upgrade current case management systems to a state-of-the-art, browser-enabled system with electronic filing capability and an application program interface (API) to facilitate sharing data with electronic filing vendors or partners in the justice system.

36.1(d) Improve records management and streamline case processing by integrating a document management system with the upgraded case management system.

Goal 36.2 Use technology to improve customer service.

36.2(a) Provide electronic access to court records consistent with Judicial Council policies on public access versus privacy concerns.

36.2(b) Provide for the electronic filing and service of documents.

36.2(c) Revise and enhance the current court Web site to improve navigation and to display dynamic information such as court calendars and the register of actions in civil.

36.2(d) Use video conferencing to enable mediation between parties who do not want to be in the same room.

36.2(e) Use video conferencing to enable mediation between parties who do not want to be in the same room.

Goal 36.3 Apply technology as a tool for public education and outreach.

36.3(a) Revise and enhance the current court Web site to provide educational information for the public.

36.3(b) Continue to enhance the “Courtroom to Schoolroom” and other outreach programs with appropriate use of technology.

APPENDIX A

1999 COMMUNITY-FOCUSED COURT PLANNING TEAM ROSTER

1999 PLANNING TEAM ROSTER

Honorable William J. Murray, Jr., Chair
Jeanne Millsaps, CEO, Vice Chair

Bench Officers

Honorable Robin Appel
Honorable Robert Baysinger
Honorable Stephen Demetras
Honorable Thomas Harrington
Honorable Barbara Kronlund
Honorable Anthony Lucaccini
Honorable Thomas Teaford, Presiding Judge
Honorable Terrence Van Oss, Assistant
Presiding Judge
Honorable Richard Vlavianos
Honorable David Warner

Court Staff

Letty Chard, Management Analyst
Terry Costa, Lead Judicial Secretary
Herbert, Horstmann, Family Law
Facilitator
Rosa Junquero, Asst. CEO
Annette Kirby, Dep. CEO

County Representatives

Robert Cabral, County Board of Supervisors,
Chair
Nick Cademartori, Chief Probation Officer
David Wooten, Chief Deputy County Counsel

San Joaquin County Bar Association

Kevin Ford, Esq.
Gina Johnston, Esq., Board of Governors and
President Elect

Public Members

Kathy Ewing, Executive Director of the
Mediation Center of San Joaquin
Lee Issetti, Executive Director of Leadership
Stockton
Sovanna Koeurt, Executive Director of the Asian
Pacific Self-development and Residential
Association (APSARA)
Joseph Laranaga
Pete Ottesen, Public Information Officer, San
Joaquin County Office of Education
John Phillips, University of the Pacific, Sociology
Department Chair
Jose Rodriguez, Executive Director of the
Council for the Spanish Speaking (The
Concilio)
Floyd Weaver, former Vice Mayor of the City of
Stockton, Vice President of the Stockton
Chapter of the NAACP
Doug Wilhoit, Executive Director, Stockton
Chamber of Commerce

APPENDIX B

**1999 COMMUNITY-FOCUSED COURT
PLANNING TEAM SUBCOMMITTEES**

**COMMUNITY-FOCUSED
COURT PLANNING TEAM**

31 Members

Bench Officers - 11

County Representatives - 3

Court Administration - 5

Public Representatives - 12

**FOCUS GROUP
SUBCOMMITTEE**

12 Members

Bench Officers - 4

Public - 8

Judge William J. Murray, Jr.,
Chair

Robert Cabral

Kathy Ewing

Lee Issetti

Sovanna Koeurt

Commissioner Barbara
Kronlund

Joseph Larranaga

John Phillips

Jose Rodriguez

Judge Thomas Teaford

Judge Richard Vlavianos

Floyd Weaver

Doug Wilhoit

**PUBLICATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE**

4 Members

Bench Officers - 3

Court Administration - 1

Judge Stephen Demetras,
Chair

Annette Kirby, Deputy Court
Administrator

Judge Thomas Harrington

Judge Terrence Van Oss

**SURVEY
SUBCOMMITTEE**

5 Members

Bench Officers - 2

Court Administration - 3

Public - 1

Jeanne Millsaps,
Chair

Judge Robert Baysinger

Letty Chard

Annette Kirby, Deputy Court
Administrator

Gina Johnston, Esq.

Judge Anthony Lucaccini

**YOUTH & EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE**

17 Members

Bench Officers - 7

County - 1

Court Administration - 3

Public - 7

Judge Richard Vlavianos,
Chair

Commissioner Robin Appel

Nick Cademartori,

Chief Probation Officer

Kevin Ford, Esq.

Judge Thomas Harrington

Herbert Horstmann,
Family Law Facilitator

Sovanna Koeurt

Commissioner Barbara
Kronlund

Gina Johnston, Esq.

Rosa Junqueiro, Asst. CEO

Annette Kirby, Dep. CEO

Joseph Larranaga

Judge Anthony Lucaccini

Judge William J. Murray, Jr.

Pete Ottesen
Jose Rodriguez
Judge David Warner
Floyd Weaver

APPENDIX C

CONDUCTING FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

We have received a few questions about how we conducted our focus group sessions. The following is designed to answer some of those questions. Additional information can be found in *The Pulse of the Community*. We do not pretend to be experts at this, but we do feel we were successful in getting good public comment while enhancing the image of the court.

1. Organizing

Our Planning Team created a Focus-Group Subcommittee which organized the focus group sessions. The committee consisted of judicial officers, public members, court administrative staff and representatives of county government. This committee has since been converted to our Community Liaison Subcommittee.

2. Identifying Focus Groups

The groups were selected by subcommittee consensus. We identified: 1) groups which generally have negative perceptions about the justice system; 2) groups which have language, cultural, and other barriers to full access to the system; 3) groups which were representative of the public in general.

Accordingly, we had focus group meetings with the major ethnic and immigrant groups in our county. We also met with a group of persons with disabilities. Because law enforcement is a major stakeholder, we met representatives of the local law enforcement agencies as well. We also met with the following groups who were viewed as somewhat representative of the general public:

- C Business Community
- C Jurors
- C Neighborhood Associations
- C Religious Community

Time was of the essence at the time we decided to meet with specific groups in the community instead of having a single community forum. There were other groups with which we would have met had we given ourselves more time. These groups include the legal community and the education community.

3. Focus Group Participants and Size of Focus Group

The actual participants for many of the focus groups were selected by community based organizations representing those groups. We simply contacted these CBOs and they selected the people they wanted to participate. For some focus groups, participants were selected by the Community Liaison Subcommittee because they were people with whom members of the subcommittee were acquainted. A good example of this selection process in the focus group we set up for the business community. In an attempt to achieve representation of all segments of the business community, we identified people in each of the major industries in our county. Of course, we also invited the leadership in the local business organizations. The focus group meetings for the Southeast Asian communities were largely organized by a Planning Team member from the University of the Pacific who had contacts in those communities.

The entire membership of two organizations were invited to participate. These groups were the Council for the Spanish Speaking and a consortium of local religious leaders. The Council for the Spanish Speaking focus groups were held during one of their regular monthly meetings. Larger groups like these were broken out into smaller breakout groups to answer the focus group questions.

