

parameters consist of new caseweights and new formulas that produce more accurate workload estimates.

Council action

The Judicial Council approved the updated RAS model parameters for use in estimating court staff workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be made by AOC staff as the data become available. With the approval of the updated model, the Judicial Council specified that the updated RAS model is not intended to set the funding needs for any court. It is merely one tool to use in the budgeting process.

Item N Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations: 2 Percent State-Level Reserve

The AOC submitted, for the Judicial Council's consideration: (1) Recommendations and options on two courts' applications for supplemental funding related to unanticipated expenses. The amount remaining in the 2 percent, state-level reserve set aside in the Trial Court Trust Fund for fiscal year 2012–2013 is \$27.7 million. By statute, the Judicial Council after October 31 and before March 15 of each fiscal year may distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from any trial courts for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs. (2) Allocations to all courts, to be distributed after March 15, of a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve.

One court withdrew its application, leaving one remaining application for council consideration, from the Superior Court of California, County of Kings, represented in the meeting by Assistant Presiding Judge Stephen D. Barnes.

Council action

1. The Judicial Council, approved, with two opposing votes, allocating to the Superior Court of California, County of Kings up to \$2.11 million and made the distribution of funding contingent upon the following terms and conditions:
 - a. The court will use its best efforts to spread the cost of the project over the full five-year period so as to minimize each year's distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
 - b. The court is allocated \$733,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for FY 2012–2013. Any unused distribution amount from the 2 percent state level reserve in FY 2012–2013 should be used in FY 2013–2014.
 - c. The funds will be distributed upon the submission of invoices for products and services necessary to acquire and deploy the court's case management system.
 - d. Any allocations for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 would come from that year's Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
 - e. In order to receive a distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 for the project, the court must provide a projection of all project costs, and detailed financial information demonstrating why it is unable to address those costs within existing resources, to the Judicial Council by no later than November 1 of each year.

- f. The Administrative Director of the Courts will monitor the project and costs (including invoices) submitted and the payments made to assure that the distributions are appropriate.
 - g. The court will provide the Administrative Director of the Courts with access to all records necessary to evaluate and monitor the project and will cooperate fully with efforts of the Trial Court Liaison Office to do so.
2. The Judicial Council also approved allocating a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve to be distributed after March 15 to all trial courts.

Item O AOC Restructuring: Vendor Options for Classification and Compensation Study

The Administrative Director of the Courts requested that the Judicial Council select and approve one of three options to perform a review of the classification structure and compensation plan for the AOC. The request was in direct response to Judicial Council Restructuring Directives, directive 19, which states that the Administrative Director must consider “whether an outside entity should conduct these reviews and return to the Judicial Council with an analysis and a recommendation.” The report contained three implementation options: (1) conduct an organization-wide evaluation of the AOC’s classification structure and compensation plan through the use of AOC staff; (2) conduct an organization-wide evaluation of the AOC’s classification structure and compensation plan through the use of an outside entity; or (3) conduct an organization-wide evaluation of the AOC’s classification structure and compensation plan using a hybrid approach in which an outside entity would review manager classifications and above, and AOC staff would review supervisor classifications and below, with oversight and validation of the proprietary methodology provided by an outside entity.

Council action

The Judicial Council directed the AOC to issue request for proposals (RFPs) for conducting a classification and compensation study and deferred a decision pending the results of the RFP process. The AOC will report back to the council on the cost estimates for conducting: (1) an organization-wide evaluation of the AOC’s classification structure and compensation plan through the use of an outside entity; and (2) an organization-wide evaluation of the AOC’s classification structure and compensation plan using a hybrid approach. Under the hybrid approach, an outside entity would review manager classifications and above, and AOC staff would review supervisor classifications and below. Additionally, the outside entity would train HR staff on its methodology, and validate the AOC’s application of that methodology. The Judicial Council also acknowledged that the timelines of the Judicial Council restructuring directives that are tied to the classification and compensation study will require modification to allow time for the RFP process.