We found the ideal size of focus groups and breakout groups to be between 7 to 10 people. Full participation by everyone is difficult in groups larger than 10.

All participants received a personal letter of invitation and were asked to RSVP. Follow-up was done by judicial clerical staff when necessary. The invitation letter contained the focus group questions.

4. Location of the Focus Group Session

None of the focus group sessions were conducted in the courthouse. They were either conducted at the University of the Pacific or at the home of a community based organization. A neutral or familiar location enhanced both the comfort level of the participants and responses to the focus group questions.

When we had break-out groups, we conducted their sessions in separate rooms. Breakouts in the same room would have been distracting and made the sessions less productive.

5. Introductory Comments - What Have You Done For Me Lately?

The introductory comments set the whole tone for the focus group meeting. The Chair of our Planning Team provided the introductory comments at each of our focus group sessions.

A key component of the introduction is what could be called, “what have you done for me lately?” In the introductory comments we outlined some programs we had recently begun and

were in the process of implementing. From this, focus group participants could see we were serious about improving the justice system. Brochures concerning new programs were made available. Our new jury information pamphlet was also distributed.

The following is a bullet-point summary of the introduction:

- Introduction of Planning Team members
- History and explanation of community-focused court planning
 - Emphasis on the fact that it is a Judicial Council mandate which is designed to govern how courts operate now and in the future
 - Enhance outreach to the community and access to the courts
- Community-focused court planning represents a change in philosophy
 - In the past, judges remained in a cocoon - isolated from the public
 - Now we are being asked to get out into the community
- Summary of local community-focused planning history to date
- Planning Team
 - Membership
 - Subcommittees
- New programs - What we've done lately
- Explanation of focus group sessions
 - Will be asking focus group questions in the letter you received
 - We would like you to focus on courts only, not the Sheriff, DA, etc.
 - We would like you to focus on court operations, facilities, and programs - not individuals
- Can't discuss pending / impending cases
- I'm sure you will have questions for us
- We would like to spend the limited time we have hearing your concerns
- If have specific questions about the justice system, some of us will stick around after the meeting
- We realize we have to do a better job of informing you about what we do and why we do it
- We'll address many questions you may have in the future. In fact, one of the things we are going to find out from you is what you want more information about - one of the focus group questions is "What information about the courts would you like?"
- Your comments will be used to develop our long-range strategic plan
- We will report your comments in a public comment report so you will know we heard you.
- We are not making any promises that we can make all the changes you request.
- Many things you may ask for we will not be able to change
 - Many things you may ask for require legislation or additional funding - for

- example, jury service fees
- We will make your concerns known to your state legislators
- This kind of dialogue has not been tried before
- This is beginning of on-going process

6. Facilitating the Focus Group Sessions

We did not have court staff or judges facilitating the sessions or taking flip chart notes. Rather, we solicited the Mediation Center of San Joaquin to perform both functions. The Mediation Center was viewed as a neutral party by the focus group participants, and there was no temptation to ask them questions about the justice system during the focus group sessions.

7. Presence of Judges

There were judges present at every focus group session. It was extremely important that they were there, and it would have been a huge mistake to not have judges in attendance. By having judges present, the participants could see that the court was serious about community-focused planning, and they were grateful that judges took the time to meet with and listen to them.

The presence of judges did not at all inhibit focus group discussion. On the other hand, the judges who did attend got an earful first-hand from their constituents instead of reading their comments later. Much is lost by not hearing from the participants first-hand, and it is a shame the entire bench did not have this experience.

Judges did have to resist the temptation to comment and attempt to correct misconceptions about the justice system. Any discussion by the judges would have inhibited the responses and a conscious effort was made to not interrupt focus group discussions. In the introduction, focus group participants were told the judges were not there to answer questions, but were there to listen. We emphasized that the focus group session was our opportunity to hear from them.

8. Recording the Comments

Mediation Center volunteers took flip chart notes. However, because they were unfamiliar with many aspects of the justice system, they did not always adequately summarize the comments. Court personnel and judges took notes which were later compared against the flip charts.

9. Concluding Comments

The Chair of the Planning Team provided concluding comments. Questions about the community-focused court planning process were answered. Emphasis was given to the following:

- C This focus group meeting was just the beginning of our community-focused court planning process.
- C No promises could be made, but their comments would be used by us to develop our long-range strategic plan.
- C We would find a way to get back with their communities in the future to let them know about our progress and give the information they wanted about the justice system

10. Collating the Comments

The majority of the comments could be categorized. This process is important for future reference. Judges and court personnel who took notes were assigned the job of categorizing the comments of their focus groups. Later refinement of their categorization was necessary.

APPENDIX D

*The Pulse of the Community
San Joaquin County Superior Court
Public Report 2000*

**Copies of *The Pulse of the Community* are available upon request.
Contact Terry Costa, Lead Judicial Secretary at
(209) 468-2827**

APPENDIX E

OUTCOMES TO DATE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS 1999-2000

**OUTCOMES TO DATE
PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS
1999-2000**

ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT/LABOR

Issue 1: Transition of Administrative Responsibilities

Goal 1.1 Ensure the successful transition of employees from county administration to local management consistent with the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act.

Policy Directions

1.1(a)-(b) Personnel Plan

- CEO held 14 meetings for all court employees to show them the AOC video tape and explain transition process and
- CEO received Judicial Counsel model personnel manual on 10/18/00
- CEO has hired a consultant to draft the court's personnel manual.
- Draft of portion of personnel manual provided to CEO 11/9/00

1.1(d) Negotiated Salary Increases and Pay Equity Adjustments

- A budget request has been made for FY 01-02 to address both negotiated salary increases and pay equity adjustments in current MOUs. The request covers negotiated increases which will take effect in FY01-02 and those increases that occurred in FY00-01.

Issue 2: Strengthening of Fiduciary Responsibilities

Goal 2.1 Ensure the successful transition of those services previously provided by the county to the court or outside provider.

Policy Directions

2.1(a) County Services Analysis

- CEO and consultant developed a list of services currently provided to the Court by the County and shared that with the Executive Committee

2.1(b) MOU Negotiation

- C 11/9/00: CEO met with County Administrator about continuation of services from County Human Services Division and County Labor Relations

CASE AND CALENDAR MANAGEMENT

Issue 3: Police Officer Overtime / Witness Inconvenience

Goal 3.1 Eliminate the need for officers and civilians to appear unnecessarily or be on-call for preliminary hearings in felony cases in Stockton and Manteca consistent with the efficient operation of the court.

Policy Directions

3.1(a) Pre-preliminary Hearing Procedures

- C March 21, 2000 - PJ appointed judicial members to task force and named task force chair

Issue 4: Small Claims and Traffic Calendars - Pro Tem Judges

Goal 4.1 Maintain a formal Judge Pro Tem Program for small claims cases which ensures that attorneys sitting as Pro Tem Judges are properly trained and scheduled to ensure the orderly administration of justice in small claims matters.

Policy Directions

4.1(a) Recruitment of Attorneys

- C** *COMPLETED* - Pool of 59 qualified attorneys recruited and in the program currently.

4.1(b) Training for Pro Tem Judges

- *COMPLETED* - 4/19/99 Initial 4 hour training provided - mandatory attendance; 6/2/00 One hour class on auto repair cases - mandatory attendance; 6/23/00 One hour class on residential security deposits - mandatory attendance; 7/14/00 One hour class on judicial demeanor, ethics, and defaults.

4.1(c) Scheduling

- *COMPLETED* - Rotational schedule completed and implemented.

4.1(d) Diversity

- *ONGOING* - 3 Latino attorneys, 2 Asian attorneys, and 1 African-American Attorney currently are involved in the program.

4.1(e) Mediation Center Services

- *ONGOING* - Mediation Center of San Joaquin County representatives mediate to settlement approximately 70% of small claims cases calendared for trial.

Issue 6: Specialized Criminal and Family Law Case Management

Goal 6.1 Continue the drug court and domestic violence court programs and expand those programs in ways that are beneficial to the parties involved and the community in general.

Policy Directions

6.1(d) Expansion of Drug Court to Juvenile Dependency Cases

Team of judges and administrators visited the San Diego County Superior Court Drug Court on November 30, 2000.

Goal 6.3 Establish a truancy calendar.

Policy Directions

6.3(b) Collaboration With Agencies

- December 2, 1999: Preliminary meeting to discuss the concept between a Superior Court judge, SUSD Associate Superintendent, and a Stockton Deputy City Attorney

Goal 6.4 Facilitate the employment of unemployed parents who have child support responsibilities.

Policy Directions

6.4(a) Family Law Court - Employment Efforts Calendar

- *COMPLETED* - The calendar began on December 1, 2000 after planning meetings between the Family Law Commissioner, the Family Law Facilitator,

Human Services - CalWorks, the District Attorney Family Support Division, WorkNet, Community Connection, and Dads Make a Difference. The calendar is held two Fridays a month. Representatives of these agencies are present for immediate court referrals of unemployed parents for job training and job search assistance.

Issue 7: Family Law Center

Goal 7.1 Most family law matters will be heard together in one central facility.

Policy Directions

7.1(a) Family Law Center - Task Force

C March 21, 2000 - Presiding Judge appointed judicial members of task force and named task force chair.

Issue 8: Night Court / Saturday Court Calendars

Goal 8.1 Provide opportunities for those who have small claims and traffic matters to appear before the court at times other than traditional business hours.

Policy Directions

8.1(a)-(b) Night Court / Saturday Court - Small Claims and Traffic Cases

C March 21, 2000 - Executive Committee decided to conduct surveys in each branch court to determine user demand.

Issue 9: Alternative Dispute Resolution

Goal 9.1 Continue and enhance the use of alternative forms of dispute resolution in small claims and civil harassment proceedings.

Policy Directions

9.1(e) Expansion of Mediation Center Services to Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy

C January 2000 - Mediation Center of San Joaquin County began the provision of mediation services in the Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy branches for civil harassment cases. They had

been providing similar services in small claims matters in those branches since September of 1998.

COURT PLANNING

Issue 10: Community / Court Advisory Board

Goal 10.1 Establish a permanent community/court advisory board which can maintain the court's connection to the community, monitor plans set forth in this long-range strategic plan, and make recommendations in the future regarding the planning of court programs, court operations, and court facilities.

Policy Directions

10.1(a) Review and Evaluation of Other Community Boards

C **COMPLETED** - February and March, 2000: Reviewed single-issue and single project community boards listed in Courts Reaching Out to Communities; Consulted with AOC Community-Outreach Staff

10.1(b) Advisory Board Scheme and Organizational Structure

C **COMPLETED** - January 19, 2000: San Joaquin County Superior Court Community-Focused Planning Team organized into three subcommittees, the Community Liaison Subcommittee, the Publications Subcommittee, and the Youth and Education Subcommittee. The Focus Group Subcommittee was converted to the Community Liaison Subcommittee. The Survey Subcommittee was abolished effective the completion of the Public Report.

10.1(c) Advisory Board - Mission Statement Development

C **COMPLETED** - April 12, 2000: Planning Team recommended the Community-Focused Planning Team continue as constituted as the court/ community Advisory Board. The Planning Team adopted a mission statement to be recommended to the Superior Court bench.

10.1(d) Advisory Board - Mission Statement Recommendation and Adoption

C **COMPLETED** - July 10, 2000: The Planning Mission statement recommended by Planning Team adopted with one minor change. Organizational structure of Planning Team reviewed with the Bench. The modified mission statement was presented to the Planning

Team on July 12, 2000. The following is the mission statement of San Joaquin County Superior Court Community-Focused Planning Team:

The mission of the Community-Focused Planning Team shall be to:

- C Serve as a court and community advisory body for the Superior Court.
- C Provide community input for the evaluation and/or implementation for the planning goals and strategies outlined in the Superior Court's Long-Range Strategic Plan.
- C Assist the Superior Court in its community-related programs.

Issue 11: Internal Planning

Goal 11.1 Establish a mechanism for advancing local long-range planning goals and the development and implementation of the long-range strategic plan, the operational plan, the annual reports, and the single issue tactical plans required by the Judicial Council.

Policy Directions

11.1(a) Long Range Planning Responsibilities - Executive Committee

- C **COMPLETED** - February - March 22, 2000: At suggestion of Presiding Judge, long-range planning responsibilities vested in the Executive Committee; Amended goal and strategy statements adopted by Executive Committee.

11.1(b) Executive Committee Training

- C **ONGOING** - Judicial Council materials and memos pertaining to planning shared with Executive Committee; All members of Executive Committee have received a copy of the California Judicial Branch Strategic Management Handbook. All judicial officers receive written bench reports which include relevant Judicial Counsel planning updates.

11.1(c) Long-Range Planning Meetings

- C **COMPLETED** - March 22, 2000: Executive Committee adopted a policy of meeting quarterly on long-range planning issues.

11.1(d) Executive Committee Oversight

- C **COMPLETED** - March 22, 2000: Executive Committee adopted a policy of discussing quarterly reports submitted by responsible persons at quarterly planning meetings.

11.(f) Reports to the Bench

- **ONGOING** - Written Bench Reports provided to the Bench and the Planning Team by the Planning Team Chair. Issues are discussed at monthly Bench meetings when necessary.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

Issue 12: Self-Help Center

Goal 12.1 All unrepresented parties will have access to assistance in civil and family law matters.

Policy Directions

12.1(a) Visiting Other Self Help Centers

- December 8, 1999 - Deputy Court Administrator and 2 judges visited the Maricopa County Court Self-Help Center in Phoenix, AZ while attending a conference on jury service reform.

Issue 13: Enhancing Customer Accessibility

Goal 13.2 Improve access to non-English speaking customers and users.

Policy Directions

13.2(a) Courthouse Information Booth

COMPLETED - January 2000: The County remodeled the information booth in the lobby of the County Administration / Courthouse building in Stockton; Staff are hired by the County and have customer service skills; Court Administrative staff trained that person on court related issues and are available to answer questions from the information booth; Court related pamphlets and brochures are placed at the information desk.

13.2(b) New Phone Tree

- C A new telephone system which is currently being tested. It is anticipated that the system will be operational in mid-January 2001. Among the features of this system

are;

- C Quick access to each particular phone branch from one telephone number.
- C Office hours and directions to all locations
- C Information on traffic, parking, small claims, civil, criminal and record searches.
- C Ability to pay traffic tickets with VISA and Mastercard.
- C Ability to apply for a one-time 30 day extension on a traffic ticket.
- C Ability to determine if one qualifies for traffic school.
- C Listing of civil filing fees.
- C Ability to be transferred to a staff person at any time during the recording.

DISABLED ACCESS AND ACCOMMODATIONS

Issue 16: Enhancing Disabled Access and Accommodation

Goal 16.1 Improve access to disabled customers and users .

Policy Directions

16.1(a) Court Facilities Review / Remodeling

- **COMPLETED** - In August 2000, the Department B1 remodeling was completed. This is the only courtroom which is completely ADA compliant.
- The Executive Committee decided to hire a consultant of court facilities planning, including a strategy for disabled access issues for building and remodeling.

16.1(c) Court Liaison for Person with Disabilities

- C Budget request for the position of Public Relations Officer was granted for FY 2001-2002. It is contemplated that this position will have disabled community liaison responsibilities.

16.1(e) Evacuation of Persons with Disabilities

- 11/30/00 - The court developed an emergency evacuation plan which addresses some of the concerns of the disabled. Sheriff's Office personnel are responsible for assisting persons with disabilities who may be in any courtroom or in the hallways outside of any of our courtrooms. Court administrative staff have been identified to assist persons with disabilities who may be visiting our clerk's offices at the time of an emergency. The County is considering the purchase of emergency carriers to be stored in the stairwells which could be used to facilitate the evacuation of persons with mobility disabilities.
- which will be located in stairwells to assist in transporting persons with mobility disabilities to the street. The San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services is currently developing an evacuation plan for the rest of the building which houses the Stockton Branch.

FACILITIES

Issue 18: Arraignment Court at the Jail / Video Arraignment

Goal 18.1 Eliminate the cost and time consumption related to the transportation of in-custody defendants for arraignment proceedings from the San Joaquin County Jail to the branch courts in Manteca, Stockton, and Tracy.

Policy Direction

18.1(d) Video Arraignment Task Force

C March 21, 2000 - Presiding Judge appointed judicial members of the task force and appointed a chair.

**INTERPRETERS AND IMPROVED ACCESS
FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS**

Issue 19: Translation of Arraignment Court Proceedings

Goal 19.1 Facilitate the accurate translation of English to all languages spoken by Non-English criminal defendants so that the entire proceeding is fully understood.

Policy Directions

19.1(a)-(b) Translation of Arraignment Scripts and Rights Forms

- C Assistant Court Administrator consulted with Language Lines about their written translation services
- C 9/26/00: A Superior Court judge met with University of the Pacific Linguistics Department concerning translation of rights forms.

Issue 21: English Translation of Clerk's Office Customers

Goal 21.1 Provide translation services to all non-English speakers who need to do business with the Clerk's Office.

Policy Directions

21.1(a) Language Lines - Clerk's Counters

- C An evaluation of necessary phone lines, additional phones and phone receivers is underway.

21.1(b) New Phone Tree - Spanish Version

- C The new telephone system which is scheduled to be operational in January (See 13.2(b)) will include both an English and Spanish version.

Goal 21.2 Improve access to non-English speaking customers and users who visit the Stockton Branch.

21.2(a) Information Booth - Stockton Branch

- C **COMPLETED** - The County staff person who works the new information booth speaks both English and Spanish.

JURY DUTY

Goal 22.1 Provide free parking to all people who appear for jury service.

Policy Directions

22.1(a) Confer With Central Parking District

C **COMPLETED** - July 25, 2000 Meeting with Central Parking District concerning parking for jurors; November 9, 2000 meeting with Central Parking District - Central Parking District committed to permitting overflow jurors to park at the new parking structure at the City of Stockton Essential Services building effective 2/1/01. This facility will be used by jurors when the 150 spaces reserved for jurors at the Hunter Street Garage, have been taken. The Hunter Street garage is the primary parking lot and is owned by the County. It is two blocks from the Courthouse. The Essential Services Building is one block from the Courthouse. Parking at the Essential Services building will replace remote parking several blocks from the Courthouse in less attractive areas of downtown Stockton.

22.1(b) Reserved Parking for Seated Jurors

C **COMPLETED** - There will be no need to provide reserved parking for sworn jurors because the additional parking at the Essential Services Building will provide enough parking to guarantee that all jurors get parking free of cost.

22.1(c)-(d) Parking Lot Shuttle Service

C **COMPLETED** - There will be no need to provide shuttle service for jurors given the close proximity of the primary and overflow parking lots.

22.1(e) Civil Grand Jury Meeting Day

C **COMPLETED** - The civil grand jury now meets on Thursdays instead of Tuesday. This has freed up parking for petit jurors on Tuesday which is typically the heaviest jury call day of the week.

Goal 22.2 Provide parking for handicapped jurors with disabilities in the immediate vicinity of the courthouse.

Policy Directions

22.2(a) Confer With Central Parking District - Nearby Parking

C **COMPLETED** - Jurors with disabilities now are provided reserved parking in lots adjacent to the Stockton Courthouse free of charge. They need only contact the Jury Assembly Room to arrange special reserved parking. The court's jury summons has been amended to provide information about how to go about obtaining this reserved parking. The parking lot map has also been amended. A message concerning this reserved parking is on the call-in recording. Once

notified, Jury Assembly staff will call the Central Parking District office who will reserve a parking stall and issue a special parking pass.

Issue 23: Jury Assembly Facilities and Restrooms

Goal 23.1 Increase the size of the jury assembly room in Stockton.

Policy Directions

23.1(a)-(b) Expansion of Stockton Jury Assembly Facilities

C The expansion of Jury Assembly Room facilities in the Stockton Branch is on hold pending resolution of statewide court facilities issues.

Goal 23.2 Make improvements to the Stockton Branch Jury Assembly Room which will make it a more comfortable facility in the short-term.

Policy Directions

23.2(a)-(b) Walls and Ceiling Tiles

C The Stockton Jury Assembly Room is on the County Government Buildings list of facilities to be painted. Walls and ceiling tiles will be painted.

23.2(e) Installation of Modems

C **COMPLETED** - March 2000 - Two modems installed in the Stockton Jury Assembly Room

23.2(g) Wall Art

C Murals painted by local youth in the WorkNet Mural Project 2000 to be installed in the Stockton Jury Assembly Room after walls and ceiling tiles are painted.

23.2(i) Direct TV

C March 2000: Direct TV provided for jurors waiting in the Stockton Jury Assembly Room

Goal 23.3 Provide jury assembly facilities at the Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy Branches.

Policy Directions

21.3(a)-(c) Jury Assembly Facilities - Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy

- The establishment of Jury Assembly Room facilities in Lodi, Manteca, and Tracy is on hold pending resolution of statewide court facilities issues

Goal 23.4 Provide places in the Stockton Branch for seated jurors to wait prior to court sessions where they do not come into contact with witnesses, litigants, criminal defendants, and family of litigants, and attorneys in the Stockton Branch.

Policy Directions

23.4(a)-(b) Assembly Jury Facilities for Seated Jurors

- The expansion of Jury facilities in the Stockton Branch is on hold pending resolution of statewide court facilities issues.

Issue 25: Evaluation and Monitoring of Jury Service in San Joaquin County

Goal 25.1 Establish a Superior Court Jury Committee for the purpose of evaluating and monitoring jury service in each of the branches and developing policies, procedures, and rules related to jury service in San Joaquin County.

Policy Directions

25.1(a) Court Jury Service Committee

C **COMPLETED** - Presiding Judge appointed judicial officers, court administrative staff, and two public members. The committee has had 9 meetings this year.

25.1(b) Exit Surveys

C **ONGOING** - Review of comment cards.

25.1(c) Jury Compliance and Summons Procedure Review

C **COMPLETED** - One-year review of Juror Compliance and Education Program completed.

C **COMPLETED** - Experiment to determine if mailing the jury service information

pamphlet would increase compliance. Based on the experiment, it was determined that the inclusion of the pamphlet with the summons did not result in increased compliance.

25.1(d)-(e) Judicial Uniformity / Waiting Time Reduction

C September 2000 - Best practices survey conducted of judicial officers.

25.1(f) Amendment to Local Rule of Court

C **COMPLETED** - Local Rule of Court 1-102 amended effective 7/1/00. Several amendments were made. The highlight is a provision concerning granting deferrals for jurors who have temporary or marginal hardships after a prospective juror appears for jury service. This provision was added to achieve uniformity among jury trial judges. Because of a newspaper article which inaccurately reported that only those who vote and drive are subject to being summoned for jury service, a provision was added that clearly indicates that the DMV list includes people who hold California identification cards.

25.1(g) Public Outreach and Education Input

C The Jury Service Committee provided input on the Court and Business Forum on Jury Service and the public education commentaries published in the Record concerning jury service during Juror and Employer Appreciation Week 2000.

C The Jury Service Committee provided input on outreach efforts made in the Latino Community

Issue 26: Juror Compensation

Goal 26.1 Encourage the Legislature to enact jury reform measures that address the issue of compensation for jury service and encourage the governor to sign such legislation.

Policy Directions

26.1(a)(c)(d) Blue Ribbon Commission Reform Education, Court and Business Meeting re Jury Service, Discuss Juror Compensation with State Legislators

C **COMPLETED** - May 11, 2000: Conducted Court and Business Forum on Jury Service at UOP. 20 largest employers in San Joaquin County, Chamber heads,

and Business Community Focus Group Participants invited. State Legislators and county supervisors invited. 20 persons attended, including Senator Johnson, Assemblyman Pescetti, and representative from Assemblyman's Machado's office. Agenda included Blue Ribbon Commission and Judicial Council's reforms, juror compensation issues, local reforms and plans for local reforms. Senator Johnston moved Budget Conference Committee to increase amount of compensation to \$25.00 per day instead of the \$12.50 the governor proposed. According to Johnston, the governor's office ultimately agreed to increase to \$15.00 per day.

Issue 27: Compliance with the Jury Service Obligation

Goal 27.1 Employ appropriate means to ensure that people summoned for jury service perform their civic responsibility.

Policy Directions

27.1(a) Jury Compliance and Education Program

Ⓒ ***ONGOING*** - Jury Compliance and Education Program in effect since 6/1/99. Juror sweep conducted November 17, 1999 with significant press coverage

Ⓒ Of the 22,141 come-see-the-judge letters mailed 6/1/99 - 10/6/00:

Ⓒ 12,710 (57%) responded by contacting the Jury Commissioner prior to the Come-See-The-Judge hearing or appearing at the hearing.

Ⓒ 10,697 (48%) contacted the Jury Commissioner before the Come-See-The-Judge Hearing

Ⓒ 2,013 (9%) actually appeared at the scheduled Come-See-The-Judge Hearing

Ⓒ 4,602(21%) completed their obligation by appearing for jury service

Ⓒ 8,108(37%) were excused for legal hardship

Ⓒ The above 12,710 are people who would never have been accounted for without the program. The above 4,602, are people who never have

appeared for jury service.

- C Only 42 people have been fined.
- C 50% of those selected for personal service of an OSC re Contempt after FTA at the Come-See-The-Judge Hearing were no longer at the DMV / Voter Registrar address.

27.1(d) Jury Compliance in Ethnic Communities

- C Our review of the Jury Compliance and Education Program statistics revealed that of the 6,182 who did not respond to the four chances to appear (summons, postcard, come-see-the-judge letter, and warning letter), 2,520 had Hispanic surnames. This is approximately 17% of those who failed to respond to the initial summons and approximately 40% of those who failed to respond to the come-see-the-judge letter.
- C The following outreach efforts have been undertaken in the Latino community:
 - C The public member on the Court's Jury Service Committee is a staff person with the largest Latino CBO in San Joaquin County, the Council for the Spanish speaking.
 - C The court no longer requires proof of non-citizenship to be excused from jury service. Nor does the court indicate on its summons that such proof is required.
 - C The Court and the Council for the Spanish Speaking Developed a flyer containing common questions about jury service which was translated into Spanish. Issue pertaining to citizenship and the inability to speak English are also addressed in the flyer.
 - C The Court provided to the Council for the Spanish Speaking the original draft of commentaries which appeared in *The Record* during jury appreciation week. These will be published in the two local Latino newspapers.
 - C August 30, 2000: Jury service presentation made to the Council for the Spanish Speaking.
 - C December 2, 2000: Jury service presentation made to the Coalition of

Mexican American Associations.

Issue 28: Public Information About Jury Service

Goal 28.1 Educate the public about their jury service obligation, the importance of their jury service, and Judicial Council reforms.

Policy Directions

28.1(a) Jury Summons Pamphlet

C **COMPLETED** - May 1999 - Published informational brochure entitled *Jury Duty: Jurors Are Essential to the Administration of Justice*. This pamphlet is available in the Stockton Jury Assembly Room, outside the courtroom where the Jury Compliance Calendars are heard, the Courthouse Information booth, the County Law Library, and all clerks counters. It was also distributed to all focus group participants and copies were provided to be distributed to the members of community based organizations represented by the focus group participants. It is also distributed to students as part of our *Courts as the Third Branch of Government and the Importance of Jury Duty* presentation. It has also been distributed at civic group presentations and the County Bar Associations Law Day Fair in May 2000.

28.1(b) Employer Information Pamphlet

C **COMPLETED** - May 2000 - Developed an informational pamphlet for employers of people summoned for jury duty entitled, *What if One of My Employees is Summoned for Jury Duty?: Answers to Commonly Asked Questions by Local Employers*. This pamphlet is available in the Stockton Jury Assembly Room, the Courthouse Information booth, the County Law Library, and all clerks counters. It was also distributed to participants at the Court and Business Forum on Jury Service held 5/11/00.

28.1(c) Live Judicial Orientations

C **ONGOING** - Since May 1999, people summoned to jury service at the Stockton Branch receive an orientation from a judge. This live orientation has replaced a less-than-personal videotaped orientation. At the end of the orientation, jurors are given an opportunity to ask questions. A bullet-point script has been created and is generally followed by orientation judges. A general overview of the local court system, summons source lists, the One-Day / One-Trial Rule, voir dire questions,

cause and peremptory challenges, hardship excuses, deferral policy, the jury service civic duty, the failure to appear policy, and juror compensation reform efforts are subjects discussed with the jurors.

28.1(d) Education Component of Compliance Program

- C Civic duty speech by the judge developed for use at the Come-See-The-Judge Hearing and OSC arraignment. One-Day/One-Trial rule explanation by Jury Commissioner staff developed for use at the Come-See-The-Judge Hearing.
- C Handout containing laws pertaining to jury service developed for distribution at the Come-See-The-Judge Hearing and OSC arraignments.

28.1(e) Information Insert for the Jury Summons

- C A draft will be submitted for review by the Jury Service Committee at their December 15, 2000. The proposed insert explains the One-Day/One Trial on one side. The other side has the slogan "It's Not Fair If You're Not There." It is anticipated we will begin using this insert the beginning of 2001.

28.1(f) Civic Group Presentation

- C **COMPLETED** - Several versions of a PowerPoint presentation created.
- C **ONGOING** - Presentations of the above programs is ongoing. 6/28/00 - Presented to Lodi Lions Club; 8/25/00- Presented to Council for the Spanish Speaking; 11/30/00 - Presented to Court and Community Leadership and Liaison Citizen's Academy; 12/2/00 - Presented to Coalition of Mexican American Associations.

28.1(g) Jury Service Web Page

- C **COMPLETED** - Web page on jury service completed. To be on-line ?????

28.1(h) Newspaper Commentaries

- C **COMPLETED** - 5/11 - 5/13/00 - Published a three-part commentary in *The Record*. The first two parts contained answers to commonly asked questions concerning jury service. The third part was a recognition of the employers in the list of top 20 San Joaquin County employers who compensate their employees

while performing jury service.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

Issue 29: Juvenile Justice - Delinquency Prevention

Goal 29.2 Elevate the reading level of youth who come within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court if they are reading below grade level.

Policy Directions

29.2(a) Reading Program as a Condition of Probation

C 11/13/00 - Initial planning meeting between the Presiding Juvenile Judge and SUSD administrative personnel.

Issue 30: Location and Time of Court Proceedings For Juvenile Traffic Hearings

Goal 30.1 Hear juvenile traffic matters at a time and place that is convenient for minors and their parents.

Policy Directions

30.1(a) Juvenile Traffic Calendaring In Branch Courts

C **COMPLETED** - November 1, 2000: Juvenile traffic matters transferred from the Juvenile Justice System in French Camp to the branch courts in Lodi, Manteca, Stockton, and Tracy.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Issue 31: Educating the Public About Their Justice System

Goal 31.1 Educate youth and provide them with positive experiences and impressions of the justice system.

Policy Directions

31.1(a)-(d) Courtroom to Schoolroom Programs

C **IMPLEMENTED AND ONGOING** - Approximately 3,536 students from 36 San Joaquin County schools were reached by our Courtroom to Schoolroom programs during 1999-2000 school year.

31.1(a) Courtroom to Schoolroom - Classroom Speaker Program

C **IMPLEMENTED** - Four programs developed: 1) *The Courts as the Third Branch of Government*; 2) *Common Issues for Youthful Drivers, Traffic Laws and Penalties*; 3) *Juvenile Law and You*; and 4) *Family Law and You*. Also, the court sends staff to career day programs. PowerPoint presentations developed for all presentations except *Juvenile Law and You*. A booklet entitled, *The Courts as the Third Branch of Government* has been put together for that program. A program menu has been developed and printed in-house.

C **ONGOING** - Presentations of the above programs are ongoing. By the end of the 1999-2000 school year we had done:

C 42 presentations of *The Courts as the Third Branch of Government*

C 24 presentations of *Common Issues for Youthful Drivers, Traffic Laws and Penalties*

C 7 presentations of *Juvenile Law and You*

C 2 presentations of *Family Law and You*

C 42 career day presentations

C Using a conservative estimate of 25 students per class, we estimate that in just over six months of this program we reached 2,925 students with these presentations.

C A newspaper article featuring this program was published in *The Record* on 1/9/00.

31.1(b) Courtroom to Schoolroom - Courthouse Tours

C **IMPLEMENTED** - Developed an organized tour program. A program brochure has been developed and printed in-house. Room, the County Law

Library, the lockup area, and age appropriate court proceedings. Presentations are also made by a judge and courtroom staff. If available, a prosecutor and criminal defense attorney also make presentations.

- C Obtained agreement of the County Office of Education to make science camp buses available at cost when not being used for science camp purposes.
- C **ONGOING** - This program is ongoing. For the school year of 1999-2000, 14 groups of students, consisting of a total of 515 students, visited the Stockton Branch.
- C A newspaper article featuring this program was published in The Record on February 5, 2000.

31.1(c) Courtroom to Schoolroom - First Impressions

- C **IMPLEMENTED** - Developed a modified version of the First Impressions program curriculum. The modifications was designed to meet local needs and achieve consistency with the California Content Standards for 5th graders. The San Joaquin County version of First Impressions involves a team assigned to each class which consists of a judge, deputy district attorney, and deputy public defender. The program is taught in 5 - 7 class sessions. The highlight of the program is the mock trial of the Big Bad Wolf for the untimely demise of two of the three Pig brothers.
- C Met with the SUSD Associate Superintendent concerning the program and selection of the schools. Three 5th grade classes in three separate schools were selected for the 1999-2000 program.
- C Efforts are focused primarily on students who are from neighborhoods in Stockton where negative impressions about the justice system are developed early in life.
- C Provided training to the instructors who participate in the first program. Training provided by the Constitutional Rights Foundation.
- C 3/16/00 - Sacramento Television Channel 31 filmed the mock trial involving one of the 5th grade classes. 3/17/00 - A newspaper article was published in The Record concerning the program and the mock trial. 4/9/00 - A laudatory editorial was published in *The Record* concerning the program.
- C The 2000 First Impressions program reached a total of 80 students.

- C **ONGOING** - The program will be expanded during the 2000-2001 school year from 3 classes at three separate schools to 7 classes at 7 seven different schools. Six of these schools and classes were selected after meeting with the Associate Superintendent at SUSD. One school from the Lincoln Unified School District has also been selected. An initial meeting of the teachers and volunteer instructors was held on November 2, 2000. A program manual was developed during the Fall of 2000 for use by instructors and teachers.

31.1(d) Courtroom to Schoolroom - Summer Youth Mentoring Program

- C **IMPLEMENTED** - Developed a program for students between their junior and senior year of high school and recently graduated seniors. The program is a 4-week program in which the student work one half of a day five days per week with their mentor. Justice system professionals including judges, attorney, court reporters, and bailiffs serve as mentors. We have developed and printed in-house a brochure describing the program.

- C 14 students participated in the Summer 2000 class. In their evaluations they had the following to say about the program:

“The judge that I had helped me decide that I can do anything.”

“Much of the ‘law’ that is known to the general public is misconceptions or ‘Hollywood.’ This program did a wonderful job of teaching and illustrating the judicial processes.”

“I learned a lot . . . If my friends were interested in the judicial system, I would highly recommend it.”

“Before this program, I was hesitant about entering the legal profession. Now, however, I feel it could very well be the profession for me.”

“The program really helped me a lot on my decisions in life. It actually influenced me to consider other careers in law enforcement.”

“This program is a great learning experience. You get to see everything that your mentor does. You learn a lot in so little time.”

“I really learned a lot, which I believe will benefit me in the

future. . . This awesome experience will lead me to think about what career is the right one for me.”

“Thanks for having us. It really has helped me organize my plans in the future.”

“I believe all teenagers should take part in a program such as this because it shows one the essence and fundamentals of our nation’s government.”

C An article about this program was published in *The Record* on July 10, 2000.

C **ONGOING** - The program will be given every year. We expect to expand the program to include 30 students during the Summer of 2001.

31.1(e) County Mock Trial Competition

C **ONGOING** - 2/19/00: Judicial officers once again participated in the annual Constitutional Rights Foundation Mock Trial Competition sponsored by the County Office of Education. Stockton branch courtrooms were used for the competition. This is an annual program.

31.1(f) Career Day Presentations

C During the 1999-2000 school year, judicial officers participated in 42 career day presentations.

31.1(g) Seek Grant Money

C Obtained a \$13,610.00 grant from the Partnership for Tomorrow Program sponsored by the County Office of Education for the 2001 Summer Youth Mentoring Program.

31.1(h) Partnerships With School Districts

C Numerous meetings have been had with SUSD administrative staff concerning our Courtroom to Schoolroom programs. 8/31/00 - Made a presentation to the SUSD middle and high school social studies teachers.

C 9/7/00 - Met with the Lodi Unified School District Superintendent and subordinate administrators to present the programs to them. 10/26/00 - Presented programs

to the middle and high school social studies teachers in the Lodi Unified School District.

- C 10/9/00 - Presented programs to the Lincoln High School (Lincoln Unified School District) social studies department.

Goal 31.2 Provide educational opportunities to the general public about their justice system.

Policy Directions

31.2(b) Newspaper Commentaries

- C See 27.1(h)

31.2(c) Outreach Catalog

- C Fall 2000 - Created and published a catalog containing descriptions of all of the Court's outreach programs. Copies were mailed to all focus group participants and people added to our mailing list. Copies are being distributed at our clerks counters and at the Courthouse Information Booth.

31.2(d) Public Comment Report

- C January - July 2000 - Developed a report detailing the public comments we received in focus group meetings and the results of surveys we conducted. This report is entitled *The Pulse of the Community: San Joaquin County Superior Court Public Report 2000*. We committed to publishing such a report during our 1999 focus group sessions. We felt it important to publish the public's comments for the following reasons: 1) It was important to show our focus group participants and the community that we actually heard their comments and that many of our planning efforts are in direct response to their perceived needs and desires; 2) The report provides our community with information about how different segments of our community actually view their local justice system; 3) It was important to document our public comment gathering process so that our community will better understand our on-going program of community-focused planning; and 4). It was important to document the comments and survey data for reference by members of the other two branches of government and for future reference by our court.

- C The report was mailed to all focus group participants, all Court and Business Forum on Jury Service participants, our local state legislators, the county

supervisors, and the mayors of each city in the county. Each judicial officer also received a copy.

31.2(e) Annual Report

- Budget request for a Public Relations position and staff has been granted for FT 2001-2002. Gathering of statistical data, drafting and coordinating the drafting of the annual report, and publication of the annual report will be some of the responsibilities of the Public Relations Officer.

31.2(f) Quarterly Newsletters

- C March 2000 - published a bullet-point summary of our December 15, 1999 Long-Range Strategic Plan. This pamphlet was developed and printed in-house. It was mailed to each focus group participant.
- C June 2000 - published a newsletter entitled, *Courtroom to Schoolroom Report Card*. The report card summarized our school programs for the year 1999-2000 school year. This newsletter was drafted and printed in-house. It was mailed to each focus group participant and to each Jury Forum participants.
- C October 2000 - published a newsletter entitled, *Focused on the Community*. In this newsletter, we summarized many of our outreach efforts. It was mailed to each focus group participant and to each Jury Forum participants.

31.2(h) Court Web Site - see 35.3(a)

Issue 32: Media / Court Relations

Goal 32.1 Establish a mechanism where the bench, bar, and local media can meet on a regular basis concerning issues of mutual concern and education of media personnel.

Policy Directions

32.1(a)-(b) Bench/Bar/Media Group

- January 2000 - The Presiding Judge established a Court Media Relations Committee and appointed a Chair.
- 5/22/00 - Court Media Relations Committee met and discussed the establishment of Bench/Bar/Media Group which would meet on a regular basis. Next meeting

to include representatives of the County Bar.

Issue 33: Public Relations and Providing Public Information

Goal 33.1 Provide information to the public concerning court operations, statistical data, current events, and outreach activities through the media.

Policy Directions

33.1(a) Press Releases

- C Press release fax list completed containing all local print and tv media.
- C Press releases issued throughout the year concerning jury and Courtroom to Schoolroom activities.

Goal 33.2 Establish the position of Court Public Relations Officer and provide clerical and budgetary support for the position.

Policy Directions

33.2(a)-(b) Judicial Council Funding

- Obtained funding for the position of Public Relations Officer and one clerical support person for FY 2001-2002.

Issue 34: Court and Community Relations

Goal 34.1 Establish a court/community liaison and leadership program to provide ethnic, immigrant and disabled communities with individuals within their community who could serve as an informational reference and liaison with the courts.

Policy Directions

**34.1(a),(b),
(c),(d),(f) Court and Community Leadership and Liaison Program**

IMPLEMENTED AND ONGOING - 16 people representing the African-American, Cambodian, Disabled, Filipino, Hmong, Latino, and Vietnamese communities have been selected by community-based organizations representing those communities to participate. 9/14/00 - 12/7/00: The CCLL Academy classes/tours.

Issue 35: Racial / Cultural / Gender Sensitivity Training

Goal 35.1 Establish a race, cultural, and gender sensitivity training program for judges and staff.

Policy Directions

35.1(a)/(e) Provide Training / Collaborate with County Bar

- 10/26/99 - The Women's Lawyer Section of the San Joaquin County Bar Association and the Superior Court jointly sponsored a program focusing on the elimination of bias. A Superior Court judicial officer coordinated the program as Chair of the Women's Lawyer Section. The Honorable Ken Kawaishi of the Alameda County Superior Court presented the program. \$10.00 was contributed by each San Joaquin County Superior Court judge to help with the cost of producing this program.

35.1(d) Video Training Tape - Southeast Asian Cultures

- In a cooperative effort with the University of the Pacific and the Alameda Superior Court, our court is taking the lead in the production of a video designed to sensitize court personnel and judicial officers to cultural issues related to the Southeast Asian cultures. Judicial Council grant monies are being used for this effort. The following summarizes activity on this project to date:
 - February 2000 - Grant application submitted to Judicial Council.
 - Spring 2000 - Organizational meetings held.
 - 5/11/00 - Focus group session conducted with San Joaquin County Superior Court Clerk staff
 - 5/18/00 - Time line developed.
 - 6/27/00 - Focus group session conducted with San Joaquin County Superior Court Judicial Officers
 - 6/29/00 - Focus group session conducted with Alameda County Superior Court Clerk staff.
 - 8/23/00 - Focus group meeting with San Joaquin County Southeast Asian communities at the University of the Pacific. This meeting was filmed and

portions will be used in the video-tape.

- 9/5/00 - Hired Daly Productions as the producer.
- 9/25/00 - Meeting with producer. CJER staff present.
- 10/00 - 11/00 - Script writing. Filming.
- 11/20/00 - Review of 8/23/00 focus group meeting / planning.
- 11/00 - Began drafting written training materials.

TECHNOLOGY

Issue 36: Technology

Goal 36.1 Use technology to improve the administration of justice, and to share data with other courts and the court's local, state and federal partners in the justice system.

Policy Directions

36.1(a) Infrastructure

C One of the Court Technology Advisory Committee's statewide initiatives is the allocation of funding to allow trial courts to replace PCs for one-third of their staff every year. In FY 2000-2001, San Joaquin Superior Court received an allocation of \$142,933 for asset replacement. It is participating with other courts in the CCED20 court technology regional group to get volume discounts from major vendors such as Dell and Gateway.

C All branch courts are now connected to the countywide virtual private network (VPN) that Superior Court shares with the DA. Network wiring at the Juvenile Justice Center in French Camp was completed during the current fiscal year.

Goal 36.2 Use technology to improve customer service.

Policy Directions

36.2(a)-(c) Electronic access to court records; Enhanced Web Site

- C San Joaquin Superior Court received a technical assistance grant of \$67,200 to enhance the Web site. Almost all of the static pages in the new Web site have been published to the new site (www.stocktoncourt.org). Generation of dynamic calendars is almost complete. Display of the register of actions in civil cases will be available by mid-December.

Goal 36.2 Apply technology as a tool for public education and outreach.

Policy Directions

36.3(a) Enhanced Web Site

- C See 36.2(a)-(c)

APPENDIX F

CURRENT PLANNING TEAM ROSTER

12/2000 PLANNING TEAM ROSTER

Honorable William J. Murray, Jr., Chair

Jeanne Millsaps, CEO, Vice Chair

Bench Officers

Judge George Abdallah, Assistant Presiding
Judge

Judge Robert Baysinger

Judge Stephen Demetras

Judge Thomas Harrington

Judge Anthony Lucaccini

Judge Michael Platt

Judge Thomas Teaford

Judge Terrence Van Oss, Presiding Judge

Judge Richard Vlavianos

Judge David Warner

Commissioner Robin Appel

Commissioner Barbara Kronlund

Court Staff

Letty Chard, Management Analyst

Terry Costa, Lead Judicial Secretary

Herbert, Horstmann, Family Law
Facilitator

Rosa Junquero, Asst. CEO

Annette Kirby, Dep. CEO

County Representatives

Nick Cademartori, Chief Probation Officer

Shelly Green, Deputy County Counsel

Judith Jones, San Joaquin County Human
Services (1/01)

Jack Sieglock, County Supervisor (1/01)

Stuart Wakling, Juvenile Justice Coordinator

City of Stockton Representatives

Donna Brown, Deputy City Manager

Roger Storey, Deputy City Manager

San Joaquin County Bar Association

Gina Johnston, Esq., President

Kevin Ford, Esq.

Susanna Alcala Wood, Esq.

Public Members

Bobby Bivens, President, Stockton Chapter of
the NAACP

Kathy Ewing, Executive Director of the
Mediation Center of San Joaquin

Lee Issetti, Executive Director of Leadership
Stockton

Sovanna Koeurt, Executive Director of the Asian
Pacific Self-development and Residential
Association (APSARA)\

Joseph Laranaga

Pete Ottesen, Public Information Officer, San
Joaquin County Office of Education

John Phillips, University of the Pacific, Sociology
Department Chair

Jose Rodriguez, Executive Director of the
Council for the Spanish Speaking (The
Concilio)

Floyd Weaver, former Vice Mayor of the City of
Stockton, Vice President of the Stockton
Chapter of the NAACP

Doug Wilhoit, Executive Director, Stockton
Chamber of Commerce

APPENDIX G

**CURRENT
PLANNING TEAM
SUBCOMMITTEES**

**PLANNING TEAM
SUBCOMMITTEES AS OF 12/2000**

**COMMUNITY LIAISON
SUBCOMMITTEE**

**20 Members
Bench Officers - 5
Court Administration - 3
County / City - 4
Public - 8**

Judge William J. Murray, Jr.,
Chair

Bobby Bivens

Donna Brown

Kathy Ewing

Herbert Horstmann, Family
Law Facilitor

Lee Issetti

Annette Kirby, Deputy CEO

Sovanna Koeurt

Commissioner Barbara
Kronlund

Joseph Laranaga

Jeanne Millsaps, CEO

John Phillips

Jose Rodriguez

Roger Speed

Judge Thomas Teaford

Judge Richard Vlavianos

Stuart Wakling

Judge David Warner

Doug Wilhoit

**PUBLICATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE**

**7 Members
Bench Officers - 3
Court Administration -3**

Judge Stephen Demetres,
Chair

Letty Chard, Management Analyst

Judge George Abdallah, APJ

Annette Kirby, Dep. CEO

Jeanne Millsaps, CEO

Terrence Van Oss, PJ

**YOUTH & EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Members
Bench Officers
Court Administration
County / City
Public**

Judge Richard Vlavianos,
Chair

Commissioner Robin Appel

Nick Cademartori

Shelly Green

Kevin Ford, Esq.

Judge Thomas Harrington

Herbert Horstmann, Family Law
Facilitator

Annette Kirby, Deputy CEO

Gina Johnston, Esq.

Rosa Junquero, Asst. CEO

Judge Anthony Lucaccini

Judge William J. Murray, Jr.

Pete Ottesen

Judge David Warner

Susan Alcalá Wood, Esq.

APPENDIX H

POPULATION GROWTH SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

APPENDIX I

**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
ETHNIC POPULATIONS**

APPENDIX J

**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT BRANCHES**



San Joaquin County Courts



Main Administrative Offices

FRENCH CAMP

Juvenile – Delinquency,
Drug Court (KADAP),
Traffic
1 Judge
½ time Referee
**½ time Hearing
Officer**

TRACY

Criminal – Traffic,
Misdemeanors, Felony
Preliminary Hearings
Civil – Lawsuits \$25,000 or less,
Unlawful Detainers, Small Claims,
Civil Harassment Restraining
Orders
1 Judge
1 Commissioner

STOCKTON

Criminal – Traffic,
Misdemeanors, Felony Preliminary
Hearings, Felony Trials, Drug Court,
Felony Probation Violations,
Domestic Violence Court
Civil – Lawsuits \$ unlimited,
Family Law, Probate, Adoptions,
Unlawful Detainers, Small Claims,
Civil Harassment Restraining
Orders, Jury Service Compliance
Civil and Criminal Grand Jury
Juvenile Dependency
Appellate Division
19 Judges
2 Commissioners

LODI

Criminal – Traffic,
Misdemeanors, Felony
Preliminary Hearings
Civil – Lawsuits \$25,000 or less,
Unlawful Detainers, Small Claims,
Civil Harassment Restraining
Orders
2 Judges

MANTECA

Criminal – Traffic,
Misdemeanors, Felony
Preliminary Hearings
Civil – Lawsuits \$25,000 or less,
Unlawful Detainers, Small Claims,
Civil Harassment Restraining
Orders
2 Judges